

Richard Bernard and His Publics:  
A Puritan Minister as Author

By

Amy Gant Tan

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

History

August, 2015

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Peter G. Lake, Ph.D.

Joel F. Harrington, Ph.D.

Jane G. Landers, Ph.D.

Paul C. H. Lim, Ph.D.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TRANSCRIPTION .....	vi
ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	vii
ABBREVIATIONS USED AND PUBLICATION DETAILS: RICHARD BERNARD’S PRINT CORPUS THROUGH 1644.....	viii
TERMINOLOGY.....	xvi
Chapter	
1. Introduction .....	1
Historiographical context.....	2
Structure.....	10
Biographical sketch: Author-minister Richard Bernard.....	12
2. The Se-Baptist, the Archbishop of York, and the making of a moderate nonconformist author-minister.....	37
Slow steps toward separatism.....	38
Writing against the Church of England.....	42
Slow steps toward (moderate non-)conformity.....	44
Publishing against the separatists.....	49
Slow steps away from publishing about separatism.....	70
Conclusion.....	87
3. <i>The Faithful Shepherd</i> and the making of a faithful shepherd.....	90
Context of pastoral manuals.....	92
1607: A dual approach of careful study and personal application .....	96
1609: A similar goal with more assistance for ministers.....	108
1621: Broadening the context: toward a more holistic picture of ministry.....	111
Sermons into print? .....	116
Conclusion.....	135
4. “This familiar and plain manner of catechizing”: Richard Bernard’s catechetical practices and publications in historical context .....	136
Bernard’s religious-educational and catechetical work: Theory, theology, and practice.....	137

Bernard’s catechetical publications: Doctrinal issues and pastoral goals.....	143
Bernard’s catechetical publications: Ecclesiastical pressures.....	151
Conclusion.....	163
5. The Bishop of Rome and the minister of Batcombe: Contextualizing Bernard’s anti-Catholic writing .....	166
Catholicism as an enduring, but not central, concern to 1616.....	168
A transition to more focused anti-Catholic concern, c.1616.....	172
Catholicism as a key concern, with an international clash of Protestant and Catholic forces seen to be near at hand, 1617-1621.....	180
Catholicism as a key, but a fraught, concern, 1622-1626.....	197
A reduced focus on Catholicism, post-1626.....	207
6. A witchcraft trial, a guide, and an allegory: How events related to the 1626 Taunton summer assizes influenced two publications.....	215
Bernard and purported supernatural activity.....	217
<i>Isle</i> and the 1626 trial.....	230
<i>Guide</i> and Bernard’s self-defense.....	240
<i>Guide</i> and Bernard’s message for those too inclined to identify phenomena as bewitchment...246	
<i>Guide</i> and Bernard’s message for those who could help eradicate witchcraft from society.....	253
Responses to <i>Guide</i> and <i>Isle</i> .....	258
7. Manuscript, print, and restrictions within the national church, 1630-1641 (Or: godly moderate non-conformity meets Laudian moderate non-licensure) .....	261
Bernard’s situation in the early 1630s.....	264
1633 and the question of the Sabbath.....	265
The 1634 visitation, part I: A bit of parish trouble.....	267
The 1634 visitation, part II: The “Laudian style” comes to Batcombe.....	279
1635 and the silenced ministers.....	282
Bernard’s continued effort to conform—and print—in the 1630s.....	285
Laudian moderate non-licensure? .....	296
To the presses! .....	301
A new face of conformity? .....	303
8. Conclusion .....	313
REFERENCES .....	319

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has been a privilege to study and write at Vanderbilt over the past years. The faculty, students, and staff have fostered an atmosphere of scholarly excellence coupled with warmth and collegiality; I am grateful to have been a part of this culture, and my work is the better for it.

I cannot—and indeed do not want to—imagine what this project would look like without the influence of Peter Lake. He first suggested I look at Bernard’s work, and certain parts of his own research (especially on John Andrewes) prompted the direction of my early inquiries into print and parish. Throughout the project, Peter’s unfailing generosity with his time, his perceptive reading of my drafts, and his enthusiasm for my work have been invaluable. His influence appears here in many more ways than I could possibly enumerate.

Paul Lim helped to direct a significant portion of my early coursework, and he, Joel Harrington, and Jane Landers have encouraged my research and helped me broaden my understanding of the early modern period in important ways. Carole Levin introduced me to the study of British history over a decade ago, and I am thankful for her continuing support of my work as well as her friendship. Kenneth Fincham has generously shared his extensive knowledge of Bernard and of key ecclesiastical sources; his comments, questions, and support of my work have been of great value. Ann Hughes has raised helpful questions and pointed me toward useful sources in conversations and email exchanges at both the beginning and end of this project. Michael Bess, Bill Bullman, John Coffey, Lisa Diller, Freddy Dominguez, Jim Epstein, Karl Gunther, David Hall, Rebecca Hayes, Sarah Igo, Robert Ingram, David Magliocco, Julia Merritt, Anthony Milton, Isaac Stephens, Michael Winship, and Jayme Yeo have heard or read portions of this work; I am grateful for their ideas, encouragements, and thoughtful critiques. My fellow graduate students at Vanderbilt, including Jessica Burch, Jenifer Dodd, Frances Kolb, Kate Lazo, Drew Martin, Ansley Quiros, and Chance Woods, have been sources of assistance, useful criticism, and good cheer. Several other individuals generously listened to my work at the IHR Religious History of Britain 1500-1800 Seminar, the Southern Conference on British Studies, the South Central Renaissance Conference, and Vanderbilt—all helped shape the direction of this project.

I have received support for this work from multiple sources. The Graduate School provided a stipend for five years and multiple short-term travel awards. The history department provided funds for travel and for paleographic training. A Binkley Award enabled me to procure

digital images of archival material. I am grateful for the assistance of the librarians and staff members at the Vanderbilt libraries, especially Interlibrary Loan and the Divinity Library. I have also benefited from the assistance of archivists and staff members at numerous institutions. To procure digital resources, I corresponded with helpful individuals from the American Antiquarian Society, the Cambridge University Library, the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the Pilgrim Hall Museum (from the latter, Stephen O'Neill gave generous attention to several inquiries). I received warm welcomes and invaluable assistance at the Batcombe Heritage Centre, the Beinecke Library, the British Library, the Bodleian Library, Dr. Williams's Library, the Somerset Heritage Centre, and the Wells Cathedral Chained Library. Batcombe resident Donald Sage shared his extensive local knowledge and provided a fascinating and informative tour of the church.

The Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities has been a significant part of my graduate career, allowing me both to deepen and to broaden the scope of my research. Along with supporting seminars with which I was involved, the Center funded archival travel as part of my work as a 2013-2014 HASTAC Scholar. As a 2014-2015 Graduate Student Fellow, I received financial support to complete my project and was able to do so alongside an excellent cohort of fellows. The Warren Center's Executive Director, Mona Frederick, has encouraged and assisted my research and professional development in numerous significant ways.

The administrative staff in the History Department and Warren Center—Heidi Welch, Jane Anderson, Brenda Hummel, Tiffany Giese, Chris Lindsey, Allison Thompson, Terry Tripp, and Joy Ramirez—have all been constantly helpful, handling questions, requests, and other details with ease. Many friends, especially Kristin Butterfield, have encouraged me throughout the project, and many in my local church have regularly asked about and prayed for my progress. I remain grateful to my high school English teacher, Nina Wolford, for shaping my thoughts about reading and writing in ways that continue to influence my work. My grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins have been constantly encouraging and have asked thoughtful questions. My brother, Craig, has been always ready to have good conversations related to my studies. My parents have been kind and supportive in ways that I hope someday to be for others. It is impossible to summarize the ways that my husband, Jason, has helped me bring this project to completion—and that is only one of the reasons I am thankful for his presence in my life.

*Soli deo gloria.*

## TRANSCRIPTION

When referring to the title of a seventeenth century publication, I have retained the original spelling in an effort to make works easier to locate. Otherwise, when quoting from seventeenth century materials, I have standardized and modernized spelling, capitalization, punctuation and changes in typeface. However, when quoting from a modern edition of a seventeenth century work, I have not made further changes.

## ABBREVIATIONS USED

AAS	American Antiquarian Society
<i>Archive.org</i>	<i>Archive.org</i> < <a href="https://archive.org">https://archive.org</a> >
BEI	Beinecke Library, Yale University
BHC	Batcombe Heritage Centre
BL	British Library
BOD	Bodleian Library, Oxford
<i>CCEd</i>	<i>The Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540-1835</i> . < <a href="http://theclergydatabase.org.uk">http://theclergydatabase.org.uk</a> >
CUL	Cambridge University Library
DWL	Dr Williams's Library
EEBO	<i>Early English Books Online</i> < <a href="http://eebo.chadwyck.com">eebo.chadwyck.com</a> >
<i>Google books</i>	<i>Google Books</i> < <a href="https://books.google.com">https://books.google.com</a> >
HP	<i>The Hartlib Papers</i> < <a href="http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/hartlib">http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/hartlib</a> >
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, 2009. < <a href="http://www.oxforddnb.com">http://www.oxforddnb.com</a> >
PH	Pilgrim Hall Museum, Plymouth, MA
SRO	Somerset Record Office/Somerset Heritage Centre
TNA PRO	The National Archives: Public Record Office
TNA SP	<i>State Papers Online: The Government of Britain, 1509-1714</i> < <a href="http://go.galegroup.com">go.galegroup.com</a> >
WCL	Wells Cathedral Chained Library
WP	Whitelocke Papers from the Archives of the Marquess of Bath

ABBREVIATIONS USED AND PUBLICATION DETAILS:  
RICHARD BERNARD'S PRINT CORPUS THROUGH 1644

Abbreviation used	Publication details
<i>Terence</i>	R. B., <i>Terence in English Fabulae comici facetissimi et elegantissimi poetae Terentii omnes Anglicae factae primúmque hac noua forma nunc editae</i> . Cambridge: John Legat, 1598.
	<p><i>Later printings:</i> 1607, Cambridge: John Legat. 1614, London: John Legat. 1629, Printed by John Legat, to be sold by James Boler. 1641, Printed by John Legat, to be sold by Andrew Crooke.</p>
<i>Large Catechisme</i>	<p><i>A Large catechisme following the order of the common authorized catechisme published for the vse of his Christian friends and welwillers, the inhabitants of Worsopp, Gainsborough, and Epworth</i>. Cambridge: printed by John Legat, to be sold by Simon Waterson, 1602.</p>
	<p><i>Note:</i> Contents included in <i>Double Catechisme</i> and <i>Iosuahs</i>.</p>
<i>Double Catechisme</i>	<p><i>A double catechisme one more large, following the order of the common authorized catechisme, and an exposition thereof: now this second time published: the other shorter for the weaker sort: both set forth for the benefit of Christian friends and wel-willers</i>. Cambridge: Printed by John Legate, 1607.</p>
	<p><i>Later printing:</i> 1609, Cambridge: Printed by John Legate.</p>
	<p><i>Note:</i> Contents included in <i>Iosuahs</i>. Includes contents from <i>Large Catechisme</i>.</p>
<i>Faithfull Shepherd (1607)</i>	<p><i>The faithfull shepheard the shepheards faithfulness: wherein is for the matter largely, but for the maner, in few words, set forth the excellencie and necessitie of the ministerie; a ministers properties and dutie; his entrance into this function and charge; how to begin fitly to instruct his people; catechising and preaching; and a good plaine order and method therein: not so as yet published ...</i> London: Printed by Arnold Hatfield for John Bill, 1607.</p>
	<p><i>Note:</i> See below for revised editions of 1609 and 1621.</p>
<i>Separatists Schisme</i>	<p><i>Christian advertisements and counsels of peace Also disswasions from the separatists schisme, commonly called Brownisme, which is set apart from such truths as they take from vs and other reformed churches, and is nakedly discouered, that so the falsitie thereof may better be discerned, and so iustly condemned and wisely auoided. Published, for the benefit of the humble and godlie louer of the truth.</i></p>



---

London: Printed by Felix Kyngston, 1608.

*Licensed 18 June 1608, Powell and the wardens.*

*Note:* I abbreviated the title of this work using its middle portion, *Separatists Schisme*; this reflects the way that many of Bernard's contemporaries referred to the work.

---

*Faithfull  
Shepherd* (1609)

*The faithfull shepheard amended and enlarged: with the shepards practise in preaching annexed thereunto: or his maner of feeding his flocke. Published by Richard Barnerd ... Much in a little: see the contents.* London: Printed by Arnold Hatfield for John Bill, 1609.

*Note:* See other editions of 1607 and 1621.

*Note:* The digital copy on *EEBO* omits *The Shepherds Practice*, a sermon appended to the work that is noted on the title page. Other extant copies include it.

---

*Sinners Safetie*

*The sinners safetie, if heere hee looke for assurance.*  
London: Printed by H.L. for T.M. and Jonas Man, 1609.

*Licensed 23 November 1608, Speight and the wardens.*

---

*Contemplative  
Pictures*

*Contemplative pictures with wholesome precepts. The first part: Of God. Of the diuell. Of goodnesse. Of badnesse. Of heauen: and of hell.*  
London : Printed by William Hall for William Welbie, 1610.

*Licensed 18 December 1609, Speight and the wardens.*

---

*Plaine Euidences*

*Plaine euidences The Church of England is apostolicall, the separation schismaticall. Directed against Mr. Ainsworth the Separatist, and Mr. Smith the Se-baptist: both of them seuerally opposing the booke called the Separatists schisme. Set out by authoritie.*  
London: Printed by T. Snodham for Edward Weaver and William Welby, 1610.

*Note:* See *Stationers Registers* for Oct. 1, 1610.

---

*Iosuahs Godly  
Resolution*

*Iosuahs godly resolution in conference with Caleb, touching houshold gouernement for well ordering a familie With a twofold catechisme for instruction of youth; the first short, for the weaker sort, set forth in sixe principall points; the latter large for other of greater growth, and followeth the order of the common authorized catechisme, and is an explanation thereof: both set forth for the benefit of his Christian friends and wel-willers.*

London : Printed by John Legat to be sold by Simon Waterson, 1612.

*Later printings under altered title:*

1629, by John Legatt to be sold by Simon Waterson.

1629, by John Legatt to be sold by John Powell (in Taunton).

*Note:* Later printings had revised dedicatory epistles.

<i>Two Twinnes</i>	<p><i>Two twinnes: or Two parts of one portion of scripture. I. Is of catechising. II. Of the ministers maintenance.</i>  London: Printed for George Norton, 1613.</p> <p>Note: The STC identifies the printer as T. Snodham.</p>
<i>Weekes Worke</i> (1616)	<p>First and second editions not extant.  Third edition: R.B. <i>A weekes worke, and a worke for every weeke.</i>  London : Printed by Felix Kyngston to be sold by Nathanael Newbery, 1616.</p> <p><i>First edition licensed 22 January 1613, Harrison.</i></p> <p><i>Note:</i> See revised edition below.</p>
<i>Dauids Musick</i>	<p>R.B. and R.A. <i>Dauids musick: or Psalmes of that royall prophet, once the sweete singer of that Israel vnfolded logically, expounded paraphrastically, and then followeth a more particular explanation of the words, with manifold doctrines and uses briefly obserued out of the same.</i>  London: Printed by Felix Kyngston for Edmund Weauer, 1616.</p> <p><i>Licensed 16 October 1615, Nid and both wardens.</i></p> <p><i>Note:</i> Alternate edition of the same year excludes Weaver’s name.</p>
<i>Staffe of Comfort</i>	<p><i>A staffe of comfort to stay the weake from falling very needfull for the afflicted.</i> London:  Printed by Felix Kyngston for John Budge, 1616.</p>
n/a	<p>[Book on repentance, pre-1617]</p> <p><i>Note:</i> Bernard made a reference in the “Epistle to the Justices of the Peace” in <i>Key</i> to “my book of legal repentance.” It is apparently not extant.</p>
<i>Key</i>	<p><i>A key of knowledge for the opening of the secret mysteries of St Iohns mysticall Reuelation.</i>  London: Printed by Felix Kyngston, 1617.</p> <p><i>Licensed 8 March 1616/7, Sanford and both wardens.</i></p> <p><i>Note:</i> One of the dedicatory epistles was published separately in 1641 and 1642 as <i>Epistle</i> (see below).</p>
<i>Fabulous Foundation</i>	<p><i>The fabulous foundation of the popedom: or A familiar conference between two friends to the truth Philalethes, and Orthologus shewing that it cannot be proued, that Peter was ever at Rome. VVhereunto is added a chronologicall description of Pauls peregrination with Peters travells, and the reasons why he could not be at Rome...</i>  Oxford: Printed by John Lichfield and James Short for William Spier, 1619.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> Title page is anonymous; Bernard is identified as author inside the work at the conclusion of the epistle.</p>

<i>Faithfull Shepherd</i> (1621)	<i>The faithfull shepard wholly in a manner transposed, and made anew, and very much enlarged both with precepts and examples, to further young diuines in the studie of diuinitie. With the sheperds practise in the end.</i>
	London: Printed for Thomas Pavier, 1621.
	<i>Licensed (as revised edition) 20 Feb. 1620/1, Featley and Cole.</i>
	<i>Note:</i> Licensed on the same day as <i>Seaven Golden Candlestickes</i> .
	<i>Note:</i> See above for 1607 and 1609 editions.
	<i>Note:</i> The STC identifies Eliot's Court Press as the printer.
	<i>Note:</i> The copy on <i>EEBO</i> lacks the final page; other extant copies have it.
<i>Seaven Golden Candlestickes</i>	<i>The seaven golden candlestickes Englands honour. The great mysterie of Gods mercie yet to come. With peace to the pure in heart aduising to vnitie among our selues.</i>
	London: Printed for Iohn Badge, 1621.
	<i>Licensed 20 February 1620/1, Featley and Lownes.</i>
	<i>Note:</i> The STC identifies William Stansby as the printer.
	<i>Note:</i> The final section of this work is a revision of <i>Christian Advertisements</i> , which appears as the first section in <i>Separatists Schisme</i> .
	<i>Note:</i> Licensed on the same day as <i>Faithfull Shepherd</i> (1621).
<i>Good Mans Grace</i>	<i>The good mans grace. Or His stay in all distresse.</i>
	London: Printed by Felix Kingston, 1621.
<i>Looke Beyond Luther</i>	<i>Looke beyond Luther: or, An ansuere to that question, so often and so insultingly proposed by our aduersaries, asking vs, where this our religion was before Luthers time? whereto are added sound props to beare vp honest-hearted Protestants, that they fall not from their sauing-faith.</i>
	London: Printed by Felix Kyngston to be sold by Edmund Weauer, 1623.
	<i>Licensed 11 September 1623, Featley and Cole.</i>
	<i>Later printings:</i> 1623 variant (note different closing to dedicatory epistle) 1624.
<i>Rhemes Against Rome</i>	<i>Rhemes against Rome: or, The remoouing of the gagg of the new Gospell, and rightly placing it in the mouthes of the Romists, by the Rhemists in their English translation of the Scriptures. Which counter-gagg is heere fitted by the industrious hand of Richard Bernard.</i>
	London: Printed by Felix Kingston for Edward Blackmore, 1626.

---

*Licensed 27 June 1625, Goade and Lownes.*

*Alternate printing:*  
1626, printed for Robert Milbourne.

---

*Isle (1626)* R. B. *The isle of man: or, The legall proceeding in Man-shire against sinne. Wherein, by way of a continued allegorie, the chiefe malefactors disturbing both church and commonwealth, are detected and attached; with their arraignment, and iudiciall tryall, according to the lawes of England. : A necessarie direction for waifaring Christians, not acquainted with those perillous wayes they must passe, before they happily arriue at their wished hauen.*  
London: Printed for Edward Blackmore, 1626.

*Licensed 4 November 1626, Featley and both wardens.*

*Later printings:*  
1627, by G.M. for Edward Blackmoore.

*Note:* Both the second and third editions had been published by 1627; see below for revised editions.

---

*Guide* *A guide to grand-iury men diuided into two bookes: in the first, is the authors best aduice to them what to doe, before they bring in a billa vera in cases of witchcraft, with a Christian direction to such as are too much giuen vpon euery crosse to thinke themselues bewitched. In the second, is a treatise touching witches good and bad, how they may be knowne, euicted, condemned, with many particulars tending thereunto.*  
London: Printed by Felix Kyngston for Edward Blackmore, 1627.

*Licensed 3 May 1627, Jeffray and Knight.*

*Later printings:*  
1629, Printed by Felix Kyngston for Edward Blackmore.  
1630, Printed by Felix Kyngston for Edward Blackmore.

---

*Isle (1627)* R. B. *The Isle of Man: or, the legall proceeding in Man-shire against sinne Wherein, by way of a continued allegorie, the chiefe malefactors disturbing both Church and common-wealth, are detected and attached; with their arraignment, and iudiciall triall, according to the lawes of England. The spirituall vse thereof, with an apologie for the manner of handling, most necessary to be first read, for direction in the right vse of the allegory thorowout, is added in the end.*  
London: Printed for Edw. Blackmore, 1627.

*Note:* Revised fourth edition. The STC identifies the printers for this edition as Eliot's Court Press and George Miller.

*Later printings:*  
1628, Printed for Edward Blackmore.  
1629, Printed for Edward Blackmore.  
1630, Printed for Edward Blackmoore.

---

1632, Printed by G.M. for Edward Blackmore.  
1634, Printed by G.M. for Edward Blackmore.  
1635, Printed by I.H. for Edward Blackmore.  
1640, Printed by G.M. for Edward Blackmore.

---

*Ruths Recompence*     *Ruths recompence: or a commentarie vpon the booke of Ruth wherein is shewed her happy calling out of her owne country and people, into the fellowship and society of the Lords inheritance: her vertuous life and holy carriage amongst them: and then, her reward in Gods mercy, being by an honourable marriage made a mother in Israel: deliuered in seuerall sermons, the briefe summe whereof is now published for the benefit of the Church of God.*  
London: Printed by Felix Kyngston to be sold by Simon Waterson, 1628.

*Licensed 8 April 1627, Featley and Knight.*

---

*Weekes Worke*  
(1628)     R.B. *A weekes worke, and a worke for every weeke.*  
London: Printed by Felix Kyngston to be sold by Simon Waterson, 1628.

*Note:* See above for earlier editions. “Fourth edition corrected and amended with diverse prayers added thereunto...” In addition, the dedicatory epistles are changed, and one of the main speakers in the dialogue changed from “Gaius” to “Virtuous Lady.”

---

*Bible-Battells*     *The Bible-battells. Or The sacred art military For the rightly wageing of warre according to Holy Writ. Compiled for the vse of all such valiant worthies, and vertuously valerous souldiers, as vpon all iust occasions be ready to affront the enemies of God, our king, and country.*  
Printed for Edward Blackmore to be sold by James Boler, 1629.

*Licensed 1 April 1629, Jeffray and Weaver.*

*Note:* The STC identifies the place of publication as London and the printer as W. Jones.

---

*Common*  
*Catechisme*     *The common catechisme with a commentary therevpon, by questions and answers, following the verie words, as they lie in their order without alteration. A profitable way, as also verie easie, and so likewise pleasant both to the teacher and learner, as by experience will be found true.*  
London : Printed by William Stansby for Samuel Man, 1630.

*Later printings:*

1632, Printed by I.B. for Samuel Man. [STC identifies I.B. as John Beale]  
1634, by I.N. for Samuel Man [STC identifies I.N. as John Norton]  
1640, Printed by Iohn Norton for Samuel Man.

---

*Creede*     *Good Christian looke to thy creede : for a true triall of an holy profession, and of the truth of religion, from all crooked by-paths.*  
London: Printed by Felix Kyngston to be sold by Edward Blackmore, 1630.

*Licensed 7 February 1629/30, Buckner and Purfoote.*

<i>Conscience</i>	<p><i>Christian see to thy conscience or a treatise of the nature, the kinds and manifold differences of conscience, all very briefly, and yet more fully laid open then hitherto. Anno 1630.</i>  London: Printed by Felix Kyngston for Edward Blackmore, 1631.</p> <p><i>Licensed 28 December 1630, Buckner and Kingstone.</i></p>
<i>Ready Way</i>	<p><i>The ready way to good works, or, A treatise of charitie wherein, besides many other things, is shewed how wee may bee alwayes readie, and prepared both in affection and action to give cheerefully to the poor and to pious uses never heretofore published.</i>  London: Printed by Felix Kyngston to be sold by Edward Blackmore, 1635.</p> <p><i>Licensed 4 October 1634, Baker and both wardens.</i></p>
<i>Threefold Treatise</i>	<p><i>A threefold treatise of the Sabbath distinctly divided into the patriarchall, mosaicall, Christian Sabbath : for the better clearing and manifestation of the truth.</i>  London : Printed by Richard Bishop for Edward Blackmore, 1641.</p> <p><i>Licensed 8 February 1640, Hansley and Man.</i></p>
<i>Article</i>	<p><i>The article of Christs descension into hell fully in the true sense thereof layd open.</i>  London: Printed by John Beale for Thomas Underhill, 1641.</p> <p><i>Licensed 7 April 1641, Hansley and Downes.</i></p>
<i>Praelaticall Church</i>	<p>Anon. <i>A short viewv of the praelaticall Church of England wherein is set forth the horrible abuses in discipline and government : layd open in ten sections by way of quaere and petition to the high and honourable court of Parliament : the severall heads whereof are set downe in the next two pages : newly corrected with additions : together with a short draught of church-government.</i>  1641.</p> <p><i>Note: Multiple editions in 1641.</i></p>
<i>Epistle</i>	<p>R.B. <i>An epistle directed to all iustices of peace in England and Wales And presented to the High Court of Parliament by R.B.</i>  London: Printed for M.S., 1641.</p> <p><i>Note: This work reprints one of the epistles from Key. The title page includes a woodcut of Charles I.</i></p> <p><i>Later printing:</i>  1642, Printed for M.S. No author listed. No woodcut of Charles I.</p>
<i>Worke</i>	<p>Anon. <i>A vvorke for the wisely considerate. In three distinct parts. Very usefull for the present time. 1. A primitive truth, which is, that elders were the onely bishops for the first hundred yeares after Christ. 2. An undoubted position concerning the worship of God, and all the parts thereof. 3. Certaine propositions concerning separation. Certain propositions gathered out of</i></p>

---

*Master Ch. his booke.*  
1641.

Note: Contents include the text of *Certaine Positions*, below.

---

*Thesaurus*      *Thesaurus Biblicus seu Promptuarium sacrum Whereunto are added all the marginall readings, with the words of the text, and many words in the text expounded by the text, all alphabetically set downe throughout the Bible. In the end is annexed an abstract of the principal matters in the Holy Scripture.*

London: Printed by Felix Kingston for Andrew Crooke, 1644.

*Licensed 2 April 1641, Hansley and Downes.*

*Note:* Bound with *Abstract*, below. *Abstract* may have been licensed together with this work; it was apparently printed first.

*Alternate Printing:*  
1644, to be sold by Kingston.

---

*Abstract*      *The Bibles abstract and epitome the capitall heads, examples, sentences, and precepts of all the principall matters in theologie : collected together for the most part alphabetically, with the doctrine and uses compendiously explained of all the chiefe points therein contayned : taken out of the best moderne divines, both reverend and learned.*

London: by G.M. for Andrew Crooke, 1642.

*Note:* Licensed with and bound with *Thesaurus*, above.

---

*Certaine Positions*      *Certaine positions seriously to bee considered of shewing the danger of doing any thing in and about the worship of God that hath not warrant from his written word.*

Printed for Giles Calvert, 1644.

*Note:* Contents included in *Worke*, above.

## TERMINOLOGY

It is something of a convention in histories of early modern English religion to mention how a work will identify and make reference to those who have been described at certain junctures as the “hotter sort of Protestants.” In this work I am not concerned with whether a particular individual was or was not definitely a “puritan” according to some precise yet ultimately arbitrary measurement. Rather, my interest in religious beliefs and their resultant actions and words has led me in this work to think of categories somewhat loosely. As a result, I have used the terms “godly” and “puritan” interchangeably, although I have generally preferred the former because, to my mind, it does a better job of communicating that it represents a permeable range of religious positions.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, even having defined “godly” or “puritan” in a flexible way, these terms are useful precisely because they allow us to discuss individuals or groups that displayed certain tendencies—and ultimately, to place them in contrast with other individuals or groups that do not.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, it is helpful to recognize certain positions that members of the godly community tended to maintain. These typically included an unabashed reformed (Calvinistic) interpretation of the Scriptures; a focus on the importance of preaching; a pursuit of a disciplined, experimental form of practical divinity; a strict observance of the Sabbath; and a constant antagonism toward the Pope himself, Catholicism in general, and any vestiges thereof which remained within the Church of England. Even so, I trust that readers will take references to “puritans” and “the godly” not as ontological assignments but as signposts whose function is to quickly and roughly orient them to a historical landscape that I hope will become sufficiently clear and nuanced over the course of the work.

When appropriate, I have categorized individuals according to their status in reference to the national church; because these positions are dependent on particular behaviors they are comparatively easier to define. They primarily include “separatist,” “nonconformist,” and

---

<sup>1</sup> Both “puritan” and “puritanism” had contemporary use, and the designation was not merely a term of abuse but also a term owned by certain individuals. See for example Lake, “The Court, the Country...,” 33, 40. Yet it is worth noting that Richard Bernard, whom this work discusses at length, used the term “puritan” to describe the position of Presbyterians as distinct from his own position: *Separatists Schisme*, 1. Nevertheless, Bernard can fairly be labeled a puritan according to most descriptions that scholars have produced in recent years.

<sup>2</sup> In general, my thinking follows, among several scholars, Rosemary O’Day and Peter Lake. O’Day, *The English Clergy*; Lake, “Defining puritanism—again?”



“conformist.” The derivative term “moderate non-conformist,” indicates an official position of conformity mixed with occasional, intentional deviation from church policies.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> I have taken this as a primary designation for Bernard; this follows Kenneth Fincham, who has observed that Bernard’s career “exemplifies ‘moderate’ nonconformity in the Jacobean church.” *Prelate as Pastor*, 229.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In what ways could publishing enhance, extend, limit, or change early modern pastoral ministry? How might ecclesiastical pressures or parish situations have influenced the genre or content of works a minister composed or the timing in which he chose to publish them? Was authorship necessarily a side project for the clergy, or could there be a true sense of bi-vocationality as an “author-minister”? More broadly, how might we better understand early modern English print culture and post-Reformation English religion if we were to couple questions about the professionalization of the clerical ministry with questions about the nature and impact of print at all levels of society?

These questions have informed the progress and scope of the present work, which seeks to demonstrate that, for a certain subset of ministers who actively pursued print authorship, there were close and nuanced connections between print and pastoral ministry. Activities in the parish, changes within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and ministers’ varied personal and religious goals could each affect the timing and the content of publications. In turn, the ability to publish could influence the way a minister chose to do his work and chose to allot his time. In the case of author-ministers and their works, only by considering print and parish ministry together can we truly understand their publications, on the one hand, and their vision for pastoral ministry, on the other.

Because ministerial careers and authorial agendas were based in particular sets of complex circumstances, demonstrating the nuanced connections between print and parish requires a sufficiently detailed exploration of the situations surrounding an author-minister’s activities. To do so, I chose to center this study on “godly” or puritan author-ministers, and specifically upon a particular case that effectively demonstrates how these different influences and activities might interact over the course of a career. I selected Richard Bernard, whose career was in many ways extremely typical of many godly, moderate non-conformist ministers of the period, and yet also atypical in a few, very helpful ways.<sup>4</sup> He was typical in that his personal choices reflected the theological commitments associated with a reformed, godly ministry, and he actively participated in

---

<sup>4</sup> Because this is a case study rather than a full biography, I focus my attention on relevant parts of Bernard’s life and work; although the study is thorough, I have not made an attempt to compile everything one can possibly know about Bernard and his situation. I trace many, but not all, of his known connections. I make reference to numerous archival sources, but I pay particular attention to some while mentioning others only in passing.

a network of like-minded individuals. Yet he was atypical in that he was particularly attentive to the possible uses of print for religious purposes; as a result, he published in a remarkably broad range of genres—from imaginative to polemic to poetic—through which he addressed a tantalizing range of topics. While a good number of godly ministers had sermons or writings published either during life or posthumously, Bernard is one of a smaller number of ministers who deliberately composed and manipulated multiple works for a print audience. Moreover, he regularly remarked upon the motivations for his writing, his desires for readers or hearers, and the situations surrounding publication, to a degree that has been particularly helpful for this type of study. In short, Bernard's career is an ideal lens through which to address the relationship between authorship and pastoral ministry in early Stuart England.

Through this case study, I demonstrate specific ways that the pastoral vocation influenced work as an author, and vice versa. By this close look at Bernard, I suggest more generally that the notion of bi-vocationality as an author-minister was possible in this period and that these two vocations could be closely connected. Participation in the print marketplace could be an integral part of the pastoral vocation as author-ministers strategically deployed print works in particular genres in a conscious effort to extend their ministries and foster continued reformation within the lives of individual parishioners and in the institution of the national church. In that regard, the primary aims of this study are to interrogate the phenomenon of puritan ministerial publishing, consider the relationship between parish ministry and print ministry, examine the audiences that ministers attempted to reach with certain genres or types of writing, and assess the goals they had for each area of ministry. By uncovering instances in which life and art influenced one another, it becomes clear that the two vocations could be intimately interconnected. Considering an author-minister's participation in one of these vocations can provide insights into his work in the other.

### Historiographical context

A recent trend in scholarship of early modern English religion is to examine religious experience; this is usually accomplished through a focus on devotional activity and coupled with some method of excluding from analysis portions of theology and praxis deemed to have had little bearing on internal, affective piety.<sup>5</sup> Yet attempting to identify and isolate devotional expression depends on anachronistic categorical divisions, conflates or erases key nuances, and tends to

---

<sup>5</sup> This includes works such as Green, *Print and Protestantism*, and, more recently, Ryrie, *Being Protestant*.

produce a false picture of a vaguely defined, homogenously “Protestant” populace largely unengaged with the major theological, political, and even social changes of the day.<sup>6</sup> Yet devotional works often addressed timely political, theological, and social issues (though sometimes in subtle ways); theological or polemical works often included clear references to internal spiritual activity; and even unpublished records of personal prayer and meditation frequently demonstrated a keen engagement with theology and controversy.

This study joins with works that reject tendencies to separate private devotion from other expressions of religious interest or homogenize Protestant devotion. Through a close analysis of the context of a range of works in a variety of different genres, this project demonstrates the interconnections among even the most basic devotional literature and key ecclesiastical, theological, and political issues—and moreover shows that Bernard as an author expected careful readers to pick up on these connections. In addition, through a close analysis of the content of these works, the study points out that Bernard as author, pastor, teacher, and theologian did not intend believers to see devotional experience (even “zeal”<sup>7</sup>) as separate from other types of religious engagement.

Although attempts to homogenize post-Reformation English Protestantism through an emphasis on devotional activity are historiographically current, they have had a longer life span. Over a decade ago, Peter Lake and Michael Questier noted the need to move away from tendencies to too easily assume unity, and rather “to allow for instability, conflict and contradiction; and to leave room for a notion of change that was the product of the interaction...between the actions and intentions of particular groups and individuals...”<sup>8</sup> In their comments, Lake and Questier also push back against suggestions that ministers played down controversial religious doctrines in their day-to-day pastoral work.<sup>9</sup> The present study, by taking a close look at Bernard’s view of the church and of the people within and beyond its bounds, supports this view. It is clear that throughout his career, Bernard made sharp distinctions in his theology, his practice, and his evaluation of individuals (in this, he went so far as in 1621 to publish a list of ministers from his area whom he considered godly brethren in the ministry—and by including some, excluded others). Bernard’s strong words against various ideas, individuals, and groups demonstrate that he saw clear battle-lines, and even friends might step to the wrong side. Moreover, in materials for the laity

---

<sup>6</sup> See, for instance, Lake with Questier, *The Antichrist’s Lewd Hat*. I am grateful to Peter Lake for sharing with me some of his current research on Samuel Ward of Ipswich, which also addresses these issues.

<sup>7</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, 70ff.

<sup>8</sup> Lake with Questier, *Antichrist’s Lewd Hat*, 318-319.

<sup>9</sup> Lake with Questier, *Antichrist’s Lewd Hat*, 317n.

Bernard did not seek a lowest common denominator of belief; rather, he regularly asserted controversial doctrines (including, but not limited to, predestination) even at times when doing so would mark him as out of step with current trends within the national church. Bernard sought unity, but only according to a very specific set of doctrines and practices that he believed to be biblical.

The present work also addresses the perennial questions regarding the impact of the Reformation(s) including its “success or failure” and its “popularity.” This debate has been pointed within English historiography: for years many works had held that European Reformation was nearly inevitable as a population tired of an ineffective and corrupt clergy and dissatisfied with traditional religion largely embraced the new teachings of Protestantism. In the 1970s and 1980s revisionist historians began to suggest that traditional religion had indeed been quite viable for most of the population and that the Reformation had, in fact, little popular support.<sup>10</sup> Recent works have attempted through various means, and with varied success, to more clearly nuance the effects of the reformation, seeing it as neither a complete “success” nor a complete “failure” but rather as a complex series of events to which individuals at all levels of society might respond in a variety of ways.<sup>11</sup>

Through its analysis of religious print and its audiences, this study provides another counterpoint to those who have seen puritanism as unappealing to most common people. As the work of Andrew Pettegree has discussed, publishers’ decisions to print certain works were largely based on the assumption that a purchasing audience of a certain size existed. Therefore, the existence of a large corpus of godly literature, much of which was composed by author-ministers such as Bernard, which was clearly targeted at laypeople, and which frequently went into multiple editions, suggests the existence of a considerable popular audience for puritan religious print. Moreover, the use of genres that held broad popular appeal demonstrates an effort by author-ministers to cultivate and expand this popular audience. Especially when author-ministers wrote

---

<sup>10</sup> Among several works see Dickens, *The English Reformation*; Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire*; Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People*.

<sup>11</sup> This scholarship is related to studies of puritan ministers and the national church (a lively area of debate as scholars have been considering whether puritanism was a radical fringe movement or a more mainstream subculture) and of the religious culture of puritan communities. In addition to the foundational work of Patrick Collinson, recent studies have helped explain what it meant for a considerable portion of society to hold to a particular set of religious tendencies and, through them, to construct a certain identity, way of life, and plan for the continuance of the church. See, for example, Collinson, *Godly People*; Haigh, *The Plain Man’s Pathway to Heaven*; Lake, *The Boxmaker’s Revenge*; and Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*; along with numerous collections such as Durston and Eales, eds., *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*.

about the same topic in more than one genre, we can discern an attempt to communicate similar religious concepts to individuals at a variety of educational and spiritual levels. Thinking of print ministry as a cohesive program aimed simultaneously at both popular and institutional audiences is key to understanding print's place within author-ministers' careers.

Along with joining the above conversations, this study breaks new ground by bringing together areas of study that have been taken, largely, as separate: on the one hand, studies of post-Reformation British pastoral ministry—including clerical professionalization, preaching, parish ministry, and more—and on the other hand, studies of early modern religious publishing and print culture. On the former topic, several studies have contributed to our understanding of the training, work, beliefs, and lives of post-Reformation clergy; in an English context, this includes work by scholars such as Francis Bremer, Eric Carlson, Kenneth Fincham, Arnold Hunt, Rosemary O'Day, Kenneth Parker, and Tom Webster.<sup>12</sup>

Regarding the latter, there has been a good deal of recent work on aspects of religious print, though of necessity these studies have been limited in various ways that, even when they deal with works by clerical authors, have not allowed the connections between print and pastoral ministry to emerge as clearly as they do in the current project. Some of this work has turned to examinations of particular genres, topics, or debates; or to the reception and contemporary valences of various works. For instance, two of Ian Green's works survey print through the lens of a particular genre (catechism) or type (steady sellers) of publication from a bird's-eye perspective; and Alexandra Walsham's *Providence in Early Modern England* examines several types of works in relation to a particular topic. Some studies have explored the ways that print influenced, and was influenced by, the contemporary religio-political situation, such as Jason Peacey's recent *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*. In the present work, I build upon these works, as well as studies by scholars such as Elizabeth Sauer and Adam Fox, who have discussed the popularity of printed texts, and of Peter Lake, who has emphasized the broad public influence of religious print.<sup>13</sup> I also make reference to topics discussed by Jesse Lander, whose work on a diverse body of texts attempts to situate the origins of early modern polemic in its historical and religious contexts; Alan P. F. Sell, who has examined various types of writing through which separatists and dissenters sought to

---

<sup>12</sup> Bremer, *Congregational Communion*; Parker and Carlson, 'Practical Divinity': *The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham*; Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*; Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*; O'Day, *The English Clergy*; and Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*; among several other relevant works see also Dixon and Schorn-Schutte, eds., *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe* and portions of Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants*.

<sup>13</sup> Sauer, 'Paper-contestations'; Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture*.

spread their ideas; and Ann Hughes, who has noted that “pamphlet controversies often had their origins in direct physical confrontations and debates between adherents of different religious positions, occasions that combined public challenges to opinions with intimate threats to status and position.”<sup>14</sup> Hughes’s work also suggests that polemicists’ writing styles can allow us to see links between high level doctrinal dispute and broader religious controversy; the present work also picks up this line of inquiry.

Some studies of particular individuals have made steps toward combining the study of print and pastoral ministry. Denise Thomas’s work on Thomas Hall discusses aspects of the intersection of these topics, although the aim of her work is more narrowly focused upon the particular issues of Presbyterianism.<sup>15</sup> Perhaps the work with aims closest to my own is Timothy Scott McGinnis’s study of George Gifford. McGinnis rightly considers Gifford’s parish and print work alongside one another, and does so to good effect. Yet again, the connection between parish and print provides a backdrop for a study that is primarily concerned with another topic (here, Gifford’s attitudes toward the “common sort”).<sup>16</sup> In solidifying my own direction in the current study, which highlights the way that print itself—print *as* print—could function as a part of pastoral ministry, I gained initial direction from Peter Lake’s work on John Andrewes. Though Andrewes was not a minister, he did seek to function in the capacity of a religious leader—and indeed a religious leader who saw his work in print as a way of achieving godly religious goals among a broad audience.<sup>17</sup> In this study, I look more broadly at how that could be done, and moreover how print ministry could function alongside, and within, an officially sanctioned ministerial career within the national church.

Combining the study of print and pastoral ministry is an important step. Although it is well known that many ministers had prolific and sometimes wide-ranging print careers, no study has focused upon the importance of print authorship across both the chronological length and the vocational breadth of a ministerial career, examining ways that ministerial participation in the print

---

<sup>14</sup> Green, *The Christian’s ABC and Print and Protestantism*; Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*; Lander, *Inventing Polemic*; Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*; Sell, “Varieties of English Separatist and Dissenting Writings”; and Hughes, “The Meanings of Religious Polemic,” 206. Several works by Peter Lake also belong in this category—among them *Boxmaker’s Revenge* and *Antichrist’s Lewd Hat*.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas, “Religious Polemic, Print Culture and Pastoral Ministry.”

<sup>16</sup> McGinnis, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the common sort*. On similarities between Gifford’s and Bernard’s careers, see the Conclusion.

<sup>17</sup> Lake, “Saving souls or selling (virtual) godliness? The ‘penny godlinesses’ of John Andrewes and the problem of ‘popular puritanism’ in early Stuart England.”

marketplace reflected and interacted with ecclesiastical positions, personal relationships, parish experiences, and theological development. Further, no study has considered didactic and devotional publications meant for the spiritual growth of readers or hearers alongside publications addressing high-level ecclesiastical concerns, seeing both types of literature as interlinking aspects of a much broader program for reform. In the present work I aim to do these things.

By uniting these areas of inquiry, I have been in some ways able to construct a new one: that of the emergence of the professional author-minister—a vocational minister who intentionally embraced print authorship in order to accomplish religious goals. Limiting my focus in this study to early Stuart puritan author-ministers, I highlight the diverse audiences that author-ministers targeted with different types of writing. By utilizing multiple genres and topics, author-ministers could effectively reach audiences of readers or hearers in whom they desired to see intellectual and affective results (results that were, often, very timely). By innovating within or moving between genres, ministers not only navigated ecclesiastical restrictions on certain types of writing but also enhanced their works' appeal for readers who might not have easily understood or been interested in another approach to religious publications.

Treating authorship as part of a cohesive, career-long approach to ministry, I demonstrate that by working as an author, a minister could actually fulfill certain aspects of his pastoral duties. Moreover, by considering publications intended for broad, public audiences alongside those intended for more private, institutional audiences, we can learn more about how these author-ministers saw their position within the national church. Clergy had responsibilities within the hierarchy of the institutional church, and they also had responsibilities in the (sometimes less clearly delineated) social network of a parish. By relating the publications of author-ministers to these two structures, or these two aspects of pastoral work, we can identify how print could enhance different aspects of the pastoral vocation as a minister attempted to spread the gospel and further godly reform both “above” in the institutional Church of England and “below” among parishioners.

Ministers could communicate with their superiors, their fellow clerics, and their own parishioners on a regular basis through in-person encounters and through correspondence. Yet for author-ministers, print offered the potential to reach far more people than they could through personal communication. Print broke down barriers of space and time, allowing ministers to address and potentially influence a remarkably large group of readers and hearers. Yet for these audiences, this study suggests, author-ministers' basic intentions reflected the same, or similar, aims



as in their personal ministry. Toward fellow members of the church hierarchy, ministers would do such things as attempt to correct problems, remonstrate to superiors, reinforce their dedication to the Church and to one another, encourage and equip one another to fight spiritual battles, and strategize about the best way to do the Lord's work. Through print, author-ministers did many of these same things through epistolary dedications, didactic works, and polemics. Among parishioners and other laypeople, ministers would seek to catechize the ignorant, teach the tractable, convert the unregenerate, and spiritually shepherd individuals through life and into death. Through print, author-ministers acted in similar roles by providing didactic and devotional works designed to instruct, to correct, and to encourage general spiritual growth. In other words, print allowed author-ministers to pursue reformation at both individual and institutional levels on an exponentially larger scale than they could in personal ministry alone. The employment of a variety of genres and rhetorical styles was central to this: it allowed author-ministers to reach a broad cross-section of society and to appeal to audiences not just intellectually through instruction but emotionally through a variety of affective rhetorical techniques.

In exploring the interactions between authorship and pastoral ministry, I consider their interactions within Bernard's life in relation to several important aspects of early modern ministry, theology, debate, and society. Though the study primarily analyzes these situations in service of the above historiographical goals, along the way it contributes to several other topics, as well. These include anti-Catholicism, clerical friendship networks, patronage, radical religion, relationships among godly believers in England and New England, millenarianism, individual piety, the collection of data, censorship, gender, witchcraft, genre, audience, the nature of Jacobean and Caroline rule, and more.

I have made a distinction between the study of texts as documentary evidence that can tell us something about an authorial career within its historical context, and the literary study of the texts themselves. Being a historian, I have done the former while, for the most part, avoiding the latter. Nevertheless, I hope that my use of Bernard's texts in order to draw conclusions about the social, religious, political, and cultural contexts that shaped, and were shaped by, the author and his experiences may prove useful to scholars of early modern literature—perhaps, at least, those who take a historicist approach to their work. Moreover, I do make a few more overt interdisciplinary gestures. These are especially, but not exclusively, in my analysis of Bernard's creative publications such as *Isle* and my discussion of the ways he used and adapted different genres throughout his

career. Although my purposes are still those of the historian, in these sections, I make a point to demonstrate how my work may contribute to conversations within literary scholarship.

My study also speaks to the literature on early modern book production and of paratextual printed materials. Both of these are particularly important for understanding the context of texts, yet are too often overlooked, especially within historical and religious studies. I have attempted to keep the context of book production at the fore in two primary ways. I frequently consider the date of publication as well as available licensing information. Where possible, I have discussed how printers and booksellers were part of Bernard's efforts. His work depended upon other individuals for production, and these relationships could have real influence on the way a book was perceived and on its content. Accordingly, it appears that Bernard sought certain partnerships, but also occasionally accepted or became resigned to others in order to see his works in print. In Chapter 2 in the section on Gabriel Powel, and throughout Chapter 7, I focus particularly on the licensing process. In Chapters 4 and 5, I mention issues related to the choice of publishers Felix Kingston and Samuel Man. Altogether, I seek to underscore that the particular individuals involved with book production were not mere accidents of the publishing trade. Investigating these connections further can help scholars better understand early modern book production and authorship.

My study depends in many ways upon the analysis of paratextual material, especially dedicatory epistles and prefatory explanations of a work's contents. Scholars of literature and of history have recently been giving more attention to dedicatory epistles, especially the ways that these could publicly initiate, reflect, reinforce, or even disingenuously suggest, patronage relationships.<sup>18</sup> I contribute by considering the ways that Bernard's epistles to the reader created a relationship with, and explained his publications to, a broad and to some degree imagined public. In addition, I place his dedicatory epistles—many, but not all, addressed to individuals of regional or national social standing—in their context as part of the politico-religious developments of the period and of Bernard's career-long printing ministry.

Because my focus is on author-ministers, in the present work I have generally left out analysis of how parishioners responded when their minister took to print—although some of the situations I describe do suggest certain sorts of reaction from parishioners (or Bernard's perception of their reaction). Bernard occasionally explained that he developed a work in response to a parishioner's request for help; he dedicated publications to friends and patrons both within and

---

<sup>18</sup> For example, Narramore, "Du Vergers Humble Reflections and Dedicatory Epistles as Public Sphere."

beyond his parish; and he encountered opposition from certain parishioners about nearly all his pastoral activities. From these we might conjecture about a large range of responses that average parishioners may have had, depending on a variety of factors. Nevertheless, because my attention here is on the author-minister himself, I leave a full examination of reception for a different study.

## Structure

Each chapter in the present work explores a variety of ways that authorship could become interwoven with aspects of religious ministry both within and beyond the parish. Following a biographical sketch that sets up the case study by orienting the reader to Bernard's career, each chapter analyzes two or more publications, placing them within historical context. Though some chronological jumps were inevitable in order to group discussions of similar publications, as much as possible I have sought to address works in the order in which they appeared. Although my original intention was to organize my chapters by genre, this turned out to be less effective than a chronological approach. As I researched and wrote, I found I could most effectively analyze and explain the content of each work—including, but not limited to, its genre—by considering how contemporary events were shaping Bernard's ideas and immediate religious goals. As such, the need to move to a chronological rather than a topical organization actually reinforced my reasons for contending that print ministry and parish ministry were closely interrelated. In the end, the primarily chronological approach makes the work more readable and makes more obvious which aspects of Bernard's personal experiences were related to each publication. It has the added benefit of making it quite clear that Bernard himself tended to publish certain types of work, on certain topics, in particular periods of his career.

Thus, far from hindering discussion about genre, the chronological approach actually fostered it. Where some scholars have treated particular genres as speaking only in certain registers, my approach emphasizes the broader relevance of genres. Choices of genre, topic, and audience were entangled with a large range of religio-political, ecclesiastical, and pastoral contexts; our analyses must acknowledge this.

Though the overarching aim of the work is to show the varied ways that authorship and pastoral ministry were interlinked, each chapter also makes more specific and nuanced arguments regarding the works it addresses. Following a biographical sketch that introduces Bernard's life and work, in Chapter 2, I explore Bernard's early career, describing key formative experiences

returning from the brink of separatism and publishing against separatists. As later chapters will show, these patterns and contexts shaped his career-long relationship with the national church as well as his publications. In Chapter 3, I analyze Bernard's well-known pastoral manual *The Faithfull Shepherd* alongside his activities related to turning sermons into print publications. I argue that in addition to providing a window into his own vision for ministry, the three editions of *Faithfull Shepherd* show Bernard's increasing awareness of, and responses to, the practical needs of his intended audience. Further, I show that Bernard's interest in print led him (perhaps surprisingly) not to take a progressive and positive view of printed sermons, but rather increasingly to avoid them and instead to fully transform sermon content into other genres before print publication.

In Chapter 4, I analyze Bernard's catechetical practices and his ecclesiastical situation alongside his published catechisms. I show that certain controversial theological concepts appeared even in Bernard's simplest catechism and also that the format of his shorter and longer catechisms indicated his view that the Prayer Book catechism was not wrong to use, but was insufficient. Acknowledging the significant shift in his catechetical publications around 1630, I argue that this change was in response not to a change in his own views but rather an acquiescence to the wishes of his bishop.

Noting that Bernard's anti-Catholic works were limited to approximately one decade, 1617-1627, in Chapter 5 I argue that this shift can be linked both to current debates within the national church and to changes in Bernard's episcopal oversight. Chapter 6 takes an even more narrow chronological perspective as I argue that *Guide* and *Isle*, which were both written in 1626-1627, responded to public and private aspects of his experiences related to a witchcraft trial held in 1626.

In Chapter 7 I seek to refine our understanding of puritan writing under Laudian printing restrictions. Though accepting the contention that some authors may have self-censored, I show that during this period, Bernard did not: he actively pursued publication and was willing to tone down certain objectionable passages in order to achieve licensure. Though his works were mostly rejected, his multiple attempts to have works licensed and published during the 1630s, and his rush to publish several works immediately upon the breakdown of censorship, demonstrate the importance that he believed the press held for the progress of religion.

Although this work uses a case study in order to uncover the often detailed and minute evidence that can help us establish a link between parish and print, I contend that Bernard's career is a useful case primarily because he is not unique. Accordingly, my conclusion (Chapter 8)

suggests comparative cases and outlines how my work can help us move forward more broadly in our understanding of author-ministers, their pastoral careers, and their publications.

### Biographical sketch: Author-minister Richard Bernard

Much of my study uses the career of Richard Bernard to demonstrate the ways that print and ministry could influence one another, using biographical elements from Bernard's life in the service of larger aims. Accordingly, it is useful to briefly outline his life and career. This background will allow me in the chapters ahead to closely examine certain aspects of his work while neither losing, nor being unnecessarily distracted by, the larger context of his career.

#### Family, education, and early ministry

Born and raised in Lincolnshire, Bernard's parents John Bernard and Anne Wright seem to have been of humble means; he later often thanked his patrons the Wray family for their financial support of him in his early scholarly endeavors. He matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge, as a sizar in 1592, proceeding BA in 1595 and MA in 1598.<sup>19</sup> He was ordained priest by John Sterne in 1596.<sup>20</sup> While at Cambridge, Bernard would have become familiar with William Perkins. He must have sat under Perkins in his early years at Christ's, where Perkins held his fellowship until 1594. There, Perkins was part of a "spiritual brotherhood" of godly leaders who followed several reformed continental theologians including Beza, Zanchi, and Ursinus—each of whom would figure into Bernard's theology, and appear throughout his works, in various ways. At Christ's, Bernard likely heard Perkins speak, and may have developed a personal relationship with him. In many ways, Bernard's career would reflect that of Perkins. Although more of Perkins' publications were posthumous or through third parties than Bernard's were, each man ministered through both parish and print. Further, both men showed a very similar range of pastoral and intellectual interests: educating and training young ministers; ministry to those in prison and facing execution; witchcraft; Ramist thought; the age of the earth; and more. Though it is impossible to determine

---

<sup>19</sup> Richard L. Greaves, "Richard Bernard," *ODNB*. John Peile, *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905*, notes that Bernard may have been related to another Richard Bernard, who took his BA from Christ's in 1567.

<sup>20</sup> *CCEd* Record ID 123281 and 200465, which reference SRO D/D/Vc 79 and SRO D/D/Vc 40. Accessed December 30, 2014.

the degree of Perkins' influence on Bernard with certainty, it is probable that this connection influenced his ministry and interests in the years to come.

Almost nothing is known of Bernard's wife, although we may presume the couple married after he completed his time at Cambridge in 1598 and before the birth of their first child in May of 1600. Two sons were born before Bernard took his first ministerial post. Benalleuel was baptized May 6, 1600.<sup>21</sup> Channanuel was born in 1600/01 and later matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford, receiving his BA in 1622-3 and MA in 1625. Channanuel later became a rector in Somerset, and his career saw some controversy including, like his father's, a deprivation from and a return to ministry within the national church. He and his wife Dorothy had many children, and he died in 1668.<sup>22</sup>

At least five additional children were born to Richard Bernard. Besekiell and Hoseel were baptized on Oct. 18, 1602 and April 30, 1605, respectively; nothing further is known of them. Masakiell, baptized Sept. 27, 1607, became a clothier and on March 20, 1636 emigrated from Weymouth, Dorset with his wife, Mary, and two children. The group with whom he traveled, under the leadership of minister Joseph Hull, settled in Weymouth, Massachusetts.<sup>23</sup> Bernard's only known daughter, Mary, was baptized Sept. 24, 1609. She left home as a young woman to work as a maid in Sir William Masham's household, with which she had a connection through her father's patron Richard Whalley. While there, she met Masham's chaplain Roger Williams, and the two were married on December 15, 1629 at High Laver Church, Essex.<sup>24</sup> Not long after their

---

<sup>21</sup> Bernard was still including his two eldest sons' names in the first question of his published catechisms through 1612, but he discontinued this practice in the 1629 edition, substituting generic names. There are no records to indicate that Benalleuel survived into adulthood, though this is possible.

<sup>22</sup> Interesting details from the Pitney parish registers—including personal notes Canannuel wrote about several events, and also a record of his purported embalming, are described in Hayward, "Pitney and its Register Book," 92-99. See also Matthews, *Walker Revised*, 309. Canannuel's son Samuel was buried in Bruton on January 19, 1638; the record indicates that the deceased's father was "of Batcombe," although at that time he had been rector elsewhere for over a decade. *The Registers of Bruton, co. Somerset*, 153.

<sup>23</sup> Masakiell married Mary Boucher, daughter of Johan and John Boucher of Coley, East Harptree, Somerset. John Boucher was a clothier. Both of Masakiell's parents-in-law were deceased before the family left for New England. Frederick Brown, ed., *Abstracts of Somersetshire Wills, etc.*, 89-90.

<sup>24</sup> Richard Whalley was brother in law to Lady Masham. Williams had originally pursued Whalley's daughter Jane, but he was rebuffed by her aunt, Lady Barrington. One of Williams' letters notes that he had turned down two church livings due to a "tender conscience" and had received "a New England call"; however, some scholars have noted he did not seem interested in taking up that call until his advances on Jane had been denied. His unusually immoderate reply to Lady Barrington seems to have resulted in the end of his employment with the Masham family, yet he fairly quickly garnered approval for the union with Mary. *Grafton magazine of History and Genealogy*, Vol. I, 21ff. This source also notes that there is a mention of Mary's brother (Warnerd or Warnard) by name in "Some William Harris Memoranda" which publishes a letter between Harris and Captain Dean of Nov. 14, 1666. On the Warnard/Wernard/Barnard question, see *The new England Historical and Genealogical Register*, Vol. 53, 63, and its corrective in *Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society* Vol. 8, 67-68. *Grafton Magazine* also mentions that at one time Mary followed her own conscience

union, the couple emigrated to America, where Williams would go on to found Rhode Island after trouble with colonial authorities. Bernard's final known child, Beniemine, was baptized Oct. 11, 1613 and was buried the following day.<sup>25</sup>

Having proceeded M.A. from Cambridge in 1598, Bernard spent some time in Epworth, Lincolnshire before taking the parish of Worksop, Nottinghamshire, on the patronage of Richard Whalley.<sup>26</sup> This may have followed some controversy or dispute, as the Worksop Churchwardens' register for 1601 records that 18 pence went "to John Dalton for going into Yorkshire to Oldfield that should have been our vicar."<sup>27</sup>

Worksop sat just on the edge of Sherwood Forest, and the area held some political and religious importance. The continued preferment of several families in the area would eventually lend the name "The Dukeries" to the region. Worksop Manor, held in this period by members of the Talbot family as Earls of Shrewsbury, was home to both Bess of Hardwick and an imprisoned Mary Queen of Scots. When James I took the throne, he was invited to visit Worksop Manor, and it hosted other members of the royal family, as well. Tobie Matthew, then Bishop of Durham, also visited in this period; he preached at Worksop before the queen, prince, and princess on Trinity Sunday 1603 and could have been introduced to Bernard during this time.<sup>28</sup> Worksop Priory had held several lands and buildings before the dissolution of the monasteries; although most of the buildings were soon taken down, portions remained in Bernard's time, including the nave of the Priory, which was converted into the parish church, and the gatehouse, which served as a vicarage. Parish registers for Worksop show roughly five to fifteen marriages, and thirty to fifty christenings, per year during Bernard's time there. With births outnumbering deaths, Bernard had a large and growing flock.<sup>29</sup> In 1604-1605, however, the parish experienced an infectious epidemic (perhaps plague, following recent outbreaks in London). This epidemic increased death rates, particularly

---

and Williams subsequently excluded her from the religious exercises he had set up in their home. Some further research (and some conjecture) regarding Mary's life appears in Easton, "Mary Barnard."

<sup>25</sup> Marshall, ed., *The Registers of Worksop, co. Nottingham, 1558-1771*, 26-36, 124. Collating records of Bernard's children is complicated by the fact that their names are spelled in a wide range of ways; among the more divergent spellings are Canannuel, Canamel, Bengallevel, and Musakiell. On the choice of unusual names for most of his children, see Chapter 2.

<sup>26</sup> CCEd Record ID: 76642. Accessed July 8, 2013.

<sup>27</sup> "Worksop Priory Churchwardens' Book."

<sup>28</sup> Thoresby, *Vicaria Leodiensis*, 159; *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury*, 52-54, 143; Holland, *The History, Antiquities, and Description of the Town and Parish of Worksop*, 38-54; White, *Worksop, the Dukery, and Sherwood Forest*; Edison, *History of Worksop*, 16-19; "Worksop Priory Churchwardens' Book". There are slight differences in the way the latter two sources transcribe the churchwardens' record of the queen's visit.

<sup>29</sup> Marshall, ed., *The Registers of Worksop, co. Nottingham, 1558-1771*, passim. See also Dwelly, ed., *Dwelly's Parish Records* Vol. 1, 58-67.

within certain families in which the infection spread rapidly.<sup>30</sup> This epidemic probably led Bernard both to seek to comfort Worksop parishioners in the face of death and to encourage them to turn to God upon this reminder of his power and coming judgment upon sin.

As I discuss in Chapter 2, Bernard became involved with a regional group of individuals concerned with certain practices and policies of the national church, and he was removed from his post for nonconformity following the Canons of 1604. Several of his associates ultimately chose to separate, while others remained within the national church. Matthew, by this time Archbishop of York, seems to have been particularly influential in recalling Bernard to conformity and encouraging him to pursue pastorally-focused reform within the national church. Following this, some of the region's godly covenanted with Bernard (for a time, until Matthew intervened) in pursuit of a strict religious discipline.

Altogether, with a good-sized congregation, at least some of whom were quite receptive to Bernard's efforts toward religious reform; the opportunity on occasion to encounter powerful individuals; and the benevolent oversight of the Archbishop of York, Bernard had much to appreciate from his living at Worksop. He did not, however, have financial security for his growing family. Although the Worksop Priory had once been wealthy, by this period much of it had passed into secular hands, and as a vicar Bernard was only allotted a portion of those funds that did make their way into the parish.<sup>31</sup> He later noted that he was thankful for the generosity of his parishioners in Worksop to provide for him, because "the vicar there is *numeratis pecuniis* only 12 l. per annum, and 3 l. yearly paid out to the king."<sup>32</sup>

### A Call to Batcombe, Somerset

Bernard wrote that "A minister placed over a congregation, so as is said, is there appointed of God, and there must settle himself to abide, unless he be lawfully called from thence, or necessity compel him to depart."<sup>33</sup> It seems that, largely due to his financial situation, Bernard was open to the idea of leaving Worksop if another lawful opportunity might call him away. According to his adversary (former ally) John Smyth, Bernard sought at least two opportunities in the early seventeenth century: "I have noted your vehement desire to the parsonage of Sawenbie, & your

---

<sup>30</sup> For instance, four sons of Henry Cottingham were buried in a period of less than one month in 1605. The parish register notes which deaths were due to the infection. *The Registers of Worksop*, 118-120.

<sup>31</sup> Barratt, "Introduction," *Ecclesiastical Terriers of Warwickshire Parishes* Vol. I, xxvi-xxx.

<sup>32</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 311.

<sup>33</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 7.



extreme indignation when you were defeated of it: Further your earnest desire to have been vicar of Ganesburgh...”<sup>34</sup>

Happily for Bernard, in 1613 he had the opportunity to move to Batcombe, Somerset, through what he later characterized as a providential set of circumstances in which God “mended his wages.”<sup>35</sup> The incumbent minister of Batcombe, Phillip Bisse, wanted to ensure that his parish would continue under godly leadership after his death. To do this, he purchased the advowson of his own parish from a relative, for one turn, for £200.<sup>36</sup> Consulting, it seems, with Bishop James Montagu, who had known Bernard from Cambridge, Bisse selected Bernard for the living.<sup>37</sup> Bernard later explained that Montagu had “sent for me into these parts, where I now dwell, not by solicitation of friends, but only out of his former remembrance of me in Cambridge, where he was then to me a liberal and memorable Benefactor.”<sup>38</sup> Although Bernard here denied that Montagu had been “solicited” by Bernard’s friends, it is possible that James Risley, Montagu’s trusted assistant, may have inspired or supported this choice. In 1613 Bernard published a grateful dedicatory epistle to Risley; the epistle’s timing and the magnitude of the favor described would accord with his involvement in the situation:

Sir: I cannot but often think of your singular good respect towards me, in whom, as now it appeareth, long acquaintance in true love hath bred a constant readiness to do me good, not only when I am present with you...but also in my absence, and that a far off, when I supposed (which was mine error) my self least in your thoughts, and therefore far enough from expecting so great kindnesses as I have now received at your hands.

Surely, Sir, as I acknowledge that you have sufficiently witnessed on your part, beyond my expectation, a mind fully bent to procure my welfare...so great kindnesses...I am indebted beyond mine ability to pay...<sup>39</sup>

The presentation was actually made by a John Bernard; this could have been his father or another John Bernard.<sup>40</sup> Giving the right of presentation to a dedicated third party would allow the dying Bisse to further ensure Bernard’s appointment after his death.<sup>41</sup> This again suggests the unusual

---

<sup>34</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331.

<sup>35</sup> Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29. Reprinted in Ussher, *Works*, XVI, 360-363.

<sup>36</sup> The advowson had been in the possession of James Bisse of Foxcott. Brown, *Abstracts of Somersetshire Wills, etc.*, 3.

<sup>37</sup> In doing so, Bisse passed over his own son for the position, which Bernard noted in *Ready Way*.

<sup>38</sup> Bernard, “Epistle Dedicatorie” *Ready Way*, Sig. A3v-A4r.

<sup>39</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, Sig. A2r. On the relationship between Montagu and Risley, his “ancient, honest, and faythfull servant”, see “The Will, Inventories, and Funeral Expenses of James Montagu, Bishop of Winchester, anno 1618,” 398-399.

<sup>40</sup> One of the dedicatees of *Staffe of Comfort* was a John Bernard of Downside. Bernard, *Staffe of Comfort*, Sig. A2r.

<sup>41</sup> Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 107.

machinations thought necessary to ensure the success of this scheme—and the great importance Bisse placed upon having a godly successor.

Bernard was appointed to Batcombe in November 1613.<sup>42</sup> He was grateful for the post; again, the new position was a large and unexpected financial boon. He later wrote:

...blessed be the hand of that divine Providence, in an un-heard of act, all circumstances considered...I have more than an ordinary habitation; the means to uphold it some one hundred and fifty pounds per annum, or near to, besides six tenements copyhold, of which I have these five last years made almost twenty pounds; and if any fall in my time, they be at my disposing for two lives to any of mine.<sup>43</sup>

A surviving glebe terrier for Batcombe reinforces his report, and so far as savings are an indication of economic status, we may note that Bisse had been able to store away the requisite £200 to purchase the advowson.<sup>44</sup> Although his own economic situation had improved, Bernard never forgot his early benefactors; he continued throughout his career to thank them in print and to encourage others to give freely in support of clerical work.<sup>45</sup> He also erected a monument to Bisse above the chancel in the church; it acknowledged both his kindness and his generosity.<sup>46</sup>

Though wealthier, Batcombe was significantly smaller than Worksop; its 1617 register showed ten baptisms, two marriages and six burials. Yet the area seems to have been growing slowly: the 1629 register showed 25 baptisms, ten weddings and sixteen burials, and the 1637 register listed 35 baptisms, 5 weddings, and 18 burials.<sup>47</sup> Bernard once described his parishioners

---

<sup>42</sup> CCED Record ID 97010, 178242, and 291142 (from SRO D/D/B.Reg/31, SRO D/D/Vc 40, and SRO D/D/Vc79). Accessed 30 December, 2014.

<sup>43</sup> Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29.

<sup>44</sup> SRO DD/RG 95 121. Admittedly, Bisse came from one of the area's wealthiest families; however, it seems that he had been well enough provided for throughout his ministry.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, *Ruths Recompence*, *Ready Way*, etc.

<sup>46</sup> Bernard's praise of Bisse on the church wall also included the amount he paid for the advowson and his opposition to "heathenish revels"—messages infused to varying degrees with religio-political overtones (see Chapter 7). In 1644, diarist Richard Symonds described Batcombe church, where he noted the existence of three coats of arms, including those of the Bisse family. He recorded the inscription on the Phillip Bisse's monument as "*Non meritum, non missa juvat, non fictus et ignis; / Purgans sed Christi mors mihi sola salus. / Sic docuit vixitque pie, sic mortuus omni / AEvo Bis Doctor, quique beatus erit. / Philippus Biss / Archidiaconus Taunton, et hujus ecclesie pastor*" (which survives today) and also noted above it "Two hands shaking, one from the clouds the other upon earth, over the brasse with this word—Farewell beloved till the Resurrection" (which does not survive). Symonds, *Diary of the Marches*, 34-5. Another inscription that survives, just above the brass, is not described in Symonds but was there when John Collinson wrote his description in 1791. It includes the text "*Hic jacet ecce tuum quondam Batcambia lumen, / Qui mihi patronus Bis tibi doctor erat. / Terra cadaver habet, varios academia libros; / Charas pastor oves, alter et alter opes. / Astra tenent animam, venerabile patria nomen; / Tam pia vita fuit, tam bona fata viri.*" Collinson, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset* Vol. 3, 466-8. Since this portion of the monument is not described in early accounts and is not on the brass itself, it is possibly a later addition; however, its message is certainly aligned with Bernard's interests.

<sup>47</sup> Not all parish registers are extant. SRO D/D/RR/28 contains the top portion of the Batcombe register from 1616, complete registers from 1617, 1629, 1637 and 1639, and a further partial register signed by Bernard from an unknown year. The 1616 register shows at least fifteen christenings, but there were likely more. Damage and fading on several

as “a very gentlemanlike assembly, and a rich people...” and indeed the area was home to some wealthy clothiers, including members of the Ashe and Bisse families, who were related both by business and by marriage.<sup>48</sup> Yet there was significant economic disparity, especially between Batcombe proper and nearby Westcombe, a wealthier part of the parish. In 1637, Batcombe Constable James Millward related to authorities the “disproportion and inequality” between the two, “for the lands belonging to Westcombe are worth more by £400 per annum than Batcombe at the least, besides many of the inhabitants of Westcombe are men of great trade and personal estate, and those of Batcombe for the most part poor men.”<sup>49</sup> Disputes over distribution of wealth and responsibility for the poor seem to have continued for some time; later that year two or three local knights were assigned to sort out the issue.<sup>50</sup> While many of the area’s elite were clothiers, occupations varied. Several agricultural industries were profitable in the area, and some residents also had interests abroad in trade.<sup>51</sup> The variation in economic interests may have increased due to the national decline in wool value in the 1620s—a problem that would have loomed large over the minds and fortunes of Batcombe inhabitants.<sup>52</sup> Some from the area had been pressed into military service; in 1635 a pension of £4 was allotted to maimed soldier James Farr, “late of Batcombe.”<sup>53</sup>

It was in Batcombe that Bernard would complete most of his pastoral ministry, author most of his works, and solidify his reputation as a godly author-minister. The parish, which included the nearby chapel of Upton Noble, had become accustomed to godly ministry under Philip Bisse, and several members of the Bisse family continued to support Bernard’s godly ministry.<sup>54</sup> Bernard was long concerned with the care of the poor, of prisoners, and of ministers. As we will see in Chapter 7, funds from the wealthy of the parish were not always forthcoming, and in practice it appears

---

documents make a full transcription problematic. The number of burials in Worksop, which can be affected by the size of a harvest, the incidence of contagious disease, and other variables, ranged more widely during these years than did baptisms and marriages.

<sup>48</sup> BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29. Members of both families appear in later chapters. The 1558 will of Thomas Ashe illustrates some of the connections of these two prominent families. “1558. Thomas Asshe” in F. W. Weaver, ed., *Somerset Medieval Wills (Third Series) 1531-1558* (Subscription, 1905), 215-216. *Google Books*. See also “Edward Orange,” “Thomas Ashe,” and “James Ashe” in Frederick Brown, ed., *Abstracts of Somersetshire Wills Etc.*, 45-6.

<sup>49</sup> SP 16/356 f. 173r. I discuss this disparity further in Chapter 7.

<sup>50</sup> *Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset*, Vol. II, 283.

<sup>51</sup> On parish economics in early modern Somerset, see Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 123ff. Smith was the patentee of Batcombe; on his complaint, Persons, who had “adventured to the value of £40 beyond the seas” was placed in custody for selling it without right, which he denied (and if his wife had done so, he claimed ignorance). TNA SP 16/407 f. 203r.

<sup>52</sup> See James I, *A proclamation for the preuenting of the exportation of woolles...* Among a variety of works addressing industry and textile manufacture in early modern southwest England, see Horn, *Adapting to a New World*, 73ff., and Ben-Amos, “Failure to become freemen: urban apprentices in early modern England.”

<sup>53</sup> SRO Q/SR/73/162, 166, 173-175.

<sup>54</sup> He called James and Edward Bisse his “Christian good friends.” Bernard, *Staffe of Comfort*, Sig. A2r.

there was some distinction between individuals including the Bisse family, whom Bernard noted as very pious and often giving to charity, and individuals such as James Aishe, who (along with others) was presented in 1634 for not paying tithes. Aishe became something of an outspoken opponent to certain aspects of Bernard's godly program.

In certain situations, key members of the parish could work together for the good of the whole—for instance, in 1624/5 Bernard and sixteen parishioners joined to request housing and provision within the parish for a family in need. Yet even this collectively submitted document may belie longstanding differences: no signatories were from the Aishe family, and the petition noted the primary involvement of James Bisse.<sup>55</sup> Interestingly, it was also in 1624 that the overseers of the poor petitioned the assizes to make wealthy parishioner Thomas Stroude (worth, they said, £600 per annum) pay his yearly rate of £4 to the poor; Stroude had “refused” to do so.<sup>56</sup> Yet we might also note that Bernard dedicated his treatise on giving, *Ready Way*, to George and William Stroud, and *Good Mans Grace* to “Christianly affected” Rebecca Strowde. Based on their similar surnames, these individuals may have been related to Thomas Stroude; if so, perhaps certain family members were more willing to give than others.

Other parish records, unsurprisingly, indicate a steady stream of concerns of varying sorts, but which often had to do with material goods (such as sums owed or goods stolen) or personal moral conduct.<sup>57</sup> Although Bernard at one time described his parishioners as “very tractable,” religious interest and behavior varied.<sup>58</sup> The parish's rather less “tractable” parishioners seem to have included, among others, Elizabeth Stone, who was presented for not living with her husband, Richard Bugley—and Bugley himself, who was presented for failing to receive communion at Easter and was “very negligent” in attending the divine service or sermons.<sup>59</sup> We may also note the case of James Watts, who in 1634 had for four years stood excommunicate, and Dorothy Palmer. The pair “traveled together about the country (as it was commonly reported) as man and wife, and lodged together” until the authorities became aware of the situation and dealt with each of them.<sup>60</sup> Or in a more ambiguous situation, a young man attempted to lodge a woman (whom he falsely claimed was his sister) in his master's house; this being denied, he quietly admitted her after his

---

<sup>55</sup> SRO Q/SR/52/1a, 3.

<sup>56</sup> SRO Q/SR/44/64.

<sup>57</sup> SRO Q/SR, passim; item summaries are available online <<http://www1.somerset.gov.uk/archives/>>.

<sup>58</sup> BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29.

<sup>59</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 297, Batcombe, 1634.

<sup>60</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 297, 2 separate entries, Batcombe 1634. Dorothy had been apprehended and committed to the house of correction at the time of Watts' presentation on 20 October 1634.

master went to sleep and “did lodge her on his own bed, and lay with her”—but what else may have happened was unknown, for “farther they confess not.”<sup>61</sup> Both the quarter sessions records and the parish registers note that several children were born to unwed mothers during Bernard’s time; this in turn prompted issues related to child support.<sup>62</sup> All of this would have been concerning to him not only in terms of sexual morality but also in terms of ensuring appropriate pastoral and financial care for all parties.

In 1622 Bernard, along with several other men—including individuals from both the Bisse and Aishe families—were signatories to a petition against Margaret Otlye, who was keeping an unlicensed alehouse in the home of a “poor aged husband who can not rule her.” She was attracting “disorderly” and “drunken” persons to Batcombe, resulting in the “great disquietness” of the upstanding parishioners of the town. The petitioners requested that Otlye be stopped and that she be made a public example in order to keep others from following a similar pattern.<sup>63</sup>

While in the above situation several parishioners joined to deal with a problem, there were also significant divisions. Though there may have been longstanding, quiet opposition to Bernard’s ministry, in the 1630s several opponents became more outspoken and presented their grievances during a visitation; Aishe in particular charged Bernard with “particularizing” against him during public preaching. Meanwhile, parishioner Richard Jourdain seems to have attempted to publicly demonstrate his distaste for Bernard’s ministry by “disorderly behaving himself in the church at time of divine service diverse times within this half year last past by justling and thronging his next fellow, and lying down as if it were to sleep, in a most unreverent manner.”<sup>64</sup> These opponents may have long disliked Bernard’s godly style of ministry for a variety of reasons, but it is noteworthy that their protests coincided with the new bishop’s efforts to enforce a Laudian style of worship; they may have been theologically sympathetic, or they may have simply appropriated aspects of Laudian change in order to accomplish their own goals within the parish, or—most likely—their motivations were perhaps a mixture of both. I discuss this situation more fully in Chapter 7.

Throughout his career, Bernard’s basic ministerial program seems to have remained constant and was largely dependent upon close personal knowledge of his flock alongside a studied knowledge of the Scriptures. When a minister added these to regular preaching and catechizing,

---

<sup>61</sup> SRO Q/SR/38/19.

<sup>62</sup> See for instance SRO Q/SR 56/74 and SRO D/D/RR/28.

<sup>63</sup> SRO Q/SR/41/148. The right side of the document is missing.

<sup>64</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 297, Batcombe 1634.

he believed that parishioners would be equipped to understand the Word of God and to apply it to their lives in direct, personal ways that resulted in true belief, spiritual comfort, and increasing godliness.<sup>65</sup> His approach to personal study was broad-based and extensive. In *Faithfull Shepherd* he noted the importance of a minister's library in an age in which ordinary study was the only means of knowing God: "A minister must have a good library, means must be used, the help of the learned. Extraordinary revelations are now ceased."<sup>66</sup> In another place, noting that "good books" were among the key things a minister needed to handle a text, he explained:

Books are lively images of other men's gifts of nature: yea, demonstrations of their learning, and witnesses of their spiritual illumination, and of the grace of their hearts. If a Minister have them by him, they attend his leisure, to hear their Authors speak, and to give him their best advice in any thing, whereof they entreat both willingly and freely...Now concerning books, it is necessary that a Minister be furnished with them, as good helps to further his study. My purpose is, if life, leisure, and ability will serve, hereafter to frame a study for this *Faithfull Shepherd*, after the method of teaching herein set down, and so, as the method may direct him to books, and the books keep him to his method, which also may help to direct a Minister in buying of fit and necessary books, in so great variety. Here for the present I will content my self, to set down only what was in the former edition, because the framing of this study will make a book of itself, of reasonable bigness.<sup>67</sup>

To indicate the extent of reading which was useful for ministers, this same work contained a bibliography which recommended topics and specific authors with which ministers should be familiar; topics included humanities (ethics, politics, economics, natural philosophy, husbandry, geography, history); divinity (including the Bible in its original languages and several translations, dictionaries, and concordances); works analyzing, annotating, and reconciling passages; commonplace books; commentaries; ecclesiastical histories; canon and consular histories; theological controversies; and more. To study even a section of these categories would be an enormous task. Yet it seems Bernard himself sought to do so. We see hints of his study throughout his published works, in which he extensively annotated the sources for his ideas. This practice demonstrated his own knowledge and credentials as an author, and in places where he cited works that supported his point, it also increased the weight of his argument by showing his solidarity with other writers. We

---

<sup>65</sup> See Chapters 3 and 4.

<sup>66</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), 94.

<sup>67</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), 143-147. It appears that Bernard did not complete publication of the intended volume explaining a minister's more extensive course of study.

find further hints of his personal reading in his manuscripts, including his letters to Ussher and Cotton.<sup>68</sup>

### Ministry beyond the parish

Bernard was active beyond the bounds of his parishes, especially in helping to foster the development of other ministers. Early in his career, he had joined with a group of ministers and parishioners in the area of Nottingham to foster godly religion and consider the merits of separation. Later, he became active in regional leadership. He became a prominent participant in regional combination lectures, and he ultimately received appointments as Prebend of Segeston, Southwell Minster in 1620 and as Royal Chaplain in Extraordinary in 1628, which further established his extra-parish authority.<sup>69</sup> He also spoke at both official and unofficial meetings of clergy, including the Synod of Southwell in 1613 and in a meeting of Dorset ministers in 1633/4 (see Chapters 2 and 7).

Bernard actively cultivated networks of godly friends, many of which included co-laborers in the ministry.<sup>70</sup> These networks allowed for mutual encouragement among the faithful and also provided forums for training and discipleship among believers. Early in his career, Bernard pursued these sorts of relationships with other ministers in his area, especially those with nonconformist or separatist leanings. By meeting together, Bernard, Smyth, Ainsworth, Dod, Hildersham, and others certainly encouraged one another in their pastoral work. Moreover, they attempted to work together to determine the best trajectory for godly ministry by participating in the Coventry conference of 1606.<sup>71</sup> These ministers were not simply a group tied together by professional affiliation; rather, they had strong emotional and even spiritual ties. The close relationships that developed between many of these ministers, who to some degree saw themselves

---

<sup>68</sup> The former describes several aspects of his personal study; BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29. The latter includes the remark “What you haue said, out of Justin Martyr... I haue not Justin by me at this present, if I miss his meaning, the text will discover it, but I take it I am in the right” which suggests his familiarity with a particular text and reminds us of the relative scarcity of some books: perhaps Bernard had lent his copy to another, or perhaps he did not have a personal copy and had in the past had borrowed a copy. PHM Cotton Family MSS, John Cotton Papers, 127v; see also *Cotton Correspondence*, 261.

<sup>69</sup> The former CCED Record ID 37642, from BI, Sub. Bk. 1 and Record ID 147877, from TNA PRO, LC 5/132, f. 45r. Accessed 30 December 2014. The PRO record mentions his appointment on the recommendation of a Mr. Saladin. I am grateful to Kenneth Fincham for pointing me toward these sources as well as the reference to Mr. Strickland, below. On combination lectures, see Collinson, “Lectures by Combination.” On Bernard’s position in Southwell see also Matthews, *Walker Revised*, 20.

<sup>70</sup> On connections between ministers in general, see Francis Bremer, *Congregational Communion*.

<sup>71</sup> See Chapter 2.

as the few, faithful leaders of a small and persecuted band, are evident through the clear tones of emotion and betrayal that appeared after Bernard decided to re-conform.

Following his move to Somerset, Bernard continued to foster relationships with clergy and laypeople throughout his region. One such way to do this was by the sharing of pulpits. He seems to have preached in Ditchat, home of fellow godly minister Richard Alleine, in 1614.<sup>72</sup> He is also recorded to have preached in the pulpit of a Mr. Strickland on Nov. 7, 1630.<sup>73</sup> On occasion, other preachers could supply Bernard's pulpit, as well; John Traske preached in Batcombe in 1614—an activity that turned out to be problematic due to Traske's theologically and ecclesologically divergent positions.<sup>74</sup> Patrick Collinson has pointed out that John Conant's preface to Bernard's posthumous *Thesaurus Biblicus* suggests a strong extra-parish influence through a regional teaching ministry, and Kenneth Fincham has called Bernard a "leading light in the combination lectures of eastern Somerset."<sup>75</sup> His appointments as Canon of Southwell and Royal Chaplain in Extraordinary would only have increased the prominence and authority from which he could address both parishioners and clerics whenever he stood up to expound the Word of God.

Bernard cultivated personal relationships with his superiors, as well. Following the practice he had begun under Matthew, throughout his career Bernard reached out to his bishops for favor and support, and he enjoyed positive relationships with several of them, who encouraged him in his ministry both within and beyond his parish. Bernard thought highly of the role of the godly bishop, and he honored these men through various dedications to his publications—including, importantly, his dedications of different editions of *The Faithfull Shepheard* to Montagu and then Matthew.

In the eyes of the godly, many areas—including Somerset—had an insufficient number of preaching ministers, or had ministers too little interested in theology.<sup>76</sup> Though Montagu and Lake had worked to further the ministry of educated preachers in their diocese (in part by bringing in

---

<sup>72</sup> Margaret Steig, *Laud's Laboratory*, 246.

<sup>73</sup> Probably John Strickland, who would at about that time become the assistant of Bernard's friend John White of Dorchester. Henry Lancaster, "Strickland, John", *ODNB*. "...Mr Stricklands course supplied by Mr Bernard of Batcombe." Crosfield, Thomas, *Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, Ed. Frederick S. Boas (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), 48.

<sup>74</sup> Steig, *Laud's Laboratory*, 246-247; Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 45. Given Bernard's background, it is unclear why this occurred. As a newcomer to the area, Bernard may not have yet known Traske (a Somerset native) well, and he may have been eager to support his seeming godliness—his theological divergence, at this early stage, was not as pronounced as it would be later. Yet it also seems that Bernard would have thought twice before having a questionable and unlicensed preacher in his pulpit.

<sup>75</sup> Patrick Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs and Hirelings: The Pastoral Ministry in Post-Reformation England," in Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft*, 203. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 193.

<sup>76</sup> Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 193-195.



ministers like Bernard), there was more to be done. Bernard attempted to encourage and disciple other ministers through a large network of personal relationships; we may view something of this network in the dedication to his 1621 edition of his manual for ministers, *The Faithful Shepherd*.<sup>77</sup> Rather than dedicating the work to his “brethren of the Ministry, and the beloved Readers” as he had in previous editions, this was dedicated to six “learned and judicious Divines”<sup>78</sup> and twenty-eight “much respected friends and brethren in the Ministry.”<sup>79</sup> Plotting on a map the locations of these ministers that are identifiable with some certainty, one finds that all are geographically close to Batcombe, and in some cases, a round trip on foot or on horseback, including a short visit, could have taken less than a day.<sup>80</sup> In other words, these men would have been quite accessible to Bernard, making inter-parish relationships that much easier. Moreover, the ministers’ locations were not spread in an even radius around Batcombe; rather, they were skewed within diocesan lines. That is, the majority of the men Bernard listed as brethren in the ministry served in locations within the diocese of Bath and Wells. This suggests that he primarily used intra-diocesan means, such as combination lectures and other meetings, to maintain professional connections. There may also be a civil component to the way this network grew; because Bath and Wells was roughly co-

---

<sup>77</sup> In previous versions the epistle was addressed generally to “his brethren of the Ministry, and the beloved Readers.” Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), Sig. Br.

<sup>78</sup> These include Dr. Edward Chetwind, Dean of Bristol; Dr. Gerard Wood, Archdeacon of Wells; Dr. Timothy Rivett, Archdeacon of Bath; Dr. William Sclater, vicar of Pitminster; Dr. Ralph Cudworth, and a Dr. King.

<sup>79</sup> Bernard’s references to most of these men are vague, but a survey of ministers active in or near the diocese of Bath and Wells at the time of Bernard’s writing in approximately 1620-21 makes it possible to plausibly identify most of them. Those that seem identifiable include Anthony Methwin, vicar of St. John’s, Frome; George Webbe, rector of St. Peter and St. Paul at Bath; Henry Allen, vicar of Brent Knoll; John Conant, rector of Limington; Robert Sibthorpe, rector of North Cadbury; Samuel Crooke, rector of Wrington; Richard Fitzherberte, rector of Cucklington and Stoke Trister; William Bucke, rector of Hilperton; Christopher Reade, curate of Upton Noble; Tobias Walkwoode, Rector of Beckington, Richard Alleine, rector of Ditchat and co-author with Bernard of *David’s Musick*; Anthony Earbury, vicar of Westonzoyland; Richard Adams, rector of Yeovilton; Thomas Woodyeates, rector of Corton Dinham; Thomas Hyde, rector of Wanstrow; John Hanmer, rector of Bingham; Thomas Newland, rector of Kingston Deverill; Peter Thatcher, vicar of Milton Clevedon; Richard Chandler, rector of Stoke Trister; Thomas Hall, vicar of Wells St. Cuthbert; Thomas Sprat, rector of Stratton on the Fosse; Thomas Hall, rector of Pylle; and Mathew Gatehowse, vicar of Chilthorne Dormer. Less clear are references to Mr. Yeomans (likely Richard Yeomans, vicar of Ditteridge, but perhaps William Yeoman of Bristol cathedral); and to Mr. Masey and Mr. Wats, both of whose surnames belong to more than one minister in that region in this period. On several of these men and their inclusion in this list, see Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 193-195. For references to names and locations see *The Clergy of the Church of England Database* <theclergydatabase.org.uk>.

<sup>80</sup> All are within a 35-mile radius of Batcombe, and eleven are within a ten-mile radius. It is difficult to determine average travel speeds for this period, but times for the royal post were expected to be seven miles per hour in summer and four in winter. Personal travel would be slower than this, but the benchmark is helpful. The semi-contemporary example of Ralph Thoresby is also helpful; he made somewhat regular journeys, on foot, of over twenty miles between Leeds and York. Cooper, “The speed and efficiency of the Tudor south-west’s royal post-stage service”; Brayshay, et al., “Knowledge, nationhood and governance: The speed of the royal post in early-modern England,” 277; Thoresby, *Diary of Ralph Thoresby* Vol. 1, 360; and *Letters of Eminent Men*, Vol. 2, 79.

terminus with Somerset, Bernard's travel to county events, such as the 1626 assizes in Taunton, would further solidify his contact with this group.

Unsurprisingly, Bernard seems to have developed particularly close relationships with certain ministers who served very near Batcombe. Christopher Reade, the curate of Upton Noble within Batcombe parish, was among those Bernard lists as his friends in the ministry, and it seems that a later curate, Nicholas Paull, was also a close associate.<sup>81</sup> Bernard probably co-authored *David's Musick* with Richard Alleine of Ditcheat, and he took a clear interest in the work of John White, a minister ejected in the 1630s and for whom he seems to have helped to provide in the during that time (see Chapter 7).<sup>82</sup>

Finally, it is important to note that Bernard sought connections with ministers far from his home. Letters to Bishop Ussher and to New England minister John Cotton, each dealing with personal, theological and pastoral issues, are extant; these were probably part of a much more robust correspondence. Especially in his dealings with Cotton and the New Englanders, Bernard was able to use his authority as a godly and senior minister in the national church to effect change in parishes throughout a growing national and international frame of influence.<sup>83</sup> Yet while he was well known, he was not well respected by all, even among the godly. A correspondent of John Winthrop described Bernard as “a man though vpright in the mayne, yet of very greate weaknesses” who might unwisely provoke a controversy.<sup>84</sup>

We also know that Bernard took at least one individual, and likely more than one, into his home in what may have been something like an apprenticeship or internship. The godly minister Robert Balsom, who was born not far from Batcombe, enjoyed Bernard's favor and tutelage as a young minister; as Samuel Clarke later described, Balsom was “entertained” by Bernard to teach school and preach occasionally, during which time under Bernard “he greatly improved his abilities for preaching.”<sup>85</sup> Upon Bernard's death, Balsom continued to foster godly devotion in rural Somerset:

... preaching occasionally at a neighbor village call'd Stoke, among a company of poor untaught people, one that lived thereabouts, told him, that if such a Minister should come and preach among that people, where there was so small encouragement, he

---

<sup>81</sup> Paull was cited along with Bernard in the 1630s for certain acts of nonconformity; further, he had access to Bernard's study while he was away and was entrusted with the important message to Mr. White. See Chapter 7.

<sup>82</sup> Rose-Troup, *John White*, 300-301.

<sup>83</sup> PHM Cotton Family MSS, John Cotton Papers.

<sup>84</sup> “\_\_\_\_\_ to John Winthrop” in *Winthrop Papers*, Vol. 3, 400.

<sup>85</sup> Clarke, *Lives*, 213.

should think that God had a great work to do upon them. Hereupon Master Balsom promised to be their Minister, where he enjoyed about forty pounds a year. The success of his Ministry there was very great, insomuch that he hath been heard say, that there were but few Sermons that he preached there, but he had intelligence, that some one or other were converted by them.<sup>86</sup>

Bernard mentioned one individual—perhaps Balsom, perhaps another—for his help in such tasks as preparing *Ready Way* for publication: “my old eyes have been well holpen by the Transcriber, one now residing with me, unto whose helpfulness, I wish answerable happiness.”<sup>87</sup> Bernard also had a strong influence upon Richard Alleine the younger, who would succeed him at Batcombe, and on Edward Bennett, Bernard’s sometime assistant. Bennett also served for a time under Alleine after Bernard’s death; his later ministry, as described by Calamy, closely reflected Bernard’s practice, indicating that he understood and followed the principles of ministry Bernard sought to foster:

...he abhorred trifling in his study or pulpit, and was much delighted in his work. He preached three times a week in public, expounded the chapters which he read, and catechized the younger and unmarried persons, and in the evening he repeated the sermons in his own family; to which many of his neighbors came for several years. He was very cautious in admitting to the sacrament, and as cautious in refusing. He used to take all occasions for good discourse; and had days of conference with his people; and carefully practised himself, the things which he recommended to others: and by his excellent instruction and wise conduct, he reduced a great part of the town to sobriety. He spent much time in visiting the sick, and resolving the doubts of many...<sup>88</sup>

Finally, and significantly, Bernard’s encouragement of younger ministers included his own son, Channanuel. Bernard personally took Channanuel to Oxford and met with leaders of Exeter College, which he may have selected for its connection with godly theology. Bernard may have also had a hand in Channanuel’s ultimate placement within a parish.<sup>89</sup>

Bernard’s interest in fostering the development of young clergy may also have taken the form of tutoring Latin to promising young pupils who might go on to university; his Latin textbook

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> *Ready Way*, n.p.

<sup>88</sup> This passage mentioned not only most of the points of the ministry that Bernard encouraged but also reflected something of Perkins, whose treatise emphasized the benefits of ministering among a willing congregation; Calamy said of Bennett that “...refusing two rich parsonages, of which he was offered his choice, he settled at South Petherton, at the invitation of the principal inhabitant.” Calamy, *Account of the ministers*, Vol. II, 276-277.

<sup>89</sup> Bernard knew the individual who gave a living to his son: the dedicatory epistle of *Common Catechisme* in 1630 acknowledged Thomas Hanham for his “good favor towards my son, and I am very thankful in his behalf, as he also himself ... as also to that worthy honored Knight, Sir Walter Earle, at whose request it pleased you so favorably and freely to bestow the living.” Bernard, *Common Catechisme*, Sig. A2r-A2v.

*Terence* may be viewed through this frame as a training work for ministers. Young men proceeding through the educational system—which included future ministers in the Church—needed to know Latin, and in some parishes this instruction would come from a minister. Through this textbook, Bernard could assist future ministers who were just beginning their course of study. This pre-ministerial function may explain why Bernard continued throughout his career to amend editions of this work, which in content is otherwise largely separate from his religious goals.<sup>90</sup>

In all these ways, as Bernard fostered the development of godly pastoral ministry through individual instruction and by public demonstration, he was able to pursue his own calling as a laborer in the kingdom of God and as an increasingly prominent member of the national church. In addition to this clerical network, Bernard cultivated friendships with many godly laypeople; these included high-ranking individuals, some of whom became his patrons, as well as individuals of lower rank whom he respected for their religious devotion.

### Print

In terms of numbers of individuals affected by his ministry, Bernard accomplished his greatest religious work through print. He managed an authorial career that stretched over forty years, dealt with a wide range of religious issues, and addressed a variety of audiences.<sup>91</sup> He sent over thirty separate publications to the press—a high number for any religious author at this time, and especially so when we recall that Bernard himself was involved in each publication (in contrast to preachers whose works were often taken to press with little or no involvement from them).<sup>92</sup> Because my study focuses on authorial intention in writing, I do not, for the most part, discuss how works were actually received or used. Yet since the functions of writing and reading (or hearing) are largely related, it is worthwhile to say a bit about how Bernard generally viewed his work as an author, and how we can discern information regarding his audiences and their uses of, and responses to, his texts.

---

<sup>90</sup> The work was in its sixth, amended edition, at his death in 1641.

<sup>91</sup> The one possible exception to calling his publishing career exclusively religious is his first work, a translation of *Terence* designed to help schoolboys learn Latin—yet even it had direct relevance for the education of future ministers. Latin learning was closely related to religious training, so this is not entirely separate from his later emphases; however, *Terence* does lean in many ways toward humanistic rather than solely religious interests. The work was reprinted several times with some alterations.

<sup>92</sup> I count his individual works as numbering over thirty; a precise figure depends upon how one defines the difference between editions, reprints, and revisions. See the front matter for a full list of his works.

Although we cannot know the size of Bernard's reading audience with precision, we can piece together some helpful information. Regarding popular literacy, even absent any formal, widespread education, a sizable portion of the public could have been fully- or semi-literate, and even illiterate individuals could learn of the contents of publications through conversation and from hearing works read aloud.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, members of the godly community emphasized personal devotion and reading; even laborers (for example the oft-referenced Nehemiah Wallington) often had both ability and desire to read widely. In other words, ideas produced in print had the potential to reach many members of the public—and especially members of the public dedicated to godly religious pursuits.

During his print career, Bernard thoughtfully honed his craft, experimenting with the medium of print by producing works in a wide range of genres and with a wide range of desired audiences. Some of his publications, such as polemics and catechisms, demonstrate a willingness to utilize existing literary forms; others, such as certain allegorical, poetical, and reference works, suggest efforts toward innovation. Indeed, he seems to have been something of a pragmatist in genre, willing to use whatever style, form, or even page layout might best fit his intended function. In a time when many godly ministers were aware of the possible stigma of print authorship, Bernard displayed a marked awareness of the possibilities of this new medium (although, as I argue in Chapter 3, his attention to print's benefits accompanied a clear understanding that print should not replace, or appear to replace, preaching). In one passage, Bernard and a co-author went so far as to describe print as a method that might not only fulfill aspects of their pastoral calling but also might replace or enhance the spiritual fruit that may or may not have appeared in the parish:

...we...at this time put our one talent into the bank, which we have heretofore (for the most part) employed in our private ministry; and would now with the fishers, when fishes wax scant at the shore, launch a little further into the deep; and with the merchants, thriving a little at home, adventure further abroad, to try in other coasts how we can make our markets. In this our present travel, we have followed the manner of such traders, making proof with these new wares, what hope there will be of venting abroad more of the same kind...yea hereby we shall gain somewhat to our selves, even a comfortable answer to make at that day of account, that whatsoever our successes, yet such have our endeavors been, hereby to do the best good we can to the church of God, and with the conscience of this we have hardened our foreheads against the many censures of men, and set it as a brazen wall against them; ... than that not doing the good we might, our own consciences should condemn us, yea, God himself, for evil and unprofitable servants.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 163ff. See also Watt, *Cheap Print*.

<sup>94</sup> Bernard, *David's Musick*, Sig A2r-A2v.

Since Bernard saw authorship as so integral to his vocation, it should not surprise us that he pursued publication so frequently and so thoughtfully, nor that he innovated so frequently.

Bernard was also something of a student of the print industry. Throughout his career, he cultivated close relationships not only with patrons (to whom he often dedicated his works) but also with printers and booksellers. He published with a variety of individuals but worked most frequently with Felix Kingston, to whom he may have been related.<sup>95</sup> Because Bernard lived outside the printing centers of London, Oxford, and Cambridge, the trouble of geographic distance—and thus inability to attend certain works through the press—compounded the usual challenges of publication. Bernard actively sought assistance on his publications—in a letter to James Ussher he sought Ussher’s counsel on some issues about which he was currently writing. He also explained circumstances regarding his taking a manuscript of *Fabulous Foundation* to some authorities at Oxford University; they liked it enough that the University printer published it.<sup>96</sup> Yet in this letter he also mentioned some trouble in tracking that work through publication: having returned to Batcombe, he had heard that it had come off the press but been unable to obtain a copy himself. Distance from the press was also a problem for the 1621 revised edition of *Faithfull Shepheard*, where the errata explained that Bernard had supplied an earlier printed edition of the work alongside a revised manuscript; this resulted in some confusion in the print shop about which to follow:

Christian Reader, in my absence many Errata have passed, which I pray thee friendly correct... In pag. 77.l.6. and p. 78, almost wholly is repeated again...because in some place they followed the written copy, and in some place the printed, and neglected to consider where to leave off. For want of a guide in my absence, more faults may be, which I leave to thy amending and friendly censure.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> The evidence for their relation is from Bernard’s letter to James Ussher, wherein he refers to his “kinsman Mr Kingston” and “cousin K.” If they were related, it is possible that the family relationship made Kingston more inclined to agree to produce works with the frequent and detailed use of marginal notes, brackets, and charts typical to Bernard’s style. BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29.

<sup>96</sup> See Chapter 5. The degree to which he actively sought publication, versus the degree to which he was swayed toward publication by the professors, is unclear.

<sup>97</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621), final page [unnumbered]. The copy on *EEBO* lacks this page; see for example the copy from Princeton Theological Seminary: <<http://www.archive.org/stream/faithfullshep00bern#page/n447/mode/2up>> *Archive.org*, Accessed 5 January, 2015.

Perhaps in part to alleviate such trouble, in 1641, at the time of the loosening of Laudian restrictions on printing, an aged Bernard went to London himself. By doing so, he would have been more able to ensure that certain long-censured manuscripts would finally come off the press.<sup>98</sup>

Information about reprints and revisions provides something of a reference point for Bernard's popularity as an author, since works that sold well were more likely to go into print again. *Terence*, *Faithful Shepheard*, *Weekes Worke*, and his catechisms each saw multiple printings and/or revisions. Even some polemical works, such as *Looke Beyond Luther*, saw reprints. Bernard's best-known work, *The Isle of Man*, saw a substantially revised fourth edition just a year after its initial publication, and it was in the eleventh edition at the time of his death (with more in the decades and even centuries to come). Other works also saw reprints and revisions. On the other side of the spectrum, perhaps most prominent among works that failed to garner as many readers as Bernard hoped was *David's Musick*: its explained in the dedicatory epistle that they were testing the market with this commentary on the first three Psalms, and that if the work was successful subsequent volumes would soon appear—yet no such volumes were forthcoming.

While reprints may suggest a large audience, one must not judge the impact of a work merely upon its times through the press. Some works were timely (e.g. *Separatists Schisme*) or were aimed toward somewhat limited audience (e.g. *Bible-Battells*); these may have served their intended purposes with even a small print run.<sup>99</sup> Moreover, some of Bernard's works circulated widely even without publication; especially in the 1630s, he appears in some instances to have sought publication even while simultaneously circulating some or all of his ideas in manuscript (see Chapter 7). Further, for some purposes it seems he actively chose to avoid print and embrace manuscript circulation precisely in order to limit his audience to a select group, such as in his writing to New England.<sup>100</sup>

A survey of marginalia in surviving copies of Bernard's works suggests that his intentions, and readers' actual practices, were harmonious: users seem to have done with the books what one might expect, given the content and published form of each. A brief survey of certain works will serve to illustrate this. We might take for our first example copies of *Isle* and *Weekes Worke*. Both of these were printed in small, lightweight editions with ties to keep their limp vellum cover closed

---

<sup>98</sup> On Bernard's publications in the 1640s and his visit to London, see Chapter 7.

<sup>99</sup> Surveys of steady sellers that went to multiple editions (such as appear in Green, *Print and Protestantism*) can thus obscure the significant importance and audience for certain timely works.

<sup>100</sup> PHM Cotton Family MSS, John Cotton Papers.

when stored or carried. Bernard seemed to intend such portability, as his discussion of *Isle* describes:

For though from his first birth into the world it be scarce half a year, yet he is grown a little bigger; but I think him to become to his full stature: so he wil be, but as a little pygmy to be carried abroad in any man's pocket.

I pray you now this fourth time accept him, & use him, as I have intended him for you, and you shall reap the fruit, though I forbid you not to be Christianly merry with him.<sup>101</sup>

Several copies of *Isle* indicate that it was used in this way, passed from person to person and not treated with overmuch reverence, as indicated by various names, epigraphs, and other marks that appear on extant copies. For instance, one copy of *Isle* held by the Bodleian contains the name of Joseph Mitchell and the date of 1633 alongside the names of several others with the same surname. This suggests that it was passed among family members—perhaps from child to child as each came of an age to have interest in the subject.<sup>102</sup> The copy also contains some other names not obviously within that family. It is not clear when the marginalia were added – it is difficult to trace such small and brief marks—yet in any case this again indicates a passing of the work from person to person. Moreover, manuscript epigraphs in the book (e.g. “A man of words and not of deeds is like a garden full of weeds”) indicate some meditations of the sort encouraged by Bernard (see Chapter 6).<sup>103</sup>

*Weekes Worke* is similar to *Isle* in size and portability. Interestingly, a 1616 third edition of this work held by the Beinecke Library is somewhat fancily decorated. The lightweight leather cover is embossed with flowers and scrolls, the ties are not of leather but of green fabric, and the edges are gilt. The decorations suggest that the book would have most likely been used by a lady—and as such, the epistles to the “virtuous ladies” and the change, in a later edition, to a female character, take on added significance. A female reader who carried this with her as a devotional book would (perhaps) identify with the dedicatees and named characters and may have even imagined herself in their place as she sought to pursue an active devotional life.

Other sorts of works seem also to have been used in ways that Bernard would have expected. His polemical works related to separatism elicited polemic, published responses from his opponents. Marginalia including additional relevant references in some copies of *Faithfull Shepheard*

---

<sup>101</sup> Bernard, *Isle of Man* (1627), n.p.

<sup>102</sup> BOD Vet. A2 f. 81.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.



suggest a thoughtful and educated readership. Marginal notes in reference works clearly suggests that readers were using the works as reference sources, adding their own entries and making small corrections where appropriate. Several books which contain lists of references show that a user has marked off each item in the list—presumably to keep track of which items he or she had already looked up. Corrections of mis-identified Scripture references or additions of related passages are also common. In one copy of *Thesaurus* held by the Wells Cathedral Library, a user has added a new subheading: under the heading for “stand”, the printed text included “Stand still, Exod. 14.13. 2 Chron. 20.17” and below this a reader added “stand apart. Isa. 63.5.”<sup>104</sup>

In addition to communicating his ideas to various audiences, print also provided a way for Bernard to establish, maintain, or further certain relationships through dedicatory epistles. Although some authors in this period dedicated works to those to whom they hoped to form a relationship, Bernard in general seems to have preferred to dedicate his works to individuals with whom he already had at least a passing acquaintance. Though a few of his dedications were addressed to laypeople or fellow ministers whose piety he wished to honor, many were to his superiors—either in terms of their office within the national church or in terms of their social station. We may note that when an individual met all of these criteria—being of high rank, of honorable religious character, and having a favorable relationship with Bernard—he might address or mention them in the epistle to more than one publication. Among such individuals whom he mentioned more than once were several members of the Wray family, who had been his early benefactors; Archbishop Matthew; and Helena Gorges.

It is worth noting as an aside that Bernard’s print works largely, but not entirely, lacked images. The general avoidance is unsurprising, since he and other godly ministers objected to anything smacking of popery or idolatry, and images in religious literature were often seen in just that way. In fact, Bernard’s meditative work *Contemplative Pictures* made explicit that the pictures were “not Popish and sensible for superstition; but mental for Divine contemplation.”<sup>105</sup> Nevertheless, some of his works did include images. *Threefold Treatise* and *Thesaurus* each included a portrait of Bernard, and the first edition of *Epistle* included a woodcut of Charles I on the title page. Portraits were not commonly viewed as related to idolatrous worship and were a common way of honoring those in positions of authority.

---

<sup>104</sup> WCL, *Thesaurus*.

<sup>105</sup> Bernard, “Epistle dedicatory” in *Contemplative Pictures*, Sig. A r.

Beyond these, two of Bernard's images are particularly noteworthy: images in the 1609 edition of *Faithfull Shepherd* and in *Key*.<sup>106</sup> In the former, the title page of both the main work and the appended *Shepherds Practise* both contain the same figure: a man standing on the right of the image waters a healthy tree in the center of the image that reaches up toward clouds with the Hebrew tetragrammaton upon them. To the left of the image, another man, stooped, looks over his shoulder at the healthy tree while grasping a dead sapling. This image choice is interesting in that while it suggests the importance of faithful care, it does not follow on the titular metaphor of the shepherd. It is, of course, possible that Bernard did not intend to allow an image on this publication; it may have been added due to a printer or publisher who perhaps believed that an image on the title page would attract sales. If the image was against Bernard's desires, he may have made that explicit in his 1621 edition, which would explain why it did not include a similar image. This would also explain why the image did not involve shepherds, as the title would suggest, but rather a tree; the woodcut may have been in the printer's shop for another purpose and only applied to this work as opportunity occurred. On the other hand, if Bernard did approve the image, we might consider his doing so as somewhat similar to the inclusion of a printed sermon at the end of the volume: the intended ministerial audience for the publication would have been unlikely to mistake the image's purpose, seeing it as an illustrative example and not as a popish image for false worship (on printed sermons, see Chapter 3). The title page woodcut in *Key* was perhaps the grandest of Bernard's images. Its multiple vignettes illustrated eight scenes from Revelation along with a ninth in which justice weighed Protestant and Catholic forms of religion, finding the latter wanting. As a strongly anti-Catholic book with a portion of the title image given illustrating the emptiness of the Catholic faith, there was little concern that the images presented might be seen as fostering popish superstition.

Lacking further information, we can not be certain how and at whose direction these images came to appear in these works. Yet it is significant that none of Bernard's meditative and devotional works include images. This suggests that while he may not have taken a hard stance on images in general, he avoided them in situations in which they could have caused any confusion about their purpose or their use in devotional practices, a stance that would have been in accord with his other theological and doctrinal positions. One must also keep in mind that images and attractively decorated title pages could increase sales, and as a savvy author Bernard would have known this.

---

<sup>106</sup> One copy of the 1598 *Terence* held by the Beinecke Library (BEI Gnt a598) has had images added, but these do not appear to have been part of the original printing.

Likewise, it appears that his naming of books, which often had a short, alliterative fore-title or used a proper name (*Two Twinnes*, *Weekes Worke*, *Ruths Recompence*, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, etc.) was also a way to attract attention and sales.<sup>107</sup>

### Bernard's legacy

Bernard died—conveniently for the historian of the early Stuart period—in 1641/2. He was over seventy years of age, had spent more than four decades in ministry, and had authored more than thirty publications. Contemporary estimations of Bernard's career varied, even among the godly. On the one hand, a favorable biographical account appeared in John Conant's epistle to the reader in Bernard's posthumously-published *Thesaurus*. Conant described him as deserving of great honor:

...he hath constantly been very laborious in the public exercise of his ministry, the fruit whereof was sealed by the conversion of many souls unto God. Those his labors, in the ministry, were not only bestowed in his own congregation, but in several market-towns next adjacent, where weekly lectures were for many years continued, by the free and voluntary co-assistance of diverse godly and orthodox divines... In that his ministerial work, he was a leader and pattern unto many, exemplifying in his sermons that method for preaching, which many years since, in his *Faithful Shepherd*, he had prescribed, or at least proposed in writing. Diverse painful and profitable laborers in the Lord's vineyard had their first initiation and direction from and under him: unto whom also many others had recourse, and from whom they borrowed no small light and encouragement...<sup>108</sup>

On the other hand, in an epistolary exchange in which an elderly Bernard had challenged the godliness of New England church policies, the elders in New England replied with a rather censorious tone:

... consider it advisedly before you break forth into hasty and sharp expressions against our proceedings lest unawares you speak evil of the ways of God. We here acknowledge ourselves to be but weak men (even the best of us) and therefore are ready...to hear counsel from yourself or any of our brethren according to God... You are now old and stricken in years, and you will find it more honorable for your gray head and more sensible to Christ and his churches to bear witness to his truth against every evil way and to stand in the gap against all corruptions in Gods house, than to be carried away with the stream of the times to do that which is evil in the sight of the Lord. ... you have long been active in controversies...though in some things happily you have been in the right yet in diverse matters you have not cleared yourself for the charges put upon you by others. Be more ready to end controversies, than to take them up. ...Strive not against it, lest you be

---

<sup>107</sup> I am grateful to Ann Hughes for pointing out the unusual nature of his titles.

<sup>108</sup> John Conant, "To the reader" in Bernard, *Thesaurus*, n.p.

found to fight against the Lord and he suddenly take you away. So praying for you and the churches of God among you. We desire the like Christian help from you...<sup>109</sup>

Although they did not question his salvation (and as a result addressed him as a brother), the New Englanders questioned Bernard's wisdom and suggested that he had lost focus on God's plan. Further, they characterized him as intemperately pugnacious and suggested that some in the godly community retained charges against his actions or theological positions that had yet to be "cleared." These are, of course, extremes. A fair estimate of Bernard's career probably falls somewhere between the near-hagiographic description by Conant and the near-polemic context of the New Englanders' correspondence.

Echoes of Bernard's parish work continued to influence Batcombe and its environs for some years. Richard Alleine, son of Bernard's nearby godly associate Richard Alleine of Ditchat, took the parish (knowing Bernard's closeness with members of the Bisse family who held the advowson, it is possible—perhaps probable—that he had provided input regarding his successor). Under Alleine, the parish continued in a decidedly godly fashion. A manuscript record noted that he oversaw a local act of iconoclasm:

Die Veneris 8o vizt die mensis Aprilis Anno Dni 1642 Mr Richard Allen junior, Clerk, being instituted to the parsonage of Batcombe which was lately belonging to one Mr Richard Bernard a great precisian, coming for an induction with a brother of his being likewise a clergyman, and another stranger, a layman being a londoner, there being a very fair crucifix at the upper end of the south end of the cathedral church of St Andrew in Wells behind the quire, this Londoner most maliciously threw a stone at it & broke it, the said two Allens standing at the lower end of the aisle, & beholding it, and watching that none came the whiles.<sup>110</sup>

The fact that Bernard's name appeared in this narrative at all—which focused upon actions that occurred after his death—suggests something of his long shadow. Yet as the passage also suggested, Alleine was not merely the successor of a godly minister. He was godly in his own right, and with the coming of the fraught middle portion of the seventeenth century, it would not be long before his actions began to stand on their own.

---

<sup>109</sup> AAS, Mather Documents, 95-97.

<sup>110</sup> Manuscript notes on the Wells Cathedral Library copy of Ludolphus de Saxonia, *Da Vita Christi*. The information card for this work, ref. A1/32, describes the book's provenance: "given to the library by Sarah Westley, wife of William Westley, Chpater Clerk of Wells. Sarah died in 1701 and gave a number of books to the library which had probably belonged to her father, Francis Keene of Wells. The two witnesses to the dramatic events related here could well have been Francis Keene himself and Mark Tabor, a Wells lawyer." Two further handwritten descriptions of iconoclastic acts, these from 1643, appear on the work's title page among other notes.

As the above passage suggests, many of the religio-political tensions of the 1640s took on local dimensions. In Batcombe, Bernard's godly legacy, along with Alleine's leadership, probably escalated tensions against the nearby royalist town of Bruton. This came to something of a head in February 1642, not too long after Bernard's death. The Bruton parish register recorded:

All praise and thanks to God still give  
For our deliverance, Matthias' eve.  
By his great power we put to flight  
Our foes, the raging Batcombites;  
Who came to plunder, burn, and slay,  
And quite consume our town this day."<sup>111</sup>

Although Bernard would not likely have advocated violence, he did have a hand in the fact that much of Somerset trended puritan in the 1640s, and it is unsurprising that many of his close associates were associated with Parliamentary activities in the 1640s.<sup>112</sup>

Bernard's legacy also continued in print. As an innovative author-minister working rather early in the period of print development, Bernard led the way for later author-ministers in a variety of direct and indirect ways. His works would be found in Richard Baxter's and Bishop Hall's libraries, and his allegorical work in *The Isle of Man* would influence John Bunyan.<sup>113</sup> In addition to certain popular works such as *Isle* that continued in print for many years, some of Bernard's religio-political works saw re-publication at key times of debate. Posthumous attributions of publications to Bernard continued into the years during and even after the Civil War—regardless of the accuracy of these attributions, this suggests that those marketing books perceived his name to have some cachet among readers. Further, the reception on both sides of the Atlantic to Bernard's posthumous works fittingly suggests the influence that he had gained by the end of his career.

Yet Bernard is not the subject of this study. Rather, the author-minister is. Through Bernard's example, I seek to suggest the large variety of ways that different author-ministers could relate to their vocations and their audiences and to illustrate a range of events resulting from the potential and actual blending of religion and print. Accordingly, it is my sincere hope that the ideas in this study have found a beginning, and not an endpoint, with Bernard.

---

<sup>111</sup> Hunt, *The Somerset Diocese: Bath and Wells*, 207. Murray, *Handbook for travellers in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, and Somersetshire*, 373.

<sup>112</sup> These individuals included John Conant, Bernard's posthumous editor for *Thesaurus*. Hunt, *The Somerset Diocese: Bath and Wells*, 208.

<sup>113</sup> Richard Baxter's library included *Conscience*, *Thesaurus*, and *Looke Beyond Luther*. Nuttall, "A Transcript of Richard Baxter's Library Catalogue (Concluded)." Denise Thomas has located several places Hall used Bernard's works: "Religious polemic, print culture, and pastoral ministry," *passim*.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE SE-BAPTIST, THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, AND THE MAKING OF A MODERATE NONCONFORMIST AUTHOR-MINISTER

In the early years of his ministry (c. 1598-1606), Richard Bernard developed increasing concerns about policies of the national church, began associating with several future separatists, was deprived of his parish ministry for refusal to submit to the canons of 1604, and took several steps that appeared to be leading toward separatism. Yet following the intervention of Archbishop Tobie Matthew in 1606-1607, Bernard not only conformed and resumed his parish duties but also set himself on a public course of actions and teachings that supported the national church more fully than many other godly ministers—even those who chose not to separate—could conscientiously do.

Although the ways in which Bernard would pursue such ministry developed and reinforced themselves throughout his career, in this chapter I show how certain theological decisions (particularly the development of the conviction that the Church of England was a true church from which a believer must not separate) and certain relationships (particularly those with John Smyth and Archbishop Tobie Matthew) began to define the way he would approach pastoral work, authorship, and the institutional Church of England. These influences from the early years of his ministry led Bernard to a brand of moderate nonconformity that, on the one hand, embraced the national church and the episcopacy, attempting to use the ecclesiastical structure to further the ministry of the gospel, and yet, on the other hand, retained scruples of conscience which led to occasional nonconformity and fostered the development of his decidedly godly preaching, teaching, and publishing ministry. Moreover, I argue that this context—Bernard’s move toward separatism and then his re-conforming—influenced not only his writings related to separatism but also the content of his contemporary devotional publications. While his anti-separatist writings made statements about the church itself, his pastoral writings made statements about his own intended focus as an author-minister addressing several key theological and practical issues within the church.

## Slow steps toward separatism

Bernard matriculated as a sizar at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1592, and while there he would have become familiar with John Smyth, who received his M.A. from Christ's in 1593 and was admitted as a fellow of that college in 1594. In 1598, both men left the college: Bernard upon receipt of his M.A. and Smyth due to his opposition to certain practices enjoined by the Church of England. Bernard spent time in Epworth, Lincolnshire, before taking up a living not far from there in Worksop, Nottinghamshire in 1601.<sup>114</sup> Meanwhile, in 1600, Smyth was elected lecturer in the nearby town of Lincoln where he continued to preach and pursue religious work, although he found censure from authorities for his positions on several issues.<sup>115</sup> In 1602, Smyth was removed from his post due to “enormous doctrine and undue teaching in matters of religion’ and preaching against ‘men of this city,’” and his preaching license was revoked in 1603.<sup>116</sup> Stephen Wright has traced Smyth's religious activities during this time and shown that although he retained a set of scruples problematic to authorities, he continued for several years to attempt to minister within the Church of England and may have regained his preaching license for a time.<sup>117</sup> Bernard later mentioned that after Smyth rejected his office in the national church, he “was made minister by tradesmen, and called himself the pastor of the church at Gainsborough.”<sup>118</sup>

The counties of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire were centers of nonconformist activity in the early seventeenth century, and over the next few years Bernard and Smyth became more closely tied to groups of individuals who desired stricter forms of religious practice and governance than the Church of England provided.<sup>119</sup> The men participated in discussions about problems in the Church of England and appeared more and more to be moving toward the cause of the separatists who believed that the Church of England was not a true church—although Bernard on occasion expressed hesitation to fully step away from the Church.<sup>120</sup> Nevertheless, Smyth recorded

---

<sup>114</sup> His induction mandate was issued June 19, 1601; Nottinghamshire Archive, “Abstracts of names of clergymen, taken from Induction Mandates (AN/IM 201-208/1), 1557-1696,” Ref. No. AN/IM 201/105.

<sup>115</sup> See Wright, *Early English Baptists*, 13-14; Richard L. Greaves, “Bernard, Richard (bap. 1658, d. 1642)”; and Stephen Wright, “Smyth, John (d. 1612),” *ODNB*.

<sup>116</sup> Wright, *Early English Baptists*, 13.

<sup>117</sup> As noted in the Introduction, Smyth later condemned Bernard for seeking personal gain through the appointments of Sawenbie and Ganesborough. Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331. For his part, Bernard condemned Smyth for essentially taking up and putting off ministerial duties at will, with or without official sanction; *Plaine Evidences*, 20.

<sup>118</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, 20.

<sup>119</sup> Wright, *Early English Baptists* 13-21.

<sup>120</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331-2. In Smyth's view, this hesitation was due to the unspiritual motives of fear and greed.

that Bernard preached sermons on Daniel 3:16-17 (a passage understood to indicate the correctness of opposing authorities who encourage improper religious practices) so frequently that “every man conceived that he would have been a ring leader to reformation.”<sup>121</sup> Bernard later indicated that this was not the case, but he did not provide an alternate reason for his choosing the text from Daniel.<sup>122</sup>

Bernard’s steps toward separatism seemed to be continuing when he refused to submit to the church canons of 1604 and was removed from his post on April 9, 1605.<sup>123</sup> The canons, part of James I’s new religious program, were designed to root out those within the church who practiced a more precise or ‘godly’ pattern of religion than the church required. Among the articles problematic for godly ministers such as Bernard were Canon 58, which required ministers to wear the surplice—a practice many saw as a dangerous remnant of Catholicism likely to lead congregants astray—and Canon 36, which required ministers to subscribe to the church’s government and ceremonies from the soul (“*ex animo*”) which “deliberately left no room for the mental reservations and qualifications that had previously made subscription just bearable to many scrupulous puritans.”<sup>124</sup>

After his removal, Bernard participated in a conference in 1606 at the Coventry home of William and Isabel Bowes to discuss ecclesiastical issues. There seemed to be hopes that, as Nicholas Tyacke has put it, the meeting would “prevent the fragmentation of the reform movement” following the Hampton Court Conference which had led to many clerical deprivations.<sup>125</sup> Information about the activities and attendees at this conference is anecdotal. John Cotton, who does not seem to have attended himself but described the meeting in a later publication, recorded that Arthur Hildersham, John Barbon, and John Dod attended, and that Smyth not only attended but requested the “help” of the conference in the first place.<sup>126</sup> John

---

<sup>121</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 333.

<sup>122</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Euidences*, 35.

<sup>123</sup> Greaves, “Bernard, Richard (bap. 1658, d. 1642)” *ODNB*. Ronald A. Marchant notes “Whether because he put on a bold front towards the court and appeared very obstinate, or for some other reason, he was not ordered to confer for his better understanding, but simply to appear at Bishopthorpe to be deprived.” Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts*, 149, 296.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Winship, *Godly Republicanism*, 16ff and 68-72. He notes that these changes left “up to three hundred ministers out of their positions.” See also Marchant, 147-148.

<sup>125</sup> Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 20. On this conference see also Newman, ““An Honourable and Elect Lady’: The faith of Isabel, Lady Bowes.”

<sup>126</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331; Cotton, *The Way of the Congregational Churches Cleared*, 7.



Robinson, Richard Clifton, and Thomas Helwys likely also attended.<sup>127</sup> Cotton's account noted that the "rigid separation" of Francis Johnson was a topic of concern, and that Smyth, having been convinced of its error, desired to go reason with Johnson, his former tutor. He further recorded that the attendees, fearing Smyth's "instability," made him promise he would not do so without their consent (a promise he would later break, to his opponents' displeasure).<sup>128</sup> Bernard likewise recorded the perception of several ministers that Smyth had taken their perspective. He indicated that Smyth went to Johnson in order to change his view:

Brought again to like it [Brownism], but not wholly, for he held some true church, some true pastors here, and did dislike the distinction of true and false church in respect of us: then went he, and conferred with certain godly and learned men, whereby he became so satisfied, as he kneeled down, and in prayer praised God, that he was not misled farther, and was so resolved, as he purposed to dissuade his tutor M. Johnson, from the same, saying, he would go to Amsterdam for that end. This will be, and is confidently avouched by diverse then there present.<sup>129</sup>

With the intense conversations and diversity of discussions occurring at such a conference, it is unsurprising that not everyone came away with the same conclusions—nor, even, the same interpretation of what had transpired.<sup>130</sup> Accordingly, Smyth's later account of this event differed. Responding to Bernard, he explained:

Whereas you say I became satisfied at Coventry after conference had with certain ministers, and here upon kneeled down and praised God: I answer: I did not confer with them about the separation as you & they know well enough in your consciences: but about withdrawing from true churches, ministers, and worship, corrupted: wherein I received no satisfaction, but rather thought I had given instruction to them: and for

---

<sup>127</sup> Timothy George suggests the attendance of Robinson and Clifton, though he gives more reason for naming the former than the latter. George notes Robinson's comment to Bernard: "after the conference passing betwixt Mr H and me, you uttered these wordes..." Robinson does not date the "conference" he mentions in this passage, and even if it is the 1606 conference, having a conversation "after" it does not necessarily prove that Robinson attended. Nevertheless, as a local godly cleric in friendship networks with others at the conference, he would seem to be a natural invitee. If we read his statement in its most obvious sense, there is no particular reason to doubt that he attended—and at any rate we know he was very familiar with the conference's outcomes. Specific comments in the primary sources relating Clifton to the conference itself are even more scarce—yet again, he was certainly part of the circle discussing separation and does show up in printed narratives of the separatists' activities. George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*, 83. See also Freeman, "Darcy... Isabel, Lady Darcy (d. 1622)" *ODNB*; Stephen Wright, "Helwys, Thomas (c. 1575-1614), *ODNB*."

<sup>128</sup> Cotton, *Way of the Congregational Churches*, 7. On this see also Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 37.

<sup>129</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 37. Bernard does not specifically state that this was at the 1606 Coventry conference; however, Smyth's response which reinterprets the anecdote mentions that it was following a conference at Coventry, and the events certainly transpired in this general time period.

<sup>130</sup> One or more of these writers may have incorrectly remembered these events, or may have disingenuously massaged their recollections in order to fit later circumstances; yet a charitable interpretation of these different accounts, in which each party is assumed to be recounting events in largely the way he understood them at the time, is entirely possible here.

kneeling down to praise God I confess I did, being requested to perform the duty at night after the conference by the ministers: but that I praised God for resolution of my doubts, I deny to death and you therein are also a slanderer: I praised God for the quiet & peaceable conference, & such like matters, & desired pardon of the L. for ignorances, & errors, & weakness of judgment, & any disordered carriage: if the ministers that heard my prayers and praises of God did misconstrue my meaning let them look unto it.<sup>131</sup>

During the conference, Bernard to some degree may have taken the side of those favoring separatism; Smyth later recounted: “I have carefully weighed with my self your Readines to embrace this truth wee professe, First, at Sr. W. Bowes his howse when it was opposed by some adversaries...”<sup>132</sup> Yet throughout this period, it seems Bernard continued to waver between an appreciation for the way of the separatists (he at least shared with them a desire to purify the church more fully) and a concern that separation was wrong. Even outside the conference discussions, Bernard sought out individuals for discussion and debate about this topic. Following a meeting with the nonconformist-but-nonseparating Arthur Hildersham, Bernard went to meet Smyth at Broxtowe. Smyth had been staying there with Helwys and experienced a serious illness accompanied by a period of spiritual doubt. During this visit, Bernard desired Smyth to engage him in debate, saying that Smyth’s debate with the future separatist Richard Clifton was unhelpful because of Clifton’s poor intellectual abilities.<sup>133</sup>

After the conference, and even more so after his meeting with Smyth, Bernard’s hesitation about separation may have been increasing—even as his aversion to many Church policies continued unabated. Both Smyth and Robinson mention that Bernard used the example of Naaman in 2 Kings 5 to describe his position. This analogy would have likened a decision to conform to some church policies—although he inwardly disagreed with them—to Naaman’s seeking a pardon for bowing down in the temple of Rimmon because it was his duty to escort the king to the temple.<sup>134</sup> Bernard later asserted that this interpretation of his words exaggerated his earlier position, but he does seem to have remained unsure about the best course of action for some time.<sup>135</sup>

Later, responding to Ainsworth’s assertion that Bernard had once seemed to “favor” separatism before turning against it, Bernard replied that he had merely explored the separatists’

---

<sup>131</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 534-535.

<sup>132</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331.

<sup>133</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331.

<sup>134</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 331-334; Robinson, *A iustification of separation*, 10.

<sup>135</sup> Bernard, *Plaine evidences*, 35.

views before rejecting them. As someone with godly leanings, the biblicism and outward holiness of those tending toward separation attracted Bernard—until, he said, he realized that both were an outward show:

I was never a leader, nor a setter of others on, as, lewdly by words, malicious men belie me: I profess myself most ignorant of what a Brownist held, before M. Smith and his followers went that way; I never saw a book of theirs, nor to my knowledge, the face of a man in the way of the separation. I confess I was much moved with fair shows of Scripture, and with great pretenses of holiness in their way; but I was not removed.<sup>136</sup>

It is important to note that Bernard later denied any leadership within the movement; nevertheless, because of his own uncertainty he also admitted that he did not lead people away from it, either. As a minister with a public position, warnings from him might have kept certain individuals from deciding to separate; for not doing so, he later expressed something like regret for the good he failed to do: “Time is an instructor to a diligent searcher; I see now, what I then saw not; if I had, the late Separatists had not misled so many...”<sup>137</sup>

### Writing against the Church of England

At some point during this period of questioning, Bernard authored a work against the episcopal governance of the national church—striking at the heart of the church’s composition. Although arguments against episcopacy were not necessarily separatist, such a work would certainly have been agreeable to those with separatist leanings.<sup>138</sup> This work, which Bernard circulated in manuscript, used what Smyth later described as “divers arguments” in order to prove that episcopal authority was “Antichristian.”<sup>139</sup> Because the manuscript is not extant and Bernard chose not to publish it, we can speak with little certainty about it. It may have been published after Bernard’s death under the title *A Short View of the Praelaticall Church of England*. Scholars have sometimes attributed this work to Bernard, and the contents accord with Smyth’s description. It was first published anonymously in 1641, following the lifting of Laudian censorship and the pre-Civil War increase in interest in a Presbyterian form of church government. It saw print again in 1666, this time under attribution to “John Bernard, sometime minister of Batcombe in

---

<sup>136</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Euidences*, 4.

<sup>137</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Euidences*, 3.

<sup>138</sup> Separatists tended to pursue congregational forms of church government, although anti-episcopal doctrine also had connections with Presbyterianism; on this see Winship, 20ff.

<sup>139</sup> Smyth, “Paralleles, Censvres, Observations,” 336.

Somerset”—problematic because Batcombe never had a minister by that name. This attribution has led some to suggest that *Praelaticall Church* was not authored by Richard Bernard (and may or may not have been authored by a John Bernard). Yet given the evidence, it is possible that this publication was produced from a copy of Bernard’s anti-episcopal manuscript mentioned by Smyth. On this inference, one or more copies could have been taken from the manuscript Bernard circulated in the early seventeenth century and, years later, have been brought to press by the holder of a copy.<sup>140</sup> Such a third-party scenario would make both the anonymous publication in 1644 and the later blunder in nomenclature more understandable.<sup>141</sup>

Whether or not *Praelaticall Church* was the document in question, the fact that he wrote an anti-episcopal manuscript shows that even early in his career Bernard was incorporating authorship into his pastoral activities. By meeting with others about the possibility of separatism, he gathered information. Along with researching doctrinal positions and organizing his thoughts, at some point he recorded his ideas in a logical or argumentative form. Yet rather than keeping this information as a personal reference, he decided to circulate his work, presumably both to receive others’ comments and to spread his ideas. Such actions were related to his beliefs about the duties of a parish minister to educate himself and those under his spiritual guidance; as he would later argue in *The Faithfull Shepheard*, gathering and analyzing information about many topics, including controversial ones, was important for pastors.<sup>142</sup> The work required to compose such a treatise reflected his desire to carefully research and defend his doctrinal positions and to organize his ideas about an issue. Once he had written up his views, he could attempt to refine his thoughts by sharing his work with trusted interlocutors.<sup>143</sup> In addition, and perhaps even more importantly, writing allowed him to spread his ideas more broadly. This would allow him to influence the views

---

<sup>140</sup> Making copies of handwritten documents—not only manuscript books but also all sorts of communications such as letters—was a common practice. These copies were often for personal reference, but could also be further circulated, produced as evidence in a debate, or published.

<sup>141</sup> Some past scholars have suggested that the work in question was later published anonymously as *Twelve generall arguments*. They suggest that this work was Bernard’s and was (mis-)attributed to William Bradshaw by its inclusion in a 1660 compilation of his works. This is a mistake, as *Twelve generall arguments* only addresses episcopacy directly in one of its articles and not in “divers arguments” as Smyth says Bernard’s does, and Article XX of that work speaks so strongly against separatism that it would not have been likely to circulate among individuals considering doing so. Again, if Bernard’s anti-episcopal book did make it to print and is extant, it is likely *Praelaticall Church*. See Taffel, “Richard Bernard: Puritan Divine”; and Grosart, “Richard Bernard.” See also Chapter 7.

<sup>142</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 35-42.

<sup>143</sup> Bernard’s letter to Archbishop Ussher indicated that he had sent a pre-publication work to Ussher more than once and also shared a work with members of the Oxford faculty. It is likely he made a regular practice of seeking editorial comments before publication. BOD MS Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29.

of readers who might be similarly confused about their position toward the Church. In other words, he could use his own research to benefit a wide audience.<sup>144</sup>

Yet, significantly, Bernard chose not to publish this work. Although Smyth asserted that Bernard would not have minded if someone else took the treatise to press as being written anonymously, no one did so.<sup>145</sup> Because of Bernard's interests in spreading his views, it might seem that a pastoral view of the situation would demand that he publish in order to reach the largest possible audience. Yet his action to the contrary can also be understood in terms of religious goals related to his relationship toward the Church of England. To publish a work so obviously against the Church, Bernard would have to publish abroad or use an illicit press, which would tend to identify his publication as subversive rather than widely accepted and legitimate. If he published while still in his clerical office, he would find censure from above and possibly lose some or all of his clerical abilities to minister to parishioners. Yet even after his removal, it could still be wise not to publish: if he harbored hopes of reuniting with the Church at some point, earning the prelates' disfavor by such a damaging publication would not have helped this cause later on.<sup>146</sup>

#### Slow steps toward (moderate non-)conformity

The period after the 1604 deprivations held many theological discussions and difficult personal choices for the godly clergy in the area of Nottinghamshire. While 1606 had seen the Coventry conference and agitation from ministers who were increasingly troubled by Church policies, it also saw the translation of Tobie Matthew to the see of York. Upon arrival, Matthew gave careful attention to the separatist issue. Working to identify and prosecute separatist leaders, he simultaneously attempted to regain the conformity of more moderate ministers. Accordingly, the years 1606-1607 became particularly decisive.

Several leaders chose to move ahead with separation.<sup>147</sup> As William Bradford later recorded, the separatists from this region formed themselves into two groups:

---

<sup>144</sup> It does not matter for the sake of this point whether Bernard wrote the manuscript before or after his removal from his parish duties. Even after his failure to conform, his unofficial spiritual leadership and prominence in godly circles would still have allowed him to keep something of a pastoral role toward many of the region's godly believers.

<sup>145</sup> Smyth, "Paralleles, Censvres, Observations," 336. Since Bernard did not later attempt to refute or qualify this allegation in his otherwise exhaustive response to Smyth, it seems that Bernard accepted this narrative. The identity of this manuscript book has been debated..

<sup>146</sup> Indeed, Smyth's work suggests that Bernard may have hoped to reunite with the Church, though Smyth casts him as inconstantly and fearfully wavering in his resolve to separate.

<sup>147</sup> Lee, *The Theology of John Smyth*, 46.

These people became 2. distincte bodys or churches, & in regarde of distance of place did congregat severally; for they were of sundrie townes & vilages, some in Nottinghamshire, some of Lincollinshire, and some of Yorkshire, wher they border nearest together. In one of these churches (besids others of note) was Mr. John Smith, a man of able gifts, & a good preacher, who afterwards was chosen their pastor...

But in this other church (wch must be ye subjecte of our discourse) besids other worthy men, was Mr. Richard Clifton, a greave and rever[n]d preacher, who by his paines and dilligens had done much good, and under God had ben a means of ye conversion of many. And also that famous and worthy man Mr. John Robinson, who afterwards was their pastor for many years, till ye Lord tooke him away by death. Also Mr. William Brewster a reverent man, who afterwards was chosen an elder of ye church and lived with them till old age.<sup>148</sup>

Although this account noted the importance of geographical distance in the division, other factors—theological, ideological, and even temperamental—may have also influenced this division and would become even more problematic in the ensuing years as differences between separatist groups became more pronounced.<sup>149</sup> Soon, both of these groups were compelled to go abroad.

Bernard, notably absent from the individuals mentioned, was among those who returned to conformity under the influence of Matthew and others.<sup>150</sup> W. J. Sheils has suggested that Matthew's dealings with radical puritans saw their actions as "a case of misplaced zeal rather than of wilful obstinacy" and that it was his practice to use persuasion rather than discipline whenever possible. Although we do not know precisely what tactics Matthew used to convince Bernard to conform, because of the amicable nature of their relationship in the ensuing years we can assume that Bernard saw Matthew's efforts at persuasion as fair and understanding and his arguments for conformity as theologically sound. Upon returning to conformity, Bernard was restored to his ministry in Worksop.<sup>151</sup> This transition had great significance both for Bernard, whose career prospects immediately changed, and for his former allies, who felt a sharp sting of betrayal from a man they now considered as a faithless apostate.<sup>152</sup>

Yet just as Bernard had moved slowly as he explored separation, he also made rather slow progress back toward full conformity. After resuming his duties, Smyth and Robinson later reported, Bernard attempted to further the growth of the godly of the region by entering into a covenant with about one hundred others to avoid hearing non-preaching "dumb" ministers, watch

---

<sup>148</sup> Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, 9-10.

<sup>149</sup> George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*, 84.

<sup>150</sup> Collinson, *Cranmer to Sancroft*, 111.

<sup>151</sup> Sheils, "Matthew, Tobie" *ODNB*. It is extremely likely, of course, that Matthew used many of the same arguments to return Bernard to conformity that Bernard would lay out in *Separatists Schisme* just a few years later.

<sup>152</sup> Smyth, "Paralleles, Censvres, Observations," has particularly bitter words throughout.

over and admonish one another, and to receive the Lord's Supper together.<sup>153</sup> Covenants within communities in the Church of England were not entirely unusual. These covenants differed both from separatism and from New England congregationalism in that those outside the covenant were able to gain church membership, sacraments, and privileges. Following this pattern, after covenanting Bernard still admitted all parishioners to church and to the sacraments (as he was required to do), and he continued to renounce separatism. Yet he still attempted to pursue this semi-separate, particularly rigorous spiritual activity with the godly. He would later explain that he had done this in order to keep the region's godly believers from joining Smyth—that is, by providing some of the benefits of a covenant community within the Church of England he might keep the godly from taking a sinful step toward separatism. Yet because covenanting was an action of utmost seriousness, the fact that he entered the covenant himself makes it seem that he, too, desired the closeness of godly discipline such a covenant would offer.

This form of semi-separation within the Church was unacceptable to leaders who were attempting to pursue religious unity and consistency across the nation, and Matthew seems to have intervened to correct Bernard's activities once again.<sup>154</sup> Yet it is interesting that even after the dissolution of this covenant, and even though over the ensuing years he became solidly conformist in his official position, Bernard never ceased pursuing degrees of reform in his parish that regularly brought him before church courts for minor acts of nonconformity. The issue of baptism proved to be particularly troublesome in ensuing years; a 1608 presentment recorded "all well except 'that the matter touching the crosse in baptisme is now depending before the Lord Archbishop'" and the Quarter Sessions of 1611 also noted that Bernard had refused "to use reverence when administering Baptism."<sup>155</sup> Yet, perhaps in an effort to make up for occasional presentments for failing to follow official practice in matters of conscience, Bernard became a strong and vocal supporter not only of the episcopate (and Matthew in particular) but also of preaching—a practice dear to Matthew's heart.

Matthew placed a strong emphasis on preaching throughout his career; William Sheils has observed that he was "pre-eminent and indefatigable" in this role, and Joseph Gavin has named

---

<sup>153</sup> Smyth, "Paralleles, Censvres, Observations," 335-336. On Bernard's later position regarding not hearing ministers from the national church, cf. Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 152-153.

<sup>154</sup> Smyth, "Paralleles, Censvres, Observations," 335-336.

<sup>155</sup> Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts*, 296. This pattern of moderate nonconformity seems to have continued after his 1613 move to Batcombe, though it was less noticed under certain more favorable bishops.

him “one of the most prolific and popular preachers of his day.”<sup>156</sup> He had risen in the Church in part due to these skills and was elected public orator at Oxford and chaplain in ordinary to Elizabeth in part due to his notoriety as a preacher.<sup>157</sup> In addition to preaching prolifically (he kept an extensive diary of 1,992 of the sermons he gave throughout his ministry and became disappointed if he preached fewer than forty times per year), he took care to ensure that the style of a sermon was appropriate for his audience.<sup>158</sup> Though he prioritized sermon preparation and careful study, he was able to preach extemporaneously when necessary.<sup>159</sup> Bernard was among those who would come to recognize Matthew’s influence in the pulpit. In a 1609 dedicatory epistle to “the chief officers, the gentlemen domestical attendants, and to the rest of the family” of Matthew, Bernard said his dedicatees “do hear the excellent truths of God, by one of whom it hath been said, He doth *regnare in pulpitis*. I do grant it, who can deny those gifts?”<sup>160</sup>

Matthew wanted his ministers to pursue the same careful approach to preaching and other religious-educational pursuits. More than simply ensuring that ministers were carrying out preaching and teaching in their parishes (a task required of bishops) he gave personal attention to ministers and others interested in developing their abilities and made his library available to those who needed it. He fostered and participated in preaching exercises in his diocese.<sup>161</sup> He also encouraged ministers in scholarly pursuits and in the publication of appropriate books. Puritan minister John Favour of Halifax, Matthew’s chaplain, dedicated his only book to Matthew. In the dedicatory epistle he explained in some detail the ways in which Matthew fostered his endeavors:

Your Grace did not only by speech move me to meditate upon this subject, but also gave me great encouragement to proceed, when I presented unto you a few sheets of paper the next morning after your motion, a slender model of one night’s framing. Hereunto I was pricked forward by a godly emulation...partly toward those multitudes of authors, sacred, profane, old, new, friends and foes, with whose works your Grace’s great and good library is plentifully furnished...<sup>162</sup>

Matthew not only provided “great encouragement” for Favour’s ambitions toward print but also read an early draft of his work and made his library available for such work.

---

<sup>156</sup> Sheils, “Tobie Matthew,” *ODNB*; Gavin, “Elizabethan bishop of Durham: Tobias Matthew, 1595-1606,” 324.

<sup>157</sup> Sheils, “Tobie Matthew’s Preaching Diary,” 382.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*; Sheils, “Tobie Matthew,” *ODNB*;

<sup>159</sup> Sheils, “Tobie Matthew,” *ODNB*; Ian Green, “Preaching in the Parishes,” 143; Gavin, “Elizabethan bishop of Durham: Tobias Matthew, 1595-1606,” 327.

<sup>160</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, Sig. A3r.

<sup>161</sup> Sheils, “Tobie Matthew,” *ODNB*.

<sup>162</sup> John Favour, *Antiquitie triumphing ouer noueltie*, Sig. A2v.



Although he did not push all his ministers to print, Matthew seems to have treated many ministers, and in particular Bernard, with such personal leadership and encouragement. This leadership, as Bernard would later record, emphasized Matthew's focus on pastoral duties and featured liberality toward ministers under his care:

I have received much from your Grace, I can repay nothing. The debt I acknowledge... I am therefore bold in witness hereof to send forth this Faithful Shepherd under your Grace's favor and protection: and to whom may I better, I say not commend him, but commit him, than to a most faithful shepherd, a patron to all faithful pastors, a countenancer of ministers, though poor, though to worldlings contemptible, such as have care of their charge, and be painful in their places. I have ever admired your Grace's good respect to ministers, your comfort and encouragement to them. I call to mind mine own happiness in particular above many, when I lived in those parts: I enjoy Gods blessing (praised be his name) where I am; and it was *digitus Dei* that reached it out unto me; *agnoscunt omnes, qui norunt*; but yet my then present means, in the presence of my many honorable, and other good friends, and your Grace's so large provision for me for the time to come, should have contented me. My removing was loss, especially in the want of so gracious a diocesan; and I should more and more bewail my folly, but that the Lord our God hath given to us here, and I may say to me very happily, a blessed bishop, a very man of God...<sup>163</sup>

Based upon this close relationship of oversight and patronage, it is likely that Matthew was involved not only in Bernard's pastoral ministry but also his print ministry. Considering Matthew's emphases on preaching, he would have been particularly interested in Bernard's development of *The Faithfull Shepheard*, a manual instructing ministers in several aspects of the pastoral ministry including sermon preparation and delivery.<sup>164</sup> In addition, it seems that Matthew (or at least his looming presence in the mind of a recently-re-conforming minister) had some part in nearly all of the publications Bernard produced during his time in Worksop. Further, during this period, all but two of the works Bernard produced were of a devotional or didactic nature. The fact that Bernard focused on such works demonstrates a concern to return to business-as-usual for a puritan author-minister: diligently performing parish duties while putting out material that might educate or encourage parishioners or other readers. Perhaps even more importantly, these works clearly indicated to Matthew that Bernard accepted his priorities of preaching and teaching.

---

<sup>163</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621), Sig. A2r-A3v.

<sup>164</sup> Chapter 3 discusses *The Faithfull Shepheard*, one of his most important works, in more detail.

## Publishing against the separatists

While the majority of Bernard's publications in this period echoed Matthew's emphasis on preaching and teaching and displayed Bernard's dedication to a godly pastoral ministry, in 1608 and 1610 Bernard published two polemical works against separatism. Although different in tone and genre from his other works, these publications likewise demonstrated Bernard's desire for episcopal approval and his attempt to shepherd the godly within the framework of the national church. These works provided a way for him to publicly recast himself as a loyal member of the Church of England, and they also helped him and others understand proper doctrine. As I will show, in developing the theological and polemical positions that he displayed in these publications, Bernard leaned upon conformist associates within the national church, and particularly upon his growing relationship with Matthew. Simultaneously, he consciously recoiled from the separatist positions now espoused by several of his former associates, and particularly Smyth, whose views became increasingly unorthodox in the ensuing years.

Like his devotional publications, Bernard's polemical works fell within a largely pastoral context. They allowed Bernard to help parishioners, former allies, and others within a broad public.<sup>165</sup> His move toward publication was also related to his specific position in the national church. Although Bernard had officially reentered the church, he had yet to prove himself to both superiors and subordinates as a committed and faithful minister. As such, he was understandably eager to publicly demonstrate his conformity and continue with his career. The publication he ultimately produced allowed him both to pursue his ministry on a pastoral level toward those he might spiritually shepherd and strengthen his renewed bond with the Church of England in a public way.

---

<sup>165</sup> Bernard seems to have had some interest in converting his former allies personally and wrote a letter to Smyth expounding several reasons against separating (most of which would later appear in some form in *Separatists Schisme*). Smyth, unconvinced, replied to persuade Bernard of the opposite and later complained that Bernard failed to respond and went straight to publication; as evidence, Smyth reprinted much of their correspondence. Later Bernard explained that he had believed a private reply would do no good, but had published only Smyth's arguments rather than private matters—unlike Smyth had done in dragging even private correspondence to light: "But to these by-matters in his letter, have I made answer at large: and before the printing of my former booke, had I it ready, which yet I reserved to my self, as some know, thinking it to no purpose so to contend with him, and supposing he would not have been so shameless, as to set out to the world a private letter of the private matters of such a nature, and lies too. ...My answer to his by-matter, in his letter, is five sheets of paper, too much here to set down, but if any be desirous to see it, I will not now (as afore) be sparing of it. The matter of his letter concerning his opinions I did publish, as by them better understanding the separatists' errors, than before; which opinions I thought fit to make known, and so rather to object against them, for more evidence of truth, than withal to make answer to private reasons for them, which might afterwards be disclaimed, till the defence of them came public, as it now is." Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, 35-36.

The process of researching and writing seems to have been a way for Bernard to solidify his own views about the nature and government of a true Christian church. During this process of research, Bernard probably made use of Matthew's library. Though direct evidence of this is lacking, we know that Matthew regularly opened his library to ministers and scholars, and we know that he was particularly interested in eradicating separatism from his diocese. As such, he would have had a natural interest in Bernard's project. It is made even more likely by the fact that a large proportion of the sources that Bernard cited in the work he produced (which he would title *Christian Advertisements and Counsels of Peace. Also disswasions from the Separatists schisme...*) are now extant in the York Minster library, where Matthew's widow donated his library after his death.<sup>166</sup> In sum, there are strong grounds upon which to suggest that Matthew not only encouraged Bernard against separatism in the first place but also continued to assist and influence him in moving away from it and writing against it—both explicitly through conversation and implicitly through the sources he made available to Bernard.

Of course, such alignments with the establishment of the Church of England, which from Bernard's perspective appeared as honest-hearted seeking after the truth, could also serve to disguise his own partial nonconformity by highlighting the stronger nonconformity of his opponents. John Robinson would accuse Bernard of making just this type of move:

But are you your self wholly conformable Mr B? If not, why do you incense the magistrate against us being yourself obnoxious to his displeasure? Or do you not hope to escape persecution your self by persecuting us? This is too ordinary a practice amongst you. But the Lord seeth your halting, and rewardeth you in your bosoms, as you have served us. And when you and others more forward then you do consider & feel in what hatred you are with the King and state, me thinks your hearts should smite you, as the hearts of Joseph's brethren did them in their trouble for their barbarous cruelty towards him. Gen. 42.<sup>167</sup>

In a polemical culture where, depending upon the situation, one might play up or play down positions to one's right or left in order to gain an advantage, this is hardly surprising. Yet Bernard in *Separatists Schisme* suggested that the separatists had moved outside the bounds of orthodoxy. One

---

<sup>166</sup> While it is not possible to identify each of Matthew's books in the Minster library, many have been positively identified as belonging to him, and it is certain that many of the early volumes came from his widow's bequest. Knowing Matthew's interest in quelling separatism, it is extremely likely that he would have owned many of the works Bernard cites, so the matches between references in *Separatists Schisme* and the Minster library are almost certainly more than coincidental. Works Bernard cites that appear in the Minster library include, among others, George Gifford, *A Plaine Declaration* (1590); Philippe de Mornay, *Tractatus de Ecclesia* (1579) and *De Sacra Eucharistia* (1605); Stephen Bredwell, *The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownisme* (1588); Francis Johnson, *An Answer to Maister H. Iacob* (1600); and more. See *A Catalogue of the Printed Books in the Library of the Dean and Chapter of York*.

<sup>167</sup> John Robinson, *A Iustification of Separation*, 83.

might have a brotherly disagreement with a godly, non-separating, nonconformist—but one must strongly oppose an unorthodox, schismatic separatist. Bernard’s work would continue to develop this distinction when in his second work against separatism he treated Smyth harshly, as an enemy to the truth rather than a misguided friend.

In addition to aligning Bernard with the Church establishment, *Separatists Schisme* also asserted his interest in displaying unity with members of the national church more broadly. This was evident even from the outset of the work in the prefatory epistles. Bernard dedicated his first work to Sir George Saintpoll and his wife (the former Frances Wray). The Wray family had been Bernard’s special patrons and financed his education, and he retained an affectionate and grateful position toward them throughout his life. Yet here, too, he was politic: Frances was the sister of Isabel Bowes, at whose home the 1606 conference had occurred. Though Bernard seemed to have felt equally grateful to both women for their support and to have been mindful of their entire family’s support of the cause of the godly, the Bowes’s well-known sympathy toward certain separatists may have influenced his choice to recognize Frances’s side of the family, but not Isabel’s, in the dedication. Bernard used this dedication to demonstrate that the Wray family’s earlier efforts to educate him as a minister *in the national church* (the universities were not established for the training of separatists) had been fruitful. He wrote:

My labour (Right Worshipful) I offer unto you as a testimony of a never forgetful remembrance, with a mind heartily thankful for your Worship’s continued favours, and bountiful liberality towards me. By your work of mercy, in the university was I brought up, whereby through the good grace of God, I am that I am.<sup>168</sup>

Through this dedication, Bernard underscored his connection not only with the ecclesiastical establishment—emphasizing his education in university—but also with the Saintpoll family and, by extension, the godly circles of which they were a part. Although one does not doubt Bernard’s gratefulness for their financial assistance during his education, the placement of these thanks at the beginning of this particular work must be seen as a conscious effort to demonstrate his spiritual and ecclesiastical alignments.

His second epistle, to the “godly reader,” again showed that he was now positioning himself away from the separatist or near-separatist camps in which he had circulated previously. It not only indicated that he imagined a broad audience for this work but also allowed him to rhetorically join himself with the mass of committed members of the Church of England. In marked contrast

---

<sup>168</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, Sig. A4r.

from his earlier separation from church members in general—embodied in the special covenant he made with the godly individuals in the region—here Bernard used the words “we” and “our” throughout the epistle, emphasizing the connection he had with any godly reader. At one point he even analogized himself as a youthful David, faithful to God and standing amid many brothers—even if those brothers were not ready for the same spiritual battles as he was: “I, a little one amongst others, and in the presence of my Brethren; not with Saul’s armour, but with a stone in a sling, even with my mean mediocrity, have nakedly discovered this way [of separatism].”<sup>169</sup> This positioning was not lost on readers—Robinson’s reply to Bernard points out that he “makes all the kingdom professors at a venture, and Christian professors I hope he meaneth.”<sup>170</sup>

In addition to portraying himself as a committed, established member of the Church of England, in this work Bernard sought to repair any theological damage done by his period of separatism, either to his own soul or to others’. He suggested the need to move strongly against one’s former errors when he explained the importance of convincing oneself that one’s previous doubts were in error. One should consider:

Whether this doubting ariseth through thy own default, by looking out reasons to increase thy dislike, and neglecting to search for arguments to give thee satisfaction. If thus thou hast offended, as many do, take as great pains in God’s sight to resolve thy self, as thou hast done to bring thy self into doubting, else dealest thou but partially.<sup>171</sup>

We must not miss the significance that Bernard’s remarkable doctrinal about-face would have on the life of a believer—and particularly a minister—at this time. Changing one’s views regarding the nature of the true Church, which were closely related to one’s understanding of the way God worked in the world and even of the ordinary way that God chose to save individuals, were significant moves that would affect nearly every part of life. Accordingly, Bernard’s initial focus in this work seems to have been an effort to lay out for himself the doctrinal basis for conformity. He needed to determine the correct view, and having done so, he needed to “take as great pains” to demonstrate the rightness of conformity as he had done previously to become convinced of the rightness of separation; this alone would put him on solid spiritual-intellectual footing. Because Bernard had been so involved in the cause *against* the episcopacy (having gone so far as to write a treatise against it), he had to show himself at least that much in *support* of the episcopacy—indeed,

---

<sup>169</sup> Bernard, “To the Godly Reader” *Separatists Schisme*, n.p.

<sup>170</sup> Robinson, *A iustification of separation*, 7. Robinson’s larger point here is to attack Bernard for giving preference to “Christian Professors” in his epistle if he later styles the whole kingdom as professors—but the fact that Bernard does so remains.

<sup>171</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 13.

he went even further, for while he had hesitated to publish his earlier work, he quickly published *Separatists Schisme*.

In addition to the task of fully convincing his own conscience that separatism was wrong, Bernard made it a point to convince others of the same. In a particularly poignant passage in the dedicatory epistle, he wrote:

It grieveth me much (Right Worshipful) to see this breach made amongst us; loss it is to the church; gain to the enemy and then what true good to themselves? Many laugh at it, some account it a matter scarce worthy thinking upon, and so few or none lament it: to me hath it been just cause of sorrow, and therefore could I not lightly pass it by: but in love to such as yet abide with us, and in desire to do my best to recover again mine own, whom God once gave me, I have published these things.<sup>172</sup>

As a shepherd, he had previously had a hand in encouraging several individuals in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire toward the way of separatism; through this publication, he might now reach them and others with his arguments against it and his public stand for conformity.<sup>173</sup> He stated his sadness about the situation and his desires that it be corrected even more clearly in the second epistle. In this, he asked readers to assist him by spreading the message they found in the book so that he might recall some former members of his flock who were now hurtfully cut off from him, their spiritual father, and also keep others from following the way of separatism:

Confidence in our cause (that here is a true church of God, from which wee may not make separation) hath made me adventurous: and the spiritual injury which some of late have done to me, more then to many, hath called me hereunto. They have taken away part of the seal of my ministry. Mine own with them may have instructors, but no fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten them through the Gospel. I will claim them, though unnaturally and unkindly they disclaim me; in love do I follow, and so will, albeit they flee from me with hatred. Friendly reader, when thou hast read this hue and cry, send it away by thy approbation thereto, and report the cause to other for discovery thereof, as thou shalt think fit. If thou happily doest find any meek ones of them in thy way, rebuke them lovingly, entreating the younglings gently for the Lord's sake, and send them back again. For in a schism many may be, who are not thereof: many affect that whereof they cannot judge, & so are misled; yet without any intendment of evil. The humble that are of a tender conscience, are very reclaimable: but the strait hearted opinionate are not so recoverable; yet I hope of both: for it is the Lord that worketh the will and the deed, both when and as he will.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, Sig. A3v-A4r.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Robinson's assessment that "The thing intended and promised by Mr. Bern. in the next place, is satisfaction to the perplexed conscience, and direction in that case..." Robinson, 28; On this passage see also Brachlow, 67.

<sup>174</sup> Bernard, "To the Godly Reader," *Separatists Schisme*, n.p.

In addition to reflecting Bernard's goals for the publication, this passage is particularly noteworthy because it provided a brief summary of the key issues that Bernard would raise in the rest of the work. As I will explain below, Bernard's key and final reason for avoiding separatism was that the Church of England was a "true church," and separating from a true church was schismatic and sinful. This passage anticipated his coming arguments by defining "our cause" as just this. In Bernard's mind, this reason alone made separation untenable. Yet he would also support his position by showing that separatism led to un-Christian and un-loving behavior—an assertion this passage again anticipated by identifying the "unnatural," "unkind," and "opinionate" nature of determined separatists.

Along with his pastoral concern to return members of his former flock to the Church, Bernard authored *Separatists Schisme* to make a public statement about his own views. He suggested in several places that he believed an author's last printed word on any controversial subject might be taken as his current (and, if the author had died, his final) opinion on the subject. Only by publishing a new work might an author make a legitimate change in his public testimony:

With this man's [separatist Henry Barrow's] sin and spirit of profaneness, ...neither he, (while he lived) published his repentance to the world in print, (as he sinned in print) nor yet any of these have declared their dislike thereof unto us in public, but rather indeed approved thereof..<sup>175</sup>

Thus, print was not merely a way to discuss an issue, but a public and enduring statement of belief that could be read not only as informative about a topic but as acceptable grounds for making moral judgments about the author; for instance, Bernard said that separatist author George Johnson "became a disgraceful libeller, loading his brother, and other more, with reproaches of shame & great infamy, & that in print to abide for ever."<sup>176</sup> Bernard moreover identified an un-Christian spirit in separatist author Henry Barrow by using his writings as evidence: "[I] will, as briefly as I can, set down the outrage thereof, as it is here and there dispersed in his book of *Discouerie*; by which, whatsoever he discovered of other, he laid open a strange spirit ruling in himself."<sup>177</sup> Although Bernard did not go so far as to judge whether an author was, or before death might have become, a true Christian, he did make judgments regarding the spiritual state of an

---

<sup>175</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 77. Note that Bernard believed that it is possible to sin and to repent in print, indicating that not only a work's content but also the way one used the medium had a moral aspect.

<sup>176</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 36. For more on the Johnson family, as well as Robinson, Ainsworth, Smyth and other separatists in the Netherlands, and their relationship to Bernard, see Donald Burke, *New England New Jerusalem* (Ph.D. Diss., Wayne State University, 2006) 128ff.

<sup>177</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 71.

author at the time a book was published and, in the absence of a corrective publication, assumed that the author likely continued in that state.

With such a strong view of the importance of print in establishing one's spiritual state, Bernard's purposes in publishing this work are even more evident. He wanted to show that his own spiritual state was that of a true believer who demonstrated love toward and unity with the members of the true church (as I show below, love and unity were key points of conformity for Bernard). By a public declaration of his own views, he defended potential attacks on his ecclesiastical conformity, orthodox theological beliefs, or godly behavior. The importance Bernard placed upon print as a gauge of an author's spiritual state was commensurate with the importance he accorded it as a means of communicating doctrine. As such, in *Separatists Schisme*, he focused his energies on locating and commenting on print works, rather than focusing on the words or actions of separatists. As a result, although Bernard's primary goal was to persuade readers against separatism, he also provided something like a guide to writings for and against separatism.<sup>178</sup> Bernard made frequent reference to many works both for and against his own position, and often to specific pages that interested readers might investigate for themselves. This stemmed from his understanding of print as able to reach a much broader audience with a permanent message. Just as he had noted that George Johnson's "disgraceful" work will "abide for ever," so did true Christian works: as he said elsewhere, "God...hath stirred up the hearts of many his servants, to bestow their strength, time, learning and means, not only to profit the present ages wherein they lived, but by their writings also, like careful Fathers to provide for posterity."<sup>179</sup>

This focus on the permanence and influence of the written word caused Bernard not only to contribute his own guide to this important topic but also to give prominence to written arguments of other authors on both sides of the controversy. Although Bernard certainly knew much about separatism from personal experience, he alluded to this knowledge rarely, and never as a prominent base for a point. In fact, the closest he came to highlighting his personal knowledge was an ambiguous statement at the very end of a long discourse: "their way (which in every particular they hold is as much known to me, as our way is to them)..."<sup>180</sup> This might allude to his own experiences, yet it could also be a declaration of close study rather than personal experience—again serving to separate himself from the fact of his former close association with separatists.

---

<sup>178</sup> This was common in polemical works at the time, cf. Hughes.

<sup>179</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 35; *Dauids Musick*, Sig. A3r.

<sup>180</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 41.



Yet Bernard's use of written sources as the primary target of his arguments held even where his personal experience was not a factor. Not only did he spend the vast majority of his work responding to written rather than oral or behavioral issues, but he also placed less interpretive weight on non-print evidence. In particular, the anti-separatist arguments that were based on the lives of separatists were labeled as mere "probabilities" against separatism, whereas the arguments against the published doctrines of separatists were "certain reasons." Even in the first section he gave more attention to issues which could be defended through print and less to other information, even credible testimony "confidently avouched by diverse then there present" and he noted elsewhere that "This can I show under hand writing: nothing here spoken without book, or by uncertain hearsay."<sup>181</sup>

In addition to publicly affirming his own beliefs, Bernard provided a guide to arguments both for and against separatism. As such, he anticipated that his audience included some "indifferent" readers who "may be persuaded" by his arguments against separatism.<sup>182</sup> He appealed to the thoughtful "Christian Reader" to consider not only his own arguments but also those of the separatists, which he believed would self-evidently lead one to embrace conformity, and he told readers who "have not observed the deceit in their allegations of Scripture (which is done diverse ways) observe these [following] things carefully."<sup>183</sup> Throughout his work he sometimes broke from his argument to make a request directly to the reader, such as "Discern, Reader, wisely; and judge the course rightly, and God give thee understanding in all things."<sup>184</sup>

In other words, although clearly intended to persuade the reader of the rightness of his view, Bernard's work did not attempt to hide information, but rather played the role of a compendium of textual information related to separatism. He included numerous Scripture references throughout the work, both in the text and in marginal notes, at one point even with the instruction "Confer these Scriptures with these quoted places..."<sup>185</sup> He made frequent reference to other writings both for and against separatism, including accounts of current events (i.e., intra-separatist controversies and scandals) and encouraged readers to consult these materials; at one point he emphatically noted, regarding the work of George Johnson, "If thou canst possibly, get his book."<sup>186</sup> Bernard

---

<sup>181</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 37, 50.

<sup>182</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 163.

<sup>183</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 170, 26.

<sup>184</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 47.

<sup>185</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 129.

<sup>186</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 158.

believed that carefully considering a broad range of relevant work would inevitably point readers toward the right path.<sup>187</sup>

Bernard expected readers to make their own informed opinions and not to be bound to follow anything of which they were unconvinced; yet his strong words left them in no doubt of what he believed to be the appropriate conclusion. The entire book showed a thoughtful use of argument and rhetoric to help readers reach this conclusion. Ann Hughes has noted that in early modern polemics, “On the one hand, religious authors present their words as obvious and fundamental truths directly and immediately conveyed to men and women by God. On the other hand, writers have to stress the importance of getting *their* version circulated in a definitive form to a wider audience and use, often *self-consciously*, a variety of *deliberate* strategies for presenting supposedly self-evident truth.”<sup>188</sup> A related tension—between asserting his obvious rightness, while simultaneously working quite hard to persuade readers of its obviousness, was present here with Bernard. In addition, his work reflected something of his other work as a minister as he presented an argument to laypeople about the best way to understand Scriptural and theological ideas.

Although he displayed certainty about his beliefs, Bernard highlighted the need to keep a humble attitude while one was considering points of doctrine, to look for errors in one’s own thoughts, and to be understanding with others who held different views:

X. Let thy own knowledge ground thy opinions in thee, and not in the judgment of other: see into the glass of the Word by thy own sight, without other men’s spectacles, and hold what thou judgest truth, only in love of thee truth; beware of by-respects: so hold the truth as never to be removed; but that which is erroneous in thee, be willing both to see, and to be reclaimed.

XI. Witness the truth, for the truth’s sake: inform others lovingly; desire that they may see the truth, but never urge them beyond their judgment, neither take it grievously if thy words doe not prevail, but wait with patience. Beware of rash judgment, neither condemn nor contemn other that are not as thy self. Think not to make thy gifts another’s guide, nor thy measure of grace their rule, for to every man is allotted his portion.<sup>189</sup>

In other words, while Bernard affirmed that there was but one right understanding of the issue at hand, there was also no license to ignore other, clear commands of God—such as those enjoining peace, love and charity—in pursuit of doctrinal purity. He believed that true doctrine must

---

<sup>187</sup> The work is also rather candid about some controversial happenings amongst separatists; Bernard clearly feels that the events speak for themselves against the way of separation.

<sup>188</sup> Hughes, “Religious Polemic,” 219. For more on the way that authors framed their positions in terms of logic, see Rosa, “Seventeenth-Century Catholic Polemic and the Rise of Cultural Rationalism.”

<sup>189</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 8-9.

coincide with true Christian behavior. For this reason, any disputed topic—including separatism—must be considered in terms of both doctrine and practice. A minister’s primary duties included not only instructing parishioners about theological concepts but also helping them understand how to use those principles to live in a right state with God and encouraging them to walk in those ways. Following his introductory section, the main body of Bernard’s work directly reflected these duties as he launched into both a long doctrinal explanation about the rightness of conformity to the church and an encouragement to behave in rightly toward God and others.

The essence of Bernard’s argument against the way of separatism was that because the Church of England is a true church, and because making a separation from a true church was sinful, separating from the Church of England was therefore sinful.<sup>190</sup> In this position Bernard aligned with the views of several godly ministers including John Sprint, William Ames, Arthur Hildersham, John Dod, William Bradshaw, John Ball, and others. Carol Schneider has identified these men as “principled Non-conformists” who “addressed themselves to the project of defining a ‘middle way’ between acquiescence in the institutional corruption of the Church of England and the schismatic option of complete separation from a Church patently unwilling to entertain substantive reform” (although Bernard actually went further toward conformity than some of these individuals).<sup>191</sup> Bernard showed the sinfulness of separation through the dual lenses of practice (it fostered un-Christian actions) and doctrine (it was based on error). Although simply the doctrinal aspect would have been enough to uphold a stand for conformity, Bernard believed that these two strands of evidence would even more fully convince careful and unbiased readers of the rightness of conformity. Yet before he could provide complete evidence of separatism’s sinfulness, he needed to demonstrate that the Church of England is a true church—otherwise, it would be right for believers to separate from it.

To establish the Church’s veracity, Bernard argued on the grounds that it had a true head (Christ), true matter (believers who hold a correct basic doctrinal framework), true form (a visible church uniting believers to God and one another) and true properties (preaching, the sacraments, and prayer).<sup>192</sup> Although each of these points was important in establishing the Church of England’s status as a true church, Bernard did not spend equal time discussing each point. In

---

<sup>190</sup> Carol Geary Schneider has analyzed Bernard’s work within the context of puritan discourse about the marks of a true church; several of her observations are helpful, though she errs in some details. Schneider, “Godly Order in a Church Half-Reformed,” 271-323.

<sup>191</sup> Schneider, “Godly Order in a Church Half-Reformed,” 303-304.

<sup>192</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 111-128, 175.

particular, he treats the first mark very briefly, taking it as essentially self-evident that the national church had a true head, Christ:

...we have no false head, we hold Jesus Christ, and worship no other God, but the Trinity in unity: If such, as have been of us, and by themselves may judge of this truth, do yet deny the same, they need rather correction, than instruction.<sup>193</sup>

His description of the “true matter” of the national church showed what he believed to be the core and non-negotiable doctrine of a Christian church. The “matter” of a church were those people which form it, and “true matter” are true believers who make a profession of faith indicating a basic belief in Christ. Bernard describes these core beliefs very simply: “Jesus the son of Mary is the son of God, Christ the Lord, by whom only and alone they shall be saved.”<sup>194</sup> In other words, the barest affirmation of true Christian belief must recognize Jesus as both divine and human (i.e., son of Mary and son of God), as Lord, and as the sole Savior of the world. Because this was the national church’s official teaching and it was believed by (at least many of) those within it, Bernard found it to meet the mark of a true church in this regard. He did not go so far as to say there were no problems, doctrinal or otherwise, with the Church of England; he certainly thought there were. Rather, he pointed out that bad behavior, transgressions, or ineptitude did not make a wife any less married to her husband, a subject any less bound to follow a king, or a tradesman less a tradesman, than those who performed their duties perfectly.<sup>195</sup> Likewise, within a true church, many things could be wrong:

...for whosoever doth profess Christ, is a Christian and true matter of a visible church, though neither good to other, nor profitable to himself.

Good Christian reader, miscarry not in thy judgment from the truth only of a good affection desirous to have all well, and grieved at what is amiss: for thou shalt find ever cause thus to be affected, wheresoever thou comest in this vale of misery and corruptions.<sup>196</sup>

Because many godly individuals who inclined toward separatism did so in response to corruption within the Church—it seems that Bernard had been one of these—the argument here is significant.

Moving on, Bernard pointed out that the “visible form & constitution of our church is not false.”<sup>197</sup> Here, he drew on the theological concepts of the visible and invisible church, in which the visible church was a group of living believers who professed faith in Christ and performed the

---

<sup>193</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 111.

<sup>194</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 112.

<sup>195</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 115.

<sup>196</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 116.

<sup>197</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 116.

functions of a church in the world, and the invisible church was composed of all true believers, both living and dead, who were heirs of salvation through faith in Christ. Separatist congregations sought to restrict membership in the visible church to individuals who (in the opinion of the other members) displayed signs of being a member in the invisible church. This often involved church members taking measures to discern a potential member's inward spiritual condition rather than accepting members predominately on outward profession of faith. Bernard argued that such attempts to purify the visible church were outside the instructions of Scripture. Although he made a point to note in the margin that "By many evident notes there be many which shew themselves in man's judgment, to be of the invisible Church of God amongst us," Bernard did not believe that the visible church must be composed only of true believers. Like the invisible church, the visible church was instituted by God. Moreover, Bernard noted that the apostles accepted converts into the church on their profession of faith and baptism—they did not attempt to see into the hearts of potential church members to confirm their conversion. Accepting those who professed belief and attempted to follow Christ would keep church members from too harshly judging one another in an effort to achieve ecclesiastical purity. Indeed, because all people—even true believers—stumbled into sin, attempting to purify the visible Church in that way was completely wrong-headed:

...neither doth corruptions hinder them to be the true visible church before men, no more than the continual corruptions of the heart, doth make an elect people before God, no true invisible members: for why should outward offences before men make them false before God?<sup>198</sup>

That the visible church was full of undesirable practices was a truism for Bernard, and he showed it when he moved to his last point, that the Church of England had true "properties" or practices. He readily admitted that not all was ideal in the properties of the Church of England, yet because it taught the true word and administered the true sacraments, it was a true church. In a passage with the marginal gloss "Observe well" he explained:

Hence is it that all divines in our church, and in all the reformed churches in Christendom (which now are or have been) do hold, that the true word of God preached, the true sacraments of Christ Jesus administered, are infallible tokens of a true church, and are reciprocally converted with the true church. I do not say a word preached, nor the word *truly* preached, nor the sacraments *rightly* administered; but thus, the *true word* preached, the *true sacraments* administered: for indeed to preach the true word *truly*, and to administer the true sacraments *rightly*, are no convertible signs with the church; for truly and rightly in preaching and administration, are not of the essence of

---

<sup>198</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 121.

the true word and true sacraments, but are the holy graces of the church; graces most necessary in delivery of the word and sacraments; yet nevertheless herein may there be corruption; so as the true word is not truly preached, nor true sacraments rightly administered, yet doth the true word and true sacraments remain, and are most certain notes of the true church. Now this property is a true property which we have...<sup>199</sup>

In this passage Bernard went so far as to make clear that even a wrong administration of the sacraments, even an incorrect preaching of the word, were not necessarily evidence of a false church. There might be great evidence that the national church was in need of much correction—but that need was essentially irrelevant in terms of the true church/false church distinction. The description of a true church was here reduced to the barest essentials, and he asserted that on those grounds, the Church of England was true.

This passage stepped back from seeking full purity or even preferred practices in order to refocus the question on one crucial binary: was the Church of England true or false? Bernard's opponent John Robinson may have been correct when, in his response to *Separatists Schisme*, he observed "And I doubt not but Mr. Bern. and 1000 more ministers in the land, (were they secure of the magistrates' sword, and might they go on with his good license) would wholly shake off their canonical obedience to their ordinaries...they would soon shake off the prelates' yoke..."<sup>200</sup> This is precisely the point: Bernard and others might prefer any number of changes in the church structure, but they were not related to the question at hand. Bernard's question was about what must be done in the current situation.

The second portion of this argument was that a separation from a true church (and therefore separation from the Church of England, which he had argued was a true church) was sinful: "That our church was truly constituted, and from which men may not make so wicked a separation with such condemnation."<sup>201</sup> Though he did not take the time to enumerate his previous beliefs and explain how he came to his current opinions, it seems that one of the most important issues for him was the question of practices that could lead—or even might likely lead—to error. As a nonconforming minister he had seen certain practices as critically damaging the church; now, as a conforming minister, he saw them (or, at least, more of them) as *adiaphora*, "indifferent" parts of worship that did not affect the veracity of the church's calling. Accordingly, in the introductory section of *Separatists Schisme* he had provided several principles for remaining a

---

<sup>199</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 123.

<sup>200</sup> Robinson, *Iustification of separation* 14.

<sup>201</sup> Bernard, "Table of Contents," *Separatists Schisme*, n.p.

“constant Protestant, in the ancient, Catholic, Orthodoxal verity and truth.”<sup>202</sup> Though many of these principles exhorted readers toward bearing with faults for the greater good, seeking truth, obeying authority, and entering controversies carefully, he gave special consideration to the question of avoiding scruples of conscience in things indifferent. In a passage with the marginal heading “Note well” he wrote: “If the ground [for a scruple of conscience] be not a judgment enlightened and convinced, it is not trouble of conscience, but a dislike working discontentedness upon some of those former grounds which thou mayest easily remove by settling thy judgment upon the word and sound reason.”<sup>203</sup>

More specifically, for Bernard, the question hinged on whether the *probability* that a practice would lead to sin was sufficient grounds for nonconformity. This was a crucial distinction. While many debates over *adiaphora* centered on obedience to authority where there was a *possibility* of error or sin on a doubtful matter, Bernard went further to say that accepting a practice with the *probability* of sin was acceptable for the greater good of the church if it fulfilled God’s clear command to obey authority:

Refuse not to obey authority, in any thing wherein there is not to thee manifestly known a sin to be committed against God...

Omit no evident and certain commandment imposed of God. If there be nothing but probability of sinning in obeying the precepts of men, set not opinion before judgment. [Marginal heading: “How to avoid scrupulosity of conscience, and contention in seeking for reformation.”]

...

Quere, Whether probabilities of sinning may give thee a sufficient discharge for not obeying a plain precept, and to neglect necessary duties otherwise, both to God and man.<sup>204</sup>

The margin here cited Gabriel Powel’s 1606 Latin work *De adiaphoris* with the note “How probability of sin cannot excuse due obedience to a sinful precept. *Video Pouelum lib. de Adiaphor. cap. 11 pag. 116.*”<sup>205</sup> In addition to being one of the only parts of *Separatists Schisme* to appear in Latin, this citation stands out because the work cited is not one Bernard would obviously choose to support his position. In *De adiaphoris*, Powel provided a typical argument for conformity in cases of indifferent practices, arguing that when one was in doubt about a practice, one must obey one’s

---

<sup>202</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 2.

<sup>203</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 11-12.

<sup>204</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 15. Bernard’s reasoning seems to be following neither Catholic probabilism nor Protestant probabiliorism. On these forms of casuistry see Meg Lota Brown, *Donne and the politics of the conscience in early modern England*, 58-61.

<sup>205</sup> Poueli, *Ordovicis Britanni, De Adiaphoris...*, 116; Powel, *De adiaphoris*, 86-87.

authority. In addition, he went further to take a strong stance against any (godly) individuals who scrupled over practices such as the sign of the cross in baptism.<sup>206</sup> Because we know that even after conforming Bernard continued to have trouble with the sign of the cross (with his omissions being brought before Matthew at least twice), it is clear that he would not have fully agreed with the entire focus of *De adiaphoris*. Moreover, while Powel's interpretation of *adiaphora* comes from a traditional conformist view, Bernard's is more nuanced. In the passage cited in *Separatists Schisme*, Powel's work presents the standard explanation of the idea of *adiaphora*. Both his Latin and the later English translation of Powel's work use the language of "doubt."<sup>207</sup>

Yet Bernard used the language of probability to push this principle further toward its logical terminus. It seems that Bernard's objections to some church practices were so great, he hardly felt 'doubtful' about their bad effects. For this reason, in order to conform he had to recognize that 'probability' essentially equaled 'doubt.' On one hand, this was an extremely small step toward conformity that shows how much Bernard truly disagreed with the Church. Yet on the other hand, it is a large step in the doctrine of *adiaphora*, pressing it as far as it can possibly go. For Bernard, even the probability of sin left some possibility of sinlessness in certain actions. This, his argument had it, far outweighed what he described as the *certainty* of sin if one would choose to separate. Although Powel would not have disagreed with Bernard's conclusion, his own position (which saw the sort of scruples to which Bernard was responding as unnecessary and misguided) would not have recognized the necessity of Bernard's more nuanced explication.

Since Powel's position was much more closely aligned with the views of the national church than Bernard's would prove to be, the citation of *De adiaphoris* is curious, and there is more than one possible explanation for its inclusion. On the one hand, Bernard may have cited Powel in order to communicate to his superiors, including Matthew, just how ready he was to maintain conformity. While his own language about *adiaphora* was less standard than Powel's and his position on puritan scruples less rigid, by citing such a clearly conformist work, Bernard could send a strong message that he was willing to align himself with the ecclesiastical establishment. By placing this citation in Latin, Bernard would have been able to make this signal to concerned superiors without being as likely to catch the eye of his vernacular readers—many of whom were godly laypeople whom he would not readily have directed to Powel for clarification.

---

<sup>206</sup> See for example Powel, *De adiaphoris*, 84-85.

<sup>207</sup> The original work is in Latin and uses "dubium." The English translation, published the following year, uses the term "doubtful."



On the other hand, it is possible that Powel himself influenced the inclusion of this citation in *Separatists Schisme*. Powel worked with the company of stationers in London, and he was the official who licensed this text.<sup>208</sup> As such, he may have been reading through the work when he noticed that Bernard did not cite his recent work in the section on *adiaphora*. To correct this, he could have contacted Bernard about making this change (which at that point would have been difficult to refuse), or he even could have inserted the citation without Bernard's knowledge.<sup>209</sup> In either scenario—Bernard using Powel as a signal of conformity or Powel inserting his own brand of conformity into Bernard's work—this reference demonstrates the grave significance of Bernard's concerns over Church practices and the care with which he had to parse this doctrine in order to conform. Moreover, it highlights the careful theological grooming required for the publication of this type of book.

Moving on in his argument against separatism, Bernard took thorough stock of both practical and theological concerns. Although evidence of its doctrinal error would be reason enough to avoid separatism, Bernard also argued against it on the evidence that it produced un-Christian behavior. More specifically, he suggested that separatism was sinful because it led to a lack of love and charity and because it involved wrong interpretation of scriptures. In a religious milieu that focused so strongly on doctrine, and in the context of a theological work against separatism, it may seem surprising that Bernard focused so much attention on Christian virtue. Yet for Bernard, love, peaceableness, and charity (or the absence thereof) were key proofs of the incorrect nature of separatism. This was clear from the outset of the work, where Bernard included the brief discourse “Christian Advertisements and Counsels of Peace to the wise hearted, and to him that is of a peaceable disposition” which exhorted readers to act charitably toward one another even in the midst of doctrinal disputes. This short section of the larger work emphasized that, as far as one could do so without sin, one must live at peace with others and with one's religious and political authorities. Bernard explained that he included this section of the work because he saw a need for these Christian behaviors: “the purpose of my penning these things, is to bring them into practice; and therefore so read thou deliberately, as thy will may be to perform them conscionably. Amen.”<sup>210</sup> One should attempt to avoid controversy altogether, but when irrevocably drawn in,

---

<sup>208</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, Vol. 3, 169; Margo Todd, “Gabiell Powel”, *ODNB*.

<sup>209</sup> The likelihood of this being Powel's rather than Bernard's choice is further strengthened by the fact that the later version of this work, published in 1621 as the final section of *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, omitted the reference.

<sup>210</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, Sig. B2r.

one should still focus on behaving with charity and should focus on doing the greatest good in general rather than being stubbornly correct in minutiae: “Endeavour for things which are of necessity, wish also the well being of the same for conveniency: but for this contend not forcibly against public peace, lest in seeking for the *bene*, thou doest utterly lose the benefit of the necessary *esse*.”<sup>211</sup> He further asserted that one should cooperate with those of different theological opinions, and even when noting offenses or problems, one should first correct errors in oneself. One should also be particularly concerned to identify whether one’s opposition to another was based on true conviction or on personal dislike—the latter was unacceptable grounds for controversy.

With this background showing the way that one should behave toward other believers, Bernard proceeded to demonstrate how separatists had behaved in unloving and uncharitable (and therefore, sinful) ways. Early in the work, he enumerated several “probabilities” against separatism.<sup>212</sup> These included not only that separatists were isolated from all the reformed churches and held similarities to “ancient schismatics” who were condemned as heretics, but also that their leaders had followed clear patterns of sinful behavior. In this regard he discussed several prominent individuals including separatist martyrs Henry Barrow and John Greenwood (“possessed with a fearful spirit of railing and scoffing, as shall after be showed; into which cursed speaking they fell above all that ever we heard or can read of, pretending such holiness...”), current separatist leader George Johnson, (“forgetting their profession and way...& also brotherly love, became a disgraceful libeller...”) and others.<sup>213</sup> Though he did not say quite as much about his former ally Smyth, he did in several places point out that Smyth had previously published a treatise that held views different than his current views—thus alleging changeableness and inconstancy (Bernard’s own changeableness, of course, was of a different sort). Moving beyond specific examples, he said more generally:

...not that I think any Church can be pure, or that there is any sin, which the devil may not draw some into, who make fair profession; ... [nevertheless, God]... doth so preserve us here, as we cannot be tainted...with such evils, as men that forsake us (with such

---

<sup>211</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 7.

<sup>212</sup> He said that he called the first section “probabilities” or “likelihoods” so that unconvinced readers might not “scoff” at them from the outset. It seems he did so particularly because this section was based more on history, experience and behavior than on Scripture. The later sections of the work, based more solidly on Scripture and doctrine, he called “reasons” and “truths.” This provides evidence that he believed arguments are more solid when based upon intellectual reasoning through Scripture than upon evidential reasoning through practice. Yet it does not suggest that he placed less importance on behavior than reasoning in general; rather, the two were equally important and must be part of any believer’s approach to controversy.

<sup>213</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 34-35.

condemnation as they do, who entertain that way) do often dreadfully fall into. What is this but a likelihood of the Lord's witnessing against them?

Besides this befalling some, there is an evil that hath seized upon most of them generally, not only that they cannot apprehend these things, but also herein, that as soon as they be entered into that way, they are so therewith bewitched (that I may so say) as they be nothing like themselves, in what was laudable and good in them: before humble and tractable, then proud and willful...<sup>214</sup>

Later in the work, he again picked up on the theme of Christian behavior, and particularly Christian love. This section began with what may be his most personally-inflected published expression of emotion about his own experience in leaving the separatists:

Such as have had a little taste of the way and affection to the same, misled by imagined truths, and by the honesty of the men for their lives, and some former familiarity had with them in an even way, (which indeed are the ordinary baits by which many are caught) yet at length perceiving the falsehood thereof, which is called Brownism, they have upon good consideration deliberated, and in deliberation and searching found out the errors thereof, and so left them: these they condemn as apostates, and what not? But if they oppose against them; not of hatred, not of malice, not of purpose to vex them, or to increase their affliction, (God is witness; the Lord is judge, who will give sentence between one and another) but only to let them see their errors, and to reclaim them, (if God be pleased) and to keep others back, then such they term godless men, deprived of their understanding, persecutors, hunters after their souls, and dare boldly pronounce sentence against them, that they shall grow worse and worse, so as men shall say, God is avenged on them. What a degree of deadly uncharitable censure is this? Is here love? Love thinketh no ill, saith the Apostle, love hopeth all things; love doth nothing contumeliously.<sup>215</sup>

Though he couched this in general terms, not only the similarities between his case and the described actions, but also the parenthetical statement calling God as witness (which would be strongest if there were specific actions against which God could make witness) suggest that this passage was related to his own experience. Bernard, it seems, saw himself as having been drawn into separatism by former connections and for a time deceived or confused about the truth. Yet when he came to see the wrongfulness of separatism, he was shocked to find that former close companions could so revile him—even so far as to call him an apostate and to interpret his efforts to change their own views as malicious. He believed that his former allies now doubted both his

---

<sup>214</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 38-39. It is interesting that in this passage Bernard notes that God keeps his true church from grave error even though “no such watch bee kept one ouer another, as were to be wished.” This mutual keeping of watch in order to help other believers avoid sin was one of the things that Bernard covenanted to do with the separating group in Nottinghamshire. Thus, though he had turned against separatism, he again showed a belief that the national church could improve its spiritual state and that this would be a beneficial practice.

<sup>215</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 51-52.

intellectual and spiritual state and had even pronounced a curse-like “sentence” upon him that he would grow worse and feel God’s judgment. If these things were so—if Bernard, who had been through so much with his separatist friends and now sought to show them why he had embraced a different way could be treated so sharply by them—one sees how he could feel justified in describing their actions as “uncharitable censure.”<sup>216</sup>

This passage began a long discourse punctuated with the question “Is this love?”<sup>217</sup> Bernard proceeded for several pages to enumerate the uncharitable behaviors of separatists more generally. Among a long list of things censured are the desire that the word be taken away from those in the Church of England, hatred, envy, and more. He continued by asserting that though separatists claim to love those in the Church of England, they do so in the same way they would love any person (i.e., any potential convert to Christianity) and not in the familial way they love Christian brothers and sisters.<sup>218</sup>

In doing so, he argues, separatists also failed to appropriately love one another. They denied that separatists might hear the word preached by a conformist minister and thus make some of their own (who might live apart from a separatist group) choose between not hearing the word at all, or being condemned for hearing it from an conformist minister. Moreover, they easily—perhaps even thoughtlessly—excommunicated one another “not only for notorious crimes...but even for light offences in some...It is not a point of love, so easily to lose a Christian member, and to cast him to the devil, judging him unworthy to be accounted a visible professor in the church of Christ.”<sup>219</sup> Although some had observed that those in separating congregations loved one another well by sharing their goods in common, Bernard responded that even non-Christian groups had done likewise and argued that this mere companionate love was not true love among Christian brethren, which “must be bestowed worthily in the Lord, else it is not at all acceptable to God.”<sup>220</sup>

He proceeded by noting that separatists persisted in “willful obstinacy, joined with contempt and scorn of all other.”<sup>221</sup> Moreover, they would not argue reasonably, but due to “perverseness of their spirit in conference” attempted to entrap an opponent in debate, and they railed, scoffed and

---

<sup>216</sup> I do not say that the situation *was* so—certainly it was the opposite in his opponents’ view; I simply emphasize that Bernard’s perception of the situation made sense with his response.

<sup>217</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 52ff. The first styling of the question is “Is here loue?” while the rest remain “Is this loue?” 1 Cor. 13 appears in the margin beside each instance of the question, and one or two phrases from that chapter accompany each one.

<sup>218</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 83.

<sup>219</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 60-61.

<sup>220</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 64-65.

<sup>221</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 65.

even (in the case of Barrow), blasphemed against religion.<sup>222</sup> Other such arguments, or perhaps accusations, against the lack of Christian behavior of separatists appeared throughout the treatise. Although it seems clear that some of Bernard's interest in pointing out these failings did come from his own experience of being reviled by them as a backslider, his descriptions of their behavior were not merely a chance for him to even the score by public exhumation of faults. Rather, he believed that Christian behavior should flow from correct Christian belief. Because right behavior followed right doctrine, evidence of incorrect behavior was evidence of incorrect beliefs, and readers must beware of any false beliefs, including the errors of separatism.

Accordingly, following this explanation of their loveless and uncharitable ways, Bernard turned to condemnation of their false belief system. This move, essentially blending his arguments against their doctrine and their behavior, asserted that obstinately holding onto doctrinal error that led to schism was itself sinful: "The last sin is their schisme, consisting of many errors" and "Lastly, their very opinions, which were the very matter of Brownism, and their own inventions, upon which they do build their constitution; and by which they have made so grievous rend and separation."<sup>223</sup> He moreover asserted that they "abuse the Scriptures, and mislead the Reader thereby divers ways."<sup>224</sup> His primary concern was over their doctrine of ecclesiology. He cataloged numerous errors, but in essence he asserted that separatists had misunderstood the nature of church membership and of church leadership. In regard to church membership, he believed separatists mistook the nature of the visible and invisible church because they sought to restrict the visible church to those who were true believers living in a right state before God. In contrast, Bernard argued that the visible church might be a "mixed company" and that one sinful church member did not contaminate the rest of the body.<sup>225</sup> He also gave particular attention to the separatist claim that the whole church had the full power of Christ (which he called the "A. B. C. of Brownism"<sup>226</sup>) and instead asserted that certain leaders held the power and authority of the church in their special duties of administering the sacraments, preaching, ordaining officers, and excommunicating individuals—a view compatible with the episcopal structure of the national

---

<sup>222</sup> He spent some space describing the work of Barrow, within which (for instance) he noted Barrow's sarcastic words: "The congregation singing together he likeneth to fowls; as Vultures, Crows, Glead, Owls, Geese..." Bernard felt that such ad-hominem attacks were utterly un-Christian. Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 68-78.

<sup>223</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 78.

<sup>224</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 26.

<sup>225</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 83ff, 102ff.

<sup>226</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 88.

church. As noted above, he also condemned their treating the Church of England as a false church and its ministers as false ministers.

A complementary treatise was appended to this work under the title “Certain positions held and maintained by some godly ministers of the Gospel against those of the separation, and namely, against Barrow and Greenwood.”<sup>227</sup> It is unclear to what degree Bernard himself may have affected the contents of this section of the work, but it is noteworthy that Bernard’s opponents did not treat it as his. Smyth did not discuss it in detail, and Ainsworth discussed it separately from Bernard’s work. Perhaps most interestingly, Robinson set the words of the “godly ministers” apart from, and at times in opposition to, Bernard’s, and he suggested that although these ministers were not separatists, unlike Bernard they remained in nonconformity.<sup>228</sup> It seems that Bernard appended this treatise to his work in order to provide further reinforcement for his own conclusions, as it aligns with his own ideas very closely. The “godly ministers” key argument against separatism was “That the Church of England is a true Church of Christ, and such a one as fro[m] which whosoever wittingly and continually separateth himself, cutteth himself off from Christ”—a point almost identical to the one Bernard espoused in the main section of the work.<sup>229</sup>

Although the “godly ministers” used slightly different marks than Bernard used to defend the Church’s veracity, they closely complemented his four marks (a true head, true matter, true form, and true properties) by focusing on the Church of England’s veracity in the realms of practice and doctrine. They began by arguing that the Church was true because it used the “outward means, which God in his word hath ordained, for the gathering of an invisible Church,” including preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments.<sup>230</sup> They argued, secondly, that the national church is true because the “whole Church maketh profession of the true faith,” and thirdly, that “we hold and teach, & maintain against all heretics and adversaries, every part & article of God’s holy truth, which is fundamental, and such as without the knowledge and believing whereof there is no salvation.”<sup>231</sup> Under this third section, the godly ministers also provided a declaration of the most basic sum of belief in Christ: “Jesus Christ the son of God, who took our

---

<sup>227</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 163.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Smyth, *Paralleles, Censures, Observations*; Ainsworth, *Counterpoison*, 200ff; Robinson, *A iustificacion of separation*, 76, 201-211, 257, .

<sup>229</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 163.

<sup>230</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 163.

<sup>231</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 166-168.

nature of the Virgin Mary, is our only and all sufficient Saviour.”<sup>232</sup> This, too, was markedly like Bernard’s formulation of basic belief, focusing on Christ’s divine and human natures and status as sole Savior. The section of the work concluded by asserting the importance of other reformed churches’ acceptance of the Church of England as true and by answering several objections.

Although likely not written by Bernard, this appended material could have increased the perceived acceptability of *Separatists Schisme* by placing Bernard and his work in a conversation with that of established puritan (though, perhaps, nonconformist) ministers. As Robinson pointed out, Bernard would likely not have agreed with every decision of nonconformist ministers nor even, perhaps, with every nuance of this treatise. Yet, recalling Bernard’s goal of reestablishing his position in the Church, by inserting this appendix he again clearly asserted his doctrinal and collegial unity with this group of non-separating, godly ministers.

#### Slow steps away from publishing about separatism

Although *Separatists Schisme* can hardly be considered anything but polemical in tone, its purposes were largely pastoral and ecclesiastical: drawing readers to right doctrine and right behavior, defending Bernard’s renewed Church membership, and establishing himself as a conforming leader within the Church. Unlike some polemicists, Bernard did not overtly address potential opponents in such a way as to invite replies. Although he certainly knew of the possibility, or perhaps likelihood, that one or more readers would publish responses to his work, it seems that after publishing *Separatists Schisme* he was ready to move on with both his pastorate and his print career.<sup>233</sup> To achieve this, it appears that he not only resumed parish duties but also altered some of his previous practices to more fully align with the established church. One particularly interesting way he seems to have done this is in his naming practices. In the late Elizabethan period, a trend had developed among certain puritan groups, especially more radical and separating ones, to name their children after biblical people or ideas—not only Anglicized versions of biblical names such as Abigail but also translations of biblical concepts such as Dust or Praise-God, and even Hebrew or Hebrew-derived names, such as Aphra.<sup>234</sup> Bernard had five sons

---

<sup>232</sup> Bernard, *Separatists Schisme*, 175.

<sup>233</sup> Bernard could not have been ignorant of the strong feelings that Smyth and others would have upon reading his work, and in an intellectual climate in which printed disputations were common, their choices to respond in print are certainly not out of the ordinary.

<sup>234</sup> Patrick Collinson, “What’s in a Name? Dudley Fenner and the Peculiarities of Puritan Nomenclature” in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge:

between 1600 and 1607, and he named them all in the latter fashion, with what seem to be originally-contrived names adapted from Hebrew: Bengallevel, Cannanuel, Besekiell, Hoseel, and Masakiell.<sup>235</sup> However, his naming practices seem to have changed after his return to the Church of England: Mary, born in 1610, had the most traditional name of all his children.<sup>236</sup> Although this could be due to her sex, as the only girl amongst boys, the naming of Bernard's youngest son indicates otherwise. This child, born in 1613, was christened Beniemiene—a somewhat unusual spelling even for the time, but clearly a version of the common English name Benjamin.<sup>237</sup> Since his older brothers' names are not similar to names in common use, this suggests that Bernard's move toward more standard names reflected his broader efforts to conform to more standard practices in non-essential matters.

While naming was merely suggestive of Bernard's public gestures away from public identification with things that might associate him too much with radical religion or separatism, several additional actions would even more clearly indicate his return to conformity. By focusing on preaching and teaching—the work most central to his ministerial calling—Bernard aligned himself with the wishes of his superiors, including Matthew, who himself was a dedicated preacher. Though Bernard recognized the importance of these duties, he no doubt also understood the ecclesiastical benefits that could come from emphasizing them. Accordingly, as he continued in faithful pastoral ministry and kept out of contentious issues, the Matthew-Bernard relationship

---

Boydell Press, 2006), 117-118. See also Nicholas Tyacke, "Popular Puritan Mentality in Late Elizabethan England" in P. Clark, A.G.R. Smith and N. Tyacke, eds., *The English Commonwealth 1547-1640: Essays in Politics and Society Presented to Joel Hurstfield* (Leicester, 1979), 77-92.

<sup>235</sup> Cannanuel was born in 1600/01 and matriculated 7 Dec. 1619 at Exeter College, Oxford, receiving his BA in 1622-3 and MA in 1625. He became rector of Pitney Lortey, Somerset, in 1624 and of Huish Episcopi in 1625. His career would also be fraught with controversy and include both deprivation from and return to ministry within the national church. Masakiell (*bap.* 27 Sept 1607) became a clothier and in 1636 emigrated to New England with the group that would settle Weymouth, MA. From christening records, we know of the births of Bengallevel (*bap.* 6 May, 1600), Besekiell (*bap.* 18 Oct 1602) and Hoseel (*bap.* 30 April 1605). Bengallevel seems to have survived at least through 1612: Bernard made it a habit to mention his children's names in the first question of some of his catechisms; he mentions Cannanuel and Bengallevel his catechisms of 1607, 1609 and 1612. (When the work was republished in 1629, these appeared as the more generic names John and Mary.) Lacking other extant sources mentioning Besekiell, Hoseel and Bengallevel, it is possible—but not at all certain—that Besekiell and Hoseel may have died in early childhood, and Bengallevel may have died sometime after 1612. Cf. Richard L. Greaves, "Richard Bernard," *ODNB*.

<sup>236</sup> Mary (*bap.* 24 Sept 1609), married the future separatist Roger Williams on 15 December 1629 and emigrated with him in 1631. Richard L. Greaves, "Richard Bernard," *ODNB*.

<sup>237</sup> Beniemiene died at or near birth (*bap.* 11 Oct 1613, *bur.* 12 Oct 1613). Richard L. Greaves, "Richard Bernard," *ODNB*.



grew. It seems that Matthew kept a particular interest in Bernard's career throughout (and even beyond) the years immediately following his return to the church.<sup>238</sup>

Bernard's publications during this period demonstrated his desire to move forward in his ministry within the national church. Following the publication of *Separatists Schisme*, Bernard wasted no time in returning to pastorally-focused authorship. Though he himself may have had little to do with the 1609 reprint of his *Double Catechisme*, he was certainly involved in revising *The Faithfull Shepherd* to its 1609 "amended and enlarged" version, and that same year he also published an entirely new work based on two sermons, *The Sinners Safetie*.<sup>239</sup> This work addressed doubting believers and sought to help them understand salvation and experience security in their faith (see Chapter 3). In other words, after *Separatists Schisme*, Bernard's authorial focus returned to the pastoral and didactic as he attempted to help parishioners pursue right doctrine and assurance of salvation and to help pastors pursue effective ministry.

Bernard continued establishing this reputation by focusing his attention on local ministry and didactic publications. We can see some of his efforts in this regard in his devotional publication *Contemplative Pictures*, which he published in 1610, toward the end of his period of writing against the separatists. It contained three extended comparisons, describing God (divided into three further subsections to reflect the Trinity) and the Devil, goodness and badness, and Heaven and Hell in verbal "pictures." Following a discussion of each, Bernard provided "precepts" for application. These suggested ways that a person should respond to these teachings and then transitioned into a sort of prayer or blessing that gestured toward God's sovereignty in granting the grace for individuals to respond appropriately.<sup>240</sup>

The overwhelming force of the work was neither toward Catholics nor toward committed (puritan-minded) Protestants. Rather, it was toward evangelizing those who were not particularly interested in religion. The dedicatory epistle was particularly telling, as we see in the following:

A man is either of God by regeneration, living in goodness, going to heaven; or of the devil by corruption, practicing wickedness, and running headlong to hell... One only true religion, the rest idolatry and superstition. There are no men miscellane, one between two of either, and yet neither. There is no mean or third place betwixt Hell

---

<sup>238</sup> Bernard would later dedicate the 1621 revision of *The Faithfull Shepherd*, to Matthew, gratefully describing the Archbishop's attentions. Bernard, *The Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), Sig. A2r-A3v; see passage quoted above on page 15.

<sup>239</sup> I discuss this work further in Chapter 3.

<sup>240</sup> This work has attracted some scholarly comments regarding the godly aversion to all things that could be construed as Catholic as well as his willingness to allow imaginative thought within meditation. Among these are Collinson, "Protestant Culture and Cultural Revolution," 47-49, and "From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia," 360-361; and Dyrness, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture*, 139-140.

below and Heaven on high. The Pope with his priests may teach a Purgatory, to pick the purposes of foolish papists: but, believe them those that list, the word yields no such warrant, to cause a judicious and sound Protestant to fear or force of it, Yet is there one, an ill mean among men, that loathed creature, that Luke-warm Gospeller: a time server professing after his pleasure, as may stand with is profit: this is the Miscellane man. ... Godly sincerity nowadays with Achitophels is held an affection from folly: just and resolute dealing, but a desperate attempt. The dislike of Luke-warmness, and hate of a false religion with Machiavellian time-servers is judged but a passionate rashness, the heat of a spirit apt to sedition.

What if this be the wicked man's censure? What if the world, the school of Satan's policy, do thus condemn true Christianity? ...<sup>241</sup>

As we see here, in *Contemplative Pictures* Bernard took the opportunity to publicize his continued commitment to a strict form of godliness—which may suggest that he had something to prove to himself and to his long-time godly followers. Having abandoned, so it seemed, many godly friends (now enemies), and having even had to abandon his efforts toward a covenanted community within the national church, was he still able to make distinctions about who was and was not a member of the true, “invisible” Church? Had he sold out, or did he still have a flame of godly zeal?

*Contemplative Pictures* attempted to answer these questions for all these audiences. Far from having accepted a half-hearted compromise in order to retain his position in the church, Bernard came forth zealously pursuing a brand of godly religion that could function within the national church but which retained a theological and practical agenda that readily marked him as a member—a leader—of the godly community.

The topics he addressed in this work and the responses he suggested all emphasized the critical, binary choice for or against God, goodness, and Heaven; this agenda was frequently implied and occasionally made explicit. For example, he wrote, “If thou hast [the Holy Ghost] not, entreat the Lord to send him: If thou hast him, carefully hold him.”<sup>242</sup> Toward both believers and non-believers, Bernard emphasized the basics of the Christian life and belief: a sentiment appearing often throughout the work:

Here is peace (O happy man) & by Christ procured. Seek in him thy soul's safety: behold here joy & spiritual security. Call boldly God father, it pleaseth this Jesus to be thy brother. Believe in him, & constantly rely on him...

O wretched sinner, seek peace to thy poor soul: seal not up thy damnation, by doing service to this devil...

The name of heaven to all is lovely, many do wish it heartily...the sound Protestant, the devout Christian by faith begs it, and he through Jesus Christ shall enjoy it... Let

<sup>241</sup> Bernard, *Contemplative Pictures*, n.p. – Sig. A3v.

<sup>242</sup> Bernard, *Contemplative Pictures*, 43.

carrying for this world be expelled with thy care of heaven: neglect not this felicity...delight not in the pleasures of death, to lose, for them, the paradise of life.... Fall groveling upon the ground, and ask forgiveness: grieve heartily, speak passionately. Smite thy breast, strike on thy thigh, shake thy head, wring thy hands, shed tears, pour, pour out thy soul unto God, and cry aloud, I say, cry, oh, spare, spare me good Lord, whom thou (O God) hast redeemed with Christ's precious blood. Oh forgive me, I confess I have offended thee: let thy patience forbear me, let thy great mercy acquit me. He that doth repent betimes, the Lord will hear him in time: God's gracious compassion, is never without pitiful commiseration...claim nought of merit, crave all of mercy...and thou shalt assuredly escape...<sup>243</sup>

Though the emotional intensity varied somewhat, the majority of *Contemplative Pictures* stressed the way of salvation and the basic motivation for godly living. The meditative format was a means to the intended goal of producing committed followers of God who intentionally rejected evil, sin, and worldliness and who—by grace—pursued God, righteousness, and a heavenly reward. Through a creative, devotional format, *Contemplative Pictures* helped readers to identify God's holiness, their own sinfulness, their position of utter despair without placing their faith simply in Christ, and the need to pursue godliness. Discouraging any trust in works while nevertheless emphasizing the desire of Christians to do good, this publication provided basic information about faith and practice.

The emphases here on the conversion of sinners and the sanctification of believers were precisely the same emphases that had appeared in *Sinners Safetie* and which appeared (though with a different audience, ministers, in mind) in *The Faithfull Shepherd*, a pastoral manual he produced in 1607 and revised in 1609 (see Chapter 3). All these works together suggest that Bernard's overwhelming emphasis in this period was toward positioning himself as a faithful minister within the national church, and performing his ministry in that regard. He was concerned primarily with bringing those within the church to know the truth and honor God. He did not abandon his concern with the Catholic church, mentioning or alluding to it in various places; yet his focus remained on faithfully shepherding the members of the church.

Before leaving *Contemplative Pictures*, it is worth noting that it contained references to religious concepts which were outside its main topic, including certain connections with theological issues of some controversy. For example, it considered questions of predestination and human responsibility, and of the error of Catholic theology. Regarding the latter, it is notable that the title suggested that the work contained pictures to be used for devotion—yet in actuality it contained only text. The images were not “popish and sensible for superstition, but mental for divine

---

<sup>243</sup> Bernard, *Contemplative Pictures*, 35, 56, 102-104, 132-134.

contemplation.” This was certainly a conscious effort by Bernard to highlight the issue of images, define the types of images that could be godly, and explain the way in which a godly person would use them. Protestants, and especially puritans, were sensitive about the use of images in this post-Reformation period, associating visible images with “idolatrous” Catholic practices. There was a consensus among the godly that multiple spiritual dangers followed the use of images in any religious setting, even if they were not intended for worship. Various strains of these iconoclastic beliefs had resulted in the “stripping of the altars” that removed various vestiges of Catholic practice from now-Protestant churches. A continued effort on the part of the godly sought to eradicate any sort of visual images from contemporary religious activities. In this regard, *Contemplative Pictures* not only rejected the idolatrous uses of images in the church, but also replaced their use with a better tool—implying that this practice of the Catholic Church was not only incorrect but also ineffective. By thus simultaneously rejecting one practice and affirming a better substitute, Bernard positioned Protestant belief as not merely a negation of Catholicism but rather as its own positive system.

Knowing this connection with Catholicism, the work’s dedication to Edmund Lord Sheffield and his family is particularly interesting. Sheffield’s prosecutions of Catholics in this area of England were well known, so Bernard’s naming him would have confirmed in readers Bernard’s own attention to the correctness of the Protestant message over and against the Catholic one. In addition, this context allows us to make sense of Bernard’s rather un-complimentary passage toward the ladies to whom he dedicated the work:

A Lady is honored in her Lord, children are dignified in the due fame, and high promotion of their parents. The first are united by God’s ordinance, the latter by nature’s influence. Whom God then and nature hath cemented, I, in my due honoring of all, presume to conjoin. Right Honorable Madam, and to you Ladies, I wish all welfare under God, on earth true goodness, in heaven enduring gladness; a time to read good things, but all times to practice, commending to your hearty assent this memorandum: women are but weak, their strength is to be under government, excellent praise is given by their wise silence, but their principal glory stands in their awe, and cheerful obedience. This perhaps may not seem a plausible service to your sex; but (good Ladies) he cannot flatter, that indeed doth give you true honor.<sup>244</sup>

Bernard was by no means an egalitarian, but the rest of his corpus demonstrated more positive descriptions of women than we find here; he highly honored not merely the “silence,” “awe,” and “obedience” but also the personal godliness, wisdom, virtue, and other qualities of many women,

---

<sup>244</sup> Bernard, *Contemplative Pictures*, n.p.

from the biblical Ruth to several high-ranking women of his own acquaintance. This description of passive submission to authority makes more sense when we recall that Sheffield's wife Ursula was known to be a Catholic. Bernard could not extol any godly virtues in a Catholic woman; to the contrary, unless she were to convert, the best Bernard could hope for her was that she not impede the work of the gospel (related, in this case, to the work of Lord Sheffield). It is for this reason that her best virtue is in her silence—and who knew—perhaps silence and obedience might even lead her to true belief.<sup>245</sup>

Although Bernard turned toward publishing devotional works following *Separatists Schisme*, Bernard's reputation within the church was still attached to his previous association with separatists—and several had written to expose this. In order to continue in this path, Bernard had to reply to refute them. In the dedicatory epistle to *Contemplative Pictures*, he explained that he felt compelled to reply even though he preferred other sorts of projects:

Though I be troubled with controversies and called into such matters of contention; yet intermix I my study sometime with these better motions. I find that questions curiously contrived do more exercise wit, to inform judgment, than to make the heart devout in our pilgrimage and this earthly exilement. By troublesome disputations men get knowledge to approve of good, but by quiet meditations men grow to more conscience in their ways, and do increase in grace. Hence is my interchange, and a cause of some stay of my answer both to Master Ainsworth the Separatist, and to Master Smith that Anabaptistical Se-Baptist: but now the time will not be long ere I publish my reply.<sup>246</sup>

One might question Bernard's semblance of annoyance here—if he knew that *Separatists Schisme* was likely to find opposition (it could hardly be doubted), and if he understood the polemical nature of his own work (he certainly did), had he not invited the debate? Perhaps so—and accordingly, he proceeded to publish his rejoinder. Yet I suggest that although he believed he should write his first work in order to make his new position public, he would have been quite content if that had been the end of the conversation. Of course most polemicists are happy to be proved right by the silence of their enemies—but even less so than many others, being in the seat of a respondent was never Bernard's cup of tea. If the pattern of his over thirty printed works says anything, it is that he enjoyed innovating, collating, and producing—not repeating his old arguments. The typical format of early modern printed disputes, in which an author responded point-by-point (sometimes word-by-word) to an opponent's work left little room for Bernard's creative authorial style. Because

---

<sup>245</sup> Bernard was not the only one to dedicate a work to Lord Sheffield; among others, Crashawe did: Campi, "The Italian Convert," 159.

<sup>246</sup> Richard Bernard, "Epistle Dedicatory," *Contemplative Pictures*, n.p.

a printed response naturally put him in a defensive posture, it might allow him to deflect criticism or to win an argument he felt he had already fought, but it made it much harder for him to pursue his own new goals. Moreover, while one book against separatism might serve as a way to position himself away from his former separatist connections, another book might serve more as an unwelcome reminder that he had these connections at all.

Bernard soon put out his second anti-Separatist work. His desires to publicly position himself within the national church and to exhort readers away from error were factors in the composition of *Plaine Evidences*. Having noticed his opponents' arguments as damaging not only to his own reputation but also the much greater cause of God, he felt compelled to respond to those who had written against him, and all the more because no one else had done so. He explained this motive in the preface:

They would over-load me with number, but as Elisha said, more are with us than against us. Indeed I want the help of my brethren: yet I neither do nor will bid, curse Meroz, the Lord forgive them their carelessness, if not the hypocrisy of men herein. If we be the Lord's people, why suffer we the Lord to be blasphemed by these men? if we be not, why halt we between two opinions? If our standing be of God, let us maintain it... Here is work, let us labor in the Lord's vineyard, if (in our judgment) it be the Lord's vineyard; else let us be going.

But say some, these men will never be answered. No more will the great adversary (he and his instruments are importunate) yet must he and they be ever resisted, till they fly from us.<sup>247</sup>

In other words, Bernard's primary goal for the church was that true doctrine be proclaimed and that the enemies of truth be resisted unto defeat. He lamented that others had not been willing to defend truth (his mention of the biblical Meroz, a city God cursed in Judges 5:23 for failing to help when needed, underscored the seriousness he accorded to other conformists' failure to take up his cause), and he thus took it upon himself, as a faithful David against his opponents, to defend the truth of God.<sup>248</sup> Even if he did not wish to reenter this battle, his position as a leader in the church compelled him to do so.

Bernard had three primary opponents. His earliest antagonist was Henry Ainsworth, a separatist and colleague of Smyth who had already been composing a compilation of defenses against anti-separatist works when he encountered Bernard's first tract; accordingly, he included a response to Bernard in *Counterpoyson*. Ainsworth's criticisms of Bernard varied. Some attacked

---

<sup>247</sup> Bernard, "Preface," *Plaine Evidences*, Sig. B3v.

<sup>248</sup> This imagery is explicit: Bernard, "Preface," *Plaine Evidences*, Sig. B3r. Bernard's corpus contains several passages in which he relates himself to David.

problems in his argumentation through logical fallacies such as begging the question or through unfair arguments in which Bernard wrongly took the words or actions of one separatist as representing the whole. Others made theological arguments, interpreting principles differently than Bernard. Still others simply reversed the question at hand by saying that the same arguments used by conformists against separatism were used by Catholics against the Church of England—and of course Bernard should accept such a defense from them as he would give to a Catholic. Compared to Bernard’s original work, *Counterpoyson* was brief. Though Ainsworth touched upon nearly every point in the main portion of the work, including most of the arguments describing the poor behavior of specific separatists, he gave them relatively brief attention. Notably, he omitted commentary on the prefatory works, including the “Christian Advertisements and Counsels of Peace” at the beginning and the response to Barrow and Greenwood at the end—lacunae Bernard would note in his response.

Yet if Ainsworth’s reply was a somewhat cursory response to what he saw as a work of average significance among other anti-separatist literature, Bernard’s second opponent, John Smyth, produced just the opposite. While Ainsworth’s response to Bernard encompassed 43 pages, Smyth’s had nearly three times that number, and with more words per page. Smyth took both Bernard’s and Ainsworth’s works into account, placing them in conversation with unpublished letters Smyth and Bernard had previously exchanged. Among other affronts, Smyth was particularly bothered that Bernard had failed to reply to a long personal epistle of Smyth’s and, rather, had taken his objections to print. More than merely failing to settle their disagreement personally, Smyth argued that Bernard had publicly tarnished his image, describing him and other separatists as inconstant (and worse). Smyth thus saw several reasons to ratchet up the affective and vituperative aspects of this engagement, and in addition to his intellectual and theological arguments for separatism, his work betrayed a strong personal distaste toward Bernard. The following passage, following a description of Bernard’s period of friendship and covenant with the separatists, is particularly illustrative:

But now all this is forgotten: & the Prelate of york hath so bewitched you with his flatterie, eloquence, & aungels, that your covenant is profaned & cast in the dust, men of your covenant must shift for themselves, you have deceived them like the staffe of reed, & you justifie your wonted speeches, you love the world, & ease with all your hart: & therfor I say vnto you with the Apostle: The love of the Father is not in you: I do therfor

Proclame you vnto the whole land to be one of the most fearful apostates of the whole nation...<sup>249</sup>

In this passage, Smyth derisively highlighted the importance of Matthew in Bernard's move toward conformity, as well as his failed attempt at covenanting within the Church. Elsewhere, he used similarly sharp language to expose former alliance with the separatists, enumerating his preaching, his connections, his actions, his private comments, and his authorship of a work against the prelacy. In this attack, Smyth took Bernard's entire publication more seriously than Ainsworth did, and he replied exhaustively to nearly everything Bernard penned in order to discredit his opponent and to present and defend what he believed to be the correct position regarding the Church of England.

A third respondent to *Separatists Schisme*, John Robinson, had been active in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire separatist circles along with Smyth and Bernard, and was also personally familiar with Bernard's situation. Robinson's reply was also long and thorough in terms of content, but it was more measured in tone than Smyth's. Because Robinson published later than Ainsworth and Smyth, when Bernard published his rejoinder in 1610 he had heard of the book but been unable to obtain a copy; as such, it figured little into Bernard's published response.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to consider the full terms of the debate across the works of Bernard, Ainsworth, Smyth and Robinson (which burgeoned in number of pages printed but largely proceeded according to standard defenses of the authors' respective views). Moreover, because Bernard's views remained the same—he said at the outset of *Plaine Evidences* that his ideas were consistent with his earlier work, and he proceeded to defend his original statements—the remainder of this section will focus on the ways that Bernard made the best of his defensive posture and attempted to use this second publication to advantage.<sup>250</sup>

Bernard's goals for *Plaine Evidences* were largely the same as those for *Separatists Schisme*: to proclaim the truth to those who did not recognize the error of separatism and to place himself in a strong position to do ministry within the Church of England. Yet the weight he gave to each of these goals seems to have shifted somewhat. For instance, in explaining his hopes for the persuasive power of his work, he was largely pessimistic:

---

<sup>249</sup> Smyth, "Paralleles, Censures, Observations," 335.

<sup>250</sup> For an overview of significant arguments on both sides of the separatism issue, see among other works Selement, "The Covenant Theology of English Separatism and the Separation of Church and State," and the work of Brachlow. The particular strain of the separatist controversy continued for several rounds as Ainsworth wrote against Smyth. See George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*; Lee, *The Theology of John Smyth: Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Mennonite*; and Culpepper, *Francis Johnson and the English Separatist Influence*.



I perceive it is in vain to persuade. Easier it is to draw a profane person from Hell gates, then to remove an opinion from a willful mind. ... They despise every man's endeavor against them, and are in admiration with their own works. ... By this might I be moved to cease this second labour; but I am not hopeless to hold some men back, & to gain some also, though I cannot recover what is wholly already lost. If I might speed in both I would be glad, if but in one, I am content: in both to lose my labor, I cannot doubt.<sup>251</sup>

Although he would have liked to persuade some people that separatism is wrong, these hopes were tempered by experience; however, to whatever degree he had toned down his expectations for the pastoral or didactic work this publication might do, he seems to have given that much more attention to positioning himself favorably within the Church of England.

In bringing up minute points of his past separatist associations, Bernard's opponents, and especially Smyth, had tarnished his reputation as a faithful minister in the Church of England, and to some degree even his qualifications as a faithful Christian fit to be in a leadership position. Bernard used several tactics to ameliorate this damage. In particular, he took care to position himself away from the separatists—and especially from Smyth, who by this time had become more radical than many of his separatist allies—and toward Matthew and the Church of England.

First, in a much more direct way than he had earlier done, Bernard attacked Smyth in what he admitted could be a “tart” manner—yet he insisted he followed Smyth's lead in exhuming personal anecdotes and embarrassments, noting that Smyth's attacks were more unjust than his:

If I happily, Reader, by occasion slip now and then in this reply: by any overthwart term, thou mayest blame me, but not much; thinkest thou not that I have just cause to be tart? He commendeth his sharpness to me as physical, to vomit my choler, and to cast up ill humours, so he saith: let it please him to take my tartness in words, upon the like commendation, even for some sharp effectual ingredients, to give him a purge for his loathsome opinions, which make him sick to death, that so he may recover health, and return...<sup>252</sup>

To be sure, Bernard replied curtly to Ainsworth, whose criticism he saw as not only theologically wrong but also based on an incomplete reading of *Separatists Schisme*; yet Bernard saved his particularly pointed rhetoric for Smyth. Although this was due in part to the vigor with which Smyth had attacked him, it was especially in response to the fact that he thought Smyth was not merely a heretic, but a mentally unstable one—one whose opinions were dangerous but which were so far gone that they could be more easily laughed at. Bernard was scathingly sarcastic, proceeding

---

<sup>251</sup> Bernard, “The Preface” *Plaine Evidences*, Sig. B2r-B2v.

<sup>252</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, 37.

to “christen” Smyth the “Se-baptist”: an insulting title.<sup>253</sup> By this time, Smyth had moved so far from orthodox doctrine that he had baptized himself; this was an action extremely unusual in Christian history, and a theologically absurd step as far as Bernard was concerned. Further, he described Smyth’s “own opinions, partly absurd, and partly heretical, which he hath mustered in his unstable brain...”<sup>254</sup> Bernard’s belief about Smyth’s loss of sense informed many of his sharpest passages. He attacked not merely his doctrine or use of academic reason (as with Ainsworth) but the way in which Smyth formed ideas, as having lost all reasonable sense. In the following, Bernard illustrated Smyth’s “perverseness of mind, and an overthwarting spirit to cross the truth” by highlighting his:

...most ridiculous absurd similes, and one very beastly, by which he would set our church, from the mingled seed of an horse and an ass in generation, producing a third thing, but neither a true horse, not a true ass: so is it (saith he) where good and bad persons are joined together: he mentioneth this two or three times, *an horse and an ass, an horse and an ass*: some man (not I) might perhaps stumble in reading, and by mistaking and contracting of *an horse and an ass* call him hastily, a horsene-ass.<sup>255</sup>

As such, Bernard’s treatment of Smyth reflected his critical condemnations of non-believers (such as he would later display in his anti-Catholic works) more than fraternal correction of believers who disagreed about points of doctrine (contentions he kept more friendly and often private, as he would do with New England congregationalists in the 1630s). While one might rightly question how these rhetorical moves fit with the view of Christian love Bernard espoused, he insisted that it was either an understandable mark of human frailty or a possible way, like strong medicine, to recall a wandering soul to the Church. Of course, on a more pragmatic level, such rhetoric also served to ameliorate some of the scrutiny he himself was under by directing readers’ attention elsewhere.

In addition to producing strong rhetoric against his opponents and attempting to remove any perception of an alliance with the wildly unorthodox Smyth, Bernard also made several explicit moves toward positioning himself in the favor of the church by reaffirming his support of the episcopate. Since Smyth and others had so clearly pointed out his previous objection to episcopal

---

<sup>253</sup> The passage, of course, is in regard to Smyth’s notorious decision to baptize himself, and Bernard goes on for some time in a mocking tone. Bernard coined the term se-baptist in this work; cf. “Se-baptist” and “Se-baptistic” *Oxford English Dictionary*. The *OED* also cites his work as the earliest recorded use of “Separatistical” and several additional terms, including “block-pate,” “didascallic,” “jail-keeper,” “joviality,” “meditating,” “pudding-wright,” “spaught,” and “spending-money,” and more.

<sup>254</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, 16.

<sup>255</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, 26-7.

governance, Bernard needed—even more strongly than he had done in *Separatists Schisme*—to come out in favor of the bishops. He did so from the outset, where the dedicatory epistles to the work are no longer in the vernacular, but in Latin, the language of educated and high-ranking clergy.

Bernard dedicated the work to Archbishop Matthew, his special patron. The brief dedication noted Matthew's exalted status and his father like care for the Church and for Bernard, even comparing him to the godly bishop Grindal.<sup>256</sup> As a result, Bernard gratefully dedicated this work to him, being reminded of his uncommon favor.<sup>257</sup> The page featured a small woodcut of a cherub amidst flora over centered text, further emphasizing the importance of the dedication and Matthew's special religious position and authority. Although multiplying words of gratitude and obeisance was commonplace in such dedications, based on the continuing relationship between Matthew and Bernard (and, again, Matthew's likely support and direction of Bernard's anti-separatist publications<sup>258</sup>), it seems that Bernard consciously chose to place this relationship at the forefront of this work. Following the damage done to Bernard's ecclesiastical position when his opponents disclosed his earlier stance (including the manuscript book) against the episcopacy, Bernard took this opportunity to reposition himself and his reputation.

Bernard followed this dedication to Matthew with an epistle to the reader ("*Huius inscriptionis Appendix ad lectorem*") in which he explicitly recognized the validity of episcopal authority. With these Latin works Bernard was addressing the powerful and educated audience before which he hoped to reaffirm himself as a faithful son of the national church, and he was also demonstrating his own qualifications as a university-educated minister. After taking several pages to affirm the importance of the episcopate, Bernard closed the epistle affirming his equal zeal for peace and truth ("*Et veritatis & pacis aequae studiosus*"). This statement subtly reminded these readers that he had not attempted to generate a needless polemical battle and was in favor of Christian unity: both were qualities central to the official desires of the national church.

Yet, interestingly, these assertions and affirmations all appeared in Latin and would thus have been less accessible to readers or hearers from a more popular audience. For those individuals, Bernard's first readable words were not an affirmation of the national church, and certainly not of the episcopacy—which appeared in Latin—but rather his condemnation of separatists and appeal toward Christian reasonableness, which appeared in the English preface.

---

<sup>256</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, Sig. A2r.

<sup>257</sup> Bernard, *Plaine Evidences*, Sig. A2r.

<sup>258</sup> Kenneth Fincham also suggests Matthew's involvement with both publications: *Prelate as Pastor*, 229.

Language, here, allowed Bernard to simultaneously send different messages to different groups. To the church hierarchy, he reaffirmed his ecclesiastical position as a supporter of the episcopacy; to the Christian masses, he reaffirmed his pastoral position as a godly minister—albeit one within the national church:

For my part, I will endeavor to further the truth, as far as I shall be able to give answer to what may be said against it; for their ill carriage, I will as well as I may bear it patiently. I hope I have in this, published sufficiently to the world my Faith and resolution, in this particular truth of the church, in contending with these our adversaries. ...In the mean space, I judge that herein I have performed on my behalf, what I ought, and what was expected at my hands to discharge, for the honor of God, the reverence of our church, the credit of mine own ministry, the verity of my undertaken cause against the schismatics, and withal for a just defense of mine own person, wickedly traduced by some. I look not to satisfy the separatists, much less the strange man Mr. Smith the Se-baptist; how can a man quiet them that love contention? I hue endeavoured to perform a duty, whereunto I hue been justly called, as I have shewed in my former book; what men may imagine I know not; how they will judge of my good purpose, I reckon not; let conscience acquit me, though all condemn me, I much care not, although I desire the approbation ever of thee a godly and judicious reader: if so thou beest.<sup>259</sup>

While the defense of the truth was most important to Bernard, and while he would nobly accept censure by those who would condemn him for doing what was right, he was particularly desirous to defend his actions and ideas publicly for any “godly and judicious” readers. He wanted to position himself as a strong proponent not of the church itself, but rather of truth more generally. While this may seem self-serving (and perhaps it was to some degree), it had implications for the greater good in so far as this positioning was critical for Bernard’s ability to do ministry at all. If he were to lose parishioners’ trust in his doctrine or character, he would have a difficult time leading them in the way of truth; if he lost his superiors’ trust, he might lose the ability to act as a minister in any official capacity. For Bernard, who believed his pastoral duties furthered the good of individual parishioners throughout the church and was part of the progress of God’s Kingdom as a whole, defending himself from those who would criticize his conformity was therefore a project of wide-reaching importance.

All this meant that the writing and publication of *Plaine Evidences* became a key part of Bernard’s ministry in 1610. Yet while Bernard was content to publish *Plaine Evidences* in order to defend truth and to protect his own ministry and preferment in the Church, following this work he

---

<sup>259</sup> Bernard, “Preface,” *Plaine Evidences*, n.p.

again moved away from polemic, authoring only didactic and devotional works until 1616.<sup>260</sup> This decision could have been due to certain practical considerations. On the one hand, he had little more to say about separatism, having already printed essentially the same arguments in two books. Moreover, the separatist position itself splintered, as Ainsworth replied against Smyth—not against Bernard—and Smyth argued for increasingly radical positions before his death in 1612. Ainsworth continued his career with a variety of other publications. Although Robinson mentioned Bernard again in 1614, he focused his writing against other opponents.<sup>261</sup> Nevertheless, in a culture where religious polemic was ubiquitous, Bernard could have chosen to continue to battle with these men, or with any number of other enemies, on any number of topics. As such, his choice to focus on other parts of the godly ministry was significant, and it demonstrated his continued efforts to follow a pattern of ministry that would have been approved by Matthew.

It is also noteworthy that Bernard's audience for *Plaine Evidences* was not entirely separate from the audience for his other works. Indeed, regarding this potential overlap in readers, we should note that both the devotional *Contemplative Pictures* and the polemical *Plaine Evidences* were both published in 1610 for William Welby and were both to be sold in his shop.<sup>262</sup> A reader browsing Welby's bookstall may even have seen these concurrent publications as comprising something like a two-part statement about the church and its needs.

Along with further publication of sermons and catechisms (including *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* in 1612 and *Two Twinnes* in 1613, on which see Chapters 3 and 4), in 1613 Bernard's didactic and devotional *A Weekes Worke* saw publication.<sup>263</sup> Printed in a small format that could be easily carried and referenced by a popular audience, this publication contained similarities to many of his previous works: like *Contemplative Pictures*, it emphasized the importance of meditation and made use of imaginative and metaphorical language; like *Sinners Safetie*, it emphasized one's need for Christ and the place of works within sanctification; and like several of his catechetical, sermonic, and devotional works, it exhorted readers toward very specific acts of godliness. It probably also echoed

---

<sup>260</sup> These included the catechetical *Iosuahs godly resolution* in 1612; a set of two sermons adapted for print as *Two Twinnes* in 1613; yet another reprint of his translation of Terence in 1614; a co-authored exposition of three Psalms as *Dauids Musick* in 1616; a work of spiritual encouragement, *Staffe of Comfort*, in 1616; and a dialogic manual for godly living, *A Weekes Worke* in 1616. In the year 1616 he published an unusually large number of works—three—and then in 1617 abruptly began a series of anti-Catholic polemics. This important shift will be the subject of Chapter 5.

<sup>261</sup> Robinson, *Of religious communion private, & publique*.

<sup>262</sup> *Contemplative Pictures* was printed by William Hall for Welby. *Plaine Evidences* was printed by T. Snodham for both Welby and Edward Weaver.

<sup>263</sup> The first edition of this work is not extant; due to its dedication to individuals in Somerset, it was probably written near the time of Bernard's move.

Bernard's parish ministry through the examples he used: for instance, one can easily imagine that it was from personal experience that Bernard thought to describe sinful ways that people could arrive at church.<sup>264</sup> It may be significant that this was Bernard's first book dedicated solely to women. As I suggest in the Biographical Sketch, the work may have been designed for a female audience. If so, this would further emphasize Bernard's focus, after conforming, on his pastoral duties—his concern with promoting personal devotion and godliness among parishioners and readers.

During this time, Bernard's public reputation as a faithful, godly parish minister within the national church was also growing on account of the success of his manual of ministers, *The Faithfull Shepherd*, which saw publication in 1607 and republication (with revisions) in 1609. All of this would have further solidified his position as a faithful servant of the national church in the eyes of his superiors. It may also have helped to ameliorate any consequences for occasional acts of nonconformity.

And again, far from treating Bernard with suspicion, Matthew seems to have acted to help him further both his parish and his print ministries, and to have given preferment to Bernard as he did so. For instance, Matthew chose Bernard to preach at the Southwell synod of 1613, which would have been a public honor. At this time, he provided Bernard with his text of Galatians 6:6 and his topic, catechesis; the sermon was published later that year as part of a pair of sermons.<sup>265</sup> In these, Bernard explained that the text "speaketh... implicitly of the Minister's duty...this Text was given me once, by one of principal authority in the Church, to urge my brethren of the Ministry, publicly assembled, to the duty of catechising." A marginal note explains that the text was "Preached at Southwell in Nottinghamshire, by the appointment of the most Reverend Father the Lord Archbishop of York, our worthy Metropolitan and much beloved Diocesan."<sup>266</sup> Matthew's politic dealings with Bernard, in which he gave him a public forum for spreading godly religion in response to his cooperation in the ministry, should not go unnoticed.

Bernard's focus on parish ministry and devotional publications would also have strengthened his reputation in the eyes of puritan members of the Church, who eagerly sought

---

<sup>264</sup> Bernard, *Weekes Worke*, 140.

<sup>265</sup> It was printed as *Two Twinnes*; see Chapter 3. Cf. Fincham, "Pastoral Roles of the Jacobean Episcopate in Canterbury Province," 80; and Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 258.

<sup>266</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 2. The text is clearly designed for an educated audience; while primarily in English, both the sermon text and the marginal notes contain Latin and Greek references and explications of his text. Matthew's invitation for Bernard to preach may indicate that Bernard's local prominence was increasing, not only through his publications and local reputation but also, perhaps, through his participation in the godly preaching exercises which Matthew supported in Nottinghamshire; cf. Sheils, "Tobie Matthew's Preaching Diary," 388; and Collinson, *Godly People*, 539, 557n.

ministers and publications that would help them develop spiritually and encourage them in the rigorous pursuit of godliness. In fact, it was this reputation for godliness, along with a few strategic personal connections, that seems to have allowed Bernard to move to the parish of Batcombe, Somerset, in 1613. Many considerations would have gone toward this relocation, but the new position was promising for Bernard. Although it took him out of the jurisdiction of Archbishop Matthew, it placed him into the see of Bath and Wells where his godly “scruples were tolerated” first by James Montagu and then by Arthur Lake.<sup>267</sup> Montagu, who was bishop during Bernard’s transition, was particularly lenient toward the sort of moderate nonconformity that Bernard practiced and was strongly committed to the same sort of preaching ministry that Bernard had been developing under Matthew.<sup>268</sup> In addition, Montagu was a longtime family friend to Bernard—a relationship that likely made Bernard’s scruples even more tolerable.<sup>269</sup> It is thus unsurprising that even after his move to Somerset, Bernard continued to emphasize preaching, teaching, and didactic or devotional publications.<sup>270</sup>

It was likely because of Bernard’s continuance on this path, along with the strength of their continuing relationship, that in 1620 Matthew appointed Bernard prebendary of Segeston, Southwell Minster.<sup>271</sup> It is quite possible that Bernard’s choice to revise *The Faithfull Shepheard* in 1621 was directly related to this appointment.<sup>272</sup> By revising this work, Bernard could again demonstrate his gratitude to Matthew and his continuing alignment with Matthew’s desires for an improved preaching ministry throughout the Church. The fact that he dedicated this edition of the work to Matthew—which he had not done with the previous editions—further underscores his interest in bringing this publication to Matthew’s attention. Though it is not explicit, the dedication may gesture toward this appointment and most recent sign of Matthew’s favor: “To suppress the remembrance of benefits received, I may not; *hoc esset magnae impietatis*: and to express

---

<sup>267</sup> Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 229. He also notes, at least in the case of Lake, the toleration of Bernard’s occasional nonconformity was based on pastoral goals rather than interests in large-scale institutional reform. *Ibid.*, 260.

<sup>268</sup> Sheils, “Matthew, Tobie.” *ODNB*.

<sup>269</sup> Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 258.

<sup>270</sup> Until 1616, at which time other episcopal factors seem to have become significant, as I will show in the following chapter.

<sup>271</sup> He was appointed to the prebendary of Segeston, alias Sacrista, on Oct. 23, 1620. *CCEd* Record ID 37642 from BI, Sub. Bk. 1, accessed 5 January 2015; Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 258; Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts*, 296.

<sup>272</sup> The first two editions had been dedicated to Montagu, who was not living at the time of the 1621 revision. Such a change was not unique: for instance, consider the differences in dedicatory epistles in the 1616 and 1628 editions of *A Weekes Worke*.

them, as I should, I cannot; *hoc est meae imbecillitatis*. Your Grace's favors afforded first and last bind me for ever."<sup>273</sup>

### Conclusion

From this analysis of Bernard's ministry and writing in these foundational years, it is possible to identify several influences that, over time, worked together to establish the basis for his later ministry. These included his early acquaintances with the Wray family, James Montagu, and the members of the godly party at Cambridge, as well as his training as a scholar and minister. Yet among a variety of influences, three stand out as having a particular continuing influence on Bernard's subsequent practices, both in print and in parish. First was his theological move toward, and then away from, separatism. Having found strong resonance with ecclesiology different from that of the national church, having tasted the benefits of a covenanted association of believers, and having experienced the difficulties of being deprived from his living due to his convictions, Bernard could not take lightly the decision to conform. Rather, he developed a very precisely-delimited theology of the nature of the true church and of the correct way to respond to *adiaphora* even when he felt something held a probability of sin. Because Bernard had moved so far to the left on this issue, his rebound actually pushed him closer to the conforming middle than many of his godly-but-not-separating colleagues. It was as if, having gone so far toward separatism and then found a theological basis to reject it, Bernard had no option but to wholeheartedly embrace conformism. Although on occasion he would continue to display his moderate nonconformity by omitting a particular form of worship or pursuing a particularly godly course of ministry, his ecclesiology had changed in such a way that, when pressed, he essentially had no choice but to defer to his superiors and make the best of his ministry with the options given him.

A second significant influence on Bernard's later ministry came from his relationship with separatists, and especially Smyth. These gave him key points of reference against which he could define his own ministry and his own acts of nonconformity. Although Bernard judged separatism primarily in terms of its doctrinal errors, he also judged it in terms of the behavior and faithfulness of its ministers. As such, Smyth's departure from standard forms of Christian practice (including the "se-baptism" that Bernard sharply decried) reaffirmed for Bernard how wrong the separatists'

---

<sup>273</sup> Bernard, *Faithful Shepherd* (1621), Sig. A2r-A2v.



path was; he would have seen it as a blessing and a providence that he had not joined them in this course.

A third way that this period strongly affected Bernard's career—and one we must not underestimate—was the development of his relationship with Matthew. In addition to leading Bernard back to conformity, it seems that Matthew influenced much of Bernard's print and parish ministry throughout 1606-1612, and to some degree continued his influence even in later years. Encouraging Bernard to emphasize his preaching ministry seems to have led not only to the growth of Bernard's own practice but also his authorship of *The Faithfull Shepherd* and several devotional works. Matthew seems to have encouraged Bernard's public strides against separatism as he sought to publicly realign himself as a member of the Church while simultaneously encouraging him toward the sort of pastoral publications that would become the staple of Bernard's corpus and the basis of his reputation as a godly author-minister. Matthew also assisted Bernard in developing a regional influence among godly leaders—a role that would continue even after his move to Somerset.

In addition to his continuance in preaching and in print in ways that would have been pleasing to Matthew, this influence can also be seen in Bernard's continued pursuit of the approval of superiors and others with important channels of influence. Throughout his ministry, Bernard would seek to take advantage of connections with powerful men—scholars, churchmen, landowners, and even Charles I—and he was closely attuned to the way that these men could be (or were) helping or harming the progress of the gospel. He frequently adjusted his actions and his publications in reference to the preferences or demands of his own bishop; by these careful choices, he hoped to most effectively foster what he believed to be the interests of the gospel and the Church. Finally, the fact that Matthew continued to intervene on Bernard's behalf even after his move to Somerset further demonstrates the lasting influence of the relationship that Bernard developed with Matthew in this early period.

One might succinctly describe Bernard's career as that of a moderate non-conformist minister who thoughtfully pursued the favor of his superiors, pursued a godly style of local and regional ministry through preaching and teaching, and pursued a diverse authorial career centering on didactic and devotional works but also including timely polemical works. Each of these marks finds its germ in this key period. While it would be wrong to identify these factors as the complete

and final basis for his career choices, we must give due weight to this formative period in order to understand the path of his parish and print ministry in the ensuing years.

## CHAPTER 3

### *THE FAITHFUL SHEPHEARD* AND PRINTED SERMONS

We have seen in the previous chapter that upon re-conforming to the Church of England, and at the urging of Archbishop Matthew, Richard Bernard determined that the best way for him to further the kingdom of God was through a pastoral ministry under the auspices of the national church; throughout the rest of his career, he performed just that sort of ministry. Through faithful parish work and ministry to his fellow clerics, he could pursue the reformation of the lives of his own parishioners and equip other ministers to do the same. Moreover, through print he could achieve similar goals for an exponentially larger audience of individuals throughout England—and beyond.

These aspects of Bernard's career were interrelated: throughout his career, there were mutual goals and influences between his personal ministry (both in the parish and among other ministers) and his print ministry. The first section of this chapter centers upon Bernard's foremost effort to help his fellow ministers through print: his creation of three editions of the pastoral manual *The Faithfull Shepheard*. A training manual for ministers and arguably Bernard's best-known publication, this work assisted young and prospective ministers in identifying their calling, considering the key components of their ministry, and learning to use key tools and ideas to effectively pursue that calling. Of course, since Bernard was himself a minister, we can also view it as something of a personal document, representing not only the course that godly ministers should take in general, but also in some ways a proposed path for his own career and a statement of how he perceived the key aspects of his calling.

In this initial part of the chapter, I first situate *Faithfull Shepheard* among other godly clerical manuals, because considering how other contemporary writers addressed this topic provides a helpful background against which to identify the aspects of ministry that were of most concern to Bernard. Then, I analyze Bernard's presentations of pastoral ministry as they appear in the three editions (1607, 1609, and 1621) of *Faithfull Shepheard*. From 1607 and throughout all editions, Bernard emphasized the key importance of a minister's personal, direct application of a text to his hearers. This focus on application depended upon careful study of the Scriptures alongside a keen personal awareness of the spiritual state of each congregant. Bernard retained

this emphasis on specific, personal application throughout all editions, seeing it as a defining aspect of godly preaching.

Yet within this key focus, there were slight shifts in his approach over the three editions. In the minor changes to the work in 1609, he adopted more accommodations toward his audience (again, presumably largely those who were, or would be, in pastoral ministry) and their understanding of his material. He displayed a greater readiness to explain and demonstrate his approach through added marginal notes and through an exemplary sermon appended to the work. His 1621 version contained still more changes and additions. These emphasized that the sort of preaching ministry he described should exist within a broader context of ministry that included a minister's skills, the Spirit's calling, and several duties—such as catechism—regularly performed among one's flock. This edition also displayed an awareness that ministers might need still more extensive assistance than he had provided in 1607 or 1609. In other words, over the three editions, *Faithfull Shepherd* provided increasing amounts of aid for its readers.

Having demonstrated the way in which Bernard developed this text, over time, to accommodate more and more for the practical needs of ministers, in the second portion of the chapter I turn to an examination of Bernard's printed sermons, including printed adaptations of content that began as sermons. During roughly the same period in which Bernard produced the two revised editions of *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609-1621), he also began producing sermon materials for publication. Scholars such as Arnold Hunt have recently discussed the early seventeenth century view of printed sermons as a "cold" medium, unable to affect audiences with the same power as preached sermons.<sup>274</sup> Bernard himself specifically discouraged the clergy in 1607 from using printed sermons to guide the composition of their own messages. On both these counts, it would seem that Bernard would choose to avoid distributing sermons through print. Yet seemingly to the contrary, Bernard's sermons, and works derived from them, began to see publication.

This, however, was no conflict of pastoral and print interest. Bernard held the common understanding that the Word *preached* had special spiritual use, but this led him to see printed sermons as having other potential uses—especially if they were transformed in some way. They should not be misconstrued as alternatives to sermons, but they might accomplish different spiritual purposes through other genres. From this, we can draw the important conclusion that

---

<sup>274</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 181. See also Rigney, "Sermons into Print."

enthusiastic adoption of print did not, in itself, imply a favorable position on the question of whether printed sermons could do the same work as preaching. Bernard did not believe that print could replace sermons, but rather that they could do a different sort of work, functioning as a complement to sermons and aiming at a different sort of spiritual goal. As a result of this analysis of Bernard's view of the distinctions between print and preaching, we can more fully understand the place of print within certain godly ministerial contexts.

### Context of pastoral manuals

Publications about the pastoral ministry were somewhat common in early modern print. Many of these—including most of the later sixteenth and early seventeenth century publications with which Bernard may have been familiar as he composed *Faithfull Shepheard*—took the form of printed sermons.<sup>275</sup> Yet works for pastors in other genres, and in particular instructional clerical manuals, were also beginning to appear. In contrast to many sermons, which offered theoretical and theological background for ministerial work and exhorted audiences to fulfill certain duties in order to correctly perform or receive the labors of pastoral work, clerical manuals tended to emphasize practical details of the calling. As such, most were longer than sermons, employed different organizational structures, and assumed a rather didactic authorial voice. Although certain pastoral works reflect aspects of other genres, structural features should not become over-important in categorization: as Matthew Allen has suggested, when one considers 'purpose' alongside 'form' in the designation of genre, one finds key distinctive features within nonfiction prose works dedicated to the instruction of the clergy.<sup>276</sup> For this and other reasons, it is possible to identify clerical manuals as a distinct genre or sub-genre. Nevertheless, there was no

---

<sup>275</sup> Printed sermons related to the ministry included a wide variety of works; those published before 1607, and thus might (among many others) have been viewed by Bernard before he composed *Faithfull Shepheard* included John Holme's *The burthen of the ministerie* (1592); George Phillips's *The paines of a faithfull pastor* (1596 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) and *The good sheeheardes dutie* (1597); and Ralph Tyrer's "The charge of the cleargie" (in *Five godlie sermons*, 1602). More such sermons continued to appear in print throughout the period. Regarding contemporary writing about pastoral ministry see also Freeman, "The parish ministry in the diocese of Durham, c. 1570-1640," 195-205.

<sup>276</sup> Allen, "The priest in *The Temple*: The relationship between George Herbert's English poetry and *The Country Parson*." See also Wolberg, *All Possible Art: George Herbert's The Country Parson*, 13-14. Wolberg's work is helpful insofar as it explicitly recognizes the clerical manual as a genre and attempts (in the service of an analysis of *The Country Parson*) to consider key works within this tradition of clerical manuals. Unfortunately, Wolberg's historical analysis of the clerical manual's place within the network of godly ministers in the early seventeenth century falls short. Her second chapter attempts to contextualize clerical manuals, but she fails to make use of any scholarly publications since the late 1970s (and uses the old, 1917 edition of the *ODNB*) which means her analysis of key issues is far outdated for a 2008 publication. Further, she too often blurs divisions—not only eliding puritanism in England and New England but also painting with a too-broad brush her picture of "Puritan" theology and practice.

singular model for clerical manuals, and considering something of the variety of emphases of these manuals can tell us something about the range of perceptions of the ministry itself and of common problems facing (and perhaps created by) ministers.

Protestant manuals on preaching were not new, and even in English some variety was available. Notable among sixteenth century English works in this genre was *The Practis of preaching, otherwise called the Pathway to the Pulpit*, a 1577 translation by John Ludham of Andreas Hyperius's work.<sup>277</sup> While earlier publications such as this one would have continued to be available in certain libraries, later decades saw new clerical manuals published, as well. Among those that would have found a godly audience was Pierre Gerard's *Preparation to the most holie ministerie*, which was translated into English by Nicholas Becket and published in London in 1598.<sup>278</sup> This work contained two books, one focused predominantly on the minister's calling and life, and one on his teaching and preaching. The work as a whole reacted against those seeking the office of minister for improper reasons, especially a prideful desire for personal glory. As such, the first portion of the work, focusing upon the lives of clergy, took a serious perspective on the calling of ministers and the need for them to live exemplary lives free from major, public sins as well as patterns of less-public sins for which one was unrepentant. Subsequent latter portions of the work focused on the minister's duties as a public speaker; emphasizing the difficulty of ministerial activities, the need for diligent study (which should produce humility) the right use of the public venue, and the importance of the willingness to teach, admonish and reprove even when an audience was unreceptive. Significantly, *Preparation's* later portions included warnings that ministers might be subject to several afflictions, including mocking, hatred, false accusations, betrayal, imprisonment, and more—yet it also encouraged individuals to “take upon them this holy charge” because “we desire nothing more than the glory of God, and the salvation of our brethren, both which, cannot be better furthered than by this charge.”<sup>279</sup> The work thus emphasized the difficult requirements but also the great spiritual rewards of the

---

<sup>277</sup> Hyperius, *The Practis of preaching, otherwise called the pathway to the pulpet*. I am grateful to Arlene McAlister for mentioning to me that her research on *Ruths Recompence* traces certain ways that Hyperius's influence may be seen in portions of Bernard's work. Yet while *Practis* and *Faithfull Shepheard* share similarities common to several preaching manuals, I know of no direct connection—and moreover, as Bernard was typically quite thorough in his references it is significant that *Faithfull Shepheard* did not cite Hyperius. McAlister's forthcoming work may speak to this.

<sup>278</sup> Little is known of Nicholas Becket; the first dedicatory epistle (to William Perriam of Devon) and the second (to “his loving Brethren” the ministers of Devon and Cornwall) seem to place him in that region, and the clergy database records that Nicholas Beckett was ordained in 1591 and served as rector of Hockworthy and Holsworthy in Devon; he died in 1603. *CCEd* Person ID 94153. See also Bussby, “A history and source book on training for the ministry in the Church of England, 1511-1717,” 157-160.

<sup>279</sup> Gerard, *Preparation to the most holie ministerie*, 283-290, 318-9.

ministry. In this way, the work was less a practical manual and more an exhortation to refocus one's goals, expectations, and perceptions regarding clerical work.

A similar emphasis on a cleric's life and public character appeared in other manuals such as George Herbert's well-known 1652 work, *A Priest to the Temple*, which emphasized a minister's holy life and public reputation over and above certain duties such as preaching.<sup>280</sup> Yet while works like Herbert's may have appealed to a less preaching-focused (and in that sense less "puritan") audience, *Preparation* must have found a godly audience. Its emphasis upon behavior was clearly described as a complement to the minister's key duty of preaching. Moreover, it followed other common godly trajectories as it condemned papists and ill-educated clergy, provided a Protestant refutation of transubstantiation, and even quoted Calvin.

Perhaps the best-known godly clerical manual from this period was William Perkins's discussion of the two key pastoral activities of preaching and public prayer. It was published in the late sixteenth century in Latin as *Prophetica*, and due to the efforts of Thomas Tuke it appeared in English translation in 1607 as *The Arte of Prophecyng*.<sup>281</sup> Unlike some wider-ranging manuals, Perkins' sole concern in this work was to equip shepherds in their "most excellent gift" of prophesying. Noting in the epistle that he had observed this gift "so handled of many, as that it would remain naked" Perkins compiled this "commodious" method.<sup>282</sup> Though it discussed public prayer briefly, the work focused almost exclusively on duties related to preaching. Within that, the majority dealt with the correct way to interpret a text and gather doctrines, containing not only a description of various books and passages in Scripture but also directions and examples of rightly expositing different types of passages. The latter portions of the work also treated ways to use and apply doctrines (including having a knowledge of one's hearers and knowing the different types of application), memorization of the outline of the sermon for delivery, and the presentation of sermons in speech and gesture. Perkins also briefly discussed the necessity of a minister to be godly both inwardly and outwardly—the former so that he "may perceive the inward sense and experience in the word in his heart," and the latter so that his life

---

<sup>280</sup> Herbert's publication has seen a moderately significant amount of work from literary scholars and has been characterized as a moderate Protestant response to godly pastoral manuals. See Allen, 20, 24, 25; and Wolberg, 42-44.

<sup>281</sup> William Perkins, *Prophetica*. The epistle's date is also retained in the later translation.

<sup>282</sup> Perkins, *Arte of Prophecyng*, n.p.

might demonstrate his teachings by example, make the congregation willing to hear on account of his goodness, and be worthy to perform these duties.<sup>283</sup>

Lisa Gordis has observed that the degree to which *Arte* emphasized proper exegesis of Scripture may suggest that Perkins saw rightly extracting doctrines as relatively more difficult than constructing and presenting a sermon.<sup>284</sup> Yet it is also important to note that elsewhere he emphasized other aspects of the minister's work. We see this in two treatises, posthumously published and said to be adapted from messages delivered at Cambridge, entitled *Of the Calling of the Ministerie*.<sup>285</sup> Rather than a technical emphasis on the way to exegete a text, the two treatises in this work present a more holistic picture of ministerial goals. Perkins emphasized that a minister must personally know his own sins, repent, and accept God's offer of redemption; this humble position made him fit for his work. In addition, he must regularly and clearly deal with the sins of a congregation (without fear of doing so even before powerful individuals) and comfort them with the promise of righteousness upon repentance. Doing this effectively, Perkins emphasized, depended upon knowing the state of one's congregants, which could only be done in cooperation with them: it was their responsibility to willingly confess sins and openly discuss their spiritual state with the minister whose duty it was to bring them to repentance and spiritual comfort. Interestingly, Perkins gave a good deal of attention to the need for a minister to spend his time amongst godly—or at least tractable—individuals in order to keep from adopting the sins of sinful companions. A poor living with a godly flock was better than a wealthy living among intractable sinners who could lead the minister, over time, to veer from the truth. Moreover, ministers were to be careful not to socialize too freely but to spend their time soberly, avoiding any “pollution” from their congregants.<sup>286</sup>

Altogether, both treatises emphasized an awareness of existing and potential sin in both the minister and the flock, alongside the need for repentance and restoration to God. Ministers were to organize their careers—not only major choices such as calling, parish, and lifestyle but also daily choices such as what to preach and how to treat their parishioners—around this central issue. Yet the treatises in *Calling* were intended for a limited audience at Cambridge and only reached a more public audience after Perkins' death. In contrast, *Arte* was prepared for

---

<sup>283</sup> Perkins, *Arte of Prophecyng*, 136-139.

<sup>284</sup> Gordis, *Opening Scripture*, 17.

<sup>285</sup> William Perkins, *Of the Calling of the Ministerie two Treatises, describing the Duties and Dignities of that Calling* (London: for William Welby, 1605).

<sup>286</sup> Perkins, *Calling*, 29-40.



publication by Perkins himself. Because he saw fit to publish the one and not the other this during his life, he may have viewed it as critical for a broad audience in a way that his other thoughts on ministry were not. One might conclude that although Perkins wanted ministers to live godly lives, to be closely connected with godly congregants, and to ensure that they and their parishioners keenly felt both sin and grace, his emphasis was upon right doctrine. Knowing the rest of his publications and his focus on theology, it may not be surprising that his attention here also tended toward the theological.

#### 1607: A dual approach of careful study and personal application

While Gerard's focus in *Preparation* largely emphasized a minister's humility before God and others, and Perkins' focus in *Arte* was on exposition, Bernard's attention turned slightly differently as he began developing his own work in the early seventeenth century. He may or may not have been aware of Perkins' printed work when he first composed *Faithfull Shepheard*, but he was certainly familiar with Perkins' practice (see the Biographical Sketch).<sup>287</sup> He must have sat under Perkins in his early years at Christ's, where Bernard matriculated as a sizar in 1592 and Perkins held his fellowship until 1594. There, Perkins was part of a "spiritual brotherhood" of godly leaders who followed several reformed continental theologians including Beza, Zanchi, and Ursinus—each of whom Bernard cites.<sup>288</sup> At Christ's, Bernard likely heard Perkins speak on many topics—perhaps he even heard the sermons that would later become *Calling*. Yet in *Faithfull Shepheard* Bernard specifically made reference to Perkins' pastoral practice but not his

---

<sup>287</sup> This is likely due to the fact that he did not cite either the English or the Latin version of *Arte* in 1607 or 1609 even though he cited many other theological works throughout *Faithfull Shepheard*. Though (as we shall see) *Faithfull Shepheard* differed from *Arte*, Bernard may have appreciated the latter enough to temper this statement if he was aware of Perkins' work. In 1607 the title page to this work said that "a good plain order and method" had not yet been published; thus, while he was certainly familiar with Perkins' approach, he seems not to have been familiar with his work on the ministry. It is possible that he was aware of the Latin version, *Prophetica*, but did not believe that was helpful for his more general audience, which included prospective ministers who may not yet have finished their schooling and might not be equipped to read in Latin. Archbishop Matthew did have a copy of *Prophetica* and, as I suggested in Chapter 2, Matthew may have given Bernard access to his library for certain writing projects. See *A Catalogue of the printed books in the library of the dean and chapter of York*, 339. Yet because throughout his career Bernard was so thorough in his citations, it seems most likely that he did not encounter Perkins' work until sometime after the 1609 publication—and even then he may have been unaware of the two treatises. If so, this could further explain why in the 1621 revision he put a holistic picture of the ministry that went beyond the function of *Prophetica* and *Art of Prophecying* as manuals on preaching. Further, this could explain why Bernard made a somewhat obscure reference to Perkins' *Prophetica* in a dedicatory epistle of the 1621 version: if, in the years between his publication of *Faithful Shepheard*, he became aware of Perkins' work, he might want to signal that new knowledge without having to explicitly explain the earlier omission.

<sup>288</sup> Lake, *Moderate Puritans* 218-219; Jinkins, "Perkins, William" *ODNB*.

pastoral publication. In fact, according to the title page of the first edition of *Faithfull Shepheard*, Bernard believed that “a good plain order and method” for ministry had not been published. He sought, it seems, to fill the void by providing a manual discussing all aspects of the ministry: “the excellency and necessity of the ministry; a minister’s properties and duty; his entrance into this function and charge; how to begin fitly to instruct his people; catechizing and preaching.”<sup>289</sup>

Gordis suggests that in comparison to Perkins, Bernard “focused more closely on the minister as interpreter and teacher, rather than on the process of teaching and interpretation itself.”<sup>290</sup> Though he did highlight the need for thorough study, Bernard’s goals for the ministry began and ended with close attention to the intellectual and spiritual state of parishioners. Their needs could only be effectively met by a pastor who rightly understood and applied the Scriptures to their specific, individual situations. This resulted in what we might call a two-pronged vision for an engaged pastoral ministry, involving both careful study and careful responsiveness to the needs of congregants.

Bernard strongly emphasized that ministers should know and respond to parishioners and other hearers; yet this would be entirely fruitless if they were not also able to provide accurate help from the Word. For this reason, Bernard sought throughout *Faithfull Shepheard* to point his audience to resources that could help them understand and interpret the Word. These began with spiritual resources including the calling of God and the work of the Holy Spirit, but they also included practical resources including study as one worked to understand the things of God.

The spiritual resources required for a true and faithful minister included his own faith in Christ and his dependence upon the work of the Holy Spirit. Bernard believed that humans could not, on their own, achieve any spiritual ends. For this reason, he exhorted readers to seek the Spirit’s help in all things. For all a minister’s efforts, only God could cause spiritual change in the parish and beyond; however, God regularly used ministers as agents. This began with calling: the minister needed to be “sent by God” to this work. In addition, the church played a key role in affirming a minister’s calling as a sort of check to personal inclination and as a guiding body for ministerial development:

...the church by examination must, or they to whom the authority of the church is committed, try thee, and approving thee by finding thee endued with such gifts as are

---

<sup>289</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), title page.

<sup>290</sup> Gordis, *Opening Scripture*, 17.

necessary for a minister, must call and institute one lawfully presented to a pastoral charge to take care over the flock. We may not take it upon us before we be called.<sup>291</sup>

Keeping in mind Bernard's earlier foray towards separatism (he made the connection clear by mentioning his "book against the Brownists" in the margin), this passage emphasized the way that God's ministers were called both to and through the Church. He focused first on those unfit in maturity or skill for the position, but then turned to any who would attempt to minister outside the auspices of the Church; he had stern warnings for both. He warned that ministers working outside the bounds of church authority were actually working outside the bounds of the Lord's calling—and therefore were not true or fit ministers of God: "So as an unfit man, ignorant and vain, may be man's Minister, but none of Christ's Messenger."<sup>292</sup> In addition to this initial blessing, ministers were to continually seek the Lord's help throughout their careers. Only "through God's goodness" could a minister find profit in catechism, and the like was true in the key discipline of the ministry, preaching.<sup>293</sup> For this reason, in describing the prayer before sermons, Bernard exhorted ministers always to seek the Spirit's assistance for the work to come:

Prayer must be the proeme; it is the Lord that both gives wisdom to understand, and words of utterance: it is the spirit that strengthenest their hearts in speaking, that guides them in the truth, calls things to their remembrance, and makes them able ministers of the gospel. The disciples might not go out before they had received the spirit; neither may we go up and speak without it. It is not by the instrument that men are converted; neither in the words lieth the power to save: but it is the Lord's blessing thereupon, who thereby addeth to the church such as are ordained to be saved.<sup>294</sup>

Reformed theology included the concept that although God always accomplished His sovereign will, humans nevertheless had a responsibility to obey his commands. This came through clearly in *Faithful Shepherd*. Although Bernard gave credit and ultimate authority to God for any positive results of the ministry, the bulk of the book contained instructions for the right fulfilling of duties. Key among these was the emphasis on a minister's study. In order to rightly divide the Word, a minister was to make regular recourse to books: certainly the Word itself, but also a variety of other resources that could help the minister understand and clearly explain the contents of the Scriptures.

---

<sup>291</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609) 6.

<sup>292</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), 6-7.

<sup>293</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), 10.

<sup>294</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), 13.

Bernard described access to a library of references for personal study and sermon preparation not as a luxury but as an essential part of the ministerial career. Although he must have expected capable laypeople to read and consult books of various types, and although he often wrote in ways that would be accessible to a broad audience, his foremost concern was that that spiritual leaders have access to good books. *Faithfull Shepheard* included a list of subjects about which a minister should be educated; after a few introductory points exhorting ministers toward all types of knowledge, the list became a sort of conversationally narrated bibliography that suggested authors and types of works that might appear in an ideal library.

In some ways echoing his concern for attention to individual needs of parishioners (on which see below), Bernard demonstrated a concern for matching books with the needs and abilities of ministers at various educational or spiritual levels. For example, regarding expositional works, he suggested a minister read analytical expositions of the Bible that show:

...the coherence, the antecedents, and the consequents, the scope of the author, the whole method & arguments for confirmation or confutation of the proposition handled. It were very good for a young beginner to read every day one chapter of two with some learned man's resolution of the same: he shall profit much thereby in knowledge of the Scriptures.<sup>295</sup>

It seems that Bernard saw these expositional works as similar to a lecture or expository sermon that a divinity student might hear, such that even young ministers without access to combination lectures, university settings, or elder colleagues could use books to pursue their training. Indeed, through commentaries, one might “as it were talk with and ask the judgment of the greatest Divines in the world, of any Scripture they write of...”<sup>296</sup>

Yet while he encouraged young ministers to read widely to enhance their knowledge, Bernard also desired that they avoid reading certain controversial topics, which could lead them into error, until they were ready. He divided his final section, on controversies, into a sort of progression through which ministers would only pass with certain spiritual and educational development: those “well grounded by these things aforesaid” might proceed to examine recent controversies, then to controversies of former times. Only after all such study might one begin examining “dangerous” controversies, which had the capacity to damage the life of the church if unqualified individuals attempted to enter them:

---

<sup>295</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 39.

<sup>296</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 40.

When we are thus fitly prepared and armed with the sound knowledge of the truth, against sophistry and subtle distinctions, then may we boldly enter upon a dangerous sort: for young novices upon whom nevertheless in these days, proud conceits, for show of learning, wild youths, wanton by their wits, foolhardily rush upon, in their very *a, b, c*, of divinity to their ruin and churches' disturbance...<sup>297</sup>

Regardless of the reader's educational or spiritual level, Bernard's descriptions of these sources indicated an assumption that ministers would cultivate an active involvement with books: not reading a text once and moving on, but continually consulting numerous sources on various topics. His discussions of the uses of concordances and commentaries made it particularly clear that he expected frequent consultation of multiple types of sources. Regarding concordances, he provided a discussion of how to use them and then exhorted his readers:

...the benefit of this is more than here I can conveniently express. Surely, he that understands his text well, and knows how to draw a doctrine, needs no printed or written sermons, to help for to enlarge it: the right knowledge how to use a concordance, is every way a sufficient help for proofs, reasons, and illustrations of the same. It may seem, and will prove irksome to him that at the first makes trial thereof: but time and experience will make it easy and pleasant.<sup>298</sup>

Likewise, regarding commentaries, he explained that one should use them not simply to confirm one's existing ideas about the text, but also consult other ministers' expertise. One might even blend one's own expertise with an author's to gain an idea from reading a concordance that the original author did not intend. Thinking of reading and research as a conversation rather than a one-way distribution of knowledge, Bernard indicated that such innovation was fine as long as it continued to fall in line with correct doctrine.<sup>299</sup>

Unlike the many other sorts of books that one might reference as needed, Bernard urged ministers to "study thoroughly" and "be well practiced in" catechisms. In particular, he noted Calvin's *Institutes* (not a traditional catechism, but a work covering the major doctrines of the reformed faith) and Ursinus's Heidelberg Catechism. He urged ministers to memorize the main points of religion exemplified in such works so that they could "have without book the definitions and distributions of the principal heads of Theology".<sup>300</sup> Since he suggested that a minister should be ready at all times to explain or make reference to the basic doctrines of the Christian

---

<sup>297</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, (1607), 42.

<sup>298</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, (1607), 39.

<sup>299</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, (1607), 40. In reference to the conversational nature of research, note again the passage quoted above: readers may "as it were talke with and aske the iudgement of the greatest Diuines..."

<sup>300</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, (1607), 40.

faith, Bernard did not suggest that catechisms were for reference as other types of books; rather, the information in them was to form the mental groundwork upon which other reference works might build.

Perhaps his clearest discussion of the value of a minister's reading—and of having books at ready reference in a library—appeared in the final chapter of *Faithfull Shepherd*. In this, he discussed those things required of a minister in general, including abilities, spiritual disciplines, and character qualities largely drawn from the qualifications mentioned in 1 Timothy and Titus. Yet alongside these internal qualities he mentioned external provisions, including not only funds to sustain a minister's life and family but also—specifically—books:

And lastly, a minister must have a good library, means must be used, the help of the learned. Extraordinary revelations, are now ceased. And to make up all both to provide things necessary, to continue him in study, to encourage him in labor: He must not want sufficient maintenance...<sup>301</sup>

This was a remarkable statement. Bernard suggested that outside divine enlightenment, books were the singular best tool for a minister to understand the Scriptures and continue in his work. If there were doubt about Bernard's esteem for the possibilities and uses of print, this surely must dispel it.<sup>302</sup>

By placing the need for books (and, thus, for study) at the same level with marks of spiritual maturity and abilities for public engagement, Bernard again emphasized the significance of personal scholarship to the ministry. The type of study he had in mind here was not a mere reading, but an active and engaged approach to texts that included intense personal thought (including meditation and prayer) as well as production through writing. Copying, recording, note-taking, commenting, and arranging were all part of the writing process that Bernard described. The activities of prayer, meditation, study, and writing elevated a merely human activity based upon personal ability to a true spiritual activity based upon the blessing of God: “the best wit readiest to conceive, the firmest memory to retain; nor the volublest tongue to utter (excellent gifts but much abused to idleness and vainglory) may not exempt a man from studying, reading, writing sometime, meditation and continual prayer.”<sup>303</sup> Among the sorts of writing

---

<sup>301</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, (1607), 94.

<sup>302</sup> He emphasizes this point again shortly after: “The understanding findeth, memory retaineth, the tongue delivereth, a zealous and gracious heart enforceth, comely gesture graceth, a good life beautifieth, a library furthereth, and a competent living animateth, prevents cares, and distractions of mind.” Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, (1607), 94-95.

<sup>303</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1607), 11.

Bernard expected from ministers was the making of a commonplace book, “for so doing he shall furnish himself with much matter, and learn to discourse, follow, and stand upon a point in a sermon.”<sup>304</sup> Though Bernard nowhere indicated an expectation for all ministers to share or publish the results of their study as he often did, throughout *Faithfull Shepheard* one finds a clear expectation that a minister would regularly engage in focused study—enlightened by the Holy Spirit but produced by diligence—which in turn provided the foundation for work among the flock.

Bernard favored ministers learning from a variety of sources; this is evident from his copious references to other works throughout *Faithful Shepheard*. It is also possible to make an interesting connection with his later evaluation of the particular skills of various authors. In a table presenting “A Catalogue of men commended in their Calling”, Bernard highlighted the particular strengths of several individuals, many of whom were writers known for particular techniques: Lactantius for well-ordered words, Cyprian for flowing speech, Chrysostom for stateliness of stile, Luther for powerfulness, Calvin for Compendiousness, and more.<sup>305</sup> This list indicated that Bernard not only read widely but also gave careful attention to the strengths, tendencies, and distinctions of various authors. He wanted others to do the same.

Along with study, exhortations toward identifying and responding to needs of parishioners featured prominently in *Faithful Shepheard*. Condemning those who took clerical wages in absentia or without due labor, Bernard used strong language and employed several metaphors to describe the diligent work required of a minister in regard to individual parishioners:

A minister placed over a congregation, so as is said, is there appointed of God, and there must settle himself to abide, unless he be lawfully called from thence, or necessity compel him to depart.

And that flock must he forthwith begin to feed, and not only desire the fleece: wages are due to the work: the painful labourer should reap the profit; and not the idle loiterer.

To feed aright its necessary, to weigh what estate they stand in, and to consider their conditions.

A counselor must know the case to give sound advice; the physician his patient, to administer a wholesome potion: And he that will profit a people, must skillfully discern his auditory.<sup>306</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 40, 52.

<sup>305</sup> Bernard, *Abstract*, 118.

<sup>306</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 7-8.

Depending on the question at hand, Bernard suggested different sets of criteria to categorize one's "auditory" and its needs. He took a moderately broad approach, identifying five spiritual "estates" or categories of people that a minister must skillfully discern. Those in each estate required a particular type of pastoral instruction and attention.

He explained that the first type, "ignorant and indocible" parishioners, often had good spiritual intentions and should be firmly but patiently taught the truth, convinced of their sin, and warned of its effects. This group included those who held to "popish religion" as well as those who relied upon superstition, human reason, material comforts, and the like. Over time, a minister's work among such people should cause these individuals to be "pricked in their hearts" and become more open to biblical teaching—at which point they should be delivered the doctrine of the Gospel. Nevertheless, there was also a point at which a parishioner's continuous rejection of a minister's efforts should be accepted: "If they abide obstinate, and will not receive the Word, after some sufficient time of trial, they deserve to be left, *Matth.* 10.14. *Prov.* 9.8. *Matth.* 7.6. *Act.* 19.8.9 & 17.33."<sup>307</sup>

The second type of parishioners were "ignorant, and willing to be taught."<sup>308</sup> Here in particular, Bernard encouraged ministers to pursue the work of catechism, including instruction on the "grounds and principles of religion," the creed, the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, and the sacraments. Seeing both catechism and teaching as a process, he warned ministers not to push individuals to learn catechetical material further or faster than they could handle; yet he stressed the importance of catechism as a practice that set the foundation for the reception of other ministerial work, including preaching.

Bernard's third type of parishioners were "taught, and having knowledge, but without show of sanctification."<sup>309</sup> This group, he urged, must be reminded of the law, the evil nature of sin, and the wrath of God in order to lead them to repentance, to hatred of sin, and to humility...at which point they would be receptive of the Gospel's consolations for sinners. The fourth type were those who "know and believe, living religiously in a holy conversation."<sup>310</sup> These individuals should be encouraged to continue in this and exhorted by the "sweet promises of the Gospel to believe and practice unto the end."<sup>311</sup> Finally, the fifth type of parishioner was

---

<sup>307</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 8.

<sup>308</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 8.

<sup>309</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 10.

<sup>310</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 10.

<sup>311</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 10-11.



“declining” either in doctrine or in behavior. These individuals should be recalled and convinced of correct doctrine or behavior through careful warnings and through encouragement about the happiness of returning to Christ.<sup>312</sup>

This focus on individual spiritual conditions required not only identifying parishioners’ spiritual states but also assisting them toward further spiritual growth. For each of the five types of parishioners Bernard mentioned, the minister’s responsibility was always toward instruction and exhortation, though the content and style of instruction were to be tailored to individual needs.<sup>313</sup> At the end of the list, noting that all congregations were mixed with each sort of people, Bernard made explicit the range of duties that such work involved (and which, presumably, could vary from time to time even for the same individual):

Inform the ignorant, confirm such as have understanding, reclaim the vitious, encourage the virtuous, convince the erroneous, strengthen the weak, recover again the backslider, resolve those that doubt, feed with milk and strong meat continually...<sup>314</sup>

In other words, spiritual growth would happen most effectively through a holistic approach to religious education and discipleship in which a minister closely attended and responded to the different needs of individual parishioners.<sup>315</sup> To achieve this, Bernard encouraged pursuing amiable personal relationships with parishioners in which the minister taught “with cheerful countenance, familiarly, and lovingly.”<sup>316</sup> This familiarity included making a regular practice of instructing members of the congregation not only from the pulpit, but also in small groups and individually.

In addition to attentiveness to parishioners’ needs in terms of content, Bernard encouraged ministers to remain attentive to congregants in terms of delivery itself. This included not only ensuring that a minister’s strengths and abilities matched the situation of his own auditory in general but also that he was mindful to match his vocal style to particular needs:

A man may be a fit minister of Christ, yet not meet for every congregation: few so qualified; a mild and a soft spirit to a meek company; a low voice to a little auditory, else some few hear, and the rest must stand and gaze; and undauntable mind to

---

<sup>312</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 11.

<sup>313</sup> This practice would therefore be quite time-consuming, and ministers who chose to give such individualized attention to parishioner needs would have to forego some number of other ministerial activities; as such, it shows the importance Bernard ascribed to this method of ministry.

<sup>314</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 11.

<sup>315</sup> The first part of Bernard's *The Sinner's Safetie* also refers frequently and directly to the role of the minister in personally directing the religious growth of his flock.

<sup>316</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 9.

stubborn persons; ...a loud voice to a great assembly, to a more learned church a better clerk; and one of less understanding to a ruder sort. Join like unto like, that pastor and flock may fit together, for their best good.

...

With the words there must be a care to the sound of the voice. The voice must be so far lift up, as it may always be heard; but not strained above nature's power, neither one sound throughout, but tunable, rising or falling as the matter requireth...so to be guided as the hearers not understanding the matter, may yet by the manner discern whereabouts you are...<sup>317</sup>

Toward similar ends of ensuring attention and understanding, Bernard suggested that ministers ensure that they have a good view of their hearers while preaching.<sup>318</sup> This could help them gauge reactions to and understanding of a message and perhaps could encourage attention through visual contact. Even those congregants actually interested in the message could tire of listening, so Bernard recommended limiting sermons to no more than an hour and the prayer before the sermon to no more than half an hour.<sup>319</sup> Regarding an awareness of congregants and concessions to their limitations, it is interesting that Richard Alleine the younger (Bernard's associate and his successor at Batcombe) chose in one funeral sermon to mention his awareness of the length of the sermon multiple times. Moreover, at the outset of that sermon, upon listing the main points (a common procedure, and one recommended by Bernard), Alleine offered an apology for his length and style: "Of all these, or of some of these as the time will permit & your patience give leave; & that in a plain & familiar strain, as my usual manner & fashion is, that I may not be a barbarian to any: the Lord give me direction & you understanding in all things."<sup>320</sup>

Bernard encouraged care in choosing passages. He may have favored the practice of working through a book or passage over a span of weeks; this appears to be the case through his encouragement to repeat the points from the previous week at the beginning of a sermon as well as through the passage-by-passage approach in some of his publications whose format resembles sermons.<sup>321</sup> His emphasis on a minister's thorough study of the Word—including knowledge of history, biblical languages, past and contemporary theological works, and more, would work well with this approach.<sup>322</sup> It would also keep ministers from unduly favoring or avoiding passages—

---

<sup>317</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 7, 88.

<sup>318</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1607), 13.

<sup>319</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, (1609), 14, 80.

<sup>320</sup> SRO DD\X\PB/2/3. Sermon on Phil. 1:23.

<sup>321</sup> For instance *Dauids Musick* and *Ruths Recompence*, which I discuss below. Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 80.

<sup>322</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 35-42.

out of personal preference, undue desire to please, fear, or other reasons.<sup>323</sup> Yet he also made a point that texts, and the sermons formed from them, must be fit both for their hearers and for the situation.<sup>324</sup>

Bernard included careful consideration of the minister's ability present material in such a way that hearers would willingly listen to the sermon and would personally accept and apply the content of the message. In particular, he warned that without close attention to driving home the message in practical ways to one's hearers, the entire sermon could become a cold, intellectual exercise for both minister and congregants. This was precisely what Bernard wanted to avoid. Along with tailoring the exposition of the text to the intellectual and spiritual abilities of hearers, a minister was to devote careful attention to the application of principles derived from the text. After deriving doctrines from a passage, one was to find "uses," ways that the doctrine might relate to congregants' lives.<sup>325</sup>

Yet "uses" were not enough. The "application" of a text went a step further by emphasizing the personal capacity in which hearers must respond to a text. Bernard instructed ministers giving application to speak in the first or second person as they appealed rhetorically and emotionally to congregants to make changes in their own thoughts or lives in light of the truth at hand.<sup>326</sup> Bernard described application as a "home-speaking" that was "the sharp edge of the sword":

[Application] makes a great difference of men's ministries, why some are judged so plain, and others so plausible, and why some move one way or other, to bring men to be better or worse: others only inform but reform not, because they speak too generally, and preach as if they meant other persons, and not their present auditory.

If they make application of uses, its but of instruction and comfort, which the wickedest man can away with. For instruction presupposeth to virtue, and stirs up to good life, which the worst would gladly have a name of, and so for praise and reward sake, will listen to it: the other is comfort and preaching of peace; which none will refuse. And this kind of application is common with some, as all that consider of their courses may plainly observe. But the application of the use of convincing, but especially of reprehension and correction, the wicked will at no hand abide... Which makes many mealy-mouthed, become so full of discretion (winding up foul offences, into seemly terms) as this discretion hath almost destroyed devotion, policy hath in a

---

<sup>323</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 19.

<sup>324</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607) 18-20.

<sup>325</sup> On Bernard's suggested sermon structure in terms of other common arrangements, see Greg Kneidel, "Ars Praedicandi: Theories and Practice," 17-18.

<sup>326</sup> There may be some room, in particularly clear texts, for an application and a use to be united; cf. Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 77 and cf. Gordis.

manner thrust out piety: and we see by this means, sins so reprov'd continue, by such plausible preaching, unreformed.

Application in this sort must needs be used: No plaster cures when we do but only know it; nor the use when it is heard of: but the particular application to the sore doth good, and then it is felt and moveth.<sup>327</sup>

Application was key: without it, congregants would have been instructed, but not changed. In addition, application was a two-person business. It was the minister's responsibility to help his flock, as much as possible, identify applications that pertained to their own life situation, and to encourage them to pursue the necessary course of action through exhortation, pleading, and the like. Yet individuals were also responsible for working with faithful ministers as they adopted these applications. In a sense, a minister gave applications to each parishioner, but each parishioner was responsible for putting them to use—or in another sense, perhaps more strongly, for making application to themselves. In his work explaining the use of the conscience, Bernard later wrote, "...we may see, why the vain people can be content to hear sermons, that apply not home to them, that which is taught; but cannot endure application: because this only works upon the heart for reformation. If there be no application to ourselves, there will never be any amendment."<sup>328</sup>

Having proceeded from the text itself to general doctrines, to specific uses, to personal applications, a minister was to answer what he perceived as any common objections and, if appropriate, sum up his sermon. Finally, he was to make one final effort to reach the hearts of his hearers—in a sense a final effort toward application: "a pithy, forcible, and loving exhortation" toward responding appropriately to the message, and perhaps reminding a particular point, and then ending "of a sudden: leaving them moved, and stirred up in affection to long after more."<sup>329</sup> Then, the sermon was to be followed, "knit up," with prayer and thanksgiving.<sup>330</sup>

It is not possible to know how widely distributed, or how well-received, the 1607 *Faithfull Shepherd* was in general. We do have evidence that Bernard gave away at least one copy himself—which although not unusual among authors, does indicate a personal investment in the distribution of his ideas.<sup>331</sup> A copy of the book in the Bodleian library contains the inscription

---

<sup>327</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1607), 71-72.

<sup>328</sup> Bernard, *Conscience*, 20-21.

<sup>329</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), 80-81.

<sup>330</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1609), 81 marginal note.

<sup>331</sup> BOD G.Pamph. 1327 (1).

“ex dono Authoris” dated July, 1607. The name of the recipient of the copy is partially obscured, but it may be Thomas Pettye, who at that time served not far from Worksop as rector of Langar cum Barnstone as well as Prebend of Segeston, Southwell Minster (a position Bernard would later hold).<sup>332</sup> If Bernard was interested in having his work receive attention and distribution, giving it to someone of Pettye’s stature was wise.

Moreover, it is significant that this copy was annotated in a similar hand to the inscription: the recipient seems to have given attention to at least portions of the work and made several notes, most of which contained Scripture passages referenced in the text. Less certainly, but intriguingly, Bernard himself may have made annotations in this copy before giving it away. There are a few marginal notes, in a different hand, that appear to have been written before the other notes were added; this is clear in the way that one text flows around the other.<sup>333</sup> The handwriting of these earlier notes is similar to existing samples of Bernard’s writing.<sup>334</sup> Altogether, then, there is plausible evidence that Bernard annotated the copy. If so, this not only enhances the ways in which we can see Bernard’s eagerness to distribute and gain favor for his work, but also shows a particularly detailed degree of his involvement in how an individual reader would perceive the work.<sup>335</sup>

#### 1609: A similar goal with more assistance for ministers

Bernard’s interest in the spread of *Faithfull Shepheard* continued beyond its initial publication and his distribution of individual copies; in 1609 he authored a revised version of the work. In fact, according to the title page he not only authored it but also published it. The precise circumstances leading to this additional and uncommon notation is unclear, as a separate printer and bookseller were still listed; however, it may indicate that he had special involvement, and perhaps a key financial investment, in the reproduction of the work.<sup>336</sup> Moreover, Bernard did not merely republish the earlier version; he made some significant changes that may reflect

---

<sup>332</sup> CCEd Person ID 121249.

<sup>333</sup> This is clear in the way the one text flows around the other; for instance, on page 2, a Scripture verse is written above and below a note in a different hand.

<sup>334</sup> Other samples of Bernard’s hand are available on several documents, including his letter to Ussher, BOD MS Rawl 89; and notes and brief passages on his correspondence with John Cotton, PHM Cotton Family Manuscripts.

<sup>335</sup> The notes which may be in Bernard’s hand are brief, providing additional marginal headings for the text, an additional reference, and a note in Greek.

<sup>336</sup> The stationers’ register does not provide helpful information about the early publication of this work, although it does record transfer of rights to the work from John Bill to the publisher of the later revision, Thomas Pavier, through a note of January 23, 1620/1.

something of a shift in his attitude toward equipping ministers. The 1609 edition contained more assistance for pastors (or would-be pastors) than the 1607 edition had. In the time between the two publications he may have encountered ministers—perhaps even readers of his book—still mistaking key concepts, and as a result he may have lowered his expectations that they would fully understand his original text as it stood. Where the 1607 edition presented a basic plan for preaching, the 1609 edition went further out of its way to assume that the basic instructions might not be entirely clear. Though the text itself remained largely the same (and indeed the pagination of equivalent content between the two editions was nearly identical), there were two significant additions: more explanatory marginal notes and an exemplary sermon at the end.

The former took a few different forms. Some of the new notes drew attention to particular sections of the work that one may have too quickly passed over in the earlier edition; some added additional references outlined subjects covered in the text; others offered further explanations than had appeared in the earlier version, such as ensuring that confusion over a “doctrine” was avoided: “Observe well what a doctrine is; many do call their collections doctrines, which indeed properly are uses, if they did but discern the evident differences between them.”<sup>337</sup> Similarly, at the end of a section on finding doctrines, Bernard added the note “much is required to be able to teach the truth soundly.”<sup>338</sup> Noting, perhaps, a confusion or reluctance about what the ministry entailed, he exhorted readers regarding the hard labor involved in their calling. This sense appeared again in a warning against “The vanity and folly and young divines” and also when he made an existing marginal note more personally relevant: changing from the academic and relatively impersonal phrase “certain caveats in entering into a controversy” to the more specific and striking phrase “When a minister hath warrant from his text to enter into a controversy.”<sup>339</sup>

Yet the latter—the addition of *The Shepherds Practise in Preaching* to the end of the work—was a still more significant revision. As Arnold Hunt has pointed out, sometime after the 1607 edition in which Bernard suggested there was no need for a printed sermon to assist with construction, he seems to have stepped back a bit and become more willing to provide certain types of sermons for assistance.<sup>340</sup> He may have shifted—just slightly—in this position by the

---

<sup>337</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 43.

<sup>338</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 59.

<sup>339</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1609), 62-63.

<sup>340</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 181. Hunt sees *Dauids Musick* as a slightly larger divergence from this principle than I do; see below.

1609 edition: though *Shepherds Practise* was intended as an example rather than as a ready-made text to be copied, its inclusion at all suggested a broader view of the assistance and concessions that young ministers might need.

*Shepherds Practise* took the form of a printed sermon whose content emphasized the importance of adapting messages to the spiritual state of parishioners. Bernard had preached the sermon before a group of ministers—perhaps at the meeting of the Synod of Southwell, a regular event at which he would be asked to preach regarding catechizing only a few years later. It was dedicated to John Favour, a well-known godly minister who had also enjoyed the patronage of Matthew and a position in Southwell, among several other honors.<sup>341</sup> Yet especially through the printed marginal annotations, *Shepherds Practise* also became an exemplary sermon according to the paradigm Bernard had outlined in *Faithfull Shepheard*. As such, it was somewhat unusual in the simultaneous functions that it held: although its clearest use is the demonstration of a proper sermon format, the content was also significant, as it was clearly relevant to ministers and could be read devotionally as a personal exhortation.<sup>342</sup>

Beginning by equating the work of Old Testament prophets to the work of faithful pastors, Bernard pointed out that the minister's duty was to speak forth the very words of God in different ways to different groups of people: words of comfort to the faithful and warnings of judgment to those who continued in sin without repentance:

From the prophets' method, and order of proceeding to a mixed people, we may learn the pattern of true preaching and right dividing of the Word, that is, the law and gospel unto a mixed congregation. The law to the stubborn, to break their hearts; and the gospel to the repentant, to comfort their spirits.<sup>343</sup>

Reminding fellow ministers not to be alarmed if divisions came as a result of their proclaiming the truth, Bernard again emphasized God's sovereignty in the outcome of their pastoral work; they must only be faithful to speak the Word.<sup>344</sup> Yet even though a minister was only as good as he was faithful to the Word itself, and even though God was sovereign, skill was important. For this reason, Bernard pointed out the benefit of rhetoric, "an art sanctified by God's spirit," and of

---

<sup>341</sup> He noted that the present hearers of *Shepherds Practise* were ministers. His 1613 *Two Twinnes* reprinted a sermon from the Synod of Southwell.

<sup>342</sup> The sermon included applications for both laypeople and ministers; however, the intended audience of readers would likely have identified more readily with the latter.

<sup>343</sup> Bernard, *Faithful Shepheard* (1621) 368-369.

<sup>344</sup> *Ibid.*, 374-381.

making sure that messages were tailored well to their hearers.<sup>345</sup> The last several pages again focused on the conclusion and climax of the sermon, the application, in which the minister spoke directly to his audience in the second person and used clear instruction coupled with emotional pleas in order to (with the work of the Spirit) drive audience members to godly responses and to more fervent pursuit of holiness.<sup>346</sup> This approach, which emphasized the minister's relating godly teachings to specific parts of his hearers' lives, recognized that strife and dissension might occur from intractable parishioners; Bernard suggested that this was to be expected even as a minister sought to foster harmony among believers as much as possible.<sup>347</sup>

Thus, throughout, *Shepherds Practise* contained the same general principles of careful sermon construction as *Faithfull Shepherd* did, both in study and in direct, practical application to hearers:

That all the ministers of Christ must learn this point of godly wisdom, thus to divide God's Word aright unto their auditories, to preach mercy to whom mercy belongeth, and to denounce judgment freely against the rest.  
...the godly there be wicked ad obstinate persons, they are in preaching mercy to the penitent, to intermix judgements for sins, to prevent the perverse and willful, for taking hold of mercy, before it be duly offered.<sup>348</sup>

Both the retention of the existing content of the earlier edition with few changes, and the similarities in the content of *Shepherds Practise* and *Faithfull Shepherd*, indicate that Bernard in 1609 had not changed his idea of the key information ministers must know. Yet he sought to clarify his original position through marginal notes and the appended sermon. In other words, the 1609 edition used minor revisions to make *Faithfull Shepherd* somewhat more helpful and personal for readers, attempting to hone places that may have hit rather dully in the first edition, but not changing much. This was not so for the later edition.

#### 1621: Broadening the context: toward a more holistic picture of ministry

Published more than a decade later, the 1621 *Faithfull Shepherd* was a thorough revision. It was hardly recognizable as the same book: much had been added, and though the original

---

<sup>345</sup> Ibid., 400-403. Bernard was a longtime proponent of rhetoric and the classical/humanistic tradition; his first work, a translation of the plays of Terence for the instruction of schoolchildren in Latin, explains the value of such literature even within a godly educational framework.

<sup>346</sup> Ibid., 404-413.

<sup>347</sup> I discuss Bernard's own use of direct application to congregants, and its ill results in the 1630s, in Chapter 7.

<sup>348</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), 370, 379.



ideas were largely retained, they had been restructured within a more elaborate organizational framework. The change was large enough to warrant both a new license for printing and a new statement on the title page: “Wholly in a manner transposed, and made anew, and very much enlarged both with precepts and examples, to further young divines in the study of divinity.”<sup>349</sup>

There was also a change in publication type. Where the previous editions were moderately thin works in quarto, this was a thicker, but much smaller, octavo volume.<sup>350</sup> This change took the work from a format most conducive to study at a desk, and one in which it was moderately easy to make notes, to a format that was more readily portable, more commodious for reading casually away from a desk, and less likely to attract marginal comments in its significantly smaller margins (indeed, even many of the printed marginal references from the earlier editions are omitted here). This probably suggested to readers that the work might be read as a narrative to inspire a holistic picture of ministry, rather than as a reference tool. Of course, the many variables involved in early modern print production should keep us from too certainly assuming that this change was an authorial choice; it could have been a business decision by the printer or publisher. Nevertheless, Bernard’s involvement with the publication of his works throughout his career does make it plausible that he intended the change.

Regardless of his plans regarding the physical object, Bernard clearly had in mind to change the book’s content. Retaining his intention for the book’s use by young students embarking on a study of theology, he seems to have recast this edition as a more comprehensive manual of the entrance into the ministry. In the revised epistle to fellow ministers, he suggested his reasons for the revision:

Now after many years finding how well it hath been approved generally, being also desired to cause it to be reprinted, and by a friend and neighbor minister being foretold of some things necessary to be added; I have almost wholly written it over again, setting it, as it were, in a new frame, and having very much enlarged it both with precepts and examples. My endeavor was now to perfect it...<sup>351</sup>

In a variation on the image of the unwilling author who was pushed toward print by eager friends, Bernard here suggested that he revised the work only after finding that the earlier

---

<sup>349</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, Vol. 4. The revision of *Faithful Shepherd* and *Seaven Golden Candlestickes* were licensed on the same day, February 20, 1620/1, and both by Featley.

<sup>350</sup> Several extant copies display limp vellum covers with ties, which would assisted with portability.

<sup>351</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd*, 1621, dedicatory epistle, n.p. All three editions have a version of this epistle, dedicated to his friends in the ministry; in this latter edition, however, he names them. On this see the note below.

versions had been of use, being importuned to reprint it, and having someone suggest ways in which the earlier versions could be made more complete. Yet any choice to revise or print a work ultimately lay with the author, not with friends who suggested republication or revisions. For this reason, we should view this work, first and foremost, as something Bernard himself believed was profitable.

Taking a bird's-eye view, in this edition Bernard sought to situate the duty of preaching within the larger context of the pastoral calling. If by 1609 he had realized that a mere description of the application of preaching was insufficient for beginning ministers, it seems that by 1621 he had concluded that the importance of emphasizing that mere performance of theological study and application-oriented preaching were also insufficient when done by an improperly qualified minister, or when done without proper preparation of the congregation.

Knowing the prominence that the godly gave to preaching, this more holistic approach may at first seem surprising. Yet Bernard in no way altered his belief in the significance of a faithful preaching ministry in which a minister, through the power of the Spirit, personally and pointedly applied the Word to the hearts of his hearers. Rather, he complemented that commitment with explanations of the type of person who might preach, the type of work a preacher should do, and the proper way in which to disciple congregants throughout the week so that they may effectively receive the Word. If followed, this context would prevent, for instance, the entrance of someone into the ministry who was ill equipped or uncalled (which in turn would prevent even someone with good intentions from having a less-than-fruitful ministry). Likewise, it would keep ministers from focusing on sermon preparation to the exclusion of other key functions such as catechizing (which, as we will see in the next chapter, Bernard saw as a key way to prepare hearers to understand sermons).

Aside from the brief explanation he included in the epistle, further reasons for this shift are unclear. It may have been due to personal experiences, such as seeing ministers who attempted to follow a godly preaching method and yet failed to produce fruit. It may have stemmed from an internal perception that discussing preaching in isolation was merely not as “perfect” as a complete treatment of the subject. It may even have stemmed from his introduction to Perkins's *Arte*; it seems he may not have been familiar with it prior to 1609, and when he became aware of it he may have felt that his earlier editions too closely overlapped its content and sought to make something more distinct.

Whatever his motivation, the result was a work that described a godly preaching ministry within the context of pastoral ministry more broadly. Bernard accomplished this contextualization by dividing the work into four “books” that corresponded, in roughly a chronological way, to the stages a young divine might go through as he entered the ministry. The first book discussed things that one should know before entering the ministry. Some of these dealt with issues similar to those that Gerard discussed: that the ministry was a worthy calling for all—including the gentry—and yet ministers should be aware of the potential that not everyone would receive their efforts well. Bernard also took time to outline the spiritual and natural requirements that those entering the ministry should meet; some things might improve over time, but others were prerequisites to entering the ministry.<sup>352</sup> Among those that could be changed were clothing, gesture, and possibly behavior: if one was a true believer, his inward sanctification would result in outward graces, but if one was not, his behavior might not be able to be amended in the same ways. Inward graces that should be evident to one entering on the ministry included illumination, supplication, and prayer; inward sanctification and zeal; and outward reformation and holy conversation.<sup>353</sup> Though Bernard was not as predominantly concerned with outward behavior as authors such as Herbert, he did present a holistic picture of ministry that was not limited to intellectual or rhetorical work. Pastors could not be merely equipped to study and produce sermons. Rather, they should be naturally equipped for all facets of ministry, and they must be spiritually equipped to live in clear demonstration of the gospel they preached.

Book Two followed the explanation of gifts necessary for anyone considering the ministry with a discussion of calling and entrance to a parish and of personal preparation for parish work. Bernard emphasized that ministers might not select their calling, nor their parish. Rather, the calling to the ministry depended on the acknowledgement of a willing candidate by the church, and his placement was to be based not on his own preference (and certainly not due to simony) but upon the best interest of the parish in which he would be placed. Bernard saw it as absolutely key that the skills and gifts of a minister fit his congregation, since his “first duty” was to discern their state and needs.<sup>354</sup>

---

<sup>352</sup> Among the latter, he noted that pastors should have a “comely bodily presence” without deformity, which might distract or detract from his message. This is interesting when one considers that Perkins had a deformed hand—it is unclear what Bernard’s opinion of that situation might be. Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621), 35-39.

<sup>353</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621), 72ff.

<sup>354</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621), 96-98.

Having gained entrance to a parish, and having taken time to discern the needs of his congregation, a minister should also take time for personal preparation: his heart and behavior should be humble, sanctified, and gracious toward congregants. In addition, he should work to develop his own resources for study, such as gathering helpful texts into a commonplace book.<sup>355</sup> He should consider his attire and deportment, which even on the way to church might enhance or detract from his message:

...And therefore that he in going to the church, go with all reverence, in such an inward feeling of the weightiness of the business, as it may frame him outwardly in countenance, in behavior, in his attire, and in all outward appearance, as it may express to others that he hath and doth look unto his feet, before he enters into the house of the Lord, and thereby teach others so to do, that they may be more ready to hear, than to offer the sacrifice of fools. We would not then be ensigns of pride in every new fashion, from the foreheads tuff to the very shoe-ties, we would not be examples of intemperancy, a foul offence in the ministry, nor any ways be in our persons a scandal to the people of God, in their very looking upon us. Our persons should move them to virtue, and not cause them in us to behold vice, and to get from us approbation to vicious courses.<sup>356</sup>

Altogether, Books 1 and 2 set up a program in which only worthy men should be admitted to the ministry on the basis of natural and spiritual qualifications; that they should be assigned to a parish fit to their gifts and abilities; and that once installed in a parish they should take seriously their calling as they pursue their own godliness, see that their behavior enhances their message, and dutifully perform the functions of the ministry (including study, preaching, and more). Having covered this, Books 3 and 4 turned more to consider the minister's practices directly related to preaching and leading Sunday activities. In these sections, Bernard retained largely the same content of the earlier editions, though he reorganized it according to a more structured format that followed closely the chronological process of study, sermon preparation, and delivery. The *Shepherds Practise* also appeared at the end of this edition. Yet importantly, in the midst of these retained elements, Bernard mentioned that although Book 4 contained instructions for preaching and although there was an example sermon appended to *Faithfull Shepherd*, the actual work performed by a minister was much greater:

---

<sup>355</sup> "And therefore it is requisite that he be a man of experience in the word, and one that hath in reading holy Scriptures, gathered together texts for a variety of matters, upon severall occasions, and have them ready noted in some little paper-booke, and at convenient leisure studied upon, to be more ready upon occasion to handle such a Text." Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), 120.

<sup>356</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), 130-131.

... [*Shepherds Practise*] is only of handling a text, but his practice stands not only in preaching, but also in meditation, in prayer, in admonishing privately, as well as in public, in visiting the sick, in hearing confession, and in pronouncing the sentence of absolution; all which do require rules how to do them well, which I wish every good minister thoroughly acquainted with, and to read such as have written particularly of these things, every of which requireth a distinct treatise, as well as this practice of preaching."<sup>357</sup>

Here, then, Bernard was explicit: though much of *Faithfull Shepherd* addressed preaching, a small portion of pastoral ministry, many other aspects of ministry than preaching deserved not only performance but particular publications instructing ministers how to perform them. Bernard even mentioned one such publication, on catechism, of his own.<sup>358</sup>

The 1621 revision included a shift of emphasis. Yet it did not contain any major shift in his theological understanding of the ministry: both earlier editions discussed of qualifications for ministers, fitting a minister to a congregation, and parish work including catechism. Rather, this shift in content was less about a changed view and more about his growing awareness of his audience responses to his publications and his growing sensitivity to ensuring that his readers clearly understood his vision for the ministry.

### Sermons into print?

It is worth pausing here to consider more closely the relationship Bernard saw between sermons and print. In particular, he emphasized the need for a minister to apply a sermon, pointedly and personally, to his present hearers. The personal knowledge and personal interaction this involved could simply not be replicated in print; this meant that any printed sermons, by nature, lost a key element of preached sermons. Moreover, Bernard discouraged ministers from attempting to create sermons from printed examples; rather, he noted the importance of a sermon stemming from one's own study and emphasized that simply the Bible and a concordance were sufficient tools for this. His belief in the relative lack of use of printed sermons for either parishioners or ministers might suggest that Bernard would avoid turning sermons into print at all. Yet he did not avoid publishing sermons; rather, he adapted them to print in various ways in order to provide a variety of tools for ministers and laypeople. During the same period in which Bernard was revising and republishing editions of *Faithfull Shepherd*, he

---

<sup>357</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), 146.

<sup>358</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621), 105.

authored print versions of several sermons. Some of these were published in a form that closely resembled a preached sermon; others were adapted more fully into other genres.

Considering the ways in which Bernard moved sermons from pulpit to print can help us better understand how he viewed both his calling as a minister and the medium of print. Bernard's belief about the different uses of preaching and print led him toward a certain approach to printed sermons: he actively pursued the publication of materials that had *originated* as sermons—so long as when he printed them, it was clear that they had become something else entirely. In other words, Bernard fell soundly in line with those who saw printed sermons as of limited use, yet he also thought creatively about the potential print uses of sermon *content*. He made a clear effort to distinguish printed sermon adaptations from preached sermons in all his works. He accomplished this in various ways—ranging from comparatively limited changes to sermon texts in *Sinners Safetie* (1609), *Shepherds Practice* (1609) and *Two Twinnes* (1613) to a variety of more overt and complete transformations of sermon materials in *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* (1612), *Dauids Musick* (1616), and *Ruths Recompence* (largely complete by 1619). A chronological survey of these publications reveals an interesting development in Bernard's approach to transforming sermons for print: over time, his print adaptations became increasingly divorced from the sermonic form.

Arnold Hunt has recently suggested that in the first decades of the seventeenth century there was a prevailing view of printed sermons as intellectual and non-affective when compared to preached sermons; the latter could arrest the hearers and affect their emotions (and, ultimately, their wills) much more readily. Yet around 1620, there was a growing acceptance of the value of printed sermons.<sup>359</sup> We might expect that a minister strongly committed to the value of religious print (such as Bernard) would have been in the vanguard of this movement. Yet a close reading of Bernard's works actually demonstrates the opposite: though he embraced certain types and functions of print, he remained conservative—and over time seems to have become increasingly so—in his approach to printed sermons.

#### 1609 and 1613: Sermons printed with primarily nominative and descriptive changes

Three of Bernard's publications retained a form closely resembling preached sermons: *Shepherds Practice*, *Sinners Safetie*, and *Two Twinnes*. As we have seen, the former was first

---

<sup>359</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 181.

appended to the 1609 *Faithfull Shepherd* and was primarily a tool for educating ministers about preaching. Though Bernard had warned ministers against using printed sermons in order to construct their own, it was possible to see this work as having a different purpose. Its intended use as an illustration of preceding points—rather than something to parrot to one’s own congregation—would have been obvious: it was bound with a manual that explained how to create and deliver sermons. Any ministers reading the work should have been aware of these purposes. Moreover, there was relatively little danger here of lay readers mistaking this work as having same spiritual benefit of a preached sermon: since the audience for *Faithfull Shepherd* would have closely delimited the readers of the appended *Shepherds Practice*, it would have been unlikely that lay readers would encounter the sermon at all. Even if they did, observant readers should have been able to identify the educational, rather than the affective, intentions of the sermon.

Bernard subsequently published two similar, sermonic works: *Sinners Safetie* in that same year, 1609, and *Two Twinnes* shortly thereafter in 1613. Each of these included what appear to be the texts of multiple sermons on the same passage of Scripture, with the first sermon in each work giving specific attention to ministers and subsequent sermons giving more attention to laypeople. Just as in *Shepherds Practice*, both of these works included marginal notes identifying doctrines, uses, objections, and other aspects of sermon construction that a minister reading the work—but omitted the more context-specific “application” of a preacher to his present audience. Moreover, and importantly, none of these works used the term “sermon” to describe their contents.

*Sinners Safetie*, which received licensure in 1608 and contained a dedication written in late 1609, must have been prepared for press nearly simultaneously to the 1609 version of *Faithfull Shepherd* and *Shepherds Practice*.<sup>360</sup> On the surface, *Sinners Safetie* seems to have reflected contemporary sermon publications in several ways. Its authorial attribution identified Bernard as a “Preacher of God’s word” at Worksop, and in the dedicatory epistle, Bernard explicitly mentioned preaching.<sup>361</sup> Still more notably, the first page (i.e., of the text itself, not the title page)

---

<sup>360</sup> Precise dates are unknown because the original version was licensed and dedicated in 1607, and reprints did not require a separate license. In contrast, the 1621 version was different enough from the original that it did receive a separate licensure and have a revised dedication.

<sup>361</sup> He called his work a “candle at noon” in comparison to Matthew, who “doth regnare in pulpitis.” The work is dedicated to Matthew’s officers, attendants, and family. Along with expressing his gratitude to those individuals,

appeared in a format quite standard for printed sermons at the time. It contained, in order from top to bottom: a small woodcut, the title, the scripture reference, the text of the scripture passage written out, and finally the text of the sermon beginning with a large initial capital. Though some variation existed, this format was largely consistent in printed sermons in the period.

Further, *Sinners Safetie* indicated that its contents had been preached: “What hath been heard with the ear, may now be seen with the eye: a double remembrance; the other less, this of more continuance. I hope the fruit will be answerable.” Due to its printing, Bernard suggested, the use of the work changed. Its benefit was its more enduring availability, and Bernard asked that his dedicatees read the work “with a mind aiming at the end which I propose.” This largely included personal meditation along with the continued the reformation of their lives.<sup>362</sup> That is, it reflected sermon construction but implied a different sort of personal use and adaptation of the work. This approach, which acknowledged differences in print and preaching while identifying value in each, was not unique to Bernard. For instance, the well-known puritan divine Richard Sibbes wrote:

Albeit the expressions of a gracious heart by lively voice breed deeper impressions, (God attending his own ordinance of preaching with a more special blessing) yet writing hath in this respect a prerogative, that holy truths thus conveyed to the world spread further, and continue longer. Those therefore deserve well of the church that this way impart those things to public and future use, by which God wrought on the hearts of the hearers for the present.<sup>363</sup>

Regarding content, the body of *Sinners Safetie* contained three sermons on 2 Peter 1:10: the first discussed the passage as a whole, and the latter two gave more specific attention to the clause “make your calling and election sure.” Each focused on calling sinners to salvation and exhorting those who had salvation to display good works, the evidence of a true inward change. In this emphasis, Bernard urged his audience to embrace two sources of joy: the eternal joy that came from true salvation and also the temporal joy that came from the conviction that one would receive the former. At the same time, he explained a doctrine of good works that emphasized their importance but placed them only following true conversion. As such, Bernard sought “to pull down the presumption of common and time serving protestants; and secondly against the Papists, who doe say we allow not good works, but do make our religion a religion of liberty and

---

such a dedication publicized Bernard’s closeness with Matthew—he knew not only the man but also his household—while yet avoiding presumption upon Matthew himself as a dedicatee.

<sup>362</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, Sig. A3v.

<sup>363</sup> Richard Sibbes, “Epistle Dedicatorie.”



of faith without works.”<sup>364</sup> Having established these distinctions, he was free to enjoin believers toward an unbridled pursuit of holiness modeled after Christ and not put to shame by the devotional activities of those who did not even recognize the gospel:

If these examples be of no force to persuade men to think that we can never be religious enough, nor over-precise, so we keep within the compass of the word for a warrant; let them consider the Lord Jesus, who was without sin, incapable of evil, & prone to all goodness, yet did he addict himself to holy exercises, praying whole nights through; then assuredly ought we to do much more than we do, yea much more than we can should we do, and as much as we can is too little: for when we have done all that; yet still are we unprofitable servants.

...Israelites will give their earrings, & appoint a day for cost and expenses, because they will have a golden calf. Papists practice herein doth show this plain: they go far on pilgrimage; they burden themselves with infinite number of prayers; they are at great cost to maintain many priests and many orders of their religion; they night and day tie themselves to their task; thrice a week they fast; many days in a year they keep (after their fashion) holy, and do strive to do more than ever God commanded, that they might merit. And shall the pure religion of Christ, the truth of God be held so little worth, as we wickedly should imagine that we therein can do too much?<sup>365</sup>

This reflected the general pastoral program that (as we saw in the preceding chapter) Bernard established in the years following his re-conformity with the national church. Although he acknowledged the threat of Catholicism and the potential harm it could do, Bernard was most concerned to bring individuals within the national church to fully understand, embrace, and follow the message of the gospel. These sermons as they would have been preached, and also as they were printed, allowed him in parish and in print to pursue these aims among multiple audiences.

Yet there were also differences in form between *Sinners Safetie* and preached sermons. In addition to not being called a sermon, *Sinners Safetie* was much longer than most sermons. While it had essentially three distinct divisions (each roughly the length of a standard sermon and ending with an “Amen”), the text did not clearly indicate these the divisions as comprising separate sermons. In some ways, this pattern echoed sermon compilations such as William Perkins’ posthumous 1608 publication, *A godly and learned exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount*. Yet while Perkins’ work explicated multiple verses across a large passage, *Sinners Safetie* explicated the same brief text three times, in three different ways. It seems, in fact, that *Sinners Safetie* may have more closely resembled the form and content of combination lectures. Such lectures

---

<sup>364</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, 78.

<sup>365</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, 29-30.

involved multiple sermons on the same passage and served the better instruction of assembled preachers as well as the instruction of laity.<sup>366</sup>

As in combination lectures, the three individual parts (i.e., sermons) took different approaches to the text.<sup>367</sup> They treated different topics: the first sermon gave particular attention to the importance of the text for pastoral ministry, noting its uses for ministers; the second focused upon the difficulty—but possibility—of attaining assurance of salvation (largely by meditation upon God’s faithfulness and promises); and the third focused upon the uses of good works as indicators of salvation. The parts also varied in their styles, which might be appropriate for different audiences: the second sermon gave longer expositions of few doctrines, and the first and third sermons gave briefer expositions of more numerous doctrines.<sup>368</sup> Moreover, just as combination lectures were public yet largely targeted toward ministers, this print work did similarly. Like *Shepherds Practice*, different parts of the sermon (doctrines, uses, objections, etc.—but never applications) were clearly denoted, Latin and Greek texts were given for comparison on key passages, and several notes drew attention to the primary text’s instructions to ministers (see Image). Further assistance for ministers appeared in the early pages of the work through small diagrams of the passage.<sup>369</sup>

Yet even more than preached sermons, print collections of sermons, or combination lectures, *Sinners Safetie* quite closely resembled another work—Bernard’s own *Two Twinnes: Or Two parts of one portion of scripture*, published just a few years later in 1613. Like *Sinners Safetie*, *Two Twinnes* presented multiple expositions of the same text, Gal. 6:6, with the first more targeted toward an audience of ministers and a second focusing more on concerns of the laity. Also similarly, it gave Bernard’s title as “preacher of the Word” at Worksop, and it provided marginal annotations pointing out the various components of sermons.

Although its two texts were clearly divided, unlike *Sinners Safetie*, *Two Twinnes* still avoided the use of the word “sermon,” instead preferring the vague term “part” as a denominator between the first and second sections of the work. It appears that Bernard avoided the term “sermon” for these works not only in the title but also in other references to the work. The

---

<sup>366</sup> On seventeenth century combination lectures, see Collinson, “Lectures by Combination: Structures and Characteristics of Church Life in 17<sup>th</sup>-Century England.”

<sup>367</sup> These differences would have been enhanced due to the fact that the lectures were presented by different preachers; since *Sinners Safetie* had but one author, this distinction was more limited.

<sup>368</sup> It is also significant that the work made moderately frequent reference to the errors of Catholicism and the ways that Catholic accusers had misunderstood certain Protestant doctrines, including election. See Chapter 5.

<sup>369</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, 5-6.

dedicatory epistle for *Two Twinnes* referred to it as “my labour.” In addition, the 1621 revision of *Faithfull Shepheard*, Bernard made reference to a “Tractate of Catechizing” he had written.<sup>370</sup> Similarities in the description of its content and *Two Twinnes* make it most likely that Bernard was calling the first portion of this publication a “tractate”—not a “sermon.”<sup>371</sup> Such a precise and thoughtful writer as Bernard was surely intentional in the way he described his works. By calling a work that was clearly in a sermonic form a tractate, he emphasized the educational and informative aspects of the work while simultaneously avoiding or even removing any implied reference to the affective, personal functions of sermons.

Bernard apparently presented the content of *Two Twinnes* at the Synod of Southwell at Matthew’s appointment.<sup>372</sup> This synod was a significant local event that allowed the archbishop to remain in contact with his clergy, encouraging the faithful and correcting those who may have begun to err, between visitations.<sup>373</sup> This would have been an ideal forum for exhorting clergy whose ministries were not being particularly effective—precisely the audience Bernard targeted in the first sermon.<sup>374</sup> It is not entirely clear how closely the printed version of *Two Twinnes* followed Bernard’s original, preached sermon, but the two parts followed the form and structure of a sermon, with doctrines and proofs drawn out of the main text and supported by other texts. It again appears targeted to an educated audience, with the discussion of Greek and Latin appearing more often than it might otherwise.

While much of the first “part” developed a defense of catechizing (which Bernard took broadly to include several types of teaching), a section of approximately two pages focused on its historical practice—some from biblical examples, but others from more recent individuals in the church and even “the very enemies of true religion” (i.e., Catholics) who had commended the

---

<sup>370</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard*, 1621.

<sup>371</sup> Bernard described that in the tractate “briefly, & yet fully is set down what catechizing is, the authority for it, the antiquity of it, how very necessary it is, of the parties to be catechized, the manner how, and in what points, with the manifold uses thereof...” The tractate was probably published sometime after 1609, since he did not mention it in the earlier version of *Faithfull Shepheard*. The publication of *Two Twinnes* in 1613 fits this timeline, the contents of the first sermon in *Two Twinnes* followed these headings quite closely, and no other known works by Bernard resemble this description. While it could be suggested that the tractate in question was *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, the content of *Two Twinnes* matched Bernard’s summary of the tractate’s contents more closely than the content of *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*. Ian Green concludes similarly: *Christian’s ABC*, 238-239.

<sup>372</sup> A marginal note in the first “part” indicates as much, although the similarity in content suggests that both were presented at the same time. The note further indicates that Matthew himself suggested the text.

<sup>373</sup> *Two Twinnes*, 2. On the synod and ecclesiastical organization in Nottingham, see Wood, “A Note on the Synod of Clergy at Southwell,” 71; and Marchant, *The Church Under the Law*, 147-188. It is possible that *Shepherds Practice* was also preached at an earlier such synod.

<sup>374</sup> For comparison, we may note that a sermon from a near-contemporary Synod of Southwell by Jerome Phillips had discussed the calling, necessity, and roles of ministers: Phillips, *The fisher-man*.

practice.<sup>375</sup> Following a general explanation of the necessity of teaching to a minister's duties, Bernard suggested that many ministers did not catechize or did not do so effectively, and then moved to outline different sorts of ministers and how they should change their thoughts or practice in order to more fully follow God's directive in this regard. Only then did he turn, quite deliberately, to his broader audience ["Now (brethren) to you of the Laity..."] to exhort them to be ready to embrace learning from ministers and to see that others do the same. Yet he returned his attention to ministers in the conclusion of the exposition, and even made note of *Faithfull Shepheard* to clarify his position on certain points. Thus the first "part" had some lay audience members but was primarily targeted to clerics.

In contrast, the second part of the work dealt with tithing, primarily addressing laypeople even as it discussed the duties of ministers:

Therefore you see that you are not only to maintain [ministers], but liberally also. So shall you encourage them in their ministry; stir up other, in hope, to become ministers; make them able to show forth good works of mercy unto the poor, and so get them favor and countenance among the people. In the primitive church professors were exceeding large handed to the church; and our latter ancestors spared not any cost to do good to the church. Which justly reproveth and condemneth now in our age...they and the like do judge of their charitable piety, twenty pounds a sufficient allowance. And it may be so, to such base fellows perhaps as they present, who are almost altogether unlearned, unfit for the ministry, and who never knew how otherwise they could get ten pounds without great bodily pains; no marvel, that such can be willing to take twenty pounds yearly for a parsonage worth fifteen score: horrible simony, execrable sacrilege! The canker-worm of God's heavy curse seize upon such possessed prays, and eat up their substance, till they cease to do so wickedly. But (Church-robber) tell me, if the incumbent be learned, and a painful godly teacher, is this thy allowance sufficient?<sup>376</sup>

The need for well-funded ministers was a theme Bernard emphasized throughout his career, and even in this relatively early portion of his career he was prepared to use this very strong language to pursue that goal. His long-term concern for funding ministers stemmed in part from his beliefs about the need for godly preachers in all parts of society; yet it was also personal, as he felt that he himself was under-funded as Vicar of Worksop.<sup>377</sup>

Whatever we might call their semi-sermonic, semi-didactic genre, it is clear that Bernard created *Shepherds Practice*, *Sinners Safetie*, and *Two Twinnes* according to a similar model and for

---

<sup>375</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 7.

<sup>376</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 35-6.

<sup>377</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 311.

similar purposes. Ministers made up key portions of the audience for each, and the full texts were targeted largely toward helping ministers fulfill their duties through example, direct exhortation, or both. Moreover, although their texts do not obviously appear to have been altered much from the form of a sermon as preached, all “applications,” which Bernard saw as exclusively for preached sermons, were removed, and helpful marginalia was added in the print versions. We should therefore view each of these works as early attempts to utilize print, not as a vehicle for sermon distribution, but rather primarily as a vehicle for ministerial training. Though he could not entirely control the way his publications were used, it appears clear that Bernard’s intentions were not primarily to distribute *printed* sermons to the laity, but rather to increase the number and quality of *preached* sermons available to them by more fully equipping local ministers.

#### 1612 - c. 1619: Altering sermons for print

Yet Bernard does seem to have had interest in using his sermons for broader audiences as well. To do so, he moved toward a more clearly altered format, making it more obvious that printed works were no substitute for preached sermons. We see one early attempt at this in another publication from approximately this same period, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*. This work took three parts: a dialogic sermon adaptation followed by two catechisms. It demonstrated a pointed attempt by Bernard to adapt sermon material for lay readers in a way that retained its content but avoided any possible conflation of preaching and print.

In the dedicatory epistle of the 1612 edition, Bernard explained that the informational content of the dialogue previously “hath been delivered after another manner, the same changed for a more easy information.” Though the statement did not identify the other “manner,” even a cursory look at the text suggests one: it closely resembled a sermon. Marginal notes throughout the work followed his pattern of noting sermonic features (including “coherence of the text with that which went before,” “reasons,” “objection,” “answer to the objection,” prevention of an objection,” “doctrine,” “proof,” and “use”) and biblical cross-references.

The text differed from a sermon insofar as it took the format of an imagined dialogue between the biblical figures Joshua and Caleb. Yet this was a rough fitting of the structure over existing content. Often a change in speaker did not alter the stream of content, which continued unabated between different speakers; other times a brief comment or question from one speaker simply prompted a continuation of the other’s exposition. In all cases, it seems clear that the

overarching content was not developed for a dialogue, but rather that changes in speakers were added later. Occasionally, this caused significant anachronisms, such as when the Old Testament characters Joshua and Caleb discussed the significance of baptism and Christ's blood.<sup>378</sup> In other words, Bernard made only a bare attempt toward transforming this content to match its dialogic setting. There was little difference, in content, between this work and the sermon from which it must have come.

Nevertheless, one significant difference did exist. Just as in *Shepherds Practice, Sinners Safetie, and Two Twinnes*, so *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* also omitted application: its text contained nothing like the affective, first- or second-person appeal from a minister to his congregants that Bernard encouraged for preachers. Perhaps in place of such appeals, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* ended with a detailed outline of ways that individuals in different states of life might live according to the doctrines presented. That is, rather than an affective appeal that was applied to a present audience, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* contained an intellectual description that was generalized so as to speak to many different potential readers or hearers. In this way Bernard remained entirely in line with notions of printed sermons as intellectual, non-affective media. Rather than merely acknowledging this (and as a result either avoiding printing his sermons, or printing them with reduced hope of their usefulness) he instead embraced both the benefits and the limitations of print by reframing and altering the sermon into a new type of message.

But what was the best format in which to do so? In 1616 Bernard explored yet another way in which to translate sermon material into print with the rather unusual publication *Dauids Musick*. The most interesting and telling part of this work may be its dedicatory epistle, in which the authors described their intent in publishing the work. This statement made the relationship between parish and print quite explicit. As Bernard and his co-author R. A. (likely Richard Alleine, minister of Ditchet, Somerset) explained in the epistle to the reader, having had some success with parish ministry, they wanted to expand their influence by directing efforts toward a larger audience.<sup>379</sup> They chose to publish a brief work on the first three Psalms to test the market, and if their work sold well, they would produce subsequent volumes to cover the rest of the Psalms in short order. The authors identified print as a way to multiply a minister's efforts in the parish—either to extend good fruit or to make up for a negative response. Further, they

---

<sup>378</sup> Bernard, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, 8-9.

<sup>379</sup> See additional discussion of this passage above in the Introduction. Bernard is listed as the author of *Dauids Musick* in the *Stationer's Register*.

asserted that they felt compelled to “do the best good we can to the Church of God” and that an exhaustive set of efforts included their work in print even though some might question their motives or see authorship as frivolous. They further explained that a major part of their effort in this work was to explain possible ways that these ancient texts could be applied and understood in a contemporary context: “...this shall always be new and helpful in all ages, even the use, methodical disposition, and fit application thereof to the present times.”<sup>380</sup> As such, the publication was intended to replicate certain aspects of the work of a minister: just as a minister’s efforts in a sermon were to take a portion of Scripture, explain it in a way that his audience would understand, and apply it to their lives, so this publication would help audience members understand the passages and their relevance:

And this is that which we have specially endeavored unto in this business: not so much to try what we could say more, as out of that small treasury that God hath put into earthen vessels, to propose what we have, whether old or new, in that method and form, which may be best and most handy for the readers use.<sup>381</sup>

The authors used this overall aim as a justification for the brevity of the format. They also pictured a fluid connection between author and reader in which the author supplied ideas and the reader appropriated them:

Also to the explanation of the words, are annexed the observation of doctrines with the several uses, that any one may see from what fountain they flow, and how thence derived, And these are briefly set down without any further enlargement, more than the quotations of proofs, out of the holy Scriptures, and that to avoid tediousness, because as one saith... Men’s wits do not crave repletion, as vessels, but rather a fit matter to set on work their own invention, and to kindle in them a desire of further searching after the truth.<sup>382</sup>

*Dauids Musick* appears to have had its origin in something like the compilation of notes from which a minister might prepare a sermon. Yet it did not obviously or necessarily target ministers, as the 1609 and 1613 publications had. The epistle suggested a broad audience for the work, and it does seem that individuals other than ministers could benefit from it (although its contents—which included Ramist-type trees, references to translation issues, and a brevity that assumed some theological background—were most suitable for a somewhat educated reader). Because of potential lay audiences, this work needed, like *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, to take format

---

<sup>380</sup> Bernard and R. A., *Dauids Musick*, Sig. A2v.

<sup>381</sup> Bernard and R. A., *Dauids Musick*, Sig. A3v.

<sup>382</sup> Bernard and R. A., *Dauids Musick*, Sig. A3v. ff. This would also have depended upon the work of the Holy Spirit.

that was clearly distinct from a sermon. Rather than again choosing dialogue, here they chose brevity. They essentially kept main ideas from sermons but presented them in unexpanded format, leaving it up to readers to find “a fit matter to set on work their own invention, and to kindle in them a desire of further searching after the truth.”<sup>383</sup> *Dauids Musick*, then, allowed Bernard and R.A. to do a sort of pastoral work through print without appearing to draw too closely toward the genre of the printed sermon. It worked best for a specific audience who was able to understand and use the abbreviated format.<sup>384</sup>

It is also possible that Bernard and R.A. intended that (along with their suggested, broad audience) ministers could use this work in sermon development. Arnold Hunt has mentioned the seeming oddity of Bernard’s advising against ministers using sermons and yet publishing here what were essentially prefabricated sermon outlines; he suggests Bernard may have determined that “since it was virtually inevitable that some clergy would use printed sermons in this way, he may have concluded that it would be as well to provide some godly and orthodox models for them to borrow.”<sup>385</sup> This does to some degree accord with the increase in providing assistance to ministers that Bernard displayed in later editions of *Faithfull Shepheard*. Yet by providing an abbreviated outline of a passage and omitting application, *Dauids Musick* is, in key ways, less like a sermon and more like a commentary—a type of tool that *Faithfull Shepheard* did encourage ministers to use as they prepared sermons. Though only the first volume appeared, the authors’ original intention was to provide outlines of each psalm; bound together, these works would certainly have resembled a commentary on this book of the Bible. Yet as with his earlier pastoral and sermonic publications, *Dauids Musick* reflected a growing awareness of the practical help that ministers needed in order to craft effective sermons, alongside a continuing resistance to using print as a substitute for sermons (especially the key function of application).

Thus far, Bernard had moved from publishing a sermon intended only as a demonstration, to publishing sermons that he did not *call* sermons, to publishing large portions of sermon content—sans application—in other forms. We see these tendencies continuing, and increasing, in another work he composed in roughly the late 1610s: *Ruths Recompence*. In this work, Bernard took this process to what may be its clearest endpoint: he fully transformed

---

<sup>383</sup> Bernard and R. A., *Dauids Musick*, n.p. [in the epistle].

<sup>384</sup> In turn, such audience members, such as godly household leaders, might be able to pass concepts to others.

<sup>385</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 181.



sermon content into a commentary.<sup>386</sup> Though *Ruths Recompence* was not licensed until April 1627 (published 1628), in 1619 Bernard commented in a letter to James Ussher that his commentary on Ruth was nearly ready. It is unclear why there was a delay in publication, though I discuss one possibility below. When finally published, the work comprised a detailed discussion of the book of Ruth. As such, it followed the pattern that Bernard gave in *Faithfull Shepheard* for sermonic exposition of passages.<sup>387</sup> Though much of the work focused upon tracing the biblical narrative and explaining its contents, Bernard followed a sermonic structure by drawing one or more clearly stated doctrinal principles from each portion of the text he analyzed. Careful choice of typeface made these obvious by having the biblical text and the statements of doctrine in italics, with explanations of each in Roman type.

The commentary discussed the text in small pieces: phrase-by-phrase, and sometimes even word-by-word, and often drew principles from these as well as from the narrative as a whole. In doing this, Bernard made use of cross-references in order to remain theologically grounded in his excurses on small portions of the text, and he contextualized his analysis of particular words or phrases within the book as a whole. Bernard covered a remarkably large range of issues, from fairly general ones including loyalty, poverty, and idolatry, more specific ones including wizards, naming practices, and wet-nursing.<sup>388</sup> The variety of applications displayed a wide-ranging view of even rather mundane parts of daily life, in which he emphasized the need for godly thoughts, actions, and behavior. He also addressed more specific issues that would regularly be of concern within a parish. Although some of these might have stemmed from Bernard's awareness of human nature, warning to readers to avoid common pitfalls, it is likely that many of them reflected issues he knew to exist in his parish. For instance, he encouraged avoiding infidelity and pursuing marriage in a public way, a problem we know occurred in the area of Batcombe, near the time of publication of this *Ruth's Recompence* (though this was likely not the only such instance.)

Although *Ruths Recompence* was the only one of Bernard's publications to advertise itself prominently as coming from sermons, the content was less obviously sermonic than his other

---

<sup>386</sup> Though some of his publications such as *Two Twinnes* and *Sinners Safetie* include sermons more closely formatted to the way they were likely preached, *Ruths Recompence* is also unique in that it is our best indication of how Bernard may have approached the multi-week exposition of a large section of Scripture.

<sup>387</sup> Cf. Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 43-4.

<sup>388</sup> Though a close study goes beyond the scope of the present work, an analysis of these issues might be an illuminating contribution to our understanding of the way that godly ministers perceived the state of, and needs of, their congregations. Bernard, *Ruths Recompence*, 445. SRO D/D/Ca 297, Batcombe, 20 Oct. 1634.

publications. The title page defined it narrowly as being edited and adapted for print (i.e., not a group of sermons but a commentary containing the “brief sum” of “several sermons”). Yet it was noteworthy that the term “sermon” appeared at all, since in earlier works it had been omitted. It seems *Ruths Recompence* was finally far enough from the sermonic form that Bernard no longer needed to avoid the term in order to discourage improper use. With a work of over 450 pages in quarto, divided into verse-by-verse analysis, it was quite unlikely that casual readers would take up the commentary and conflate the experience with attending a sermon. Meanwhile, ministers using this resource to construct sermons would not be improperly copying; to the contrary, they would be making use of a commentary, a type of resource Bernard recommended for use in sermon preparation.

The divisions of *Ruths Recompence* (like *Dauids Musick*, but unlike *Shepherds Practise*, *Sinners Safetie*, and *Two Twinnes*) were based only on the biblical text, giving brief attention to each verse. This means that it is not possible to identify the content and length of each individual sermon upon which the commentary was built. Moreover, while Bernard’s earlier works contained clearly-denoted uses, objections, and other sermon components, here none of those are indicated except through the italicization of doctrinal principles. In other words, although the change in genre to a commentary prompted Bernard to move further from the sermonic form, it did not preclude using, nor marginally noting, sermonic components such as uses, objections, and the like.<sup>389</sup> Of course, *Ruths Recompence* was not entirely divorced from a sermonic form. To the contrary, its doctrines and explanations did that which a sermon mainly intended to do: they helped audiences understand how a biblical text related to their own lives. Sometimes, this was specifically targeted to contemporary audiences; for instance, Bernard used a mention of anointing with oil to prompt a discussion of why the use of facial cosmetics did not honor God.<sup>390</sup>

The work appears to have been intended largely for lay audiences. The text was almost entirely in English, and it described the contents of the book of Ruth in a clear way that would be appropriate for hearers with many different backgrounds—perhaps similar to the range of hearers that would attend a sermon preached. The work was not overly simplified, as a catechism might be for children; a wide range of attentive and thoughtful readers or hearers

---

<sup>389</sup> For example, one finds “uses” and other features noted in the margin of William Sclater’s commentary on 1 Thessalonians, which was published in 1619, at approximately the same time that Bernard told Ussher he was completing his own work on Ruth. Sclater was a godly minister who lived in Bernard’s diocese of Bath and Wells and pursued a similar career as an author-minister. Sclater, *An exposition with notes on the first epistle to the Thessalonians*.

<sup>390</sup> Bernard, *Ruths Recompence*, 256-257.

would have been able to follow the straightforward content. Marginal notes throughout contained cross-references to related Scripture passages. Occasionally, these marginal notes made reference to theological works or to Latin, Greek, or Hebrew words, indicating that Bernard expected some educated or clerical readers; when this occurred within the main text, it appeared in terms that the average hearer could comprehend.<sup>391</sup>

As he emphasized the spiritual rewards of following the Lord and the dangers of doing evil, Bernard discussed the biblical text's use in situations with which average readers and parishioners would be familiar. This aligned well with the strategic approach he laid out in *Faithfull Shepherd* of anticipating likely issues that hearers would have and also tailoring one's message to what one knows of congregants' spiritual states. It is interesting that in his exegesis, Bernard consistently leaned toward making moral judgments about events that the biblical text left somewhat ambiguous. For instance, in his discussion of the first portion of Ruth, he made judgments about Orpah's motives in returning to her country: although the text merely records her words and actions, Bernard attributed these actions to sinful inward attitudes.<sup>392</sup> As we will see in a later chapter, Bernard's style of ministry—not only the pointed sermon analysis but also the personal application which required, or assumed, a knowledge of hearers' spiritual states—became a point of contention within his own parish. This tendency may illustrate one way in which such offense to congregants could occur.

Yet the most notable thing about *Ruths Recompence* is not what it included, but rather what was missing: first, any major, direct Calvinist or anti-Catholic passages, and second, a coherent focus or theme. As we will see in the following two chapters, Bernard was ready in low-level catechisms, high-level polemics, and all works in between to speak strongly against the evils of Catholic doctrine, and also to emphasize Calvinistic doctrines. Yet both of these were largely absent here, appearing only in an occasional comment or a veiled allusion. While the book of Ruth provided plenty of opportunity to turn discussions of idolatry, foreign religion, and other topics into condemnations of Catholicism, Bernard took comparatively few of these issues up in relation to Catholicism—and never with the sort of vehemence we find in other works from the late 1610s and early 1620s. Likewise, apart from several mentions of providence, references to predestination were lacking or vague.

---

<sup>391</sup> For example, Bernard, *Ruths Recompence* 187, 190, 252-3, 257, and 420.

<sup>392</sup> Bernard, *Ruths Recompence*, 79ff.

But even if by 1628 he could not publish freely about Catholics and Calvinism, why would he not have published it nearer the date of its initial creation, which he mentioned to Ussher in 1619? More fundamentally, why would he have chosen Ruth, of all biblical books, to preach on in the first place, and then to write up as a commentary? It is not possible to answer these questions with certainty; however, a likely answer is that the early version of the work, and the sermons upon which it had been based, targeted the major national issue of the Spanish Match, but that Bernard did not succeed in having the work published before such topics were banned from public discussion in 1620. Unable to publish, he set the work aside until he found opportunity to publish it some years later—although in an edited format that took into account more current ecclesiastical pressures and restrictions on print works.

Among all the topics addressed in *Ruths Recompence*, the topics of female behavior (including, primarily, positive descriptions of female godliness) and of foreign-ness (centered around Moab) receive a significant proportion of the text's attention. Taken together, which is appropriate since the title character of Ruth was both female and foreign, it is right to see the question of foreign marriage as central to *Ruths Recompence*. And indeed, the subtitle of the work suggested as much: the publication did not merely attempt to describe the contents of the biblical narration, but rather described a potential pattern for any foreign woman "called" to become a part of God's chosen people through marriage: "Wherein is shewed her happy calling out of her own country and people, into the fellowship and society of the Lord's inheritance: her virtuous life and holy carriage amongst them: and then, her reward in God's mercy, being by an honorable marriage made a mother in Israel."<sup>393</sup>

In the late 1610s, godly anxiety about international Catholicism was at a peak. This was certainly related to a variety of issues including the thirty years' war and England's Protestant alliance fomented by princess Elizabeth's recent marriage with Frederick, elector Palatine.<sup>394</sup> Yet even closer to home, there was the problematic issue of a potential Spanish wife for Charles. Jeffrey Shoulson has pointed out the significance of the issue of conversion to early modern English commentaries on Ruth.<sup>395</sup> Yet while Shoulson uses this issue to consider conversions of Jews to Christianity, it is also possible—even necessary—to see Bernard's discussion as directly

---

<sup>393</sup> Bernard, *Ruths Recompence*, title page.

<sup>394</sup> Bernard comments on these events in *Weekes Worke*.

<sup>395</sup> Shoulson, *Fictions of Conversion: Jews, Christians, and Cultures of Change in Early Modern England*, 71-81. Shoulson makes reference not only to Bernard but also to Edward Topsell, whose late sixteenth century commentary was the most obvious English predecessor to *Ruths Recompence*.

related to the question of the Infanta. With the timing of the original sermons and the drafting of *Ruths Recompence* c. 1619, it is difficult to imagine that the sustained references to foreign marriage that Bernard would have made in his analysis of Ruth could have avoided religio-political overtones. Finally, we should note that while Bernard took the example of Ruth as a positive example of true conversion, he was also cautious:

Note here, first, that daughters of a bad race, may prove good wives, and good children in law sometime: as these daughters of idolaters did; when God restraineth nature, and giveth grace withal. For many times there are tractable and gentle natures, where religion is not grafted... though it is dangerous to graft in a bad stalk: for an hundred to one, but a Michal will make a David know that she is Saul's daughter."<sup>396</sup>

The implications of this sort of caution against the potential danger of taking a foreign wife would again have been quite clear to readers or hearers c. 1619. If Bernard did preach sermons on Ruth, and began composing this commentary, with a main theme being the correct response of believers to a potential Spanish Match, it seems most likely that its delayed publication would be due to James's proclamation of December, 1620, which attempted to silence public discourse on matters of state.<sup>397</sup> Unable to make *Ruths Recompence* meet its primary political goal, Bernard turned to other projects.

It is again uncertain what specific event did finally prompt Bernard to publish *Ruths Recompence* in 1628. Yet it is clear that in order to do so he would have needed to tailor the content to the ecclesiastical and printing restrictions of 1628, including removal of the discussion of controversial issues including Catholicism, Calvinism, and other topics. Any remaining references to the Spanish Match obviously needed removal, as well. Yet while the revised work lacked teeth in these key theological and political areas, we may identify certain reasons that Bernard may have chosen to take the work to print when he did.

Though *Ruths Recompence* was licensed in 1627, its publication may not be entirely unconnected with the slightly later events of 1628, when in July Bernard was made Royal Chaplain in Extraordinary and when Charles, in order to garner concessions from parliament, was in humor to favor more traditional, Calvinist, and anti-Catholic elements within the religio-

---

<sup>396</sup> Bernard, *Ruths Recompence*, 50. See Shoulson, 79.

<sup>397</sup> Although the proclamation did not silence every kind of discourse, it certainly would have given Bernard, who was always aware of his position in the national church and of the very public audience for print, reason for pause before publishing something with such clear political overtones.

political structure.<sup>398</sup> Bernard may have recognized and attempted to take advantage of certain opportunities within the ecclesio-political system to put forth his long-held views (albeit in a more veiled way).

In addition, he may have decided to capitalize on the work's remaining strength as a devotional work for women. Its dedicatory epistle, which was entirely taken up with praising women, suggests a female audience. Regarding the timing of the publication, it is noteworthy that it appeared in the same year as a revised edition of *Weekes Worke* which also appealed to female audiences. Revisions to *Weekes Worke* included a change in one of the two original speakers from male to female and a new dedicatory epistle which (as in its earlier versions) addressed females. At least one extant copy of *Weekes Worke* has a binding decorated with flowers and could have appealed to women as a portable devotional book.<sup>399</sup> Perhaps indicating that sort of reception as a devotional work inclined for women, in one copy of *Ruths Recompence*, in a contemporary hand, someone wrote a brief poem on the verso of the final page of the text. The poem used the Scriptural example of the wise virgins who were ready with oil-filled lamps to encourage preparation for death.<sup>400</sup>

Bernard only dedicated three of his publications to women, and two of these came out in 1628—for this reason, it is plausible that he felt particularly concerned at this time to encourage godly female behavior and appeal to female readers. Again, the reason for this emphasis is unclear. At about this time Bernard's only daughter, Mary, left home to live as a maid in the household of one of Bernard's more well-to-do patrons; perhaps her coming of age prompted him to provide her with solid devotional literature. Or perhaps certain changes he foresaw in the restrictions on clerical actions caused him to re-emphasize the significance of the home, and thus of wives and mothers, on the propagation of godly religion.

Whatever the reasons that prompted him to go to press in the late 1620s, this much is clear: first, *Ruths Recompence* was Bernard's only work that clearly announced itself as coming from sermons; and second, its form was roughly based upon the method of identifying doctrines and relating them to his audience that Bernard outlined in *Faithfull Shepheard*, while yet avoiding key aspects of the sermonic form. By doing so, he successfully brought content from his preached

---

<sup>398</sup> On Bernard's appointment as royal chaplain see Chapters 1 and 5. On the actions of Charles I related to the 1628-29 parliament see Kevin Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, 52-53.

<sup>399</sup> See the Biographical Sketch in the Introduction.

<sup>400</sup> BEI MLx350 628b *Ruths Recompence* (1628).

sermons into print, while retaining his commitment to the uniqueness of preaching itself. Indeed, in some ways *Ruths Recompence* was the crown of Bernard's sermonic-devotional publications. Clearly significant in terms of its length (notably longer than his other devotional works at nearly 500 quarto pages), *Ruth's Recompence* saw Bernard reach a new benchmark in his attempts to translate sermons into a print medium. The result was a work based upon a series of sermons that retained much of the same information that they had when originally preached, but that read very naturally in print—much more like a work created for print than one adapted to fit its requirements. The extent of this work, which expounded the entire book of Ruth, also allowed Bernard to comment upon a remarkably broad range of issues. In this way, perhaps more than any other devotional work, we gain an indication of the wide variety of issues that concerned Bernard across the span of time that it took for him to preach the sermon series and author this publication.

Because of Bernard's interest in changing the genre of sermon material, we do well to look elsewhere in his corpus for sermonic elements. We find certain aspects of these in portions of his 1616 *Key*, an exposition of the book of Revelation. An examination of the work suggests that at least portions of it began with the type of study that might result in sermons. *Key's* format, in particular the fourth section, shared many features of sermons. Though Bernard stopped short of uses and applications, a verse-by-verse, and often word-for-word exposition and explanation, along with doctrines drawn from passages, were readily apparent. *Key* did not indicate whether Bernard actually adapted this work from sermons he had preached, or whether he simply used techniques from sermon construction as he created this commentary. Yet in either case, he would have known that this commentary might be a reference for others' sermons—and as a result even this somewhat polemical work was closely related to the pastoral calling. In this way, *Key*, too, was an example of a print work which was clearly not a sermon, yet which had aspects that closely resembled one. In addition, the formatting of this section closely reflected his adaptation of sermons in *Ruths Recompence*. Finally, it makes sense to see portions of *Key* in the context of Bernard's sermon publishing due to the timing of this work. It appeared within the period (1609 to 1621) in which Bernard developed several works for pastors and in which he experimented with translating sermons into other print genres. Moreover, it is most contemporary with the initial assembling of *Ruths Recompence* (c. 1619)—which, like *Key*, was a commentary. Thus, while *Key* was obviously closely related to Bernard's anti-Catholic agenda

(see Chapter 5), he constructed it during precisely the period in which he was producing print works out of sermons.

### Conclusion

An examination of the three editions of *Faithfull Shepheard* allows us to identify the particular concerns and emphases that Bernard saw for ministers. Chief among these were the need for pastors to perform careful study and the need for them to directly and personally apply the word preached to the lives of their congregants. Due to these convictions, Bernard was wary that either ministers or parishioners might misuse printed sermons. Because he promoted the use of religious print, thought highly of its spiritual uses, and published works himself, it might at first seem surprising that Bernard would be conservative in his approach to printed sermons. Yet to the contrary, his view of print in a sense made it easier for him to oppose printed sermons. Knowing the possibilities of print, he did not take a binary view that printed sermons must be accepted or rejected. Rather, he encouraged that they be reshaped into something that was more effective for a print medium. His commitment to the good of the church kept him innovating as he tried to adapt certain parts of sermon content to fit the particular strengths of print.



## CHAPTER 4

### “THIS FAMILIAR AND PLAIN MANNER OF CATECHIZING”: RICHARD BERNARD’S CATECHETICAL PRACTICES AND PUBLICATIONS IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Bernard’s preaching ministry did not stand on its own. He complemented it with several other key activities, including catechizing. In 1619, he wrote a letter to James Ussher describing part of his experience teaching and catechizing congregants each week:

I have a very gentlemanlike assembly, and a rich people, and yet, blessed be God, very tractable, sanctifying the sabbath with reverence. Between morning and evening prayer many come to my house to have the sermon repeated, which diverse write, and having their notes corrected, do repeat them after publicly before the congregation, by way of question and answer. I asking the date and ground, then the proofs, with reasons, and after the uses, with motives, and they answer accordingly, which they do very willingly. Besides the catechism questions, and sometimes questions out of a chapter, and all before the second service in the afternoon; and yet for all this variety I avoid tediousness, which keepeth the people constant, who have greatly increased their knowledge beyond that which I am willing to speak...<sup>401</sup>

Even acknowledging that Bernard would put his best foot forward in a letter to a superior such as Ussher, it is clear that throughout his career he did give much thought to religious instruction. Further, although parishioners varied in their views of his catechetical methods, and although he sometimes saw trouble for failing to catechize in ways that aligned with the wishes of his superiors, regular catechizing was a central feature of Bernard’s pastoral ministry. The focused attention he gave to this practice led John Conant (a minister who authored the preface to one of Bernard’s posthumous works and who had for “sundry years last past, some intimate acquaintance with him”) to point out that his parishioners were “by his constant pains in Catechizing... more than ordinary proficient in the knowledge of the things of God, and the Youth of his Congregation very ready in giving understandingly an account of their faith...”<sup>402</sup>

---

<sup>401</sup> BOD MS Rawl 89, fol. 28-29. Though the practice of catechism, or instructing someone (usually an unbaptized initiate to the faith or a young person seeking confirmation) in the key parts of religious doctrine had been a longstanding Christian practice and taken different forms, in this period it typically denoted a set of questions and answers taught to a learner (frequently a young person) in such a way that when prompted with a particular question, the learner would recite a memorized answer. Many set forms of such questions and answers were published in the early modern period.

<sup>402</sup> Conant, preface to Bernard, *Thesaurus*, n.p. Samuel Millerd seems to have been one opponent to Bernard’s catechetical work; parishioner Richard Britten called Millerd out for this in 1634: “Are not you ashamed of what you have done to be the means to hinder the teaching of the catechism whereby we and our children have received so much benefit: you that have been a professor of religion, and to fall away: Look to your conscience in what you have

In this chapter, I turn my focus to Bernard's catechetical practices and publications, placing a careful reading of these works within the context of Bernard's own theology as well as the ecclesiastical context of early Stuart England. As I do so, I demonstrate that his catechetical writings can be divided into two groups, corresponding with two chronological periods: 1602-1629 and 1630-1640. In the earlier period, Bernard developed and refined a two-part catechetical method that closely aligned with what we know of his theoretical and practical goals for catechesis. He published the first portion of the method in 1602, and it reached a fairly final form with both parts in 1607. Although he added and subtracted certain elements to this method over the period and refined a few ideas, until 1629 his catechetical work retained the same flavor, making no significant departures in method or content.

In 1630, however, Bernard produced an entirely new catechism, substantially different from his earlier ones. In this same year he published *Good Christian Looke to thy Creede*, a work that was largely catechetical both in its question-and-answer format and its content, but which he did not title a catechism. In other words, 1630 marked a sharp turn in which Bernard produced a catechism different from the one he had retained for years and also published a new work that adapted aspects of the catechetical genre. I suggest that we can explain this shift by examining it in the ecclesiastical context of 1629 and 1630, during which time Bishop Curll took the see of Bath and Wells and began enforcing restrictions on catechetical practice within the diocese. Thus my overarching argument is that the timing and the content of Bernard's catechetical publications were influenced not only by his own convictions about catechesis, but also by pressures imposed upon him from above. Moreover, his publications in the later period demonstrate a real impetus toward creative negotiation in which he actively embraced conformity yet sought innovative ways to continue to provide the sort of religious instruction that he believed was necessary for learners to receive.

#### Bernard's religious-educational and catechetical work: Theory, theology and practice

Catechism was integral to Bernard's vision for godly ministry. In his discourse in *The Faithfull Shepheard* about ministering well to five different types of parishioners (see Chapter 3), Bernard by far spent the most time discussing the second group of parishioners, whom he

---

done." SRO D/D/Ca 299, p. 122. Millerd's precise activities to hinder Bernard's catechetical work are unclear; see Chapter 7.

described as ignorant and willing to be taught. This is unsurprising, as this group was the one most obviously in need of catechizing, and Bernard saw catechism as the primary basis for a fruitful parish ministry:

Experience shows how that little profit comes by preaching where catechising is neglected. Many there are who teach twice or three times in a week: and yet see less fruit of many years labour by not catechising withal, than some reap in one year, who perform both together.<sup>403</sup>

He encouraged catechizing ministers to tailor their efforts not only to the spiritual state (e.g. ignorant and willing) but also to the intellectual ability of individuals: “Note the variety of wits, and as they be, so deal with them; take a word or a piece of an answer from one, when you may expect much from another...”<sup>404</sup> Similarly, he explained that the minister should pursue catechism in a winsome and accessible way—not compelling students, but rather drawing them, toward greater knowledge. His warning against catechizing in a standoffish or critical manner derived, he said, from his own experience:

...draw them to it also without compulsion; but if thou beest proud and cannot stoop to their capacity, or impatient to hear an ignorant answer, or disdainful to be familiar; few will come to thee willingly, and none but by force; and these will profit little by thee. Experience hath been my school-master, and taught me these things, and I find great fruit, to my comfort.<sup>405</sup>

Bernard concluded this section of the work by placing the responsibility for learning squarely on the shoulders of the minister. Though certain catechumens might remain ‘indocible’ and fail to show growth, one should “Suspect that we bee wanting in our duty, when none profit by our pains...”<sup>406</sup> In other words, if a minister failed to see any growth at all, his own practices were likely the primary culprit.

In addition to *The Faithfull Shepheard*, Bernard discussed catechizing at length in his 1613 publication *Two Twinnes: Or Two Parts of One Portion of Scripture*, a work that, as I showed in Chapter 3, presented two complementary, sermonic expositions of Galatians 6:6.<sup>407</sup> The first of

---

<sup>403</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 8-9. This idea is not unique to Bernard; cf. Green, “For Children in Yeeres and Children in Understanding,” 417, and Collinson, “Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings,” in Collinson, *Cranmer to Sancroft*, 202.

<sup>404</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 9.

<sup>405</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 10.

<sup>406</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 10.

<sup>407</sup> The sermon on catechism was given by Bernard at the 1613 synod at Southwell with the text and topic provided by Tobie Matthew; see Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 2, and Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor* 256-257. See Chapter 3, above, and also Green, *Christian’s ABC*, 238-239.

these expositions concerned the “too much neglected” duty of ministers to catechize, as well as the duties of ecclesiastical officers to enforce ministerial catechism, of church wardens to present ministers negligent to catechize, and of the laity to be catechized.<sup>408</sup> Here, he defined catechism as “a divine ordinance, from old time used in God’s Church, as a necessary means, to inform to ruder sort, summarily, by questions and answers in the principles of religion.”<sup>409</sup> Though much of this work echoed ideas from *The Faithfull Shepherd*, the more extensive treatment here allowed Bernard to consider the biblical, apostolic, and patristic precedents for catechism in some detail. Interestingly, he traced the precedent for catechizing to Christ himself, taking the passages in which Christ commanded that children not be hindered from coming to him as indicating that they were coming to be taught or catechized.<sup>410</sup> As in *The Faithfull Shepherd*, Bernard here discussed the importance of catechism as providing a foundation of spiritual understanding upon which a minister could build sermons and other advanced teaching; yet in this text he went even further:

Which kind of instruction in this manner is much more profitable than to discourse and dilate upon a point sermon-wise, which is waste labor to the teacher, as experience showeth, till the people be thus proceeded with all; by which the minister shall discern of either the knowledge or ignorance of his parishioners, yea, themselves shall hereby be made to take knowledge of their blindness, when they shall perceive themselves simple and childish in answering: this will set the people on work to consider what to answer, when, in the minister’s teaching alone, they sit as careless and unprofitable hearers, as lamentable experience doth show. This will discover themselves to themselves, and prevent their overweening conceits of their own knowledge: and if they answer well, hereby they may be commended, and the minister comforted in administering to them holy things...<sup>411</sup>

Bernard argued that catechism had a diagnostic role through which parishioners, as well as their attentive ministers, might discern the extent of their spiritual knowledge. Of course, having used catechism to identify a lack of knowledge, it would frequently become the prescription for the very ailment it diagnosed.

Having established catechism as a foundation for an effective ministry and a gauge for the spiritual state (and needs) of a flock, Bernard moved to discuss several categories of ministers in

---

<sup>408</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, ii, 14-29. The second portion of the work regards the duty of the congregation to provide for ministers: the give-and-take relationship between a hardworking minister and a congregation who supports his needs is an important ideal to which Bernard frequently refers.

<sup>409</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 5. He defined it further in an entry in his posthumously-published *Thesaurus*,

<sup>410</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 15. Cf. Matt. 19, Mark 10, and Luke 18.

<sup>411</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 11-12.

regard to their catechetical methods: those who did so with diligence and profit, those who did so negligently, and those who did so diligently, but “not very profitably.”<sup>412</sup> Encouraging ministers in the first group and reproofing those in the second, he proceeded in the aid of the third group to describe certain catechetical practices that he believed yielded the best results. Combining this description with his remarks in *The Faithfull Shepheard*, at least one of his preferred catechetical methods becomes clear. He favored assembling catechumens together in a room and continuing through the catechism with one of them, encouraging that student to go as far as he or she was able, before turning to the next individual to do the same. He observed that such a procedure would help ensure students were truly retaining information, rather than simply parroting answers they had just heard other students give.<sup>413</sup> At the conclusion of each session, he recommended noting how far each student had proceeded, in order to begin in the same place at the next session. Bernard also approved of other catechetical practices that might be more appropriate in different situations. For instance, certain parishioners might best be catechized privately or perhaps even individually: he suggested “...the old babes in years, as much as lieth in you suffer not them to perish for lack of knowledge: win them by favour, whom you cannot bring perforce: come to them privately, whom you conveniently cannot deal with publicly.”<sup>414</sup>

Of course, while it is clear that Bernard took seriously his responsibility to catechize his parishioners, it did not always take precedence: on at least one occasion he left Nicholas Viniage, the son of the parish clerk, to catechize the children while he was elsewhere in the building.<sup>415</sup> In addition, either he or his curate Nicholas Paull (or perhaps both) did not always catechize after Sunday evening prayers—an omission that probably occurred because other (unauthorized) religious activities were taking place at that time.<sup>416</sup> This received attention at the 1634 visitation amidst a series of presentations of both men for actions of nonconformity.

Nevertheless, Bernard saw catechism as a key part of religious development. For this reason, no matter the venue or method, Bernard wanted those weak in the faith to develop relationships with godly leaders who would encourage growth in theology and the Christian life. As Tessa Watt has noted, for popular audiences whose primary method of communication was

---

<sup>412</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 15-17.

<sup>413</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 17. Ian Green also notes this in *Christian's ABC*, 238-239.

<sup>414</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 15.

<sup>415</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fol. 61. Bernard was presented for this action.

<sup>416</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299. In a passage that refers to both men, “the minister” is said to omit to catechize after Sunday prayers.

oral, the social permeation of catechetical information was largely tied to a "radius" of people within the influence of a church. This radius could be extended by utilizing the "satellite station" of the godly household.<sup>417</sup> Though Bernard would not have thought in such terms, he certainly placed importance not only on parishioner-minister relationships but also on relationships between learners and other personally-known spiritual leaders. These leaders would demonstrate right knowledge and right behavior, helping learners understand and apply doctrines in their individual lives. He implicitly demonstrated this in *Weekes Worke*, which contained a didactic dialogue between John, an older believer, and Gaius, a younger believer.<sup>418</sup> Though any spiritual leader was helpful, Bernard believed that household leaders had a particular responsibility to instruct and catechize those under their care in order to facilitate the broader ministry of the Church. This was evident in his *Thesaurus*, which listed ministers and parents as the two parties enjoined by Scripture to catechize.<sup>419</sup> It was also clear in his 1612 publication entitled *Iosuahs Godly Resolution...set forth for the benefit of his Christian friends and wel-willers*. Before the main part of this work, which contained a copy of Bernard's shorter and larger catechisms, there was an imagined dialogue of thirty-six pages in which the biblical figures Joshua and Caleb discussed the importance of godly household government. It included such instructions as:

...we that have charge of families are commanded to inform them; even necessity to keep a holy unity among us, should hereto persuade us... How can ministers reform whole assemblies, if we do not our endeavor to help them in our families? This want of private help maketh the public ministry so unprofitable, as commonly it is. The whole burden of care for souls is laid upon the minister's shoulders, when a private watch is imposed upon every man, & household instruction upon every faithful & religious Governour of a family. Therefore families have been called the churches of God, wherein God was, & ever ought to be worshipped with holy exercises. And how can a master be a domestical head, and let his members perish? ...there be none that have either care of themselves, wish well to their children, desire faithfulness in their servants, and covet to see Jerusalem in prosperity, but they would betake them speedily to this so great, so necessary and godly a work.<sup>420</sup>

---

<sup>417</sup> Watt, *Cheap Print*, 69.

<sup>418</sup> This work was licensed in 1613/14, and there is an extant third edition of 1616. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, entry for 22 January, 1613. The fourth edition of 1628 changed the younger believer, Gaius, to the character of "the elect lady." Although Bernard gave weight to the duty of men to be household religious leaders, he mentioned women in the dedicatory epistles to several devotional and catechetical publications, and he dedicated three works solely to women. Both men and women in this period were regularly involved in the spiritual education of children and servants.

<sup>419</sup> Bernard, "Catechize," in *Thesaurus*, n.p.

<sup>420</sup> Bernard, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, 22-23.

In this dialogue, Joshua identified several holy exercises that household leaders must practice, including catechizing, and the fact that two of Bernard's catechisms were printed along with this dialogue clearly indicated the significance with which he accorded this practice.<sup>421</sup>

Bernard's emphasis on household catechism and instruction in religion was also clear in the dedicatory epistles that prefaced this work. The 1612 edition was dedicated to Sir Henry Pakenham and his wife, to whom Bernard wrote,

For this end I have sent forth, with the principles of religion, and the points of catechism, certain instructions delivered dialogue-wise, teaching and persuading all Christians, to a mutual care of one another's salvation, & every household governour, with the members thereof; to an orderly disposing of themselves, that Jesus Christ may dwell amongst them, and that the houses of Christians may be lodgings for the Lord...<sup>422</sup>

Even more strongly, the 1629 edition's dedicatory epistle to Sir Henry Rosewell, Sir John Drake, and their "virtuous and truly Religious Ladies" encouraged all of them to instruct those in their care according to godly principles, and if possible, to use his book as a tool to do so:

...be pleased to make this a furtherance, if happily it may so bee held worthy, to such as bee under you, for increase of knowledge in points of catechism, and for holy practice, they may come to an happy resolution in these lukewarm days to serve the Lord our God...<sup>423</sup>

These passages also suggest Bernard's broad view of catechisms: they were not merely to be learned as rote knowledge, but something that learners should understand and should adopt as a rule for governing their thoughts and actions. Household catechisms could help learners see that catechetical teachings affected daily practices because they would be taught by a familiar leader who could demonstrate this godly conversation and behavior on a daily basis.

Another passage highlighting Bernard's lasting interest in household catechizing appears in the dedicatory epistle to Thomas Hanham in the 1630 *The Common Catechisme*.<sup>424</sup> Bernard indicated that he hoped this work would be helpful for family catechizing, demonstrating to parents how to formulate new questions about catechetical material children already knew. Again, Bernard here emphasized the responsibility of parents to ensure their children both

---

<sup>421</sup> Bernard, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, 27.

<sup>422</sup> Bernard, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, Sig. A2v-A3r.

<sup>423</sup> Bernard, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*, iii-iv.

<sup>424</sup> Bernard, *Common Catechisme*. According to the dedicatory epistle, Bernard had pursued this method with Hanham's family. Hanham then requested a written copy so he could proceed in the same manner. Since others had made similar requests to Bernard, he ultimately decided to publish the work.

recited and understood the implications of catechetical doctrine. Though memorization of catechisms was a first step, it was never an end unto itself, and even busy household leaders should give careful attention to the religious education of those under them (as such, Bernard took time to commend Sir Walter Earle for particular diligence in household catechism even amid a demanding schedule).<sup>425</sup>

### Bernard's catechetical publications: Doctrinal issues and pastoral goals

We saw in Chapter 3 that Bernard and others like him placed great importance on a faithful preaching ministry—yet he was convinced that this would not see proper fruit unless congregants had been properly introduced to spiritual things through the process of catechism. Moreover, knowing the importance he ascribed to parishioners understanding religious concepts, it is clear that not only the practice but also the content of a catechism was of great importance to him. Bernard saw catechism as a way to make dedicated disciples who understood, believed, and practiced a lively, reformed version of Christianity. It was a holistic practice intended to move a learner's mind, will and life toward the ways of godliness, providing a strong theological and practical foundation for salvation and spiritual growth. With this more inclusive view of catechism, the pastor truly concerned about the spiritual state of his parishioners would use a variety of educational techniques in order to ensure not only rote knowledge but also comprehension—and more than mere comprehension, the ability to correctly interpret and follow key doctrines regarding salvation, the role of good works in a believer's life, right preparation for communion, and more. Because of this focus, Bernard saw the national church's requirement that ministers preside over regular catechetical lessons as good, but also as insufficient. Too many ministers, he insisted, accepted rote knowledge and failed to help learners understand the spiritual implications of the doctrines they recited. Moreover, although Bernard did not think the Prayer Book catechism was wrong to use, he also did not see it as containing a properly clear explanation of the significance of its contents that would help learners apply its teachings to heart and life. This is something that I will return to a bit later.

I now want to examine the method of catechism that Bernard seems to have used in his own parish ministry, and which he dispersed via print, through the year 1629. Because of the

---

<sup>425</sup> Bernard, *Common Catechisme*, ii. Earle had been an MP and a political leader in southwest England. He had also been influential in having a living presented to Bernard's son Canannuel.



importance Bernard ascribed to both ministerial and parental involvement with catechizing, as well as the importance of helping learners fully grasp the significance of religious concepts, it is unsurprising that Bernard, like many other godly ministers in this period, began to develop and publish his own catechisms. As I will show, he designed these in a way that would be useful both for parents and for ministers who would teach learners having a variety of needs and abilities—this reflected his longstanding interest in tailoring religious instruction to learners at different levels. His catechisms also echoed several aspects of his reformed theological leanings through the type and arrangement of doctrinal content in certain portions of the works. This content frequently followed the work of puritan leaders in England and reformed theologians from the Continent, and at times it differed from that in the Prayer Book catechism.

Bernard's first catechetical publication appeared in 1602, quite early in his career. It was entitled *A Large Catechisme following the order of the common authorized Catechisme...*, and as the title advertised, it followed the order of the Prayer Book catechism, but it went into much more detail, which allowed Bernard to imbue the catechism with a clearly predestinarian point of view, especially through some questions he added about the Apostles' Creed.<sup>426</sup> Further, it emphasized the duty of pursuing a holy lifestyle of the sort associated with puritanism in England. Unlike the Prayer Book and other catechisms that were designed to teach basic points of doctrine, Bernard's work included instruction on godly thoughts, behaviors and right uses of doctrines. For example, in the section of his larger catechism regarding the sacraments, he wrote:

*Q. How must you be exercised in the time of administration, and afterwards?*

*A. I must I. meditate upon the death & passion of Christ, how grievously I have sinned. 2. God's endless mercy. 3. the unity and fellowship that is amongst the true members of the Church with Christ, and one with another: rejoicing in heart, and praising God therefore with the congregation. Afterwards I. I must give alms to the needy brethren, and do other good works of charity in token of thankfulness, that day especially, for so great a mercy. 2. Grow from thenceforth in obedience, faith, and unfained love to my life's end.<sup>427</sup>*

As this question illustrated, for Bernard right behavior was inextricably tied to correct thoughts or meditations. Christians were obligated to think on religious truths and then “afterwards” to experience the fruits of these thoughts by behaving in godly ways. It is also

---

<sup>426</sup> The printer, John Legate, was printer to the University of Cambridge where Bernard had studied. He printed and reprinted several of Bernard's works, including his early catechisms and his work *Terence*, which was essentially a textbook designed for schoolboys learning Latin.

<sup>427</sup> Bernard, *Large Catechisme*, 42.

noteworthy that Bernard's catechisms strongly emphasized the duty of pursuing a godly lifestyle. Again going beyond what the Prayer Book provided, Bernard's publication included instruction on godly thoughts, behaviors and right uses of doctrines. Following a response about doing good works, the catechism asked, "Can you briefly show me any rules to be observed, that you may do so?" The response to this question rehearsed meditative and behavioral instructions touching nearly all life activities.<sup>428</sup> By thus encouraging learners to form or reform their lives in godly ways, Bernard aligned himself with other champions of this godly style of practical divinity: not only William Perkins, but also Arthur Dent, John Dod, Lewis Bayly, and other authors of works exhorting believers toward godliness.<sup>429</sup> Bernard also added another section that was not based on the Prayer Book's outline. This section provided "rules" for daily life throughout the week as well as particular duties of individuals toward one another in various relationships.<sup>430</sup>

This catechism was also noteworthy for its back matter. It included exemplary prayers that expanded upon the Lord's prayer, creed, decalogue, and sacraments; these were to function as a "short explanation" for the "runder sort."<sup>431</sup> Immediately following were six "Psalms gathered out of David's Psalms" set into meter. Keeping in mind that the work's title addressed the catechism to Bernard's "Christian friends and wellwillers", it is likely that he thought of this as a home catechism and, with the back matter, perhaps an all-in-one reference for family worship.

In 1607, Bernard published another catechetical work entitled *A Double Catechisme, one more large, following the order of the common authorized Catechisme...the other shorter for the weaker sort: both set forth for the benefit of Christian friends and wel-willers*. As the title indicated, it contained two catechisms: a larger one, very similar to his 1602 catechism, and also a shorter one "for the weaker sort" of parishioners.<sup>432</sup> Each portion of this work indicated something significant. The section of the work containing the larger catechism demonstrated that he still saw benefit in his 1602 publication, which retained largely the same form in this edition. The portion of the work containing the shorter catechism—the portion new in this edition—more clearly suggested

---

<sup>428</sup> Bernard, *Large Catechisme*, 42-46.

<sup>429</sup> Cf. Hambrick-Stowe, "Practical Divinity and Spirituality," 194.

<sup>430</sup> This last section is curiously different in form than the preceding sections, with the expected answers all quite long—a marked contrast to Bernard's tendency to break long sections into smaller questions for easy memory. It is not clear why he changed his style in this section; perhaps he added it shortly before publication and did not have time to edit it to match the rest of the document.

<sup>431</sup> Bernard's tendency to catechize during prayer comes up in his 1634 presentment, as described above.

<sup>432</sup> This may indicate a spiritual weakness of unwillingness to dedicate one's time to this sort of study, or a physical or intellectual weakness which has made one incapable of learning the longer and more difficult catechism.

Bernard's most basic catechetical goals. Since the function of a catechism was to contain a fundamental collection of information that would, by God's grace, bear spiritual fruit, it is safe to assume in most cases that the very shortest form of a particular author's catechisms would contain those doctrines which he deemed the most foundational and critical. Applying this to Bernard's work, it is interesting that in his shorter catechism he did not follow the traditional arrangement of information around the Apostles' creed, Lord's prayer, decalogue, and sacraments. Rather, this work was structured around the topics of God, sin, salvation, and a believer's works after salvation. This differs from the structure of the prayer book and suggests that although Bernard did not necessarily disagree with the contents of the official catechism, he believed that if a student could not learn a larger catechism that interpreted and contextualized the catechetical material in the Prayer Book, then he or she was best served to learn something largely different. In other words, although he did not reject the Prayer Book Catechism outright, his work implicitly suggested that it was not the best and most basic formula for learners to follow.

The arrangement of this shorter catechetical method was particularly noteworthy for the way it highlighted the doctrines of justification. Bernard's arrangement walked the learner through a scheme that featured God's perfections, humanity's sin, and Christ's redemption before it moved on to Christian behavior or doctrines of the church. As such, the catechism not only focused upon concerns central to an experimental reformed theology but also resembled some elements of an *ordo salutis*, such as the *Golden Chaine* by William Perkins. It also followed Perkins's work in first describing God and the Trinity, then creation, fall, redemption, sanctification and glorification, though he was not as explicit as Perkins about the centrality of Christ to each part of the *ordo salutis*.<sup>433</sup>

Beyond this, just as in the larger catechism, the shorter also demonstrated Bernard's attention to understanding rather than rote memorization. In the shorter catechism, Bernard placed recitation of the traditional elements of catechism within interpretive sections (for example, the ten commandments appeared within the section on human inability to keep God's law). This required the learner to view the laws within a particular theological interpretation of their significance. This had, largely, the same function as the interpretive questions that appeared in the larger catechism, but it was able to do so in less space.

---

<sup>433</sup> On the *Golden Chaine*, see Muller, "Perkins' *A Golden Chaine*: Predestinarian System or Schematized *Ordo salutis*?"

The godly and reformed flavor of Bernard’s catechetical materials did not only align his teachings with the English puritan tradition, but also echoed certain key teachings from reformed theologians beyond England. This was to be expected, as continental theologians exerted strong influence across much early modern English religious thought.<sup>434</sup> Yet certain connections were especially apparent between Bernard’s works and both Calvin’s *Institutes* and Ursinus’s Heidelberg catechism.<sup>435</sup> One can assume some influence from these sources due to Bernard’s recommendation in *The Faithfull Shepheard* that ministers use them; yet beyond this, the resemblance between their content and his own is noteworthy. Consider, for instance, the first question and answer of Bernard’s shorter catechism:

*Q. How many things are needful for you to understand, that you may know both God and your self?*  
*A. These 6. things: I. rightly to conceive of God what he is, by his word and works: II. to understand the creation: III. mans misery by the fall: IV. our redemption: V. our sanctification: VI. the certainty of our glorification.*<sup>436</sup>

This question not only reflected the first sentence of the *Institutes* (which described the key importance of the “knowledge of God, and of ourselves”) but also the second question of the Heidelberg, which asked:

*Quest. 2. How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou enjoying this comfort mayst live and dye happily?*  
*Ans. Three. The first, what is the greatness of my sin and misery. The second, how I am delivered from all sin and misery. The third, what thanks I owe unto God for this delivery.*<sup>437</sup>

Both Ursinus and Bernard turned these introductory questions into an outline for the rest of their catechisms—a method which was not a feature of catechisms such as the one in the Prayer Book. Yet Bernard did not unthinkingly copy these works; for instance, his catechism not only contained slightly different headings, but more of them, than the Heidelberg, reflecting his propensity to break up larger ideas into smaller ones. He also chose to follow loosely even his own headings: he added additional material about the sacraments and prayer, two elements not mentioned in the introductory question.<sup>438</sup>

---

<sup>434</sup> For instance, see McGiffert, “Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism,” 463-4. McGiffert uses Bernard as an exemplary case.

<sup>435</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 40.

<sup>436</sup> Bernard, *Double Catechisme*, 1.

<sup>437</sup> Calvin, *The Institution of Christian Religion*, 1; Ursinus, *The Somme of Christian Religion*, 58.

<sup>438</sup> This is interesting because the sacred progression that takes place in the believer from justification through glorification precedes the sacraments and prayer, perhaps indicating that only those who are truly saved can rightly participate in those two activities. If so, it may not be unlike Perkins’ work in the *Golden Chaine*; as Muller has noted,

In addition to his arrangement of key theological material, Bernard also fell in line with reformed English and continental authors and theologians in his presentation of a predestinarian view of salvation. Calvinist teachings had been normative in post-Reformation England, but debate on this issue was increasing in the early decades of the seventeenth century; thus, Bernard's continued predestinarian stance during this time was significant.<sup>439</sup> Clearly believing that this controversial issue was important enough to include at the elementary catechetical level, Bernard was not content even with brief references to election—rather, he spelled out the implications of this doctrine quite explicitly. In response to a question about whether all men continue in a sinful and cursed estate forever, Bernard's catechism had the response “No: but only the reprobate, whom God hath not decreed to save, to manifest his justice: for the elect, being predestinate to eternal life, are in this world in their appointed time called effectually, through Gods word and his spirit, justified, and sanctified, and so shall continue...”<sup>440</sup> It further specified:

*Q. Are none of the reprobate, ever in the estate of grace and Gods favour?*

A. No verily...

*Q. Can any of the elect then be ever before God, in the state of damnation?*

A. No indeed...

*Q. May not men then live as they list, sithence he being a reprobate, cannot be saved, or an elect, he cannot be damned?*

A. No: for that one elected cannot but use the means, which are ordained for him to walk in, to make his election sure to himself: which whoso doth not, cannot be saved.<sup>441</sup>

This quotation appeared in his larger catechetical method; yet even in his shorter one—the most elementary one, containing the very most basic of doctrines—he made reference to the “effectual calling” of the Word and the Spirit and to election as the means for continuing in grace.<sup>442</sup> By placing these doctrines in both catechisms, Bernard demonstrated just how central he believed they were to Christian belief and behavior. Finally, a more minor indication of the

---

“As a result of his intention to demonstrate the effects of God's saving decree in all aspects of life, Perkins examines the sacraments as instrumental causes of perseverance. Faith must exist prior to the reception of the sacrament since a sacrament is only a sign and a seal of God's promise without ‘any inherent or proper power . . . in itself.’ Confirmation of present faith, definition of the visible church, and union of the faithful with Christ and in Christ with one another are the ends of the sacrament. Sacraments apply only to the elect and are given for those who are already under the covenant of grace,” 78.

<sup>439</sup> On Bernard and anti-Calvinism, see Chapter 7.

<sup>440</sup> Bernard, *Double Catechisme*, 17-18.

<sup>441</sup> Bernard, *Double Catechisme*, 17-18.

<sup>442</sup> Bernard, *Double Catechisme*, 5-6.

reformed influence in Bernard's catechisms was that each one associated the sign of the water in baptism with blood of Christ. This was a doctrinal point wholly absent from the Prayer Book, but which appeared in Ursinus and Calvin, as well as the work of certain English divines including Perkins.

Thus far, Bernard had completed a two-part catechetical method. The larger was first published in 1602 and then published in a revised version in 1607, where it was accompanied by the shorter catechism. In 1612, Bernard republished both catechisms together, with only minor alterations, but with some additional material, in a work entitled *Iosuahs Godly Resolution*.<sup>443</sup> The first part of this publication contained an imagined dialogue between biblical characters Joshua and Caleb regarding godly household government, and the second part of the work contained his larger and shorter catechisms—presumably as an aid to those who might wish to begin catechizing in their own households. This was, then, the third time that Bernard had published his larger catechism, and the second time he published his shorter catechism. In 1629, *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* was reprinted, which comprised the fourth and the third time, respectively, that the same two catechetical methods had been produced. We know that this reprint was not merely the doing of the publisher because it had a new dedicatory epistle composed by Bernard himself (in which he mentioned that the work “is now revised after a very long time...going again after fifteen years to the press...”)<sup>444</sup> Interestingly, this 1629 printing was made not only to be sold in London but also in Taunton, in Bernard's home county of Somerset.<sup>445</sup>

Again, this completed a progression in which, over several printings, Bernard developed and refined a twofold catechetical method. His shorter catechism contained what he believed to be most crucial for knowledge and understanding of salvation—a method that frequently reflected continental catechisms and English reformed works expounding the *ordo salutis*.

---

<sup>443</sup> Though the alterations are small, they may not be entirely insignificant; of particular note, the word “recreate” has been replaced with the word “retire”—perhaps an alteration related to the Sabbath debate.

<sup>444</sup> It was to Henry Rosewell, and John Drake, Kts., and their wives. Rosewell had the advowson of Limington and thus placed Conant in it in 1619, and he was High Sheriff of Devon in 1629 and also had some interest in the New World settlement. The 1612 edition, composed when Bernard was still in Worksop, was addressed to Henry Pakenham, of Lincoln, and his wife. The contents of the two epistles is quite different. See *Report and Transactions*, Vol. 20, “Sir Henry Rosewell: a Devon Worthy.”

<sup>445</sup> The elder John Legate seems to have died in 1620, so the 1629 printing was likely by his son, who took over his business. This large print run may have simply reprinted a good-selling edition; however, it is also possible that Bernard pushed for the large run in anticipation of his having to quit printing this catechism (see below) or in order to supply good copies of catechisms to several families from his diocese who were leaving for America—on which see Moore, *Pilgrims*, passim. The London publication was to be sold by Simon Waterson; the Somerset publication was to be sold by John Powell.

Although his larger catechism did follow the basic structure of the Prayer Book, it did so only with additions and excurses that imbued it with a tone and message closely aligned with the reformed, predestinarian, experimental theology of the godly members of the Church of England.

Because Bernard's catechisms aligned with the reformed doctrines espoused by many puritan authors, they were similar to many other catechetical works being published at this time. As a busy minister, then, why would Bernard begin publishing his own catechisms rather than just using and recommending those already available? First, although the Prayer Book was widely used, it is not clear that editions of many other catechisms had a broad enough market penetration to allow all his parishioners, or those within his broader sphere of pastoral influence, to access appropriate materials. Further, the fact that an edition of his 1629 catechism was specifically to be sold in Somerset may indicate that he wanted multiple copies of the same catechism to be available to parishioners—perhaps for consistency in local catechizing. All publications had limited print runs, and since copies of different catechisms were produced at different times, it may have been difficult to procure several copies of an appropriate text for parish use.<sup>446</sup>

It appears that Bernard also pursued catechetical publication because he felt a spiritual responsibility to do so: providing additional catechetical tools was a way for Bernard to further what he saw as a crucial practice. Because his catechisms differed in length and style from other catechisms—including the Prayer Book catechism—these works could help catechizers more effectively tailor their efforts to the needs of individual catechumens. Given his emphasis on meeting parishioners at an appropriate intellectual and spiritual level, this was likely a key goal for his works.

At a more basic level, we might say that Bernard published catechisms because he could: following his studies at Cambridge, he had established something of a publishing career and a professional relationship with printer John Legate through the publication of *Terence in English*. This meant that along with his (perhaps intrinsic) personal inclination to write books, he had the connections and the professional qualifications to approach other print ventures with hopes of success. As Ian Green has noted, the authorial atmosphere for catechisms since the reformation had tended toward continued production, and a ready writer such as Bernard would have had

---

<sup>446</sup> He did use copies of his catechism within his own parish: SRO D/D/Ca 299, f.57r.

little reason not to share his work publicly.<sup>447</sup> Indeed, throughout his career, Bernard's attitude toward authorship seems to have favored publishing works that might be useful for a godly readership, letting the market decide the result.

#### Bernard's catechetical publications: Ecclesiastical pressures

Thus far, Bernard was similar to several other godly writers of catechisms whose works, as Ian Green and others have reminded us, were a significant part of the market for popular religious print. Bernard was also similar to those authors who included controversial theological content, such as discussions of predestination, in even low-level catechetical material—something that scholars including Suellen Towers and Peter Lake have discussed.<sup>448</sup> I now want to move a step further in my look at Bernard's catechisms. Just on the heels of the 1629 reprints of his consistently-used shorter and larger catechetical methods, in 1630 Bernard published an entirely new method, entitled *Common Catechisme*. This marked a sharp departure from his previous pattern of catechetical publications. As a result, it can provide insight into the ways godly author-ministers negotiated their position both in the print market and in the church.

*Common Catechisme* was advertised quite clearly as following the Prayer Book “with a commentary thereupon by questions and answers, following the words, as they lie in their order without alteration.” Although it added some information to the Prayer Book catechism questions, these modifications were much less than in his earlier publications.<sup>449</sup> Further, the typeface was marked throughout so that the actual words from the Prayer Book were italicized. These shifts into different font styles made it very clear where and how Bernard was adding to and dividing up the Prayer Book's words. Perhaps even more than his choice of language, the

---

<sup>447</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 76.

<sup>448</sup> Although Ian Green has asserted that theological differences tended to be “treated briefly or cautiously, or concealed...” in elementary catechetical materials, other scholars such as S. Mutchow Towers have demonstrated that this is not so; indeed, Towers points out the clear teachings about double predestination and other controversial doctrines that appear in catechisms, including Bernard's. Green, *Christian's ABC*, 566; Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 279-281. Likewise, Peter Lake has shown through an analysis of Stephen Denison's works that “Calvinist doctrine could indeed penetrate into catechisms, funeral sermons, and the parochial ministry of the early seventeenth-century church. Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*, 20. Lake draws this conclusion in opposition to G. Bernard, “The Church of England c. 1529-1642.”

<sup>449</sup> It may also be significant that with this work, Bernard made use of a new bookseller, Samuel Man (who, in turn, used several printers). Bernard's prior printer of catechisms, John Legate, had died; although Legate's son took over the business, gaining rights to reprint Bernard's earlier works, Bernard does not seem to have pursued a relationship with Legate the younger, and given his several other connections in the print trade it is not surprising that Bernard did not attempt to publish this new work with Legate. Yet it is noteworthy that the work was printed by Samuel Man—with whom Bernard had published no other books—rather than one of his established London connections.



frequent changes in typeface sent the message (to all readers, and certainly to his superiors) that he was intentionally presenting the official teaching of the national church.

Yet, interestingly, before the official catechism began, Bernard included a sort of catechism about catechisms. One of its questions asked “Why is this catechism to be taught and learned before all other catechisms?” The answer Bernard provided was not that it was a particularly good catechism nor that it contained the most important points of religion. Rather, students must first learn this one due to authority, for the sake of uniformity, and so that if the family moved the children would not become confused. Further, by asking why the work should be learned *before* all others, Bernard assumed that this catechism was not to be used alone—a telling caveat that suggested he continued to hold the view that the Prayer Book catechism was insufficient for holistic catechesis.

In addition, although *Common Catechisme* closely followed the order and the sense of the prayer book catechism, it retained some small but significant divergences, especially in the section regarding the sacraments. Here in particular, it seems that Bernard was unable to simply accept the Prayer Book catechism as it stood. Rather, he retained the interpretation of baptism as symbolizing Christ’s blood—the interpretation in his earlier works, and in other godly and reformed works, but wholly absent from the Prayer Book—and he added a clear and direct warning about coming unprepared to the Lord’s Supper—again an addition entirely outside the Prayer Book itself.

Q. What is the inward and spiritual grace?

A. The purging of our souls by the blood of Christ, and sanctification of the Spirit.<sup>450</sup>

...

Q. What if you come unprepared [to the sacrament of communion] without these?

A. I come unworthy, I eat and drink my own damnation. God may punish me, and the devil may enter into me, as he did in Judas, and bring me to destruction both of body and soul: from which evils the Lord deliver us, for his mercy sake. Amen.<sup>451</sup>

Here, Bernard added two full questions and answers that had no corollary in the official catechism. At a time when debates about the sacraments were often central points of tension between puritan and conformist members of the church, these divergences made a significant theological statement. They reflected the same reformed understanding of the sacraments that Bernard displayed in his earlier catechisms, yet they were even more noteworthy in a work that

---

<sup>450</sup> Bernard, *Common Catechisme*, n.p.

<sup>451</sup> Bernard, *Common Catechisme*, n.p.

so prominently announced its conformity to the Prayer Book—indicating a continued unwillingness to wholly abandon some of his earlier emphases.

Many scholars, including Christopher Haigh and Arnold Hunt, have emphasized the significance of sacramental teachings in this period, particularly the godly emphasis on preparation for communion in order to ensure that one did not partake unworthily and incur judgment.<sup>452</sup> Even beyond personal pastoral encouragement and preaching, godly ministers and laypeople produced a remarkably large number of printed sermons, manuals and treatises that were published to help believers spiritually prepare for the Lord's Supper. Bernard supported such work, and he saw a competent understanding of catechetical material as particularly important in this regard:

...without the grounds of catechism... How can they examine themselves, and prepare themselves to the Lord's Supper, being ignorant of the doctrine of the sacraments? With what comfort can we admit such persons so ignorant (though living in the church) to the Lord's Supper, when the teachers in the primitive time would admit none but the well instructed into baptism? Saint *Paul* catechised the ancient, as we have heard: and we have a commandment in the Book of Common-Prayer to admit none to the sacrament uncatechised, which have not learned their catechism.<sup>453</sup>

He made this point again in the preface to *Common Catechisme*, where one of the seven reasons that one should learn a catechism was “To be able to examine our selves of our faith, of our duties to God and man, of our right devotion in prayer, and of the holy use of the blessed Sacrament, especially before we come to receive.”<sup>454</sup> Because of the great importance that Bernard placed on rightly receiving the sacrament, and because of the link he understood to exist between catechism and spiritual preparation for the sacrament, it was not surprising that he made a sticking point of this issue. Likewise, with too many parishioners misunderstanding the nature of baptism, Bernard would not have wanted any confusion over whether baptism itself could save. Thus, rather than pointing to the water, he intentionally pointed back to Christ's blood: not the sacrament, but the sacrifice it looked to, was efficacious. Even in a self-consciously conformist work that attempted to align closely to the Prayer Book catechism, Bernard could not bring

---

<sup>452</sup> See, for instance, Haigh, “Communion and Community” and Hunt, “The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England.” Both of these works emphasize the importance of the sacrament of communion in early modern communities and discuss the broader implications of puritan concerns over admitting unworthy partakers. See also Holifield, *The Covenant Sealed*; Boulton, “The Limits of Formal Religion” and Spufford, “The Importance of the Lord's Supper to Seventeenth Century Dissenters.”

<sup>453</sup> Bernard, *Two Twinnes*, 16.

<sup>454</sup> Bernard, *Common Catechisme*, v.

himself to back away from certain strongly-held beliefs that might otherwise endanger the souls of readers.

In summary, then, Bernard made a clear attempt in *Common Catechisme* to conform to the Prayer Book, yet he at the same time indicated that this was not the only useful catechism, and he modified it on significant points of sacramental importance. For Bernard, the official catechism might be nearly adequate—maybe even more so than his previous work had suggested—but it was not wholly adequate, at least not in certain respects. Yet if the Prayer Book catechism was flawed, and if Bernard had already published a strong catechetical method, why would he write this new version?

We may first recognize that if he was going to compose a new catechism in this period, its contents would be circumscribed in ways that they hadn't been when he was producing catechisms in 1602-1612, since the years leading up to 1630 had seen increasing restrictions on the clergy and on religious print. For instance, we might note James's 1622 *Directions Concerning Preachers*, which limited discussion of predestinarian issues to learned individuals and disallowed their discussion before general audiences, and a 1628 royal declaration silencing those who wished to dispute or comment upon the meaning of the Thirty-Nine Articles. For author-ministers such as Bernard whose viewpoints required a specific way of interpreting the Articles, these injunctions limited their ability to teach and write about doctrines in a way they believed was correct.<sup>455</sup> More significantly for print works, in 1624, the King's *Proclamation against Seditious, Popish, and Puritanicall Bookes and Pamphlets* charged that all religious works had to be approved by authority, thus limiting the publication of works expounding doctrines not in favor with these authorities.<sup>456</sup> This tightening of oversight on all sides would have been a factor as Bernard considered his options for publication.

Yet (until later in the 1630s) works that had already been licensed and printed could be reprinted without relicensing. This had allowed *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* to be reprinted in 1629.<sup>457</sup> So we have a situation in 1630 where Bernard could have—and just had—reprinted a catechism that seems to have reflected his theological and didactic commitments very well...and where producing a new catechism would require him to step back from or disguise several of his

---

<sup>455</sup> Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 210-211. See also Fincham and Lake, "Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I."

<sup>456</sup> Towers, *Religious Printing*, 161.

<sup>457</sup> Towers, *Religious Printing*, 9, 277-279.

positions in order to receive licensure under the Laudian regime. Why, then, would he choose to produce a new catechism? I suggest that Bernard's composition, publication, and personal use of *The Common Catechism* was most directly related to episcopal pressure, and to the episcopal visitation of Bishop Curll in 1630.

In September, 1629, Leonard Mawe, bishop of Bath and Wells, died. Mawe had not only been largely absent and uninvolved during his brief time as bishop, but also had a favorable personal relationship with Bernard, who had known him since boyhood.<sup>458</sup> Under Mawe, as under the earlier oversight of Archbishop Matthew in York and bishops Montagu and Lake in Bath and Wells, Bernard largely had the freedom to pastor and publish according to the godly model he had spent so many years refining.<sup>459</sup> Although there was something of an interlude in this pattern when Laud himself held the see, Laud's tenure was brief, and he was nonresident.<sup>460</sup> For nearly all his pastoral career, Bernard had received a good deal of latitude in the pursuit of a godly and reformed parish ministry. Yet when Curll took the see in 1629, he began enforcing Laudian policies with more regularity.<sup>461</sup> Curll's translation to Bath and Wells also roughly coincided with Charles's Royal Instructions of 1629, which were the basis for a more stringent imposition of conformity across the Church in the 1630s. Although these instructions did not specifically address the form of catechism to be used, they did emphasize the importance of conformity to the Prayer Book in divine service and, more generally, the importance of bishops retaining control over unauthorized godly activities within their dioceses.<sup>462</sup>

It is thus unsurprising that Curll's visitation articles of 1630 reflected a particular interest in the content of the material used for catechizing. Visitation articles would regularly ask something like whether a minister catechized according to the Book of Common Prayer, focusing more on the performance of catechism than the set of questions used. This style seems to have

---

<sup>458</sup> See the preface to Bernard, *Conscience*. In Latin, he explained that their families came from the same town, that Mawe's grandmother was a sponsor to his baptism, and that he had known Mawe since boyhood. Though the publication date is 1631, the dedicatory epistle is dated from January, 1630. See also Hudson and Symson, eds., *Lincolnshire Notes and Queries*, Vol. 3, 73; and Hunt, "Mawe, Leonard (d. 1629)" rev. David Hoyle, *ODNB*.

<sup>459</sup> Patrick Collinson describes Bernard's relationship to the puritan episcopal influences in Bath and Wells and Winchester in *The Religion of Protestants*, 85-86. Laud's brief episcopacy there, of course, was an exception to this pattern.

<sup>460</sup> It is possible that Bernard held off on his reprints of *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* during Laud's time and reprinted them in Mawe's episcopate, but there are other possible explanations. Nevertheless, it may be noteworthy that Bernard's epistle to Curll in *Conscience* commended only the dead bishops of Bath and Wells—Montagu, Lake, and Mawe; this conveniently allowed Bernard to avoid a commendation of Laud.

<sup>461</sup> Dorman, "Curll, Walter (1575-1647)," *ODNB*.

<sup>462</sup> Fincham, ed., "Annual Accounts of the Church of England, 1632-1639."

been more in use by bishops who had previously overseen Bernard, including Matthew, Montagu, and probably Lake. However, Curll's 1630 articles asked specifically whether the Prayer Book catechism was used and, to make the point clear, also asked for the name of any other catechism used.<sup>463</sup> And indeed, in that year curate John Bowden of Wilton, Somerset, was presented for failing to catechize out of the Book of Common Prayer and instead using another form of catechism.<sup>464</sup>

Notwithstanding his early consideration of separatism, for nearly all of his career Bernard fell on the 'conformist' side of his 'moderate non-conformity.' That is, he felt that continuance in ministry was of critical importance, and when pressed, he would bend, though only as far as absolutely necessary. It seems to be for this reason that Bernard produced *Common Catechisme*, which conforms to Curll's wishes by using the form of the Prayer Book catechism—but goes as far as possible to provide as many of his own interpretations as he could within this framework. By using this publication in his own parish, Bernard could remain in technical conformity with this regulation but was able to move further toward a godly version of ministry. We see this clearly in a 1634 presentation, wherein it is suggested that Bernard "asketh questions at his catechism, and requireth answers not expressed in the Book of Common Prayer," to which he responded that he had "enlarged the church catechism in print, and useth the same in the church"—an answer suggesting the argument that *Common Catechisme*, having received approval for print, must be acceptable for parish use.<sup>465</sup>

In 1630-31, Bernard produced two more new publications, and the contents of both also support this view of episcopal pressure as an influence on his catechetical writing. First, early in 1630 he produced *Creede*, a work that was catechetical in style, but was not officially advertised as

---

<sup>463</sup> Kenneth Fincham suggests that Lake's visitation was probably to include the articles used by Abbot: *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* Vol. 1, 100. Curll, *Articles to be enquired of, in the first trienniall visitation*. While it may have been new for Bernard's diocese, the fact that Curll's articles asked specifically what book was used to catechize was not unique. In fact Williams's articles for Lincoln in 1625 were even clearer: a copy of the additional catechism was to be provided for review (though this requirement was omitted in the 1627 articles). In 1620, Harsnet's articles for Norwich had demanded whether the prayer book catechism and "none other" was used. Laud's articles for St. David's in 1622 had asked positively whether the prayer book catechism was used, but without implying an exclusion of other catechisms; however, his 1635 articles required ministers to use "only" the Prayer Book catechism.

<sup>464</sup> Steig, *Laud's Laboratory*. 208. She references SRO D/D/Ca 274.9, September 1630 and mentions that he was also presented for collecting verses out of the Psalms, comparing them as he pleased, and singing them in church... perhaps similarly to the way that Bernard had collected the Psalms in the back of his 1602 catechism.

<sup>465</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, p. 113.

a catechism.<sup>466</sup> As an author, Bernard frequently refined and innovated the style and contents of publications in order to help audiences understand religious concepts, so it was probably a very small step for him to think of using a catechetical question-and-answer style in a publication that was not actually a catechism. *Creede* used a catechetical format to provide a body of doctrine about the creed and other typical catechetical topics. It seems that due to limitations on catechism itself, *Creede* was a way for Bernard to continue the work he had been doing with his earlier catechetical materials.<sup>467</sup> He officially catechized from the Prayer Book, but that did not mean he could not teach additional information from elsewhere, such as another book conveniently structured with a question-and-answer format.<sup>468</sup> He may have used this work, or another like it, in his parish as he sought to educate his parishioners beyond the limitations of the prayer book: the presentation in which he was questioned about catechizing with material other than the prayer book also mentions that he was activity by making “private repetitions with his parishioners in the church between dinner and evening prayer by questions and answers before the catechising” and that he or his curate catechized during prayers (a practice that had apparently been countenanced by Bishop Lake).<sup>469</sup> The existence of these sorts of catechetical, or extra-catechetical, activities within his parish reinforced the idea that Bernard wanted to provide parishioners with more catechetical instruction than the Prayer Book catechism, alone, permitted.

In the slight generic adaptation of *Creede*, Bernard followed several trends. Popular works, including broadsides, had for years been produced to help learners memorize and understand

---

<sup>466</sup> *Creede* was licensed on 7 February 1629 (i.e., 1630) by Buckner and Purfoote. This was about three months after Curll was enthroned as bishop on 4 December 1629.

<sup>467</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 54-55. In *Creede*, Bernard followed several trends. Popular works, including broadsides, had for years been produced to help learners memorize and understand spiritual truths, especially those relating to the key theological concepts which also appeared in catechisms. Godly householders would frequently use such texts for the instruction of children. More specifically, dialogic religious texts and even dialogic catechisms were already in print circulation, although the genre had been used with varying degrees of success. Bernard's own previous works also include question-and-answer exchanges as imaginary dialogues in *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* and *A Weekes Worke*, although neither of these works are catechetical in nature.

<sup>468</sup> As such, this work differed from a catechism in several ways. First, the work's title suggested a specific discussion of the Creed, and accordingly it began with several pages of questions about the Creed's message. Only after this did the work move to other topics. Moreover, although the work mentioned that learners could gather truths out of the Prayer Book catechism, it implicitly denied it pride of place: it did not follow that question with the official catechism, nor even with Bernard's own version of it from *Common Catechisme*. Rather, Bernard asked an entirely new set of questions about the ten commandments, Lord's prayer, and sacraments, followed by a long series of questions about how true Christianity differs from other belief systems. Bernard, *Creede*, 8.

<sup>469</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299 p. 112-113. In regard to the latter, the text indicated that “...the minister doth usually catechize at the middle of prayers, as Bishop Lake ordered it to be (as they said).” Though Bernard would be the most obvious referent here, this could be read as leaving some question about which minister—Bernard or curate Nicholas Paull—was meant.

spiritual truths, especially those relating to the key theological concepts which also appeared in catechisms.<sup>470</sup> Godly householders would frequently use such texts for the instruction of children. More specifically, dialogic religious texts and even dialogic catechisms were already in print circulation, although the genre had been used with varying degrees of success.<sup>471</sup> Bernard's own previous works also include question-and-answer exchanges as imaginary dialogues in *Iosuahs Godly Resolution* and *Weekes Worke*, although neither of these works were catechetical in nature.

For Bernard, *Creede* was a way to continue the theological work he had been doing with his earlier catechetical materials without so obviously going beyond the Prayer Book catechism. Because his official line was that he closely followed the Prayer Book in catechizing, *Creede* had to appear to differ substantially from a catechism. He achieved this in several ways. First, he titled the work as if it only addressed to the Apostles' Creed, and he began with approximately seven pages of questions about its message. Only after this did he begin addressing other topics:

*Q.* Now besides this your *creed*, are there any other helps, to awe a man to Godward, and to keep him from carnal security?

*A.* Yes indeed, very easy to be conceived, and to be gathered out of the other parts of the common catechism with settled meditations thereupon.<sup>472</sup>

Here, he echoed his official support for the Prayer Book catechism, yet he nevertheless implicitly denied it pride of place: he did not follow that question with the official catechism, nor even with his own version of it from *Common Catechisme*. Rather, he asked an entirely new set of questions about the ten commandments, Lord's prayer, and sacraments, followed by a long series of questions about how true Christianity differed from other belief systems.

Bernard did not design *Creede* as a catechism merely under another title, although it was not far from that. This publication worked through the creed phrase-by-phrase, but unlike a full catechism, it did not ask the learner to recite or define the commandments, Lord's prayer, and sacraments, although it included interpretive questions about these and other elements. For this reason, it is best to see this work as a catechetical companion, explaining or interpreting doctrines that learners would find in the Prayer Book catechism in order to ensure a correct understanding of these elements.

---

<sup>470</sup> Cf. Watt, *Cheap Print*, 230-233.

<sup>471</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 54-55.

<sup>472</sup> Bernard, *Creede*, 8.

Two features of these interpretive questions and answers were particularly significant. First, their primary function was essentially the same as many of the questions in his earlier catechetical works: they encourage the catechumen not just to recite, nor just to understand, major points of religion, but to use those to cultivate a self-consciously godly way of life through humble self-examination and pursuit of a strict version of godly behavior. For instance, in response to a question on how meditation on the Lord's prayer might rouse one from "carnal security" the catechumen might answer six things, including:

V. How can I desire with sorrow, in sight of sin, the pardon of sin, even as I forgive others trespassing against me, and yet wallow in sin, as the swine in mire, in drunkenness, adultery, gluttony, murder, slander, lying, swearing, forswearing, and greedy coveting, also in malice, envy, grudging, ill-will, with desire of revenge, and in other uncharitable courses?

VI. How can I desire to be delivered from evil, and the power of temptations, and yet willfully run into ill company, hearken to ill counsel, follow ill examples, avoiding the society of such as be well disposed; but easily yielding to Satan's suggestions, studying to fulfill the desires and lusts of the flesh, and conforming to every vain fashion, custom and practice of this present world?<sup>473</sup>

Although this passage did not directly call for a gathering of visible saints or a separation of godly members of the community, it certainly sets the stage for the development of the sort of separated godly society of the visible church that Bernard and many puritans desired. Moreover, it closely followed the goals and designs of his earlier catechetical works, which emphasized the importance of living out one's faith through obedience to God's law. In other words, Bernard's longstanding catechetical goals of passing on a particularly godly style of practical divinity did not change in 1630.

Second, it is significant that while Bernard's catechetical priorities seem to have remained the same, some things *had* changed. Noticeably absent from this work was any direct reference to election or Calvinist doctrine—a sharp change from his earlier works. Although restrictions on religious print cannot explain Bernard's decision to print a new catechism rather than reprint his older ones, licensing restrictions almost certainly explain why reformed doctrines do not appear in this work.<sup>474</sup> Due to these restrictions, Bernard chose his words carefully, remaining

---

<sup>473</sup> Bernard, *Creede*, 12-13.

<sup>474</sup> Following James's 1622 restrictions on Calvinist teachings and anti-papal invectives the appearance of both of these began dropping markedly in first editions of religious publications. By 1630, it would have been extremely difficult or impossible for Bernard's book to receive licensure if it had expressed the same reformed doctrines that appear in his earlier works. Towers, *Control of Religious Printing*, chapter 6.



ambiguous at key junctures. For instance, learners were to meditate upon the Lord's Supper for several reasons, including the following:

Hereupon to judge of the desperate, and utterly forlorn estate of all mankind, with loss of God's favour, and the hope of heaven, being accursed for ever and damned in Hell, if this had not been a remedy beyond merit of all men and angels, and the worth of ten thousand worlds. And that therefore we owe to God for this so unspeakable a benefit our bodies, our souls...<sup>475</sup>

In such passages, Bernard came as close to the doctrines of depravity, unconditional election and reprobation as possible, but he stopped short of actually saying that no human motivation was involved, and instead simply gave glory to God for providing salvation for sinners.<sup>476</sup> Shrewdly, here remained within the limits imposed upon him by the church while still providing significant help for puritan-leaning audiences. With key passages already implying reformed doctrines, it would take only a word of explanation for a godly catechizer to imbue the passage with full Calvinist meaning.

Although restrictions on religious print cannot explain Bernard's decision to print these new catechisms rather than reprint his older ones, such restrictions almost certainly explain why Calvinist doctrines do not appear in this work. Although Ian Green has asserted that theological differences tended to be "treated briefly or cautiously, or concealed..." in elementary catechetical materials, other scholars such as S. Mutchow Towers have demonstrated that this is not so; indeed, Towers points out the clear teachings about double predestination and other controversial doctrines that appear in catechisms, including Bernard's.<sup>477</sup> Likewise, Peter Lake has shown through an analysis of Stephen Denison's works that "Calvinist doctrine could indeed penetrate into catechisms, funeral sermons, and the parochial ministry of the early seventeenth-century church."<sup>478</sup> Yet, as Towers also argues, following James's 1622 restrictions on Calvinist teachings and anti-papal invectives the appearance of both of these began dropping markedly in first editions of religious publications. By 1630, it would have been extremely difficult or

---

<sup>475</sup> Bernard, *Creede*, 15.

<sup>476</sup> Bernard, *Creede*, 26-34. Yet even with the restrictions on anti-papal publications, Bernard is able to spend some time in anti-papal argument, explaining why Catholicism robs God of glory in the final section of the work, which rehearses nearly thirty different heresies, errors, and fallacies. The false belief systems Bernard discusses include Atheisme, Gentilisme, Iudaisme, Turcisme, Hereticks, Arianisme, Montainisme, Nouatis, Donatists, Pelagians, Anabaptists, Schismatics, Libertines, the Family of Love, Opinionists, Sectaries, Ubiquitaries, Papists, will-worshippers, Newtralistes, Temporizers, Machiauel-like politicians, Luke-warme Laodiceans, prophane persons, obstinate impenitents, presumptuous sinners, hopeless desperates and carnall securitans.

<sup>477</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 566; Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 279-281.

<sup>478</sup> Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge*, 20.

impossible for Bernard's book to receive licensure if it had expressed the same reformed doctrines that appear in his earlier works.

Another of Bernard's 1630 publications, *Christian See To Thy Conscience*, also suggests that episcopal restrictions influenced Bernard's publications.<sup>479</sup> This work, a treatise on the conscience, contained a dedicatory epistle to Bishop Curll himself. This dedication appeared in Latin, a change from Bernard's more typical, popularly accessible English writing, and one useful for demonstrating his educational accomplishments. Though the content of the work was fairly wide ranging within the topic of conscience, the timing which coincided with this episcopal change was noteworthy. Together, these suggested that not only should readers attend to their own consciences, but also that ministers should be allowed to follow their consciences in parish ministries (which would include catechizing).<sup>480</sup> Further, publishing this work, Bernard took a topic sometimes discussed privately issue between a minister and his bishop and displayed it before a broad audience; part of the reason for the public nature of the writing could have involved leveraging popular opinion, and popular pressure, in his favor on that issue.

Nevertheless, Bernard probably also had a broader didactic purpose in mind for the work, as *Conscience* provided a comprehensive approach to both theological and practical aspects of the topic.<sup>481</sup> In describing the conscience, Bernard drew heavily upon a variety of images to approximate the different functions of conscience: director, judge, vice-gerent, witness, looking-glass, record, and book, to name a few. Although not actually a person, Bernard pointed out that conscience was capable of action as the "divine thing in the soul, less than God, and above man."<sup>482</sup> Although it contained some creative images, the content in this work was primarily instructional (in contrast to, for example, the predominantly imaginative modes of communication in *Isle* and *Contemplative Pictures*).

Dividing his subject into several component parts, he described different aspects of the conscience in fifty-four brief chapters. Beginning with the general—the existence and basic name and functions of conscience—and then proceeding to explain the variety of types, actions, and products of the conscience, Bernard instructed readers not only about conscience itself but

---

<sup>479</sup> *Conscience* was licensed 28 Dec 1630, and the epistle was dated the Calends of January 1630 (i.e., 1631).

<sup>480</sup> It includes a discussion of the difference between a true objection of conscience and an unsubstantiated scruple.

<sup>481</sup> Recent work on the conscience in early modern England has been primarily from literary scholars and includes Braun and Vallance, eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe*, and Kisting, "Authority and Inwardness." Kisting's summary of godly approaches to conscience and casuistry is helpful but, unfortunately, omits a discussion of Bernard's work.

<sup>482</sup> Bernard, *Conscience*, 9.

also about the way that they should respond to the different activities of the conscience. There were fewer calls to action, and more biblical and theoretical exposition, than in some of his other works; this was probably a reflection of his awareness that his audience included church officials. Yet the inclusion of even some calls to application for a lay audience indicated that this work was also pastoral and devotional—not simply theological—in scope. We further see these aspects of the work in the numerous places that refer to parish experiences. For instance:

*How a man may know when his quiet conscience is this ill conscience.*

...By it suffering thee in evils, and especially in these, In formal worshipping of God, hearing, praying, receiving the sacrament without any power at all of religion. In continual neglect of religious government of thy family, In living out of, or idly in a calling; for such a one is slothful, unprofitable, and wicked, Mat. 25, and therefore cannot have a good quiet conscience. In being disrespectful of thy pastor, especially for seeking thy reformation, in profaning the Lord's day...<sup>483</sup>

Although Bernard may not have been thinking of specific incidents when he composed this passage, we know that each of the concerns listed above was of interest to him within his own parish ministry.

Viewing this progression in Bernard's catechetical works in the context of both parish ministry and episcopal restrictions, two additional pieces of information become significant. First, the godly minister Richard Alleine published a work similar to Bernard's *Common Catechism* in this same year.<sup>484</sup> Like Bernard's, Alleine's catechism closely followed the order and wording of the Prayer Book catechism, breaking it into small sections and then elaborating on several of them. These two ministers lived quite near one another and were friends and close associates; thus, it is entirely possible that they consulted one another about ways to continue catechizing under this episcopal restriction, settling on similar courses of action.

Another factor pointing toward episcopal involvement is the choice of printer and bookseller for this work. Through his career, Bernard had steady relationships with certain printers and booksellers; in particular, during his time in Somerset he worked consistently with printer Felix Kingston (they were possibly related), and Kingston was the one who printed *Creede* and *Conscience*. Yet *Common Catechism* was printed by William Stansby for Samuel Man. This was the only work Bernard ever produced with either of these men. We can't say for certain why he went with Stansby and Man here, but we do know that Curll's visitation articles of 1630 were

---

<sup>483</sup> Bernard, *Christian Conscience*, 130-132.

<sup>484</sup> R. A. *A breife explanation of the common catechisme distinguished into three parts*.

also printed by Stansby. For this reason, it is possible that Bernard actually consulted beforehand with Curll to see what would be acceptable in terms of catechizing, and then used Curll's connections (rather than his own) to have this work printed. This again would support that we should see Bernard's *Common Catechisme* as related to Curll's initiatives; and moreover, that Bernard's publication was not subversive, but rather was openly conforming.

Finally, *Common Catechisme* seems was a rather good seller. It was in its sixth edition by 1632, by which time Bernard had revised it slightly and provided marginal cross-references. A particularly interesting revision was in the section introducing the catechism, which asked why the order of creed, decalogue, Lord's prayer, and sacraments was observed; the answer was: "To teach me, I. That I must believe, before I can obey: 2. That if I believe, I will obey: 3. That believing and obeying I am then to pray to God: That being such a one, I may comfortably use the Sacraments." This seems to be a move to further contextualize catechetical material within the *ordo salutis* as he had done in his earlier works. *Common Catechisme* reached an eleventh edition by 1640. All these editions were printed for Samuel Man—it was standard for one bookseller to keep rights to a work—but even having this commercially successful work, Man never published any of Bernard's other works.

## Conclusion

This long look at Bernard's catechetical publishing sets up a few concluding reflections. Most importantly, it demonstrates the delicate negotiations required of author-ministers with puritan leanings who desired to remain in good standing in the national church during the doctrinal upheavals of the 1620s and 1630s. Bernard's choice to print a new catechism in 1630, even though he had just had a double reprint of his previous work in 1629, is best seen not as a change in religious priorities, but as a demonstration of conformity to the wishes of his bishop, Walter Curll. In this work, Bernard hedged his catechetical preferences: with the exception of some differences on the sacraments, he omitted most of his previous interpretations of the official material and joined the ecclesiastical establishment in giving at least tacit support to the Prayer Book catechism.

Through *Common Catechism*, Bernard sent a clear message to Curll that he was willing not only to conform, but to do so publicly. Moreover, he sent a clear message to the public that conformity—albeit slightly hedged—was important. Having formerly been removed from his

post and drawn back from the brink of separatism by Matthew, and having more than once been presented for some act of nonconformity, it was key for Bernard to show his submission to the church authorities. Without such a move, his future ministerial activities both in parish and in print could have been further restricted.

Yet there is no reason to conclude on the basis of this publication that Bernard's religious-educational desires had changed. Through the publication of *Creede* he was able to add more background to Prayer Book catechism. This companion to the catechism provided readers with the same type of interpretations of doctrines that his earlier catechisms had done even while allowing him to officially catechize from the Prayer Book (though even here, Bernard was forced to back off from some predestinarian teachings due to printing restrictions). While he certainly remained Calvinist in his own views, he did not mention these doctrines in several areas where he previously would have supported and explained them. Yet rather than ignoring the issues completely, he chose to use ambiguous language that in the hands of a Calvinist minister or household leader could easily be imbued with predestinarian meaning when taught to a learner. In this way, Bernard did as much as possible to negotiate ecclesiastical restrictions in order to provide godly catechizers with officially acceptable materials that, with a few tweaks, could effectively support holistic, godly and reformed religious education.

There is a small piece of evidence, in the diary of Samuel Hartlib (who seems not to have known Bernard personally but who was familiar with his works<sup>485</sup>) that sometime after 1635 a manuscript catechism of Bernard's was circulating: "Richard Bernhard of Batcome hase a MS. Catechismi Quaestiones vpon the V. Cap. Catechismus...."<sup>486</sup> If "V. Cap." refers to the fifth question of the Prayer Book catechism, this manuscript may be a version of *Creede*, or it could be another work altogether. A later entry by Hartlib notes the dedicatory epistle to Hanham in *Common Catechisme*; because he mentioned this epistle and did not call the work a manuscript, Hartlib seems to have obtained a print copy of this work.<sup>487</sup> In this way, we may see that Bernard, or his readers, or both, made simultaneous use of manuscript and print—perhaps toward different ends, with print being more easily distributed and manuscript being less beholden to authorities.

---

<sup>485</sup> See Chapter 7.

<sup>486</sup> HP 29/3/22A.

<sup>487</sup> HP 29/3/27A. The online transcription incorrectly has "Rich." as "Michael" in this entry.

Seeing Bernard's 1630 publications as a direct response to ecclesiastical pressures further allows us to modify Ian Green's argument that the restrictions of the 1620s and 1630s were not a major factor limiting the proliferation of catechisms in these decades.<sup>488</sup> Although Towers and others have already given evidence to dispute Green's claims to this effect, Bernard's case is significant because Green actually uses Bernard in crafting his point. He suggests that Bernard is a primary example of a godly minister who nevertheless emphasized the benefits of using a unified catechetical method (the Prayer Book's), rather than multiplying catechisms. Although Bernard did write words to that effect in *Common Catechisme*, a full look at his catechetical beliefs clearly demonstrates that he believed other catechisms were necessary, and his own publishing record demonstrates that he had no qualms about multiplying the number of catechetical materials on the market. In other words, the abrupt way in which Bernard changed his catechetical publications and the careful ways in which he framed words about the sacraments and reformed doctrines actually support the notion that ecclesiastical strictures in both diocese and printing house effectively exerted pressure on catechetical publications and practices.

In short, what we see through Bernard's publications in this period is the willingness of a godly minister to officially conform, but to continue working out different ways that he could adapt his conformity to his strongly-held convictions about proper instruction for those under his care. Faced with the requirement to catechize with the words of the Prayer Book catechism, Bernard innovated both in his publication of *Common Catechisme*, which featured a creative way to divide and comment upon certain issues, and innovated even further by developing his catechetical companion, *Creede*. Yet here again, ecclesiastical pressures limited the ways in which Bernard could present doctrines regarding salvation and predestination; he finessed by providing ambiguously-worded passages that instructors could imbue with a reformed meaning.

Although Bernard certainly disliked ecclesiastical restrictions upon his ministry, he responded neither by turning his back on the Church nor by rolling over and giving up his scruples. Rather, he innovated. He continued to seek a path that would allow him both to conform and to provide the religious instruction that he believed was necessary for Christian growth. Together, Bernard's publications from this period demonstrate a determined—and seemingly successful—effort toward ecclesiastical and theological negotiation in both print and parish.

---

<sup>488</sup> Green, *The Christian's ABC*, 75ff.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE BISHOP OF ROME AND THE MINISTER OF BATCOMBE: CONTEXTUALIZING BERNARD'S ANTI-CATHOLIC WRITING

Much recent scholarship has focused on the influence of Catholic and anti-Catholic polemics on the political, religious and rhetorical stages of early modern England. Significant among this work is Peter Lake's discussion of anti-Catholic thought as a foil against which an English Protestant self-definition developed, and Anthony Milton's discussion of the ways in which these anti-Catholic views could be leveraged and massaged, depending on the necessity of a particular political or rhetorical circumstance.<sup>489</sup> As Milton has further pointed out, these nuances kept English Protestants from displaying a "simple allergic reaction to all things popish"; rather, portions of even the most devout Protestant lives could be closely integrated with Catholicism.<sup>490</sup>

In this chapter, I take these principles as presuppositions from which to conduct a more detailed investigation of specific factors that could cause an author-minister such as Bernard to assume certain public positions against Catholicism. Through this analysis, I show that a variety of contextual factors could influence not only an author's choice to write and publish anti-Catholic works, but also the tone and content of these works. By considering these factors as a whole, I also highlight the ability of anti-Catholic writing—including, but not limited to, polemics—to hold different resonances and speak to different audiences.

Throughout his career, Bernard held the same basic theological position against Catholicism: that it was a danger to individual readers and parishioners, to England, and to the Church of God. Yet while he had a long and varied publishing career, his works took a more distinctly anti-Catholic focus during a particular portion of these years—roughly 1617-1626.<sup>491</sup> Further, as I will show, within that period there was something of a shift in the tone and content of these publications around the year 1622. Because Bernard's anti-Catholic publishing was situated in this contained way within his broader career, and because it took a marked shift in c. 1622, it is possible to identify particular factors that were at play in his published rhetoric against

---

<sup>489</sup> Lake, "Antipopery: the Structure of a Prejudice" and Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*.

<sup>490</sup> Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance."

<sup>491</sup> I will show that his 1616 work *A Staffe of Comfort* is somewhat transitional; thus, while his anti-Catholic polemics appeared from 1617-1626 as I mention above, I date the period of his increasing concerns about the influence of Catholicism more inclusively, from 1616.

Catholics, and thus possible to better understand the relationship between his dual careers as minister and author.

Bernard's writing was influenced by internal factors including a course of personal interests and research questions that reinforced its own production. It also responded to certain external factors that he believed threatened parish, church, and nation. These included strife with Catholicism on local, regional and national stages; specific episcopal activities in his diocese of Bath and Wells; and changes to his own place in the ecclesiastical and ecclesio-political structure. These internal and external influences were necessarily interrelated. As an author with a seemingly limitless interest in acquiring information, Bernard's production of anti-Catholic publications continued to suggest new avenues for research and writing, yet it gained crucial fuel through his existing concerns about the role of Catholics and Catholicism in local and national affairs.

From approximately 1617 through 1621, Bernard's anti-Catholic writing emphasized the role of England in eradicating Catholicism from the nation through church and local government, and also as part of God's full effort to bring the international, eschatological victory of the true faith. The expectation of both temporal and eternal victory is palpable in his early works. Yet 1622 brought prominent conversions of Protestants to Catholicism (though this was, of course, nothing entirely new) alongside political concessions to Catholics due to the pursuit of the Spanish match. Perhaps even more importantly, after 1622 it became increasingly clear that the puritan position, including its opposition to all things Catholic, was falling out of royal favor; in its place, James and later Charles began elevating the interests of the group or faction that has (in various forms and with various caveats) been called "Arminian," "anti-Calvinist," or "avant-garde conformist."<sup>492</sup> Among royal restrictions on the godly and in favor of this faction, the 1622 Directions concerning Preachers limited the ways in which ministers could attack, either in pulpit or in print, the forces of the Pope, which he and other puritans understood to be the Antichrist. Beginning in 1623, Bernard's anti-Catholic works seem to have taken both these changes into account: on the one hand acknowledging these ideological and political setbacks of Protestants against Catholic forces, and on the other adopting a more careful tone in order to align with the new restrictions on the sort of godly anti-Catholic program that would put Bernard out of favor with authorities (and probably also keep his works from being licensed). These later works were

---

<sup>492</sup> See among other works Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*; and Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity at the court of James I."



more obviously attentive to the incomplete victory of Protestantism over Catholicism in England, the substantial theological doubts among many English people, and the ways in which lay Catholics were questioning lay Protestants about their beliefs. In 1623 and 1626, Bernard published against Catholics and even against anti-Calvinists, but he did so in subtle and nuanced ways that avoided naming certain individuals or directly engaging with controversies. This allowed him to retain his position of clear conformity to the church while still furthering his own godly religious agenda. Yet in the end, still more changing factors, including political shifts, Laud's move to the see of Bath and Wells, and Bernard's own intellectual shifts seem to have been enough to turn the tide of Bernard's anti-Catholic emphasis in in later parts of the 1620s.

Altogether, I argue that we must not see Bernard's foray into anti-Catholic writing merely as an expected part of the work of a godly author-minister who wanted to keep readers or parishioners from falling to Catholicism's false teachings, nor merely as the product of a theologian with strongly-held positions against the Church of Rome. Although these longstanding factors were significant, Bernard's anti-Catholic publications were carefully targeted and often multivalent responses to specific ecclesiastical and ecclesio-political factors, as well as to personal interests and patterns of inquiry. All of these factors would play a key role in authorial choices about both the timing and the content of publications. In this chapter, I first analyze what we know of Bernard's foundational beliefs about the danger of Catholicism, and then I proceed to contextualize and historicize the amplification and then deamplification in his published rhetoric about Catholics during this particular ten-year period.

#### Catholicism as an enduring, but not central, concern to 1616

In order to see why, and how far, Bernard moved past his previous pattern for engaging Catholicism during his decade of anti-Catholic writing, it is important to consider his position on Catholicism during the formative years of his career. It is possible to do this because early in his print career, he developed certain tendencies in the way he dealt with Catholicism that continued in largely the same pattern until 1616. Bernard's first published passage against the Catholics appeared as early as his first religious work in 1602, his *Large Catechisme*.<sup>493</sup> In this work, he followed questions regarding the nature and marks of the church with questions about Catholicism:

---

<sup>493</sup> Bernard, *Large Catechisme*, 14. This was his second published work, following his translation of Terence.

Q. Is the Church of Rome a true Church of Christ?

A. No, but of Antichrist the Pope, the chief teacher of the doctrine of devils.

Q. What reason have you to disallow that religion?

A. For that it is a false religion. I. The author is the devil. II. The means used to uphold it are unlawful: 1 deceived councils: 2 unwritten verities and forged authors: 3 falsifying the fathers: 4 corrupting scripture by adding thereto, Eccles. 9.2. by taking from it, Heb. 1.3. Mat. 19.13. by false interpreting, Heb. 13. 16. Rom. 7. 25. 5. retaining the people in ignorance by forbidding to study the word, and teaching it in an unknown tongue. 6 pretending revelations, and showing lying miracles. 7. counterfeit holiness. 8 bloody persecution. III. The matter of their religion is untruths, idolatry, heresy, and novelties invented by man. IV. The form in the service ridiculous, by foolish gestures, carnal, by fleshly pomps and delights, their worship is hypocrisy. V. The end to advance men by worshipping of Saints, and extolling mans power and merits. VI. The benefit gotten is nothing, for to do all in it, and because it keeps a man in the estate of damnation: for it allows the breach of all the ten commandments. ... VII. Gods judgments against many of the most fiery professors thereof, which is never seen to happen to zealous and constant professors of the truth.<sup>494</sup>

This passage was republished or reprinted in essentially the same form in 1607, 1612 and 1629 within both *Double Catechisme* and *Ioshuahs Godly Resolution*.<sup>495</sup> In this formulation of his catechetical method, Bernard exhibited a clear position against Catholicism—indeed, he went out of his way to demonstrate that it derived from diabolic origins and allowed the breaking of all ten commandments. This underlined the extent to which he viewed Catholicism’s errors: the Church of Rome had not merely strayed in a few points, but was fundamentally opposed to God’s purposes for the Church.

Yet while he certainly believed Catholicism to be a real and present threat, his catechism emphasized other issues. Here, and indeed throughout his early ministry, Catholic teachings were something about which Bernard warned, but were not necessarily a primary area of focus. For instance, we see a decentralization of the topic of Catholicism in his 1609 *The Sinners Safetie*, an exposition of 2 Peter 1:10. Although the work discussed several spiritual dangers and dealt with the devil, idolatry, wicked or “voluptuous” living, and other topics frequently associated with popery by anti-Catholic authors, it mentioned Catholicism only relatively briefly and retained a didactic, rather than polemic, tone throughout. Bernard provided general instruction about

---

<sup>494</sup> Bernard, *Large Catechisme*, 13-15. The points in which Bernard asserted that Catholicism broke the ten commandments may seem tenuous, but he explained them more fully in the catechetical treatment of the decalogue a few pages after this description. Note that “councils” in this quotation is likely “councils” but could be “counsels” or even an implied blending of the two.

<sup>495</sup> Bernard, *Double Catechisme* and *Ioshuahs Godly Resolution*.

godliness and reminded readers of the evils of Catholicism by framing it not as the foremost evil to be avoided, but as a misguided practice that nevertheless garnered something of an admirable zeal from its adherents:

For the world, we think we do never enough: to satisfy our wills, or our selves in willful pleasures, wee judge it not amiss to keep no measure: delight draweth us to spend much time, to bee at much cost; yet nothing too much, nothing too dear: lustful appetites set us to labor, both long and tedious, yet to attain the purpose proposed, we can endure the pains: in a word, nothing after our corruption is at any time beyond that which is meet: where Will ruleth and the heart delighteth, there nothing for that is untunable, nothing unmeasurable, though in superstition and setting up of Idols. Israelites will give their earrings, & appoint a day for cost and expenses, because they will have a golden calf. Papists practice herein doth show this plain: they go far on pilgrimage; they burthen themselves with infinite number of prayers; they are at great cost to maintain many Priests and many orders of their religion; they night and day tie themselves to their task; thrice a week they fast; many days in a year they keep (after their fashion) holy, and doe strive to doe more then ever God commanded, that they might merit. And shall the pure religion of Christ, the truth of God be held so little worth, as wee wickedly should imagine that wee therein can doe too much? that we may therein be too holy? Surely these enemies of God, this antichristian generation, shall rise up in judgment against us, except religion be of more precious account, we better in practice, and cease to be so too too [sic] profane, as too many be; whom the Lord God of heaven amend in his due time, Amen.<sup>496</sup>

Of course, while the sluggish behavior of Protestants might be no better than the zeal of Catholics, Bernard left no room in this work to find good in Catholicism, a religion full of “Pharasaical Papists” who misunderstood not only the doctrine of obedience but also the Protestant position on good works.<sup>497</sup>

Following this pattern to an even further extent, Bernard’s 1610 *Contemplative Pictures* did not discuss the Church of Rome in detail at all, though it considered several topics that could easily have suggested a discussion related to Catholicism: God, the Devil, goodness, badness, Heaven, and Hell. It is surely significant that while writing in c. 1608-1610, Bernard was in the heat of controversy over separatism.<sup>498</sup> As such, his primary polemical concern was with his former separatist allies, and his foremost ministerial goal was to ensure that his flock followed a godly course of life without falling to the influence of separatism (either as a result of his own former teachings or others’ attempts at persuasion). These works’ primary objectives seem to

---

<sup>496</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, 30-31.

<sup>497</sup> Bernard, *Sinners Safetie*, 78, 90.

<sup>498</sup> See Chapter 2.

have overridden any desire to publish against the Church of Rome.<sup>499</sup> In addition to providing insight into anti-Catholic writing, this example should qualify our understanding of puritan responses to national anti-Catholic initiatives in the early seventeenth century, including the executions of Catholics in 1604-1605: although divines such as Bernard were aware of these activities and may have supported them in principle, the attacks on puritanism and the intra-godly debates of the time could appear more pressing and more in need of immediate attention.<sup>500</sup>

Throughout his early career Bernard treated Catholicism as one of many concerns, spending the majority of space in his publications discussing matters of faith and behavior that was not directly related to Catholicism. For instance, his *A Weekes Worke* encouraged faith, meditation, true devotion, and godly living. Indeed he here seemed to indicate that Catholicism was not a large problem among the people: "...men seem to hate so very much popish superstition, as they neglect altogether Christian devotion; it is judged enough to be no Papist, though otherwise a man be little better than a very Atheist in all his courses."<sup>501</sup> At the conclusion of *Weekes Worke* Bernard appended two prayers for the Sabbath morning and Sabbath evening. These gestured toward some particular concerns that were not directly related to the main contents of the book, including the development of godly ministers and the congregation's liberal financial maintenance of ministers.<sup>502</sup> This part of the work did make reference not only to the Protestant alliance in Europe and the "Man of Sin"—a title taken from 2 Thessalonians 2 that Bernard and others understood to refer to the Antichrist, the Pope.<sup>503</sup> This passage, couched within an exemplary prayer designed for the Sabbath evening, included the following:

Bless these particular Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and herein especially the principal member of the same, our dread Sovereign the King's Majesty, the Queen, Prince Charles, Frederick Prince Elector, and the Lady Elizabeth, the Honorable Council, and worthy Nobles, the Ministry and Ministers of thy Gospel, and all Schools of learning, for the furtherance of religion.

---

<sup>499</sup> As I mention in Chapter 2, Bernard also noted in *Contemplative Pictures* that he had paused in the middle of the controversy in order to complete this devotional work.

<sup>500</sup> See, for instance, Ellison, "*Measure for Measure* and the Executions of Catholics in 1604".

<sup>501</sup> Bernard, *Weekes Worke* (1616), 131. Because the third edition of 1616 is the earliest extant edition, and a work by this title does not appear in the stationers' registers, it is not possible to know precisely when the first edition appeared. Given the timeline of reprints for Bernard's other works, the first edition would have been published at least some months, and likely a year or more, before the third edition. The fourth edition, amended and enlarged, was published in 1628; this replaced the Gaius character with the "elect lady," which further reinforced that the work was directed toward true believers; it probably also worked more deliberately to attract a female audience.

<sup>502</sup> Bernard, *Weekes Worke* (1616), 158-159.

<sup>503</sup> See for example Bernard, *Looke Beyond Luther*, 6-7.

Lord continue peace among us, unite our hearts in one in the truth, and for the truth: cause justice in true judgment to bee maintained, grievous wrongs and oppressions to bee utterly suppressed good, works of zeal, mercy, & piety to be every way furthered, and the instruments to be highly advanced. And if there be any enemies to thee (O God) and to thy people maintaining that man of sin, (O Lord thou mighty God of heaven) reveal them to the world, discover all crafty Achitophels, set thy self against them, and all wicked seducers misleading thy people by error into Antichristian superstition and idolatry, and either convert them, or confound them, for the safety of thy people and their great peace, yea for the more full manifestation of thy hatred against that man of sin, against that tyrannical regiment, and that bloody persecuting power, with all the treacherous, and traitorous adherents to the same...<sup>504</sup>

Again here, Catholicism was one among several issues of concern. Nevertheless, Bernard was aware of the importance of Protestant leaders for the national church and the insidious nature of Catholic practice, and he encouraged readers interested in personal devotional practices to remain alert and ready to act on this issue.

#### A transition to more focused anti-Catholic concern, c.1616

Even as late as 1616, by which time he was firmly settled into his new pastorate in Somerset, Bernard's publications showed restraint in treating concerns with Catholicism, as we see in his co-authored exposition of the first three Psalms, *Dauids Musick*. This sermon-like work mentioned Catholicism a few times in its expository passages; for instance, it suggested that one of the doctrinal "uses" of Romans 2:2 "confutes Papists, who hold that councils cannot err."<sup>505</sup> Yet in its exposition of Psalm 3:1, beyond one mention of Antichrist (referring to passages in Revelation and, importantly, not to contemporary persons or events), the work kept its exposition grounded in the Old Testament. Given godly expository techniques and doctrines that linked the Church to Israel, Bernard had several opportunities in his analysis of this passage to inveigh against the Church of Rome. That he did not do so indicated a willingness in certain situations to pass up potential opportunities for anti-Catholic discourse.<sup>506</sup>

It seems that several factors over the years leading up to 1617 finally drew Bernard to conclude that the threat of Catholicism was worth his more focused attention. For example,

---

<sup>504</sup> Bernard, *Weekes Worke* (1616), 175-178.

<sup>505</sup> Bernard and R. A., *Dauids Musick*, 59.

<sup>506</sup> The fact that this is a co-authored work further complicates this issue, but Bernard was certainly involved with the work's production to some degree and would at least have approved of its contents.

there were prominent national cases of conversions from Protestantism to Catholicism throughout the first portion of the seventeenth century. One of these may have been particularly troubling to Bernard: that of Tobie Matthew the younger, who converted early in the century. Matthew's conversion was a great concern for his father, the Archbishop of York; because of Bernard's close relationship with Archbishop Matthew, he must have been aware of this situation. He would have known something of the grief and trouble over the situation that the Archbishop and other ministers and godly friends experienced in trying to recall the younger Matthew.<sup>507</sup> Bernard would also have been aware of the ambiguous nature of the younger Matthew's continued ability to visit court and, thus, the failure of several powerful individuals to recognize or to excise the evils of Catholicism from centers of power in England.

While the activities of individuals would have been troubling, perhaps even more disturbing for a minister such as Bernard was the persistence and even increase of pro-Catholic *ideas*, both across the nation and within his own region. On an institutional level, for instance, a movement among certain religious intellectuals questioned or denied that the Pope was the Antichrist—a point that struck at the heart of much anti-Catholic theology (and, therefore, also at the heart of much Protestant self-definition). In 1614, John Prideaux of Oxford University noted this theological development as part of a disturbing trend away from rigorous Protestant scholarship:

If Luther be found in some mongrel temporizers, that are so forward to censure them; I should think among some professors, our first love were in some measure recovered. Fathers and brethren, is this a time to make a doubt, whether the Pope be Antichrist or no, seeing his horns and marks are so apparently discovered? And must we now fall back to be catechized by Lombard, and Aquinas; as though our own men's doctrine, so evidently grounded on scripture, not refusing the touch of pure antiquity, or any true school-learning, were not conclusive, and acute enough, for our abstractive capacities? Our first love to Gods word was a great deal more fervent; when so many burned in defiance of Romish mixtures. ... The meditation of his sudden coming, & the endangering of our present happiness, are the motives to hasten this first love. To hate the abominations of Popery (as the Ephesians did here the deeds of the Nicolaitans) is an evidence of a soul prepared, for the entertaining and relishing this first love.<sup>508</sup>

---

<sup>507</sup> A. J. Loomie, "Matthew, Sir Toby," *ODNB*.

<sup>508</sup> Prideaux, *Ephesus Backsliding*, 35-37. Cf. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 111. Prideaux was master of Exeter College, where Bernard's son Cannanuel would matriculate in 1619. At that time, Bernard met with Prideaux and other university leaders to confer about some of these issues.

Bernard was aware of these disputes; in his 1617 publication, *Key*, he would demonstrate a clear commitment to both anti-papal and anti-Catholic theology and rhetoric, taking the view of Prideaux and other reforming Calvinists within the national church.<sup>509</sup> These theological alignments would become particularly important to his publishing decisions over the coming decade.

Religio-political issues gave somewhat frequent alarm throughout the early modern period, although the type and extent of these fears varied according to current events. In the 1610s and early 1620s, godly believers such as Bernard had reason to grow increasingly concerned. The martial and diplomatic activities of Catholic and Protestant forces in England and across Europe included: the possibility (later reality) that prince (later king) Charles would take his wife from a Catholic nation; the dawn of the Thirty Years' War; the marriage alliance of the Protestant Frederick, Elector Palatine and the English princess Elizabeth in a geographic area fraught with religio-political turmoil. Godly Protestants warned that both military defeat and political compromise with Catholic powers could bring hardship for believers and hinder the spread of the gospel.<sup>510</sup> We know from his works that Bernard was aware of national and international events and concerned about what they might mean to the cause of God; for instance, he specifically encouraged individuals to pray for Frederick and Elizabeth as part of an international Protestant alliance.<sup>511</sup>

Alongside these national and international contexts for the battle between Protestantism and Catholicism, Bernard was probably also encountering concern on a local level and may have been discussing these issues with concerned individuals in his diocese. Among such individuals may have been William Sclater, a friend of Bernard and fellow Somerset author-minister, who in 1616 preached before the assizes in Taunton to complain about the problem of recusancy:

That of recusancy I know is commonly matter of inquisition; and yet to this day, the several sorts of recusants are either unknown, or winked at. There are besides our superstitious recusants the papists, and the curious recusants, the brethren (as they would be called) of the unbrotherly separation, a sort of profane, I know not whether I may say recusants or negligents: men that out of a godless disposition, in very contempt of all religion, forsake our assemblies. The living God is scarce served with such devotion in his Temple on the days of assembling, as Bacchus the idol of the heathen by these men upon their ale-bench. I beseech you that have to deal by way

---

<sup>509</sup> See Bernard, "The Epistle to the Iustices of Peace," *Key*, n.p.

<sup>510</sup> On the influence of international issues on anti-Catholic polemic see Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 42ff.

<sup>511</sup> Consider, for example, his comments linking Frederick and Elizabeth with the progress of the gospel in *Weekes Worke* quoted above. As I mention below, this interest took on a new fervor in his 1617 work, *Key*.

of information, of all others let not these profane persons be forgotten. We wonder much without any cause of wonder, at the multiplying of recusants. Know this for a rule, popery hath a natural issue out of profaneness. And we have no reason to marvel that men should fall from atheism to superstition, from profaneness unto popery.<sup>512</sup>

Sclater noted not only that authorities commonly failed to prosecute recusants, allowing professed Catholics to remain as functioning members of society, but also that this omission allowed Catholic religion to continue attracting certain individuals.

All of these factors—threats of a Catholic political takeover either by military force or diplomatic capitulation, theological developments that questioned whether the Pope was indeed the Antichrist, significant (perhaps increasing) numbers of recusants, and significant (perhaps increasing) popular acceptance of Catholicism—were continuing concerns in the years surrounding Bernard’s period of anti-Catholic publishing.

In addition to general concern with the presence and even the possible ascendance of Catholicism, we must also place Bernard’s activities within his particular episcopal contexts under Bishops Montagu and Lake.<sup>513</sup> In 1616, Montagu published *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James...*; in the preface, Montagu made a special note of James’s exposition of Revelation, which had been written earlier but not yet published:

Fifthly and lastly, for the point of Antichrist; I have heard many confess, that they never saw so much light given to that mystery, never discerned so much truth by the uniform consent of the text, and strength of interpretation of places, as they have done by his Majesty’s book... Now since I have begun with this point of Antichrist, I will make bold to proceed a little with his Majesty’s paraphrase upon the revelation, wherein that treatise of Antichrist is principally grounded.<sup>514</sup>

Montagu’s organization of the *Works*’ contents placed James’s work on Revelation, including the meditation on Revelation 20, at the front. For a staunch anti-Catholic such as Montagu, this was an opportunity to remind the Church of England of its opposition to papal authority by highlighting not his own, but rather the *king’s* position in this regard. By the time James was pursuing the Spanish alliance, he had tried to position himself more as a bringer of international religious peace rather than a defender of Protestantism; nevertheless, the reprinting of his earlier

---

<sup>512</sup> Sclater, *A Sermon Preached at the last generall Assise*, 17-18. On debate about whether the Pope is the Antichrist, see Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 110-112.

<sup>513</sup> Bernard was always intensely aware of and responsive to the motions and desires of his bishop. On his earlier attention to episcopal agendas see Chapters 2 and 4.

<sup>514</sup> Montagu, “The Preface to the Reader” in James I, *Workes*, n.p.



works brought attacks upon Antichrist back into the public eye with a degree of royal backing.<sup>515</sup> Montagu's collection made the king's anti-Catholic words current and relevant in the time of these rekindled debates about the nature of the Catholic threat.<sup>516</sup> Given the close relationship between Bernard and Montagu, it is entirely possible that the two men discussed Revelation as Montagu was preparing this work for press, or even that he may have encouraged Bernard to publish his own work on Revelation, which would respond to the King's assertion that this is an important topic and also allow for a godly-inflected exposition to emerge on the coattails of this royal work.

Yet Montagu's was hardly the only episcopal voice with which Bernard was concerned. Following Montagu's translation to Winchester, Arthur Lake took Bath and Wells. Like Montagu, Lake supported the work of preaching ministers in their own parishes and at combination lectures. In order to foster the advance of the gospel through such men, he seems to have accepted a certain level of nonconformity in to the scruples of godly ministers such as Bernard and Sclater.<sup>517</sup> This similar emphasis on preaching seems to have fostered something of a bond between Lake and Bernard. As Kenneth Fincham has noted, this bond led Bernard to move from publishing his hopes that Lake would be a good bishop in 1617 to publishing his praise that Lake was indeed a holy, learned, blessed bishop after 1621.<sup>518</sup>

Lake assisted the work of godly ministers within his diocese in order to foster an evangelical preaching ministry, but he was no puritan himself: he favored ceremonial conformity and disliked extempore prayers and private catechism.<sup>519</sup> Moreover, although he did seek to eradicate recusancy, he did not take the same hard line against Catholicism as puritans like

---

<sup>515</sup> Cf. Sharpe, "Transplanting Revelation, Transferring Meaning," 121-129.

<sup>516</sup> In "A Praemonition to all Christian Monarches" James included a clear position on the Pope: James, *Workes*, 328.

<sup>517</sup> His nonconformity did not go unnoticed; in 1617 he was presented for failing to wear the hood. Yet Lake made Bernard some concessions; see SRO D/D/Ca 204; Fincham and Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I," 179; Fincham, "Lake," *ODNB*; and Fincham, "Pastoral roles of the Jacobean episcopate," 195, 233-241, n. 39. In the latter Fincham notes that Lake's indulgence for the purpose of furthering preaching "conflicts with Roger Morrice's claim that Lake indulged Bernard merely at the request of Bishop James Mountagu"; see DWL Morrice MS J p. 42.

<sup>518</sup> Fincham, "Pastoral roles of the Jacobean episcopate," 234-235, 241.

<sup>519</sup> Lake and Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church*, 137. "Bishop Lake, for example, for all his favour towards puritan preachers such as Richard Bernard and William Sclater, criticised ministers who used extempore prayers and private catechisms in preference to those officially authorised, and those who disliked 'some things in our church, because therein we follow the Church of Rome'. Though the joint pursuit of an evangelical agenda allowed such differences to be concealed, the enforcement of subscription and ceremonial conformity, as occurred in the 1580s and 1604-06, produced mutual recrimination along these fault-lines." Cf. Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 261

Bernard did.<sup>520</sup> It may be that Lake's indulgence toward both puritanism and Catholicism actually combined to create both the ability and the need for Bernard to write against Catholicism. He may have begun sensing under Lake, more so than under Montagu, that Catholicism was not an issue of enough concentrated concern in his diocese. Yet due to Lake's policies, Bernard retained the freedom to express his thoughts on these issues in a way that he would not under later bishops who demanded more scrupulous conformity.

The first work in which one might observe signs of Bernard's increased public concern about Catholicism is his near-concurrent 1616 publication, *A Staffe of Comfort*. Several of Bernard's pastoral or devotional works were sermon-like in that they began by interpreting a passage and then drawing out practical applications (see Chapter 3); however, *Staffe of Comfort* essentially functioned in the opposite way. It began with practical complaints and then provided answers from the Scriptures. As such, it echoed the function of pastors as counselors to parishioners seeking help.

Dedicating this publication to friends including parishioners James and Edward Bisse, Bernard explained that the purpose of the work (true to the title) was to bring spiritual comfort to those in need:

...it is to the heavy laden that I wish refreshment, and to the sorrowful glad tidings, health to the sick, rest to the troubled, soundness of comfort, to the broken in heart, strength to the weak and feeble soul, and full supply of whatsoever is wanting for true joy to every one of the Lord's elected people.<sup>521</sup>

Rather than simply explaining principles of Christian life in a positive way, this work took the rhetorical strategy of intentionally placing itself on the defensive in order to answer nearly 250 pages of "objections" that expressed fear about godly religion. The objections addressed topics ranging from personal confusion (such as how to know which was the true religion) to the work of God in the world (such as why He would allow bad things to happen to religious people) to one's spiritual and practical duties (such as giving to the poor). It answered objections to godliness and offered comforts to the afflicted on a variety of topics, from unhappy marriage, to unfair imprisonment, to fearing death, and many more. In these instances, Bernard's answers emphasized trust in a good God and obedience to His commands.

---

<sup>520</sup> "Often indulgent towards moderate puritans, Lake did not share their entrenched hostility to the Church of Rome, and counted among his friends at least one former recusant, Lady Elizabeth Booth of Bath." Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor* 269-70; "Lake," *ODNB*; and "Pastoral roles of the Jacobean episcopate," 364-366.

<sup>521</sup> Bernard, *Staffe of Comfort*, Sig. A5r - A5v.

While the work did not provide indications of specific parish activities that inspired it, it covered a wide range of topics and objections that Bernard would have encountered as a parish minister. It is also possible that extra-parish interests influenced the work to some degree; for example, the questions he included to help those persecuted for the sake of their religion may well have been in response to situations he imagined rather than personal experience. Nevertheless, in its discussions of personal doubts about religion and about one's own salvation, and also in its discussions of godly behavior, *Staffe of Comfort* certainly contained echoes of his pastoral ministry.

It is particularly interesting, especially in view of his upcoming works, that along with these pastoral answers to cases of personal belief and behavior in many types of life situations, he dedicated a significant portion of this book to defending the truth of Protestantism over Catholicism and encouraging Protestants not to fear Catholic forces. Beginning with the first question of the work, and also elsewhere in the book, several questions and objections dealt with confusion over the true religion. It is useful to survey several of these to gain a sense of this thread of ideas:

Object. It may seem by this, that Religion is but one way: and yet there are many religions, that I know not which way to turn me...

Object. But so many, though they be of diverse and differing opinions, do challenge to themselves this one Religion, and do so condemn one another, as I (an ignorant man) cannot tell what to doe, or how to know the truth. ...

Object. I was (I may tell you) of that Roman faith, spoken of through the world, as Saint Paul speaketh, Rom. 1.8. and 16.19. but now am of this, called the reformed Religion; I fear me, that I have done much amiss, in forsaking that, which the Apostle hath so commended. ...

Object. This our Religion hath not so many godly Ceremonies; nor holy Church ordinances, to keep the people in devout exercises for the service of God, as that hath...

Object. But yet this reformed Religion is every where spoken against of many: and this I can say, that men very wise in the world, men of great place, and very learned too, like that Religion, & cannot away with this, but for the present state. ...

Object. Many among us nowadays fall to that Religion. ...

Object. But that Religion hath been spread mightily abroad, many Monarchs of the earth have with one mind given their power and authority to that See; and kindreds, tongues, and nations, have worshipped the same. ...

Object. If this were so, men of wisdom and learning on that side would see it, without all doubt. ...

Those of that Religion hope to advance again that supreme head (as they call him) and some with us fear that he will prevail, and get dominion over us. ...

Object. But in the mean space they murder many of Gods Saints. ...

Object. These be good comforts; yet I read, that before the great overthrow of this Romish state, & before Christ coming, there shall be terrible days; in which men's hearts shall fail them with fear, which may make us greatly to bee dismayed. ...

Object. The Pope, and his power, make great preparation against us, of the reformed religion, to root us out, and to destroy utterly our names from under heaven. ...

Object. These our enemies have their Diviners, and their Wise men, they give credit to their Machiavellian Jesuits, and their conjuring Priests, mocking at the Preachers of Gods word among us. ...

Object. The Church is robbed of these servants and messengers, the true Pastors, by Antichrist; the vision thus failing, the people perish. ...

Ob. There is a pressing of soldiers everywhere, we must into the wars: but how we shall prevail I cannot see. ...

Object. Wee are very shortly to join in battle with a great beast, which be the enemies of our faith and true religion. ...

Object. The enemies serve under a mighty potentate, and are a great multitude. ...

Object. But besides his own strength and puissance, he hath many Princes his confederates, who have joined their powers to his, and we are but a handful: therefore do they boast and make themselves sure of the victory.<sup>522</sup>

From these questions, we can identify two basic sets of problems related to Catholicism that Bernard recognized. First, he was concerned that several of his readers or parishioners were unsure whether Protestantism was or was not the true religion. Some individuals were concerned that many people held to both sides of the question, that even learned experts disagreed, and that in certain practices, Catholicism seemed to have the better hand. As a result, some Protestants feared that they had erred by leaving the Catholic faith. Others had more generalized doubt that one could even know which religion to choose, or perhaps whether *any* religion was true at all.

A second group of issues centered on fears of what Catholic military and religio-political forces might be able to do. Beyond social disgrace as the godly were mocked, Bernard responded to the fear of Catholic hostilities—both in terms of international wars of religion (in which England would face powerful, allied Catholic forces) and in terms of the potential for England to lose its status as a Protestant stronghold (and thus return to policies that persecuted Protestants). Though the actual likelihood of these martial and religio-political changes varied with the winds of national and international politics, it is instructive that so much of Bernard's response went toward comforting his reader-parishioners that the true faith would not fall even in the midst of

---

<sup>522</sup> Bernard, *Staffe of Comfort*, 3-4, 7-17, 191-194. For brevity I omitted the answers given for each question and objection.

wars and persecutions. For Bernard and his godly parishioners, the Catholic threat was not merely to the eternal soul. It also had to do with physical welfare.

Though Bernard answered each of the objections he raised, the fact that he included so many dealing with Catholicism indicated that he had come to see the persistence of Catholic believers and of Catholic teaching in England as a great danger. It caused confusion to those with weak faith, it led souls astray, and it threatened to harm the church through displays of martial and political power. Bernard perceived these dangers in theory as well as in practice. Nevertheless, overwhelmingly, this was a pastoral work concerned with questions affecting parishioners. As such, it made only transitional moves toward a particularly anti-Catholic position—yet the transition would soon be much more complete.

Catholicism as a key concern, with an international clash of Protestant and Catholic forces seen to be near at hand, 1617-1621

Having considered that Bernard displayed some level of concern with Catholicism alongside his other duties throughout his career, I now turn to examine the approximately ten year period in which his anti-Catholic rhetoric became more central. In this section, I demonstrate that in the first portion of this period, from roughly 1617 to 1621, Bernard's writing displayed an elevated concern with the dangers of Catholicism. He saw the Catholic church as a serious foe, and his overall tone was one that emphasized an aggressive religio-political agenda against Catholics and that foresaw a clear victory. To explain this shift in topic, I examine several ways in which the Catholic threat appeared to be on the rise and also how Bernard used eschatological interpretations to contextualize these toward a hopeful view of the defeat of Catholic forces. I also consider how the actions of particular bishops would have encouraged Bernard in his anti-Catholic program.

It was likely a continuance of the concerns about Catholicism articulated in *Staffe of Comfort*, along with Bernard's awareness of Bishop Montagu's anti-Catholic feelings (which may have been sharpened by his preparation of James's *Works*), that suggested a new path of research for Bernard: an exposition of Revelation, with special consideration of the place of Catholics and the Pope within the path of providential history and prophecy.<sup>523</sup> Perhaps a compilation and

---

<sup>523</sup> Among the large body of scholarship analyzing early modern apocalyptic theology, Joseph Chi's work on John Cotton is of note because of Cotton's connection to Bernard through the PHM manuscripts. Chi, "Forget not the

expansion of a series of sermons on the book (see Chapter 3), *Key* was a lengthy and detailed publication emphasizing many issues that Bernard felt were of vital concern to the church. It contained not only his own extensive interpretation of Revelation but also something of a directory to others' interpretations of the work.<sup>524</sup> Bernard later commented, "surely with great study I brought it forth, and with most ardent prayers daily."<sup>525</sup> In addition to the scholarly preparation for the work, which included exposing himself to a variety of ideas via books, he seems also to have sought help from trusted counselors including James Ussher.<sup>526</sup>

In composing this work, Bernard responded to a variety of additional factors. For example, though pastoral concerns continued to appear and followed similar themes to those in *Staffe of Comfort*, he especially highlighted the dangers of Catholics living in England in several of his dedicatory epistles. He argued that Catholics who outwardly conformed to the practices of the national church were actually more dangerous than recusants; unlike the latter, conforming Catholics could not be easily identified and were therefore more insidious.<sup>527</sup> Yet unlike *Staffe of Comfort*, which focused primarily on popular concerns and issues related to his shepherding of individual souls, *Key* pursued more high-level intellectual and political effects through its expository work and its analysis of the historical, ecclesiastical and political valences of Revelation. This difference in purpose and intended audience was clear even from the outset, as Bernard provided several dedicatory epistles that indicated the various implications of his research.

Bernard's first, and in that regard most prominent, dedicatory epistle was to his recently-consecrated bishop, Arthur Lake. It was written in Latin, a choice that placed its contents in the scholarly realm and highlighted Bernard's educational and theological abilities. Because this epistle was penned shortly after Lake's appointment to Bath and Wells, and thus before he had been able to cement his style of episcopal rule, Bernard seems to have intended the dedication to

---

wombe that bare you, and the brest that gave you sucke': John Cotton's Sermons on Canticles and Revelation And His Apocalyptic Vision for England."

<sup>524</sup> Anthony Milton has importantly highlighted that Bernard, like many godly ministers, allowed that Catholics not only had good skill in explicating the biblical text upon humanistic investigation, understanding its moral teachings, and even identifying the "general heads of Gospel, wherein we and they agree, and by profession whereof they be called Christians." Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance," 89, 93.

<sup>525</sup> Rawl. letters 89 fol. 28-29, Richard Bernard to James Ussher. The epistle to the reader in *Key* explains that "by conference with some" he decided to add to his work his opinion on Mr. Brightman's interpretation of the seven churches mentioned in Revelation.

<sup>526</sup> Bernard's letter to Ussher, written following the publication of *Key of Knowledge*, implies that Ussher had pre-publication knowledge of the work.

<sup>527</sup> Bernard, *Key*, Sig. B2v-B3r. Cf. Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance," 101, 106.

present himself, his qualifications as a godly minister, and his hopes for Lake as a godly bishop, to his new diocesan. The letter expressed praise for the outgoing Montagu, noted the favor under which Bernard had ministered during Montagu's tenure, and expressed his hope that Lake's rule would likewise prosper the advance of the gospel. While clearly presenting his own humble position beneath his incoming bishop, Bernard nevertheless took the opportunity to assert his wishes for Lake's upcoming time in office. Again, even at this early date following Lake's move to Bath and Wells it is likely that Bernard had some idea of Lake's reputation, not only as favorable to preaching ministers but also as someone with a less firm opposition to Catholicism than his own. The fact that Bernard published his hopes for Lake's tenure in a work with such a strong anti-Catholic position would not have gone unnoticed by the bishop, nor by other readers.

Yet Bernard wanted the implications of this work to be noticed not only in the ecclesiastical, but also the political, arena: he hoped readers and officials at a variety of levels would recognize the dangers of Catholic ideas within the church, international Catholic forces, and Catholic individuals within England, and that they would use their offices to act against these forces. To emphasize these aspects of his work, Bernard included several more dedicatory epistles, noting how various groups of individuals could respond to the dangers of Catholicism. In his epistle addressed to the judges of the common laws of the realm and to the lawyers and students in the Inns of Court, he emphasized that a legal and political stance against Catholicism helped both church and society; he argued that Catholics were enemies to the laws of England, for they "cannot possibly be good subjects, entertaining such a religion." Later in the same epistle, he even more pointedly urged the judges to enforce justice on "Priests, Jesuits, and other traitorous spirits" and to "Let the law also, have the due course against these obstinate Recusants, which after all meek and gentle usages to reclaim them, will not be won..."<sup>528</sup> The next epistle reminded the "Worthy Justices, Prisoners of Malefactors and "Preservers of peace," that "without your vigilance and faithfulness, the Judges cannot do, what either their places require, or themselves desire to do, for the good of our country."<sup>529</sup> Thus, Bernard made several requests to these officers, as well:

...so in like manner, I beseech you...to search out these walking spirits of Antichrist; I mean, the Priests and Jesuits... Likewise that the statutes be executed upon open

---

<sup>528</sup> Bernard, "To the Right Reverend, the Iudges" in *Key*, n.p.

<sup>529</sup> Bernard, "To the Watchfull Eyes..." in *Key*, n.p.

Recusants, who too boldly dare to profess themselves of the Popish Church. And withal, that a circumspect eye be had of our Church-Papists...<sup>530</sup>

The next epistle, to the “sons of valor, martial men, and lovers of arms, of what degree and place so ever, resolute for Religion, ready to fight for the honor of Christ, the safety of our King and Country...” followed these same themes but applied them to the just nature of a military attack on Catholicism.<sup>531</sup> Using one of Revelation’s most memorable images, the ten horns, to advantage, he pled:

Are we not one of the ten horns, that gave our kingdom once to the Beast? For who went at the Pope’s command, to the holy land, sooner than we? Who defended the Pope, more than we? ...Thus were we for him, and so shall we be against him. ...Consider this, you that be wise hearted, why above all other Nations, they have sought to invade us: and why they assay by unheard of, and unmatchable villainies, to root us out from under heaven... Can any other reason be given, than this, that the Devil their Lord, and our deadly foe, suggested into them, that we are, and shall be, one of the greatest means, under God Almighty, to bring an utter overthrow and desolation to that Antichristian state?<sup>532</sup>

Altogether, in these initial epistles, Bernard attempted to mobilize official activity against domestic Catholics and military activity against international Catholicism. Finally, he moved to a more traditional epistle to the reader. In this, he noted that his role as minister was to urge kings and princes to do what is right—including keeping Catholicism from spreading and using force if necessary—a sentiment echoing several of his concerns in the previous epistles.<sup>533</sup>

In each of these epistles, Bernard provided key reasons from society that individuals at all levels—from high-ranking officials to general readers—should heed the message of *Key*, and of Revelation. Demonstrating again and again that not only Catholicism but individual Catholics were a threat to both church and state, Bernard appealed to each reader to apply this knowledge within his or her walk of life. Noting dire problems that Catholics caused at all levels of society, and having seen those in his own parish and those in higher levels of church and government failing to respond properly to this threat, Bernard hoped that his lengthy explanations of the need

---

<sup>530</sup> In this section he quotes a preface to a Paul’s Cross sermon by “Ro. B.” concerning the danger of church-papists, as well. Anthony Milton suggests the speaker may have been Robert Bolton. Bernard, “To the Watchfull Eyes...” in *Key*, n.p.; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 258.

<sup>531</sup> Bernard, “To the Watchfull Eyes...” in *Key*, n.p.

<sup>532</sup> Bernard, “To the Watchfull Eyes...” in *Key*, n.p.

<sup>533</sup> Bernard, “To the Christian Reader...” in *Key*, n.p. Unlike the other epistles, most of this one is concerned with a point of exposition (Brightman’s analysis of the seven churches) about which some people had asked for additional clarification.



to stand firm against the spread of the Church of Rome, along with his careful exposition of God's apocalyptic message, would stir individuals to action.

The work's contents fit well within certain veins of eschatological thought typical for the period. Like several Protestant and puritan thinkers, Bernard emphasized the necessity of a historical interpretation of Revelation, and he gave a good deal of attention to placing the Catholic Church within this framework.<sup>534</sup> Presenting *Key* as a careful work of scholarship, and even going so far as to include at the beginning a list of the major "writers upon the Apocalypse, read by the author of this book, for his help and furtherance to the understanding of that heavenly Prophecy," Bernard's work was densely argued and well annotated throughout.<sup>535</sup> Its four major parts discussed, respectively, that the book of Revelation should be studied by a variety of individuals (including Catholics as well as Protestants); that it was not concealed but a "mystery made manifest"; what made the prophecy obscure to some; and a guide to understanding the book, both as a whole and in its parts, including an extensive "interpretation of the most principal and hardest things in every chapter."<sup>536</sup> Bernard ended with appendices that sought to clarify some of Revelation's interpretive puzzles; "The Art of Arithmetic for Papists" provided twenty-two separate ways of calculating the number 666 using various titles or offices of the Pope, and three other charts addressed numbers used in Revelation.

As I suggested in Chapter 3, the form of this work suggested an origin in a series of sermons; however, in its final form it was a well-researched academic work that took a form much more akin to a commentary. Yet there was still a move toward emphasizing the uses of spiritual concepts for each reader. While the meat of the exposition discussed the interpretation of prophecies of events yet to come, the epistles of the work dealt firmly with the present. Bernard's message was clear: in order to usher in the end of days and to be on Christ's victorious

---

<sup>534</sup> On his use of a historical interpretive framework, see Ball, "A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660," 70, and Bernard, *Key*, 123. Bernard made a critical distinction that the *matter* of the book was historical and not allegorical, although the *manner of setting down* the prophecy did use figurative speech "full of Metaphors, and almost altogether Alegorical." On Bernard's exposition of the number of the beast in particular, see David Brady, *The contribution of British writers between 1560 and 1830 to the interpretation of Revelation 13:16-18*, passim.

<sup>535</sup> Bernard, *Key*, n.p. The organization of this list, with its divisions between authors of different eras and different confessions, and his explanation ("Read we may all of all sorts: but in the first place, the best and last of our own, and other reformed Churches; the more ancient, as living in greater darkness, and so not so well seen into this prophecy, in the second place. And the enemies, as perverters, in the last place") echoed the structure of the list of authors recommended for ministers in *The Faithful Shepherd*.

<sup>536</sup> The table of contents indicates that there are five major divisions to the work, but the fifth division on the table is actually Chapter Six under the fourth part.

side, both political and religious leaders needed to give their full efforts over to the struggle against the forces of Antichrist.

A letter Bernard wrote on May 26, 1619 to James Ussher is helpful in explaining why he continued, in the years following *Key*, to publish against the Catholics; more broadly, it helps us understand that not only external events in parish, nation, and world alerted him to this danger, but also that his personal interests and his connections through the godly community affected that which he chose to research, write, and publish.<sup>537</sup> In this letter, he explained that having finished *Key* (regarding which he indicated some previous communication with Ussher<sup>538</sup>) he had begun a second essay revising his position on the first six chapters of Revelation.<sup>539</sup> Though Ussher had not yet completed his *Annals of the World*, even at this early date he was known for his interests in anti-Catholic theology as well as history. He had previously challenged a Jesuit (who declined) to a disputation over the Pope's identification as Antichrist, and his first work, *Gravissimae quaestionis, de Christianarum ecclesiarum...* traced the rise of the Pope as Antichrist, among other historical and theological work.<sup>540</sup>

Bernard was particularly interested in Ussher's comments upon his work (some portion of which he may have sent along with the letter) and his opinions on various interpretations of Revelation:

I have made a second essay upon the six first chapters, which this year hath begun at London. If that course seem good I purpose to go on, if not, I give over. I wish I had your opinion of my rules where I hit or miss in the fore part of my book, the first, second, third, fourth, and especially the fifth and last chapter. I thank you for your pains in setting down your judgment of the woman, the first and second beast, and the false prophet, which I will truly weigh, if so be I go on to take up the prophecy before me, and either I will approve them or else give my best reasons, why not : in this, good Sir, let me beg freedom of spirit, not for any innovation or singularity, my soul knoweth, but that, as I shall by the course of the prophecy be led, I would set down my mind, not neglecting the judgment of any man, much less your's, whom I do much reverence, and whose reasons for the P. Max. draw me not a little after them.<sup>541</sup>

---

<sup>537</sup> Ussher, *Works*, Vol. XVII, 360-363; BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29.

<sup>538</sup> The words "...for that in your letter you lovingly encourage me...indeed I do what I may according to my poor talent. I have gone on in the Revelation, as you see..." seem to indicate Ussher's prior knowledge of this endeavor, along with his encouragements about faithful pastoral ministry, a topic which Bernard addressed in the prior sentences.

<sup>539</sup> He said the work "this year hath begun at London."

<sup>540</sup> Alan Ford, "Ussher, James (1581-1656)," *ODNB*.

<sup>541</sup> Ussher, *Works*, Vol. XVII, 361; BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28v.

Bernard's description of his own intellectual path is striking. By showing the changing and exploratory direction of his writings (the "second essay" Bernard mentions here was almost certainly *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, printed in 1621), this letter provides another important window into the impetus for Bernard's period of anti-Catholic writing. Although the many factors in parish, diocese and nation concerned Bernard, his own intellectual interests and the winding, serendipitous paths of scholarly inquiry also contributed to his authorial choices. His research for one book suggested and fostered investigation into additional research questions, and his record of publications expanded accordingly.

It seems that Bernard had an especially exploratory bent in his approach to publication. With some frequency, it seems, he would begin to write up a particular idea, or even to publish a portion of it, without being certain of the outcome. By following this path, he chose to let various factors, including friends and editors, the market, and (ultimately) providence, influence the course of his future work. Such tendencies were clear not only in his publication of *Dauids Musick*, in which he and R. A. published an exposition of just the first three Psalms with the promise of more if the first book was well received, but also in his explanation to Ussher, above, of his "second essay" in which "If that course seem good I purpose to go on, if not, I give over."<sup>542</sup> By following an open-ended course of research, writing, and publication, Bernard adapted his work to the various influences around him while still pursuing paths he found to be interesting and worthwhile.

This convergence of personal interest and external influences was again apparent in Bernard's description of his publication of his 1619 work, *The Fabulous Foundation of the Popedom*. As he told Ussher:

Whilst my second essay hath begun under authority, I fell to another study, to write a short history of the primitive Church only out of the epistles of St. Paul and the rest, with the seven epistles to the seven churches in Asia; and in looking through the same with the Acts of the Apostles, I know not how, by that time I had ended, a strong conceit came into my mind occasioned from Paul's travels, and the years of his life after his conversion, that Peter was never at Rome. This thought so took me up, that I laboured the point with all my power and helps I could get, first handling the point in a book and answering all the adversaries' arguments, then making a chronological description of Paul's peregrinations by itself. In which in one table I. I set down where Paul was to his death, II. How long he abode in every place, III. Where Peter was at those times, IV. That he could not be at Rome during the time of Paul. When I had finished my labour, and went this lent to Oxford to have a son admitted into a

---

<sup>542</sup> Bernard and R. A., *Dauids Musick*, Sig. A2r-v.

college, I took it with me, the regius professor so liked it, when by some friends I was so moved to present it to him, as I presently allowed it to be published, and so it is out, but truly as yet I have none, neither do I hear that any is openly sold, the stationer's reason I know not. If you get not one before I can send, you shall have one, if cousin K. will cause it to be sent. I beseech you let me hear freely your judgment of it. I have almost a commentary ready upon the book of Ruth. Thus am I doing, to express my thankfulness to God for his mercies, and for my peace; though with these things I have had heavy crosses, which the Lord will mix with his blessings, lest I should forget to walk humbly before him, and loose a special token of his love, for whom he loveth he rebuketh and chastiseth.<sup>543</sup>

Thus, either by coincidence or by a strategic management of his affairs, Bernard was completing his scholarly inquiry against the historical basis for the papacy at just the same time that he went with his son, Channanuel, to Oxford, where he would matriculate at Exeter College.<sup>544</sup>

Although Bernard had attended Cambridge, Oxford was a sensible choice for Channanuel due not only to its geographic proximity to Somerset but also to Bishop Lake's ties to the university (he gave preference to certain Oxford graduates, at least those from New College, in assigning livings in his own diocese).<sup>545</sup> Moreover, both Oxford in general, and Exeter College in particular, were a good fit for someone with theological preferences along the lines of Bernard's. Among other faculty, William Goodwin, John Prideaux, and Sebastian Benefield, prominent Oxford divines to whom Bernard would dedicate his forthcoming publication, shared several of his theological and pastoral concerns.<sup>546</sup> This affinity would certainly have been attractive as he sought teachers for his son's education.<sup>547</sup> On Bernard's account, having brought this

---

<sup>543</sup> Ussher, *Works*, Vol. XVII, 362-363; BOD Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28v-29r. As I discuss in the introduction, the "cousin K." who might send Ussher the book appears to be London printer Felix Kingston, and whom earlier in the letter Bernard more explicitly calls "my kinsman, Mr. Kingston" and who spent time in Ireland. This reference is significant not only because it again emphasizes the role of printers within godly intellectual circles, but also because it suggests a familial link between Bernard and Kingston.

<sup>544</sup> Foster, ed., *Alumni Oxonienses*, 114.

<sup>545</sup> Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 190; "Lake, Arthur (bap. 1567, d. 1626)" *ODNB*; and "Personalities and Politics in Early Stuart England," 1005.

<sup>546</sup> All three dedicatees had pedigrees both of particular importance within the ecclesio-political structure and of conservative and anti-Catholic religious leanings. Goodwin, dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of Oxford, had been chaplain to James and in 1614 had produced the strongly anti-Catholic publication *A sermon preached before the kings most excellent maiestie at Woodstocke*. John Prideaux, also chaplain to James, married Goodwin's daughter, and took a conservative theological stance that "enhanced the college's appeal to Calvinists at home and abroad." Appointed in 1615 as Regius Professor of Divinity, his influence slowed efforts to stem puritanism. Of particular relevance to Bernard's interests with this publication, Prideaux strongly believed and publicly asserted that the Pope was antichrist. Sebastian Benefield was Lady Margaret professor of divinity and an avowed Calvinist, as well. Cf. W. F. Wentworth-Shields, rev. Vivienne Larminie, "Goodwin, William (1555/6-1620)," *ODNB*; A. J. Hegarty, "Prideaux, John (1578-1650)," *ODNB*;

<sup>547</sup> Though Cannanuel likely had input toward selecting a college, we may assume that Bernard held some sway over his son's choice, as well.

manuscript with him to Oxford, Bernard was convinced (not of his own will, he indicated<sup>548</sup>) to show it to Prideaux, a divine known for his insistence that the Pope was Antichrist and who therefore would have been a particularly weighty ally on this topic. It seems Bernard subsequently showed the work to the Calvinists Goodwin and Benefield, as well. To these three men, he wrote in a dedicatory epistle: “What I have done, I need not to preface unto you, who have examined and allowed thereof; but whatsoever it be, I am bold to publish it under your much honored names.”<sup>549</sup> The gratitude Bernard expressed was, no doubt, real; yet readers would realize that he also named them in order to publicly position the work as approved by (and in some senses, as coming from) these well-respected divines. Dedicatory epistles in this period often sought or acknowledged the protection of a patron whose name might help its sale or acceptability, and Bernard was no stranger to this.<sup>550</sup> Here, he used the names, and by extension the real and perceived theological expertise, of these divines to bolster his own, and the work’s, credibility.

Having received the approval of *Fabulous Foundation* from these divines and also apparently having been referred or recommended to the university printer by them for the publication of this work, the publication appeared in 1619.<sup>551</sup> Though the work addressed something of an academic topic, its form made it suitable for a popular audience. That is, following a “summary of the reasons, proving Peter never to have been at Rome” listing twenty propositions and a strongly-worded conclusion supporting them, the text adopted a more popularly-accessible dialogic format. This main portion of the text was entitled “A familiar conference betwixt two faithful friends Philalethes and Orthologus, to show, that it cannot be proved that Peter was ever at Rome.”<sup>552</sup> Though much of the output of the Oxford press at this time included academic works and sermons, it did at times produce works intended for a broader

---

<sup>548</sup> This passage in the letter to Ussher is markedly similar to epistles to the reader in several contemporary works, wherein an author asserts that he was not seeking publication of his own, but was pressed to do so by the insistence of friends.

<sup>549</sup> Bernard, *Fabulous Foundation*, Sig. ¶2r.

<sup>550</sup> While many of Bernard’s dedications were to influential laypeople, he also regularly wrote dedicatory epistles that used the name of a bishop, and once addressed Charles I himself.

<sup>551</sup> Bernard’s note to Ussher that the work was published but not sold, at least initially, is curious; it is not clear why this occurred. It could have something to do with the brevity of publisher William Spier’s time as an Oxford bookseller; see Barwick, *A book bound for Mary Queen of Scots*, 48; and Madan, *Oxford Books*, 298, 311, 312.

<sup>552</sup> Bernard, *Fabulous Foundation*, 1. The names could be roughly represented as “friend of truth” and “reasonable.” The two mention additional individuals named Theophilus (friend of God) and Pseudadoxus (false glory) and Pseudocatholicus (false Catholic) and Theodidactus (God-taught).

audience.<sup>553</sup> Nevertheless, this work of Bernard's was a particularly stark blend of styles associated with polemic and of conventions of popular devotional works. As such, it was a way of making important theological issues available and understandable for a wide audience—indicating that Bernard saw debates about Catholic teachings not only as high-level issues for scholars but also as important for the edification of a broad range of less-educated parishioners.

The epistle to the reader in this work expected opposition, and in this regard can be read as almost tentative, although without apology. His language here certainly seems more aware of potential opponents than the language he had used years prior in *Separatists Schisme*; perhaps his earlier difficulty taught him something about the importance of moderating his tone in controversial works. Further, there is an interesting contrast between the tone in the epistle, which anticipated something of a polemical style, and the actual content of the work, which used the familiar rhetorical technique of a dialogue between friends rather than the pointed argumentation of most polemics. This rhetorical choice was useful, allowing him to take as his basis a careful set of propositions, and to address certain high-level intellectual questions (for instance, the authority and reliability of antiquity<sup>554</sup>) while retaining an offensive rather than defensive stance about his topic. In other words, Bernard framed the debate in such a way that there was no real disagreement: both his characters come to the same conclusions. Though this is not entirely unusual—for instance, his devotional book *A Weekes Work* contains a dialogue between John the apostle and an eager Christian learner—it was less typical, but extremely effective, for a work containing controversial material. Here, the enemy was not an individual Catholic, but ignorance; accordingly, readers could defeat the error not by facing off against opponents from the other religion but by the (perhaps) easier task of educating themselves and others about theological errors, just as Philaethes wished to do. This technique allowed Bernard to correct not only Catholics, but also Protestants, who might have been misled on this point—and to do both without having to set up opposing sides of a debate. This choice of a

---

<sup>553</sup> Consider, for example, Hungerford, *The advise of a sonne*.

<sup>554</sup> Aware of the significance of addressing the truth, held by tradition, that Peter was the head of the church at Rome, Bernard began by addressing the reliability of antiquity; he concluded that it had two divisions. Although “true antiquity” always agreed with verity, false antiquity may err. Bernard, *Fabulous Foundation*, 2-3. To support his claims, he showed that early writers also questioned Peter's claims to Rome. Following this, Bernard established that it must matter for the existence of the papacy that Peter was in Rome (which Bellarmine had not accepted). Then, drawing not only from the New Testament but from other historians and ecclesiastical authors, Bernard analyzed the lives of Peter and Paul, demonstrating their whereabouts (which, for Peter, did not include Rome) at various times; he concurrently provided objections for previous interpretations which did place Peter at Rome. Finally, Bernard added a few pages to the work about Paul's life, showing that his reputed last peregrination from, and then back to, Rome is likewise unsubstantiated.

dialogic technique was not merely rhetorical. Rather, it reflected the balance Bernard sought between addressing issues of concern before an educated, ecclesiastical audience and before a popular or parish audience. Many of the same popular concerns about Catholicism, as well as the same popular leanings toward Catholic doctrine, that Bernard noted in *Staffe of Comfort* would have continued to receive his attention as he wrote *Fabulous Foundation*; in particular, many of his parishioners would have believed that Peter established the papacy. By framing this work in a way that was accessible for a less educated audience, Bernard could provide a way for parishioners to refute certain aspects of Catholic doctrine and, simultaneously, display the complex and helpful fruits of his research before an educated audience.

Of course, Bernard could not always kill two birds with one publication. In his letter to Ussher, as he set out his conclusions about Peter's travels and asked for input on certain portions of anti-Catholic works, Bernard mentioned that his commentary on Ruth was almost ready. This was almost certainly *Ruths Recompence*, a work based upon a series of sermons he preached in the late 1610s but which would not see print until the late 1620s. As I suggested in Chapter 3, the sermons on which this work was based may have been intended as a sort of contextualization for and warning about the Spanish Match. Royal directions prohibiting discussion of these policies would have kept it from print until, years later, Bernard published a version that omitted overt political references.

The years following 1619 were productive for Bernard, and in them he continued to develop his course of anti-Catholic publishing alongside his devotional printing and parish work. In 1621, he completed some work on pastoral and devotional publications: he amended his earlier publication *The Faithful Shepherd* and also produced a very brief devotional work, *The Good Mans Grace* (see Chapter 3). The latter contained several ways to help readers better comprehend and meditate upon the Lord's prayer. It was mostly pastoral and devotional, but a section at the end did indicate a particular concern with Catholicism over and above other incorrect religious programs.

Although the format of *Good Mans Grace* was different in style from Bernard's other publications, it addressed similar pastoral goals to those he emphasized throughout his ministry, and also acted as something of a complement to his catechetical works. It demonstrated how that passage of Scripture could be used as a framework for devotional activity; and it focused upon the Lord's prayer in order to help "those that know it not" to understand it, meditate on it,

and use it to guide life and prayer. Like *Contemplative Pictures*, it encouraged meditation largely by example: here, that included such assistance as a rhyming exposition of the Lord's prayer and an exemplary prayer that demonstrated how one might turn the biblical text into a more extensive contemporary prayer. Yet while *Good Man's Grace* encouraged meditation by providing several different ways to think about the Lord's prayer—poetry, exposition, and sample applications—it was unlike *Contemplative Pictures* in that it used practical and theological language that avoided imagination and metaphor. Although the work displayed some creativity in composition—and especially in its presentation of three different ways to consider the prayer—even its most poetic portion was largely doctrinal:

*And lead us not*  
By laying objects before us.  
In the danger so leaving us.  
And by withdrawing grace from us.  
*Into temptation,*  
Satans powerful suggestion.  
Natures wretched corruption.  
This present world's pollution.  
*But deliver us*  
By thy Divine inspiration.  
By inward sanctification.  
By a holy conversation.  
*From evil,*  
Past, by freely remitting.  
Present, by powerful protecting.  
Future, by grace preventing.<sup>555</sup>

Considering such portions of the work, it is clear that although its style was unique among Bernard's corpus, its content was not. Even in this work which stretched the boundaries of genre and page formatting within devotional literature, he continued to follow the trends of moving away from imaginative writing and focusing on equipping believers for godliness. It attempted to achieve the goals of exhorting readers to know key passages of the Bible, to apply them to life, and to live in a godly way (which included leading those in one's household toward godliness as appropriate). These goals, which Bernard had for his parish ministry, featured strongly in all of his devotional publications. *The Faithful Shepherd*, Bernard explained that one of the central duties of a pastor was to ensure that his parishioners understood key doctrines. By working to

---

<sup>555</sup> Bernard, *Good Mans Grace*, n.p.



achieve this in his parish and by producing print works such as *Good Mans Grace*, Bernard pursued that duty in both arenas.

*Good Mans Grace* also included a brief “admonitory conclusion” identifying ten types of iniquity and explaining how one may depart from each. Although each type of iniquity was discussed at similar length (two paragraphs), Bernard’s language against “papism” was more strongly worded than the other nine iniquities; for instance, it was the only one he described as being “of the bottomless pit.”<sup>556</sup> By comparing this passage against Catholicism with the other warnings, it was clear that although he intended to provide a broad-based directory of errors, any of which might trouble readers of this popular devotional work; yet at the time of writing it appears Bernard was most concerned about the particularly insidious danger of Catholicism. Consider, for example, the tone of the passage against schism in comparison with the passage against Catholicism:

The seventh is schism, which is an uncharitable disunion, and an unlawful separation from the true Church of Christ, or any true member of the same, forsaking the fellowship of the Saints willfully in a factiousness of spirit making unlawful assemblies within and among themselves.

We depart from this iniquity, when we condemn such an unchristian division, and do know and acknowledge the true congregations of Gods people, abiding with them, keeping among you the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace.

...

The tenth is papism, which is man’s superstitious invention, a counterfeit Christianity, unchristianly judaizing, and wickedly imitating the heathenish idolaters, teaching old heresies, and the professors thereof practicing, by Machiavellian policies, all deceit, treachery, treason, and merciless cruelties to uphold the same.

We depart from this iniquity of the bottomless pit, when we disclaim that Antichrist of Rome as the Head, & the Romish Church, as it now stands, as the whore of Babylon, and being come out from her, shall zealously uphold and maintain this truth, and faith which we now stand in, unto the end, which God grant. Amen.<sup>557</sup>

Altogether, one can view *Good Mans Grace* as reflecting many of Bernard’s pastoral and theological aims from this period. While he continued to write and preach on topics of general religious knowledge (and particularly on strengthening readers’ and parishioners’ comprehension of catechetical material), at the conclusion he also suggested his particular concern with Catholicism during this period.

---

<sup>556</sup> Bernard, *Good Mans Grace*, Sig. C2r ff.

<sup>557</sup> Bernard, *Good Mans Grace*, Sig. C4r ff.

Yet we learn most about Bernard’s anti-Catholic agenda from places in which he addressed it directly—something he did again in this same year. Under the title *Seaven Golden Candlestickes...*, Bernard produced four related treatises which were published as one work. Each treatise took a different approach toward Catholicism, with special attention to the ways that England could and should work to foster the defeat of evil. His first treatise, about which he had previously written to Ussher requesting input, expounded the letters to the churches that he had mentioned in the epistle to readers in *Key*. Bernard defended the theological position that the churches represent different eras in church history (which “is not a conceit, but an opinion more than probable”).<sup>558</sup> For each church, he provided a side-by-side view of the passage and its antitypical interpretation, which was largely an informative or academic exercise, followed by a brief passage of “considerations for instruction and use” which echoed the sermonic convention of helping hearers understand how a doctrine should change their personal thoughts, attitudes, or activities.<sup>559</sup> Through his expositions, he traced not only the progress of the true gospel but also the progress of the forces of evil—interpreted generally as the progress of Catholicism and papal authority. Though he kept international (primarily European) events in mind, latter portions of his interpretation become more Anglo-centric, especially as he dated the shift between the fifth and sixth churches from the death of Mary I and the ascension of Elizabeth in 1558. It is noteworthy that in his earlier letter about the work, Bernard requested Ussher’s particular attention to the fifth and sixth chapters—apparently the analyses of the fifth and sixth churches in which he had given a particularly prominent place to England. Bernard perhaps justified his somewhat novel interpretation on the grounds that preceding generations would have been unable to correlate historical details with these prophecies until after they occurred; nevertheless, this novelty seems also to have produced a desire for corroboration of his interpretation from a respected divine. Bernard also mentioned to Ussher that he began the second essay “under authority.” It is not clear precisely what this meant, but it again suggests some caution in interpretation and writing.

---

<sup>558</sup> Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, Sig. A3v-Sig. Br.

<sup>559</sup> Thus, although the antitype of the letter to Ephesus appeared in the patristic period of church history, Bernard’s readers could still observe several principles for their own lives, such as “Where God soweth the seed of his Word by his apostles, there Satan would thirst [thrust?] in his false apostle to sow tares” and “That excellent men may decay in their first love...that even the decay of love may cause God to remove his candlestick, except men repent.” Thus, while Bernard’s readers could not change history, they could attempt to see their own actions and situations in light of the patterns in which God regularly worked, which would provide both encouragement in trials and correction to disobedience. Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, n.p.

Seeing the present state of the church as falling within the Philadelphian era, Bernard noted that Catholic forces:

...by their Tridentine Council, by their seminary priests, by their conspiracies, treacheries, treason, and raising of rebellion in England and Ireland; by their murdering of princes, by their bloody persecutions in France, and most cruel massacre, by their Spanish invasion, by their hellish gunpowder-plot have not been able to hinder [the progress of the gospel].<sup>560</sup>

Encouraging believers to continue their faithful pursuit of Christ and continue seeking that God would subdue their enemies, Bernard saw this state as the “height of excellency and glory” that the church would achieve. Following this state, Bernard explained that there would be a yet-future state of outward peace, but in which there would be significant decay of inward godly religion. Although individuals would have opportunity to repent of their “luke-warmness” toward God, following this state Christ would return as judge at the end of the age. In his conclusion, Bernard gave particular attention again to the (current) Philadelphian state, in which:

...the Gospel hath gotten free passage and must get; for Christ hath opened, and none can shut, howsoever the Adversary may attempt to hinder and endeavor to overthrow the professors of the Gospel: yet shall these our enemies be overcome, and be made at last to submit unto us; sure it is that great trials shall be...but certain it is, that the Church God will preserve, and make her renowned, and this will he do shortly...<sup>561</sup>

On the heels of this triumphalist, militant approach to the contemporary state of Christian history, Bernard’s next three treatises within *Seaven Golden Candlestickes* attempted to persuade readers to participate in the defeat of antichristian forces and suggested ways to do so. For Bernard, Revelation was not simply about identifying God’s activities, but about persuading Christians to join with Christ in triumphing over evil. Thus, the second treatise, “The Honor of England,” attempted to hearten readers by demonstrating the special blessings that God had given England, which were “to encourage us still in his service against that Antichristian power.”<sup>562</sup> In the next treatise, “The great mystery of Gods mercie,” he traced the history of the Jews in light of the doctrine that the world would not end until the conversion of the Jews, and

---

<sup>560</sup> Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, n.p.

<sup>561</sup> Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, n.p. As evidence, Bernard makes reference to the fact that comets, since Luther’s time, had been harbingers of this coming victory. There is evidence of significant comet activity during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which was not only noted by scientists but also came into popular discourse through literature; Levy, *The Sky in Early Modern English Literature*, 13ff. On a 1618 comet noted by a relative of minister John White (a friend of Bernard’s), see Whiteway, *Diary*, 13, 23.

<sup>562</sup> Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, Sig. A3v.

noted that the idolatrous Catholics were hindering this Jewish return to the faith.<sup>563</sup> Arguing that the Bible clearly foretold this event, he suggested that “so much for the honor of Christ and our good, let us use such means as may further [the conversion of the Jews], even also in compassion to their poor souls, and our mutual solace together” and exhorted believers to pray to this end, to send them information which might help convert them, and to labor to remove the Catholic threat, which was “the main let” hindering their conversion.<sup>564</sup>

The final section of the book, “Peace to the pure in heart,” displayed particularly clearly the way in which Bernard’s concern was more narrowly aimed at Catholicism than it had been in earlier periods. This portion of *Seaven Golden Candlestickes* was, essentially, a republication of his earlier “Christian Advertisements and Counsels of Peace,” but now with a new and explicitly anti-Catholic gloss. This treatise had been published in 1608 as the introductory portion of *Separatists Schisme*. Its contents in both publications were, largely, the same, emphasizing the importance of godly behavior and charity when engaging others in theological debate. Yet where in 1608 this was clearly applied toward the debate over separatism in which he and his opponents were engaged, in 1621 it was applied as a warning in an anti-Catholic context: engaging wrongly in intra-Protestant feuding could weaken Protestant forces against their primary enemy, the Catholic church. Or in other words, as the second portion of the section title explained, the treatise gave “good advice to walk wisely, to preserve unity among ourselves, that our united forces may be stronger against the common enemy.”<sup>565</sup> The structure of the 1621 version was reorganized in such a way that nested lists were reduced and subheads increased, which made the revised version somewhat easier to read than the 1608 version. Given that the works were written over a decade apart and that in the intervening time Bernard had experimented with the structure of instructional works (such as *Dauids Musick*) and had been working on a thorough revision of another early work (*Faithfull Shepheard*), it is not surprising that he might alter the presentation.

Yet it is very significant that here he also altered the purpose of the work toward Catholicism; his alterations in both the content and the structure of the work reflected this. For

---

<sup>563</sup> Several authors have noted the significance of early modern English theological positions on the eschatological situation of Jews. Among other works, see Crome, “Friendship and enmity to God and nation,” 750ff. Crome mentions several theologians, including Brightman, whose work Bernard discussed in *Key*.

<sup>564</sup> He explained that the Catholics were a hindrance because Jews “detest idolatry”: to see (Catholic) Christians practice idolatry, was a stumbling block to them.

<sup>565</sup> Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, n.p.,

instance, he added the new section title “How to avoid popery, schism, and uncharitable contentions among one another,” which broke up a section and also, importantly, listed popery first. The primary additions to the text were in the introduction and conclusion to the work. Although this version added more errors in the list that appeared in the work (and thus still placed Catholicism as one among many problems), the new sections were predominantly anti-Catholic and clearly emphasized the Catholic church as the true (Protestant) church’s primary foe. Among these changes, the following new section now appeared at the end, concluding the work with a call to follow a teaching of peace, toward the specific end of creating unity against the Catholic forces:

Dost thou not behold the times? We have among us the Pseudo-Catholics, are they not crafty foxes? Division they seek to hold on foot; they know, a Kingdom divided against itself, cannot stand. By union they strengthen themselves, by dis-union we grow weak. If we support one another in love, their enmity can do us no harm. They are subtle; our innocency is not enough, but we had need to be as wise as Serpents; and let us labor to be of one mind, that we may jointly turn our forces against them.<sup>566</sup>

Altogether, through 1621 Bernard acknowledged that eschatological triumph had not yet arrived (the church was, as he had suggested, only in the penultimate prophetic state). Yet his anti-Catholic works to this point had something of a positive, victorious tone; the church was in the process of conquering its enemies. As the dedicatory epistles to *Key* had emphasized, local authorities could more effectively deal with church-papists and recusants, and the state could take a stronger position against the international forces of Catholic religion, but to do so was possible. Or again, as *Fabulous Foundation* reflected, it was clear that there were still wrong beliefs about the Pope, but as the title emphasized, these were mere fables—and as the contents suggested, they could be corrected even by a brief dialogue that was fit for a wide audience of readers. Moreover, true Christians, as the final section of *Seaven Golden Candlestickes* reminded readers, needed only to stand faithfully, avoid internal controversies, and order to together work toward the defeat of Rome. Bernard’s perception of the state of the church was not rose-colored, but through 1621 it was, overall, optimistic and ready for war.

---

<sup>566</sup> Bernard, *Seaven Golden Candlestickes*, Sig. I3r.

## Catholicism as a key, but a fraught, concern, 1622-1626

Yet while Bernard's eschatology taught him that Christ (and his Protestant church) would be victorious in the end, the battle was still raging—and some events of 1622 and 1623 suggested that the Protestants had begun losing some important ground. Though the godly would appreciate certain policies in 1624 that moved England against Spain, altogether the years following 1622 looked more tumultuous and less promising for Protestant interests than previous years had. Moreover, the successes (or potential successes) of Catholic interests in this period were coupled in England with the advance of anti-Calvinist interests. Though Calvinist and anti-Calvinist factions had been at odds for decades, in the late 1610s and early 1620s royal favor began to shift toward the latter.<sup>567</sup> As such, godly members of the church had to worry not only about the forces of Antichrist but also the forces of compromise and theological confusion within their own church.

We can identify a concordant shift in Bernard's approach to the public defense of puritan and of anti-Catholic positions in his post-1621 publications. Though *Staffe of Comfort* had acknowledged individuals' personal struggles with belief in Catholic or Protestant doctrine, his writings of 1617 and 1621 were largely focused upon encouraging Protestants to join the battle against Catholics in *external* ways by attempting to eradicate their influence in English society and battle against Catholic powers. Following 1622, Bernard's works became less attentive to political policy and more to ideas—both to the personal beliefs of lay readers, and to the intellectual arguments that could stand against Catholics' theological assertions. This change, I will show, reflected and responded to several developments.

In 1622, the castle of the Protestant Frederick (husband to the English princess, Elizabeth) was stormed by Catholic forces, and shortly later his electorate was transferred to Bavaria.<sup>568</sup> For this and other reasons, the defeat of Catholic political powers was proving to be no foregone conclusion. Closer to home, there were continued friendly overtures from the English political establishment toward Catholic nations, particularly related to the Spanish match. Moreover, several powerful and visible English Protestants were questioning or abandoning their faith—

---

<sup>567</sup> Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 48-49; Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution*, 6-53; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*;

<sup>568</sup> Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution*, 1.

including the influential Countess of Buckingham and her family.<sup>569</sup> The Buckingham family chaplain John Percy (*alias* Fisher) was no stranger to religious controversy, and had for many years been telling Protestants, in print and in person, that their church did not exist before Luther's time. These questions were brought to the fore in May, 1622, when Percy was invited to debate Francis White, James I, and the future Archbishop Laud on this topic. Notably, Daniel Featley, who would have been a clear choice to debate Percy, was not chosen—a move that even at this relatively early date indicated a royal shift away from favoring a Calvinist theological orientation; this would increase and become clearer over coming years.<sup>570</sup> Details of this conference and the king's involvement were somewhat slow to emerge, though manuscript accounts circulated before the print ones of 1624 and later.

In 1623, *The Fisher caught in his own net*, a print account of another debate in which Percy had participated, was circulating.<sup>571</sup> This debate had been informally held in June 1623 at the home of Humphrey Linde, where Percy and John Sweet had debated—or attempted to debate—Daniel Featley and Francis White. As the published account had it, the encounter consisted mainly of arguments about the structure of the questions at hand and the way in which to proceed. In particular, the Catholics wanted the Protestants to produce a list of names of Protestants from the first century on, and the Protestants (particularly Featley) wanted first to establish a syllogistic, logical framework for a broader argument about the truth of Protestantism. Neither side left satisfied.

Because the disputants never reached the meat of the debate, the description of the event in *Fisher caught* did not provide an answer to this the Catholics' charge that the Protestants produce a list of “names, names, names” establishing their church's pedigree. Further, it appears that many laypeople were discussing these issues among themselves, often leading to confusion and personal crises of faith. Protestant authors had answered Percy some years earlier in large, academic works, but the average layperson would have been unaware of, or unable to fully understand, much of this material. In other words, through early 1623, no clear and direct

---

<sup>569</sup> On the Buckingham-Villers family conversions, and on the Percy (“Fisher”) debates more broadly, see three works by Timothy H. Wadkins: “The Percy- ‘Fisher’ Controversies”; “Theological polemic and religious culture in early Stuart England”; and “Percy [*alias* Fisher], John (1569-1641),” *ODNB*. On the feel of Catholic “triumphalism” and the conversion of leading Protestants see Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics*, 49.

<sup>570</sup> I am grateful to Greg Salazar for bringing Bernard's connection with Percy to my attention and for sharing his work in progress with me. His forthcoming work on the Percy-Featley debate will place the event in its religious and political contexts.

<sup>571</sup> *The Fisher caught in his owne net* (n.p., 1623).

answer to the Catholic suggestion that Protestantism was novel (and therefore wrong) had been available to the popular reading audience.

In his role as author-minister concerned with the souls of England's Protestants, Bernard responded within the year with a relatively brief, popularly accessible answer to Percy's challenge. He published *Looke Beyond Luther*, a work defending against the charge that Protestantism was novel and providing "sound props to bear up honest-hearted Protestants, that they fall not from their saving faith."<sup>572</sup> It was licensed by Featley himself—not unusual in that Featley licensed several of Bernard's publications, but noteworthy due to Featley's involvement in the controversy. In this publication, following a dedicatory epistle focused largely upon providing reasons that Catholicism could not be true, Bernard argued that the Protestant faith was not a new development, but rather had existed in the Scriptures, the hearts of God's people, and the books of godly writers from the beginning of Christian history. Bernard then added three additional arguments, showing that the Church of Rome itself has given evidence that key portions of Protestant belief (e.g. those presented in the Apostles' Creed) were true; that the non-Catholic monks before the coming of Augustine to the British Isles held to true doctrines, and that God Himself had defended it as true by stopping the spread of Catholic forces.

In the first portion of the work, Bernard proceeded to demonstrate the academic and theological solidity of his position, but in a way that would be largely understandable to a broad range of readers. Rather than attempting to reply polemically to a particular treatise, Bernard responded only to one charge—that of identifying the Protestant faith before Luther—and from there proceeded positively to create his own argument. It is noteworthy here that he crafted his arguments according to a logical structure. Featley's insistence upon logic as a formal, academic way of proving one's position had figured largely in *Fisher caught*. Bernard may have realized that a bow to this academic formula was not merely a good way to proceed, but would also provide a measure of popular respect for his arguments.

In the second portion of the work, Bernard turned from an academic to a pastoral tone. Writing much more conversationally, he sought to equip his readers to respond in their own lives to charges that their acquaintances might suggest to them about the Catholic faith—or, failing that, at least to keep their own faith from being shaken. In this, he particularly emphasized that Protestants did not need to gain formal knowledge in order to refute the Catholics' assertions;

---

<sup>572</sup> Bernard, *Looke Beyond Luther*. He was answered briefly in *A Reply to D. VWhite and D. Featly*, 19-22.



rather, they could stand firm against all possible charges using merely information that they knew from the catechism, including Lord's prayer, decalogue, and creed. Though he had in the first section of the work shown that it was possible to refute adversaries using an academic, logical approach, he did not expect that his readers would do so in their own conversations. Rather, they could respond merely in faith with what they did know. In addition, he emphasized the importance of turning doubt back on the Catholic faith. He suggested that readers:

...demand of them [Catholics], and put them to prove, whether Christ and his Apostles taught, and all the rest there mentioned, did learn and practice, all that the Church of Rome now doth? If they can show this but in the first hundred of years, profess thou to be satisfied, and not to require farther after a continual succession in the Ages following. Press this home to them; stand only upon this; this is plain dealing, to begin with them, where they begin. And if they will not endeavor to satisfy thee in this, certainly the Catalogue of the names of Christ, of his Apostles, and the rest in the Primitive Church, are put only in the forefront to cozen thee, if they can.<sup>573</sup>

Altogether, in *Looke Beyond Luther* Bernard as a faithful minister acted both as an apologist and as a pastor, instructing readers not only how to attack their own anxieties but also how to debate with an opponent—which, if the opponent failed to engage, would further strengthen the resolve of the Protestant. Very intentionally, he catalogued specific points of doctrine that could mislead a Protestant by suggesting that “They will tell thee” or “They teach” and then explained why such statements were contrary to the truth—seeking to equip readers at all intellectual levels to keep the faith.

If *Key* and *Seaven Golden Candlestickes* had demonstrated Bernard's keen interest in the progress of the gospel on a large scale, *Looke Beyond Luther* showed his continued pastoral care for individual readers who might be of weak faith. Yet at the same time, the work gained a reception among certain powerful individuals within the church; in his 1624 *Catalogus Protestantium*, a work that had a similar purpose to *Looke Beyond Luther*, George Webbe listed Bernard's work on this topic alongside that of Augustine, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others:

“Papists...challenging us to show where our Church, where our religion was in former times? Which challenge of theirs howsoever it hath been answered to the full at divers times, by divers learned Worthies in our Church...the most part of the books which of late come from the press, are written of this subject...”<sup>574</sup>

---

<sup>573</sup> Bernard, *Looke Beyond Luther*, 39. This also reflected one of the strains of Featley's argument from the Percy debate.

<sup>574</sup> Webbe, *Catalogus Protestantium*, 3. Later Bishop of Limerick, Webbe was serving in Bath when Bernard in 1621 named him as one his godly ministers in the area in the dedicatory epistle to the revised *Faithfull Shephard*. Webbe himself was an author-minister whose corpus contains an interesting variety of works.

In this way, parish and national concerns, and both lay and clerical readerships, became intertwined. One work could address multiple audiences, and attention to the spread of the gospel among individual believers could also lead to the spread of the gospel in the aggregate. Bernard's personal and pastoral duties—both in parish and in print towards a popular audience—were not divorced from his larger goals for the church. These sets of goals were inseparably interrelated.

Yet beyond these theological purposes related to defending Protestantism, we also detect in *Looke Beyond Luther* a growing awareness that Bernard's particular brand of anti-Catholicism (that is, a puritan approach strongly opposed to any vestiges of Catholic practice) and his theological orientation toward Calvinism were falling increasingly out of favor. Bernard was aware of the Directions Concerning Preachers, which stipulated that:

...no preacher...shall causelessly, and without invitation from the text, fall into better invectives, and indecent railing speeches against the persons of either papist or puritans; but modestly and gravely...free both the doctrine and discipline of the church of England from the aspersions of either adversary, especially when the auditory is suspected to be tainted with the one or the other infection.<sup>575</sup>

In a characteristic move (see Chapters 4 and 7), it appears that Bernard decided to respond to these restrictions by continuing to print by combining a formal adherence to the instructions of his superiors with continued attempts to publish on issues he felt were of key theological import. In *Looke Beyond Luther*, he accomplished this harmony in several ways. First, he avoided “invectives” and “railing speeches” not merely by moderating his tone but also by avoiding any mention of specific current events or names. In *Looke Beyond Luther*, Bernard did not draw attention to Percy himself nor any of his Protestant adversaries. Rather, he made reference to a vaguely defined group of Catholic scholars who had been answered by Protestant authors. Further, the main enemy was not a particular Catholic but rather the idle and uninformed conversation of lay Catholics who were, by the description Bernard suggested, accosting unsuspecting Protestants with confusion and disorder. By setting up *Looke Beyond Luther* as a corrective to uninformed and disorderly lay conversations, Bernard was able not merely to follow the letter of the law by avoiding polemic, but indeed to further its spirit by attempting to keep laypeople from contentious debate. Yet from his perspective, he was furthering the purposes of

---

<sup>575</sup>James I, “Directions concerning preachers,” 150.

godly religion by equipping Protestants to stand firm in their faith. This context was not lost on readers; one copy of *Looke Beyond Luther* in the Beinecke library has, in a contemporary hand, a sentence noting its connection with Henry Rogers's *An answer to Mr. Fisher the Iesuite, his five propositions concerning Luther*.<sup>576</sup>

In the early 1620s, English Catholic printer and author John Heigham had published *The Gagge of the Reformed Gospell*, a work attempting to use passages from the English Protestants' version of the Bible to prove the veracity of Catholic teachings. Though the work gained a reasonable reception and readership (a second edition appeared in 1623), it became well known primarily because of the reply to it that Richard Mountague published in 1624, entitled *A Gagg for the new Gospell? No: A New Gagg for An Old Goose*.<sup>577</sup> Though purportedly a reply against Heigham, Mountague's work actually targeted puritans who, he asserted, actually drove people from the Church of England due to their determined anti-Catholicism. Moreover, much to the chagrin of godly readers, Mountague suggested various points of agreement between the Church of Rome and the Church of England—which he narrowly defined as being non-Calvinist. In doing this, as Peter Lake has argued, Mountague was performing “an exercise in the polemical manipulation of the king's religious and political susceptibilities” in which his arguments sought to strengthen James's opposition to religious war and simultaneously “dismiss as Puritans those people clamouring for war and denouncing the Spanish match in pulpit and parliament.”<sup>578</sup> There has been a good amount of scholarship investigating various aspects of this controversy, including its role in fomenting a divide between godly, Calvinist/puritan members of the national church, and Arminian members of the church who emphasized “Laudian” forms of worship and were more willing to compromise with parts of Catholic practice.<sup>579</sup> These issues became quite controversial and were hashed out not only in print—for instance in the pointed 1626 publication of Anthony Wotton, who decried Mountague's attempt to bring both Arminianism and Catholicism to the national church—but also in personal activities—for instance a 1626

---

<sup>576</sup> BEI Mhc5 B456 L87, *Looke Beyond Luther* (1624).

<sup>577</sup> The title page continued: “Who would needs undertake to stop all Protestants mouths for ever, with 276 places out of their owne English Bibles. Or An Answer to a late Abridger of Controversies, and Belyar [belieer?] of the Protestants Doctrine.”

<sup>578</sup> Lake, “Calvinism and the English Church,” 71.

<sup>579</sup> On the broader controversy, among several works, see Foster, *The Long Argument*, 128-134; Lambert, “Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship”; Lake, “Calvinism and the English Church”; Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*; Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 159-200; Tyacke, “The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered”; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*, 215-236; and Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 62-69, 194; Scheck, “The Polemics of John Heigham and Richard Montagu,” and Walsham and Milton, “Concerning recusancie.”

lecture by Prideaux that did not name Mountague but was in “the form of a systematic refutation point-by-point of the arguments and supporting citations” in *Apello Caesarem*.<sup>580</sup>

Bernard, too, had a hand in this controversy, although this has not been discussed so extensively by scholars. In 1626, he published *Rhemes Against Rome: Or, the Remooving of the Gagg of the New Gospell*, a publication which rebutted several of Heigham’s claims and often provided a verse-by-verse refutation of the scriptures Heigham used to establish his points.<sup>581</sup> Yet it did not follow Heigham precisely: Bernard expanded his argument on points he believed were significant, and chose not to address certain other points—a practice he defended in the epistle to the reader.<sup>582</sup> Moreover (and importantly, as I will suggest), he also rearranged the order of certain issues, placing questions of salvation toward the end of his work.

By this time certain attacks on Catholicism had become somewhat limited by governmental statute.<sup>583</sup> Although Bernard could have decided to publish only upon a reading of Heigham, the current ecclesio-political climate of concessions to Catholicism was not necessarily welcoming to anti-Catholic works by the mid-1620s. Further, Heigham’s work had been out for some time before Mountague replied, and Bernard did not enter the fray until even later. For these reasons, we should conclude that Bernard must have composed *Rhemes Against Rome* with knowledge of Mountague’s work.

One should read *Rhemes Against Rome* not simply as a response to Heigham but also—and more importantly—as a response to Mountague. As such, we can see it as something of a godly corrective to the position of the anti-Calvinist establishment; just as Featley’s debate with Percy in 1623 had offered a godly counterbalance to the royal debate the previous year, so here Bernard’s response to Heigham offered a godly alternative to Mountague’s better-known and royally-favored response.

---

<sup>580</sup> Wotton, *A Dangerous Plot Discovered*. Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England,” 649.

<sup>581</sup> Richard Bernard, *Rhemes Against Rome*. The work was licensed on 27 June 1625, but as the publication date on the title page is 1626, it seems not to have been published until at least the following March (a reason for the delay is unclear). The work was licensed by Goade and Lownes. Mountague suspected Goade of being part of a group that drew up articles accusing him of Arminianism and Roman Catholicism; Goade also licensed Samuel Ward’s 1626 sermon attacking Mountague’s views. Elizabeth Allen, “Goade, Thomas,” *ODNB*. In 1624, Blackmore, one of two publishers for *Rhemes*, sold an anonymous work with a similar title: *A gagge for the Pope, and the Iesuits*.

<sup>582</sup> Bernard, *Rhemes Against Rome*, Sig. a2v.

<sup>583</sup> Tightening of governmental strictures about ministers’ activities and authors’ publications included not only the 1622 *Directions Concerning Preachers* but also the 1624 *Proclamation against Seditious, Popish, and Puritanicall Bookes and Pamphlets*.

At the very least, through *Rhemes Against Rome*, Bernard demonstrated dissatisfaction with Mountague's attempt to refute Heigham. By publishing an alternative work, he implicitly asserted that previous attempts to refute *Gagge* were insufficient. In particular, he showed that the way to oppose Catholics was not to affirm similarities as Mountague had, but rather to beat them at their own game. Heigham's main point was that the Protestants' English translation of the Scriptures proved the truth of Catholicism; Bernard cleverly inverted this, arguing that the Catholics' English translation of the Scriptures (Douay-Rheims) actually refuted Catholic doctrine. As he proceeded, Bernard used careful exposition not to correct Heigham's assertions about the Church of England (as Mountague had) but rather to challenge his statements about the Church of Rome.

Yet beyond merely attempting to craft a more effective reply to Heigham than Mountague had done, *Rhemes Against Rome* was also pressing more particularly against the content of Mountague's work itself. The hints of this critique were vague but suggestive—which, due to Bernard's position in the church, were all he could have mustered without receiving strict censures from above. First, he used an interesting analogy in the advertisement to the reader. Styling himself as David, he explained:

True it is, that my principal calling and daily endeavor is (like David's in his minority) to keep and attend sheep in the country, my furniture is rather the crook and scrip, than the sword or sling. Yet if wild beasts range and ravage among our flocks, we are awaked to stretch forth our hands, are rescue our Lambs...<sup>584</sup>

That is, he was content in his work as a parish minister who tended his own flock unless there was a danger that crept in unnoticed. With the analogous danger, clearly, being false teachings about Catholicism, Bernard continued with the narrative. He described David's defense of his chances against Goliath based upon his previous work:

Plain shepherdly David, had he trusted in his own strength, and not rather in the goodness of his cause, being Gods quarrel, might easily have been discouraged not only by the braves and threats of the Philistine, but much more by the checks and snaps of his elder brother Eliab; who (perhaps being better furnished with abilities both for war, and for court) thought to frown his rural brother out of the field. But God is pleased to advance his truth and cause the rather by plain and weak means. For my part, nothing hath moved me to this encounter, but the zeal of God's truth, and desire to instruct the meaner sort, and establish our less learned Christian brethren. As for curiosities and subtle contemplations, I leave them unto others, or

---

<sup>584</sup> Bernard, *Rehemes against Rome*, Sig. av.

rather to be left of all others, so far as they tend to engendering of strife among ourselves, and prejudice to the Church.<sup>585</sup>

If Bernard was David, the better-equipped Eliab must have been Mountague, who by his education and status was more fit both for (theological) battle and court attendance. Yet though Mountague/Eliab heard the assault of Heigham/Goliath against the people of God, he did not offer direct challenge to it. This left Bernard/David to step in and challenge Heigham/Goliath. Yet Mountague had not only failed to answer Heigham's challenge, but had also gone too far in pursuing "curiosities and subtle contemplations" that should be "left of all others" because they brought strife and prejudice. Although Bernard analogized himself to David with some frequency, this particular formulation of the David story, with its focus on the differences between David and Eliab, should not be overlooked.

It is also possible to see an attack on Mountague in the way that Bernard arranged *Rhemes Against Rome*. Bernard admitted at the outset that he did not follow Heigham's work point-by-point; throughout the work he broke some of Heigham's points into several of his own, and he failed to answer certain other points (he found some too "frivolous, or of small moment, or weak and naked enough of themselves"<sup>586</sup>). Importantly, he placed several of his responses in an order different than Heigham's, which allowed him to gather discussions of free will, good works, and soteriology together in the final section of the book. Although these issues were significant in any arrangement, placing them at the end ensured that readers would see the connections between these theological points, and that they would not easily forget them by moving on to other topics as Heigham's work did. In contrast, readers found at the end of *Rhemes Against Rome* a nearly 100-page defense of Calvinist doctrine.

Bernard was correcting the anti-Calvinist position. Due to religio-political circumstances, he could hardly say so; thus, he framed these merely as a response to Heigham and left it to readers to connect the dots.<sup>587</sup> It is difficult to know how the majority of contemporary readers understood the work, but we do have evidence that at least William Prynne did read the work as anti-Arminian. In an extensive compilation of Calvinist arguments, Prynne mentioned that Bernard's Proposition 29 moved "against universal and sufficient grace, or in plain terms, against

---

<sup>585</sup> Bernard, *Rhemes Against Rome*, Sig. a2r.

<sup>586</sup> Bernard, *Rhemes Against Rome*, Sig. a2v.

<sup>587</sup> Nevertheless, Bernard was circumspect and followed a pattern similar to the one he had used in *Looke Beyond Luther*, avoiding the mention of many names and of the "invectives" which had been prohibited in 1622.

natural free-will itself.”<sup>588</sup> Although this citation was brief and was one of many in Prynne’s list, the fact that he noted *Rhemes Against Rome* work in terms of anti-Arminianism—not solely anti-Catholicism—is significant.

Although significant in their own right, *Looke Beyond Luther* and *Rhemes Against Rome* existed within a larger discourse of puritan attempts to respond to Catholic accusations in a way that provided an alternative to (or attack upon, or gloss of) responses by those with Arminian leanings. Notable among these was the publication, in one volume, of Andrew Cooke’s *St. Austin’s Religion* and William Crompton’s *St. Austin’s Summes*. Both used the work of Augustine to refute a particular set of accusations against Protestants: Cooke addressed a set of accusations that the Protestant church did not exist before Luther, and Crompton concerned himself with a set of assertions about the truth of Catholic doctrine. The former would have thus been quite clearly connected to the Percy debates, and the latter, as Peter Lake has observed, was connected to Mountague’s work.<sup>589</sup> Together, the two controversies that this dual work addressed were the same two conversations into which Bernard addressed *Looke Beyond Luther* and *Rhemes Against Rome*.

There are, in fact, multiple similarities between Crompton’s and Bernard’s works on this topic. Both addressed a specific Catholic’s assertions: Bernard against Heigham; Crompton against Breerely. Both answered the Catholics’ charges with an implicit gloss on Montague’s Arminianism; both arranged their works so as to make this gloss, and their own support of predestinarian theology, clear. Both authors proceeded not so much polemically as positively, crafting their own argument based on their own source (Augustine and/or Scripture). Yet it is an interesting question why Crompton’s work seems to have become so problematic—even to the point of probably having being burned—while Bernard’s apparently saw no such opposition. Perhaps it was because Bernard did not so obviously insert himself into these discourses at the highest levels: Crompton dedicated his work to Buckingham, while Bernard addressed a relatively less prominent figure, Ralph Hopton. Or perhaps it was due to a slightly more moderate treatment of predestinarian issues by Bernard than Crompton. As a further comparison for Bernard’s generically divergent but topically similar publications of both *Looke Beyond Luther* and *Rhemes Against Rome*, it is interesting that Sir Edward Rodeney (a prominent

---

<sup>588</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands old antithesis to new Arminianisme*, 73, 77.

<sup>589</sup> I am grateful to Peter Lake for sharing with me his work in progress on this controversy as it relates to Edward Elton and William Crompton.

Somerset individual, known to Bernard in at least some capacity<sup>590</sup>) had in his papers manuscript copies of both an amiable dialogue between a Protestant and a Catholic and a more academic dispute on the same topic.<sup>591</sup> The fact that both genres appear in one individual's papers suggests that Bernard's two works may have had some overlap in their audiences.

#### A reduced focus on Catholicism, post-1626

After *Rhemes Against Rome*, Bernard never again published a predominantly anti-Catholic work. Moreover, the works he did publish demonstrated a move back toward his pre-1616 tendencies, in which Catholicism was one among many concerns. Through the remainder of the 1620s, this shift was transitional, but over time it is clear that his focus had turned—or was made to turn—to other issues. After a decade of thinking carefully about the theological differences between Catholicism and Protestantism, exhorting others to resist the danger of the Church of Rome, and searching the Bible for help against anti-Christian forces, Bernard's own resolve against Catholicism must have been strengthened, as well. Indeed, there were hints of his continuing concern about the Church of Rome even into the 1630s and 1640s. Yet the works Bernard authored after 1626 moved away from any particular anti-Catholic agenda, and several had no significant connection with Catholicism at all.

Just as several factors seem to have converged to draw Bernard toward his period of anti-Catholic publishing, several factors seem, again, to have influenced his move away from it. First, as noted above, increasing strictures in the 1620s on the topics appropriate for discussion and increasing censorship of publications would have made it difficult for Bernard to publically emphasize topics at odds with the emphases of the ecclesio-political establishment. Moreover, later in the 1620s his appointment as Chaplain in Extraordinary would have only increased his desire to remain in good standing with Charles and other leaders in order to leverage what influence he did have in the most effective way. As I showed in Chapter 2, following his move away from separatism in c. 1607, Bernard believed that the best way to pursue the reformation of the church was by working through—not against—the ecclesiastical structure. Having providentially received this gracious preferment, he would not endanger the potential leverage for the gospel that his position offered merely for the sake of an unadvised publication.

---

<sup>590</sup> Bernard mentioned Rodney in the dedicatory epistles of *Isle* (4<sup>th</sup> edition) and *Threefold Treatise*.

<sup>591</sup> BL Add. MS 34239, fol. 55r ff., 65r ff.



Yet anti-Catholic publications were not only somewhat problematic for Bernard on the national stage; they also became more troublesome in his diocese of Bath and Wells, as William Laud succeeded Lake as bishop in September 1626.<sup>592</sup> Although Lake had held a position of indulgence toward Bernard's godly tendencies because of his careful attention to preaching, Laud's tenure as bishop (and later archbishop) was marked by an increased effort to bring the activities of ministers into full conformity with official church agendas. Public activities (including publication) that seemed to go against the movements of the church could bring Laud's displeasure. Desiring to remain in good standing with the church in order to perform his work as a minister, Bernard probably found it expedient to put his efforts somewhere other than the fight against Rome. Further, as we will see in Chapter 6, other events of 1626 also seem to have affected Bernard's own interests and pastoral concerns. Nevertheless, as I will show in this final section of the present chapter, his move away from anti-Catholic writing was not a sharp break but rather a slow process.

In late 1626 Bernard published his wildly successful devotional allegory, *Isle* (see Chapter 6).<sup>593</sup> In the allegory, after the character "Sin" was searched out and arrested, a trial ensued. Following the convictions of Old Man, Mistress Heart, Willful Will, and Covetousness (together with Idolatry), Papistry was the final prisoner to be tried.<sup>594</sup> Papistry was from the county of Babylon, a "bastard Christian begotten of Heresy, Judaism, Paganism" and indicted for several crimes:

thou...by violent force and arms invaded the territories of the Church of God, and by Spanish Inquisitions, bloody massacres, stabbing, poisoning, and killing of kings, gunpowder plots, treasons, rebellions, and other hellish practices, usurped authority and thrusts upon God's people their human traditions, inventions, superstitions, will-worship, heresies, Jewish ceremonies, and paganish idolatry to the damnation of many Christian souls contrary to the peace of our Sovereign Lord the King, his Crown and Dignity...<sup>595</sup>

*Isle* described the evils of Catholicism as twofold: the religion was a danger to individual souls who might believe it, and it was also a danger to nations and governments. Moreover, while the

---

<sup>592</sup> He was confirmed in September 1626, shortly following the licensure for publication of *Rhemes Against Rome*. CCEd Person ID 2801.

<sup>593</sup> Although both *Rhemes Against Rome* and *Isle of Man* have publication dates of 1626, *Isle* was not licensed until November 4, 1626—over a year after the licensure of *Rhemes* on June 27, 1625.

<sup>594</sup> There are some earlier references to Catholicism, but this trial is the key place in which the book treats the issue. This portion of the trial makes up about fifteen percent of the allegorical narrative.

<sup>595</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), 263-264.

rest of the allegory had been devoted to one's internal spiritual state, the trial of Papistry broke this pattern by emphasizing not the trouble with individual acceptance of Catholicism, but with Catholicism itself as a religio-political entity in the world. In other words, Bernard's attention moved from the merely internal in order to condemn something he saw as *both* and internal and external threat.

The section of the work in which Papistry was tried contained several further aspects that made it stand out from the rest of the work. The jury of virtues that had tried the inward sins was replaced, at Papistry's request, by a jury of theological and ecclesiastical witnesses (Common Principles, Apostle's Creed, Second Commandment, Pater Noster, Holy Scriptures, et al.). Further, in certain places both within the allegory and in the margins, reference was made to anti-Catholic works that were not fully discussed in the text; some of these were advanced theological texts—even in Latin.<sup>596</sup> Given his intended, popular audience, Bernard may have intended these citations not as instructions for further reading but rather as evidence that should merely be accepted: the authorities have said something, and common lay readers might simply believe it.

The trial of Papistry in *Isle* suggested no change in Bernard's anti-Catholic attitudes. It emphasized, as did *Key* and other works, the danger of Catholicism not merely to individuals but to the state. It called individual readers (through the allegory) to try the claims of Catholicism with using texts and ideas that would have been familiar to most any reader, following the pattern of *Looke Beyond Luther*. It made reference to his publication of *Rhemes Against Rome*. Nevertheless, something had changed: Catholicism was now a much less prominent concern. By keeping the trial of Papism relatively brief and omitting any advertisement of it on the title page, the prominence and import of this section was relatively small.

In other words, *Isle* had something of an anti-Catholic agenda, but Bernard gave pride of place to other issues. One might, of course, point out that this was not unlike some of the

---

<sup>596</sup> For example, Bernard also made a point to have the charge that Catholicism was a mix of Judaism and paganism brought, but rather than expounding it he (still within the allegory) referred readers to other works: "...this man [Papism] with his associates, hath instead of Christian religion, set u pa service of Judaism and Paganism, which I am able to prove in a multitude of particulars: but because I am loath to be tedious in my relation, I have brought here with me three books, that the Jury may judge of all the particulars, or they may be read before the Prisoner.../ What books Sir Christianity? / My Lord, one is that, that is called *The Three Conformities* set out lately. The other is, *De Origine Papatus*, set out by one Doctor Morison, and dedicated o his late Majesty: and the third is, our learned Countryman Doctor Rainoldes his *Conference with Hart* never answered of any papist to this day..." Cf. Francois de Cro, *The three conformities* (English translation 1620), Thomas Morison, *Papatus, seu Depravatae religionis origo...* (1594), and John Rainolds, *The summe of the conference betwene Iohn Rainoldes and Iohn Hart...* (first published 1584). Bernard, *Isle* (1627), 278-279.

devotional works he produced during the previous decade such as *Good Mans Grace*. Yet this time there were no further anti-Catholic publications that would follow it to press. In this way, we can see *Isle* as beginning a transitional period in which Bernard either subsumed his anti-Catholic sentiments within other works, or left the topic of Catholicism largely alone in the service of other concerns.

We can see further evidence of a transition toward placing anti-Catholic concerns behind or within other issues in 1628. Bernard's work *The Bible-Battells* was directed primarily toward influential political and military leaders and especially the bellicose Charles I, who was the recipient of the work's first dedicatory epistle.<sup>597</sup> Largely academic, the publication compiled principles for godly warfare from the Bible and antiquity. Given the nature of the book and the fact that none of Bernard's publications attempted to interact with martial policy—at least not directly—it is reasonable to conclude that Bernard composed this work in response to his appointment as Royal Chaplain in Extraordinary on July 20, 1628.<sup>598</sup> Likely perceiving a need to compose a work on a topic of interest to the king, seeing an opportunity to write on a subject of national importance, and (following such a preferment) desiring to avoid issues on which he knew he differed from official policy, this historical/ theological survey of military deportment may have seemed ideal.

Taken in the political context of 1628, this work was clearly a plea to England's leaders to make a certain set of (political and) military decisions—and, indeed, to make decisions that further the progress of the Protestant faith. Certainly aware of the restrictions on overt discussion of Catholicism as well as the impropriety of reaching above one's stations to give instruction to a monarch, Bernard's gestures toward war on Catholic states remained understated; yet it is possible to piece together a view of this work in which Bernard appealed to Charles to lead England as not only a Christian, but an anti-Catholic, warrior-king. The king's recent friendly

---

<sup>597</sup> On this work's relationship to contemporary sermons and publications regarding Christian warfare, see Hale, *Renaissance War Studies*, 487-517.

<sup>598</sup> TNA PRO LC 5/132, f. 45r. This appointment was at the recommendation of a Mr. Saladin. There is a reference to a John Saladin traveling with Philip Lord Herbert overseas in may 1638: TNA PRO SO 3/11. I am grateful to Kenneth Fincham for both these references. There is also a Mr. Saladin mentioned in a letter of 18 December 1626 from Dr. Samuel Clerke to Secretary Conway, which notes that the bearer Mr. Saladin is "tutor to the Lord Kellam the Lady Denbigh's son, and likewise to my Lord Chamberlain his son" and was to succeed Clerke in the mastership of a hospital which Clerke had at Leicester. TNA SP 16/42 f.32; A description of the letter appears in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I. 1625-1626* Vol. 1, 499, and has "Kellam" as "Kenelm." Ariel Hessayon notes that Philip Herbert, fifth Earl of Pembroke, was tutored by Mr. Saladin and matriculated at Exter College. *Gold Tried in the Fire*, 320. Exeter was the college where Canannuel Bernard had matriculated several years earlier.

gestures toward godly members of the church may have also played a role. In order to extract money from parliament, Charles had made steps to return Abbott to favor and made certain other concessions c. 1628; Bernard's elevation to national position, and his work, may have reflected these overtures.<sup>599</sup>

First, in the epistle to the reader, Bernard made specific reference to God's protection of England during the attempted invasion, the gunpowder plot, and the "many Treacheries and Treasons practiced against us"—implying God's protection of the Protestant nation against Catholic enemies. Even more significantly, in explaining the grounds for "necessary" wars, Bernard explained that war against the enemies of God is well founded:

...a just war, if also necessary, forcing to take arms against an infesting enemy, is to be preferred before an unjust peace. ...

Offensive war upon just and necessary grounds is lawful... But defensive war...better becometh the people of the Prince of peace; and indeed, the wars foretold in the Revelation, which the church shall have with the beast, the dragon, the whore, the false prophet, and with God and Magog are altogether defensive. ... So that the offensive war is on the enemy's side, and the defensive war is altogether on Christ and his church's part, by which yet they shall overcome: would God this were considered of; if the enemy begin, let us stand for our religion and lives with courage, Christ will take our parts and give us a glorious victory in the end. The Lord hath spoken it; if we believe his prophets, we shall prosper; and he that believeth maketh not haste, if we take a right course, let us stand still, not fear, fight valiantly the Lord's battles, for and in the cause of religion, seeking to avenge the Lord on those Romish Midianites, and behold then the salvation of the Lord...<sup>600</sup>

Although Bernard avoided declaring that Catholic forces were those described in Revelation, this would have been an association understood by many people, even those who did not hold to that view. Moreover, readers would have no need to wonder about Bernard's own views on this, since in *Key* and other works he had discussed the identity of the Antichrist. Yet Bernard was even clearer about his objective, as "Romish Midianites" (a phrase he had used to similar, and more explicit, effect in *Key*<sup>601</sup>) equated contemporary foes in the Church of Rome with those described by the Bible as an iniquitous people defeated by the Israelites.<sup>602</sup> Thus, quite provocatively, Bernard had not only identified Catholic powers as an enemy, but had defined a war with any power led by the Antichrist as inherently defensive and just. Taken with his earlier

---

<sup>599</sup> Cust, *Charles I: A Political Biography*.

<sup>600</sup> Bernard, *Bible-Battells*, 53-55.

<sup>601</sup> Bernard, "To All Generous and Noble Spirits..." in *Key*, n.p.

<sup>602</sup> Cf. Numbers 31 and Judges 6.

statement that just wars were better than unjust times of peace, in this passage Bernard essentially argued that England was *obligated* to go to war and defeat its Catholic enemies. Though this passage appeared in the middle of the work in a way that might identify it as a minor sub-point, it had the distinction of being the only place in the work with the command “Note this” in the margin to call attention to its significance; the other marginal notes focused on providing cross-references, citations, brief clarifications, and brief passages in Latin.

This work as a whole attempted to achieve several goals, including those of being acceptable to Charles’s agenda and displaying Bernard’s abilities as a researcher and author, yet it nevertheless reflected his continuing position of antagonism to Catholicism. Though it discussed Catholic powers only briefly and did not give them prominent placement, the main passage in which it did so was particularly pointed. This again suggests that Bernard’s position against Catholicism had remained strong, but various factors had begun influencing his choices to make his anti-Catholic sentiments less prominent within his publications.

Bernard’s 1630 semi-catechetical work *Creede* also included a certain amount of anti-Catholic material.<sup>603</sup> In this publication Bernard supplied a list of questions and answers in which a respondent would point out the principal errors in a large list of belief systems.<sup>604</sup> The passage began:

Q. This indeed is true religion, but now in your profession, can you difference your self rightly by some one main point or other, from all sorts of wicked ones; and from their paths of death and damnation?

A. Yes, I suppose, if you please to try me.

Prominent among the answers in this section, and taking the most space (indeed, hardly the brief “one main point” that most of the other answers reflect) was Bernard’s section against Catholicism:

Q. But how from the papists?

A. By giving to Jesus Christ his full and due glory, communicable to neither men nor angels.

---

<sup>603</sup> The latter work, published in the same year as *Common Catechisme*, should be viewed as a catechetical supplement containing material that Bernard felt was key for Christian education but, due to episcopal pressure, could not publish in his catechism; see Chapter 4.

<sup>604</sup> These include what Bernard refers to as: athiests, heathen idolators, naturalists, Jews, Turks, heretics in general, Arians, Montanists, Novatus and his followers, Donatists, Pelagians, Anabaptists, Brownists and Separatists, Libertines, the Family of Love, Opinionists, Sectaries and Novelists, Ubiquitaries, Papists, will-worshippers, Neutralists, temporizers, Machiauel-like politicians, luke-warm Laodiceans, profane persons, obstinate impenitents, presumptuous sinners, hopeless desperates, and carnal securitans.

Q. Is this then the main difference between us and them, in their robbing him of his glory?

A. Yes verily: For if I hold and believe Jesus Christ to be, that which indeed he is, and that I do not impart his glory to any other, I can never be a papist.

Q. In how many things consists this his glory?

A. In four things principally.

I. If I do hold and believe, that Jesus Christ is only and alone the spiritual head of his church, sending his holy Spirit to be only his general vicar, and not any mortal man: for this cuts off the proud blasphemous Goliath's head, the Pope's usurped supremacy, and all that dependeth thereupon.

II. That Jesus Christ is only and alone the law-giver to our consciences, and his written Word the only infallible rule of all his worship and service.

For this cuts off their traditional word, all the Pope's laws, and infinite humane inventions, burdening the consciences of papists.

III. That Jesus Christ is he only and alone mediator of intercession, as well as of redemption between God and vs.

For this cuts off their idolatrous praying to the Virgin Mary, saints and angels.

IV. That Jesus Christ is the only and alone savior, by the means of his passion pacifying Gods wrath, and purchasing for us in Heaven and eternal inheritance.

For this cuts off (not good works done in thankfulness & in obedience) but the conceit of meriting by them; also the damned idol of the mass, that pretended unbloody sacrifice, all satisfactory penance and punishment to God; this also quencheth out the fire of purgatory, and quite marreth the Pope's market.

By comparing this passage with the anti-Catholic passages in his 1602 catechism, we find that from the earliest years of his ministry through his well-advanced years—that is, from the time of his early tendencies toward nonconformity through the later decades of his strongly conformist position—Bernard maintained and propagated strong anti-Catholic sentiments. Moreover, because both the above passages are from catechetical literature, it is clear that he did not see these anti-Catholic beliefs as high-level doctrinal disputes but as key dangers to the Church, about which believers at all educational and spiritual levels should be warned and catechized. Although the language in the 1630 passage may not seem particularly abrasive on an initial reading (omitting, for example, explicit references to the devil), its theological implications were still damning: Adam's fall came from seeking to be like God, and by accusing the Catholic church of this presumptuous sin, Bernard accused it of attacking Christ Himself—an error from which the only escape was swift and full retreat.

Although “any theological work was, inevitably, a work of controversy,” and in the tense religio-political climate of the early Stuart period one can identify concern in many religious publications about the progress of Catholicism, throughout the rest of his career Bernard

continued to make his comments on these issues less and less central.<sup>605</sup> Altogether, following 1626 Bernard increasingly relegated discussions of the Catholic threat to less prominent subsections or brief comments within other works. Fortunately, other battles presented themselves, and in addition to keeping up his devotional publishing for the good of parishioners, he found several ways in which to use the press to help the church address other important issues. For instance, in 1626 and 1627, he published *Isle* and *Guide*, works that primarily addressed the problems of internal sin and external supernatural evil. In this regard, one could say that Bernard was shifting his efforts from attacking the works of Antichrist, to attacking the works of the Devil himself.

---

<sup>605</sup> Salzman, *Literary Culture*, 176.

## CHAPTER 6

### A WITCHCRAFT TRIAL, A GUIDE, AND AN ALLEGORY: HOW EVENTS RELATED TO THE 1626 TAUNTON SUMMER ASSIZES INFLUENCED TWO PUBLICATIONS

In 1627, Bernard published two works that stand out as unusual from the rest of his corpus: his allegory, *The Isle of Man*, and his manual about witches and witchcraft trials, *A Guide to Grand-Jury Men*. As James Sharpe has observed, many prominent demonological writers' works were "only one aspect of their literary output, one aspect of a broader body of theological, evangelical and pastoral writing."<sup>606</sup> This was certainly true of Bernard, whose demonological work (*Guide*), and also whose many devotional works (including *Isle*), were part of a large corpus of many different genres. In addition, as I have argued throughout the present study, the publishing agenda of an author-minister was tied in many ways to his personal and ministerial experiences.

While previous chapters have examined Bernard's publishing across spans of several years, this chapter looks more narrowly at one event and two publications from a relatively brief period of time. This provides opportunity for the careful exploration of how a specific set of experiences, along with various theological commitments, led Bernard to publish certain works, to tailor certain aspects of their contents, and to target certain audiences as he did. Specifically, this chapter addresses Bernard's experiences at the 1626 summer assizes in Taunton where two accused witches, Edward Bull and Joan Greedie, were tried and executed, and during which time Bernard provided assistance to Bull. I argue that these events were key influences on *Isle* and *Guide*.

Bernard connected *Isle* with his experiences at this trial in several ways. Along with specific details related to the trial that appear in the prefatory material, the topic of the allegory (criminal and judicial activity) and its emphasis upon finding evil within—not outside—oneself are related to key issues that Bernard considered during the period of the assizes. As a devotional allegory, *Isle* has not yet attracted much attention for its connections to the 1626 assizes; yet the timing and contents of the work demand that we view it in this context.

---

<sup>606</sup> Sharpe, *Witchcraft in Early Modern England*, 18.



Though *Guide* has received more attention for its connection to early modern witchcraft trials—and to a degree the 1626 assizes more specifically—it, too, requires a contextual framework of Bernard’s own experiences with purported supernatural activity.<sup>607</sup> Much scholarship on the intellectual history of early modern witchcraft moves past *Guide* rather quickly, and with some justification. Making only a modest impact in its own time, *Guide* broke little new ground in terms of ideas about witchcraft. Perhaps its most remarkable intellectual contribution was the large amount of research that went into its composition; it made reference to a large number of treatises and compiled examples from a wide range of popular accounts—both print and oral—of what was perceived to be both real and pretended demonic activity.<sup>608</sup> This comprehensive research was important (and the chapter will return to it), but not revolutionary. Yet while *Guide* may not contain significant developments in the early modern understanding of the supernatural, it proves to be quite an interesting publication if we approach it from a different perspective.

For Bernard, *Guide* was not merely an intellectual exercise; it was personal. His pastoral calling had exposed him to supposed demonic activity more than once throughout his career, and he retained a vested interest not only in understanding the various phenomena that he had personally witnessed, but also in helping people at all levels of society make sense of similar experiences. Moreover, his particular set of activities as minister to the accused witch John Bull had led to rumors that he himself did not hold an orthodox view of witchcraft. In *Guide*, then, Bernard had two purposes—both closely connected to his broader pastoral program and both based on a careful process of research and interpretation.

First, he wanted to defend himself publicly against attacks on his views and even his orthodoxy; as a public religious figure, maintaining his reputation as a godly and theologically sound minister was key for his reputation and future ministry. He drew upon both learned and popular publications as he constructed a defensible, orthodox view of the supernatural that took into account as much information as possible. Then, he interpreted this view, attempting to

---

<sup>607</sup> Wallace Notestein observed this connection between Bernard, the trial, and *Guide*: Notestein, *A history of witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718*, 234-236. In addition, on the Taunton case and Bernard, see Davies, *Four Centuries of Witchcraft beliefs*.

<sup>608</sup> In a survey of early modern English demonologies, Simon F. Davies notes Bernard as particularly “well-read”: Davies, “EEBO-TCP in reception studies: reading demonology in early modern England.”

make the work relevant for a large audience.<sup>609</sup> This in turn became a public statement of his orthodoxy.

Second, as part of his vocational pastoral ministry, he wanted to equip readers from a variety of backgrounds and life circumstances to understand and respond correctly to the presence of evil in the world. On the one hand, he wanted all Christians to be slow to identify sources of evil outside themselves, rather than being “too much given upon every cross to think themselves bewitched.”<sup>610</sup> This goal was closely connected to Bernard’s purposes in *Isle* toward encouraging the search for sin within one’s heart. On the other hand, he gave attention to individuals who he believed should be involved in helping to eradicate witchcraft from society—either by not supporting “good” witches themselves, or by using appropriate social and legal means to identify and try suspected witches. Within the latter group, *Guide* particularly targeted individuals on grand juries who would decide whether accused witches were to be tried. Helping accused witches have a just trial and avoid wrongful accusation was part of Bernard’s calling as a minister to promote godly justice within society.

Together, these personal and pastoral motivations, each of which was related to Bernard’s own experiences with purported supernatural activity and specifically with the 1626 trial, directed his efforts as he wrote and published *Isle* and *Guide*. Moreover, these publications allowed him to take what had been personal concerns and local issues, and leverage them in order to comment publicly on issues of national importance. In this chapter, I first survey Bernard’s own experiences related to purported supernatural activity, both early in his career and during the 1626 witchcraft trial—with the latter including an analysis of a trial deposition. Second, I analyze *Isle*’s connections to the 1626 trial and its relationship to Bernard’s approach to witchcraft. Finally, I turn to *Guide* itself to consider Bernard’s creation of this work in view of his personal goal of self-vindication, as well as his pastoral goals toward both those over-fearful of external evil forces in the world and those responsible to help eradicate witchcraft from society.

### Bernard and purported supernatural activity

Bernard’s experiences with supposed supernatural activity began long before the 1626 trials. Reports of possession were moderately common throughout this period, and in the early

---

<sup>609</sup> As I will suggest at the end of the chapter, this framework, along with a rather revolutionary emphasis on humane treatment of the accused, would come to further fruition in *Isle*.

<sup>610</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, title page.

seventeenth century the means and effectiveness of exorcistic practices were strongly bound up with demonstrations of the power and veracity of the exorcists' religious confessions. When exorcists were of a godly persuasion, their behavior was seen as demonstrating that God acted within a Reformed, Protestant framework and that He would act powerfully on behalf of the godly. The activities of puritan exorcists were also bound up with key doctrinal issues including certain beliefs regarding God's work in the world and the coming end of days; a commitment to fostering the godly community, and a strong anti-Catholic theology.<sup>611</sup>

Even the familiar activities of Christian prayer and fasting, when used in relation to sensational phenomena such as supernatural activity, could sway public understanding of exorcists' faith and practices. The use of prayer and fasting by godly exorcists, who avoided anything resembling the "superstitious" or "idolatrous" objects and ceremonies of Catholic practice, thus made particularly strong statements in favor of the form of Protestant religion practiced by the exorcists. With this in mind, it is unsurprising that the Canons of 1604 circumscribed exorcisms, including those that emphasized prayer and fasting, because of their potential to attract favorable public attention toward non-conforming or even radical versions of puritanism.<sup>612</sup>

It is unclear how closely Bernard had been associated with the notorious and controversial exorcisms of John Darrell in the late sixteenth century; yet it is almost certain he would at least have been aware of them through his connections from within the patronage circle of Isabel Bowes.<sup>613</sup> One of Bernard's godly mentors, Arthur Hildersham, tried and failed to exorcise Thomas Darling, the "Boy of Burton," who claimed to be possessed by a devil sent by a

---

<sup>611</sup> As Peter Elmer and others have pointed out, beliefs about and responses to witchcraft became religiously and politically significant (he characterizes the approaches as "Puritan" and "Anglican"; although these labels have been contested, the fact that some version of these divisions hinged on responses to the supernatural is significant); Elmer, "Towards a Politics of Witchcraft in Early Modern England," 107-108. See also Freeman, "Demons, Deviance, and Defiance," 60, 62.

<sup>612</sup> Cf. van Dijkhuizen, *Devil Theatre*. Van Dijkhuizen is right to point out possession's relationship with both anti-Catholicism and radical puritanism, as well as its valences with certain eschatological views. Unfortunately, the analysis does not nuance the term "Protestant" as clearly as would be helpful.

<sup>613</sup> Darrell also benefited from the patronage of Isabel Bowes (nee Wray, and also Foljambe), and was part of Arthur Hildersham's circle; on her life see Newman, "'An Honourable and Elect Lady': The Faith of Isabel, Lady Bowes." On Darrell and the relationship of his case to broader themes of orthodoxy and the religio-politics of early modern England, Thomas Freeman suggests that "Darrell's career illustrates the subversive potential, or perceived subversive potential, of aspects of puritanism" such as communal fasting, and that exorcisms provided an unusual forum through which the godly might build their ranks. Freeman, "Demons, Deviance, and Defiance."

witch; Darling was later successfully exorcised by Darrell.<sup>614</sup> Bernard's name does appear in an account of the exorcism of a certain John Fox. It was reported that the Devil caused Fox to be violently thrown down, his skin to turn a black color, and his body to experience paralysis during which a voice would be heard coming from his belly, throat or mouth.<sup>615</sup> The account, recorded by minister Stanly Gower, primarily described interactions between minister Richard Rothwell and the Devil (who spoke out of Fox).<sup>616</sup> He also reported that Bernard was involved with the situation via prayer and was among those who counseled Fox:

...many prayers were put up to God for him, and great resort, especially of godly Ministers, to him: amongst the rest Master Bernard of Batcombe, then of Worksop; and Master Langley of Truswel, betwixt whom and John Fox, I have seen divers passages in writing, he relating by pen his temptations, and they giving answers when he was stricken dumb.<sup>617</sup>

Bernard's experience with purported supernatural phenomena was also influenced by his position within a society with very real religious and social concerns about demons, possession, and witchcraft.<sup>618</sup> Such fears were present throughout, and indeed beyond, England.<sup>619</sup> Yet it is particularly significant that Somerset, where Bernard ministered from 1613 to 1641, had regular reports of supposed supernatural activity throughout the period.<sup>620</sup> In the late sixteenth century

---

<sup>614</sup> On the connection between Bowes, Darrell, Hildersham, and others, see Freeman, 34-36. See also Atherton and Como, "The Burning of Edward Wightman," 1220-1222. On Bernard and Hildersham, see Chapter 2.

<sup>615</sup> This John Foxe was distinct from the author of *Acts and Monuments*. The report was written by Stanly Gower in his life of minister Richard Rothwell and appears in Clarke, *The Lives of Two and Twenty English Divines*, 92-94. Gower was a disciple of Rothwell, and both men were associated with the patronage circle of Isabel Bowes. See also Joseph Hunter, *The History and Topography of the Parish of Sheffield in the County of York*, 242-243. It is unclear whether the Foxe exorcism occurred before or after the passing of Canon 72, which forbid such activities without direct episcopal approval.

<sup>616</sup> Gower, 94. The narrative ends as the Devil left Fox, who spoke briefly and then, after three years of silence, recovered and "spake graciously to his dying day."

<sup>617</sup> Gower, 92.

<sup>618</sup> Using the case of Essex, Macfarlane has suggested: "We may conclude by guessing that the 500 assize indictments we have constitute less than one-third of the accusations actually made in court, and that these court accusations represented only a very small faction of the actual suspicions in the Essex countryside at this time. Even if we confine ourselves to the surviving records, however, we find that over 227 villages in Essex at this period are known to have been connected with witchcraft prosecutions in one way or another." Macfarlane, "Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart Essex," 78-79. In terms of the Somerset trial of 1626, it may be significant that there was a spike in witchcraft accusations in that year in Essex; cf. Macfarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England*, 25-29.

<sup>619</sup> *Guide* mentions travelers' relations of "pagans and savage nations" amongst whom witchcraft is "rife." Bernard, *Guide*, 94.

<sup>620</sup> During his time in Epworth and Worksop, Bernard would certainly have been aware of various witchcraft accusations both nationally and locally. In 1597, just before Bernard's tenure as a minister began, William Somers of Nottingham accused at least thirteen individuals of witchcraft before he himself was likewise accused. In addition, in 1601 Ellen Bark of Nottingham was presented for witchcraft. Notestein, *A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1713*, 393-394. Notestein cites several contemporary works including John Darrel, *Detection of that sinful...discours of*

there was a report of a “miracle” very near Batcombe at Ditchat, Somerset, in which a woman experienced symptoms of bewitchment or possession and experienced healing upon the efforts of the godly to help her. A sensational account of the incident appeared in print in 1584 and again in 1614. It included descriptions of visions involving a headless bear and a glowing (perhaps angelic) child, and it listed locals who would affirm the veracity of the tale.<sup>621</sup>

Two additional supernatural events were reported to have occurred in Somerset during this period were recorded later by Richard Bovet.<sup>622</sup> First, an Edmund Ansty had begun circulating among his neighbors the report that he had seen a spirit or apparition on a dark road not far from Yeovilton, Somerset, at roughly the same time as the 1626 Taunton assizes.<sup>623</sup> Second, there were reports of “fairies, or spirits” that “showed themselves in great Companies at diverse times; as sometimes they would seem to dance, at other times to keep a great Fair or Market” in an area near.<sup>624</sup> After narrating one such account of these fairies dated roughly a decade after the 1626 trial, Bovet noted that this sight was a continuing part of local narrative: “...diverse of the Neighbors assured me that they had at many times seen this fair-keeping in the summer time, as they came from Taunton Market; but that they durst not adventure in amongst them, for that every one that had done so, had received great damage by it.”<sup>625</sup>

In addition to somewhat general reports of supernatural phenomena, Somerset also saw targeted legal proceedings directed against those who sought to use unnatural or supernatural forces.<sup>626</sup> The 1609 Somerset Quarter Sessions records include a deposition of Margaret Bridge,

---

*Samuel Harshnet*, 109-111 and Samuel Harsnett, *Discovery of the Fraudulent Practises of John Darrel*, 5, 102, 140-141, 320-322. On demons, witchcraft, and intellectual writings about them from this period, see Clark, *Thinking with Demons*.

<sup>621</sup> This report appeared again in 1614 in T.I., *A Miracle, of Miracles*. The “headless bear” in this tale may have influenced others, including Matthew Hopkins and William Shakespeare. Gaskill *Witchfinders*, 4; Simpson, *Studies in Elizabethan Drama*; and Rahter, “Puck’s Headless Bear—Revisited.”

<sup>622</sup> Bovet, *Pandaemonium*. The work was published in 1684, and the incident indicated that roughly four years before publication, the author had interviewed Ansty, who at that time dated the apparition to about sixty years before.

<sup>623</sup> Bovet, 199-201.

<sup>624</sup> Bovet, 207-210.

<sup>625</sup> Bovet, 210.

<sup>626</sup> Total numbers of Somerset witchcraft proceedings during this period are not available, but to gain some perspective on the relative frequency of witchcraft prosecutions one may consider the numbers of indictments within certain other counties. For 1603-1625 in Hertfordshire there were 17 indictments for witchcraft among 1018 total indictments (with simple larceny being the most common). Sussex had only two indictments for witchcraft out of 546 total. Cockburn, “The Nature and Incidence of Crimes in England 1559-1625: A Preliminary Survey” in Cockburn, *Crime in England*: 49-71, 55. A.D.J. Macfarlane found that in Essex, over the period 1560-1680, witchcraft indictments made up about five percent of criminal proceedings: Macfarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England*, 30, and “Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart Essex,” 75. Yet comparisons are difficult not only because of sampling factors (catalogs and summaries of records vary according to the particular years they survey, and even in the same period counties could vary in population, litigiousness and judicial efficiency) but also because social and cultural factors that affected belief and reaction to perceived supernatural events could be quite localized. It is also important

Mary Tomson, Mary's mother Christian, and Mary's brother William in the attempted use of a love charm, and the 1612 Somerset Quarter Sessions describe the case of Elizabeth Busher of Hinton who was "both reputed and feared to be a dangerous witch thorow the vntimely Death of men, woemen and children wch she hath hated, threatned and handled as by divers Articles pfferred against her..."<sup>627</sup> One Batcombe resident, along with several individuals from surrounding areas, provided information in 1631 about a supposed touch healing and other supernatural activity.<sup>628</sup> Meric Casaubon related a case he was aware of as a young child in Somerset in the early seventeenth century, in which a man formerly thought to be bewitched ended up himself being accused of witchcraft and, after an attempted escape, was executed.<sup>629</sup>

Beyond his early involvement with the possession cases, Bernard himself had additional interactions with, or awareness of, certain other cases of supernatural occurrences. In *Guide*, he recorded knowledge of "a very rare instance of an afflicted person near by me" that appeared to be troubled by Satan.<sup>630</sup> And in what appears to have been personal research, Bernard interviewed a repentant white witch, Mr. Edwards of Cambridge, who told him "many" things during "a whole afternoon's discourse."<sup>631</sup> Bernard also mentioned the "death of five brethren and sisters, lately condemned and executed for Witches, one more yet remaining, formerly brought before a judge, and now in danger to be questioned again."<sup>632</sup> Further detail is lacking; yet because Bernard described the rather specific and perhaps private detail of potential further questioning and made reference to it as an issue of present concern, some personal connection to the situation is plausible.

In regard to the 1626 trial, a manuscript in the British Library identifies itself as a deposition related to the trial, and Bernard's *Guide* provide some information.<sup>633</sup> Though *Guide*

---

to note that witchcraft accusations seem to have ebbed and flowed to some degree rather than held steady across decades: cf. Sharpe, *Witchcraft in Early Modern England*, 25.

<sup>627</sup> *Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset*, Vol. I, 96-97. Also quoted in Crawford and Gowing, eds., *Women's Worlds in Seventeenth-Century England, 1580-1720: Sourcebook*, 171-172, from SRO Q/SR 7/49051.

<sup>628</sup> SRO Q/SR 64/161.

<sup>629</sup> Meric Casaubon, *Of Credulity and Incredulity*, 170-171. There are further mid-seventeenth-century Somerset witchcraft cases mentioned in Glanvill, *Saducismus Triumphatus*, which he seems largely to have had through the reports of Robert Hunt. See also Marion Gibson, *Witchcraft and Society*, 227ff.

<sup>630</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, (1627), 60.

<sup>631</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, (1626), 137-138.

<sup>632</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, "Authors Earnest Requests." I have been unable to locate records for the trial of the siblings he references.

<sup>633</sup> BL Add. MS 36674, fol. 189r - 192v. Unfortunately, the deponent is unnamed. The document is in a collection related to witchcraft and the supernatural. It has not been widely used in major recent surveys of early modern British witchcraft; however, it has been mentioned briefly in a variety of works, such as Syme, *Theatre and Testimony in*

suggested that more than one person reportedly experienced symptoms of bewitchment, the deposition focused upon the bewitching of a man named Edward Dinham, who experienced trancelike states lasting two or three hours.<sup>634</sup> During these trances, he was perceived to lie insensible to others, and at times to have something “beat up and down in his stomach and belly” and to “thrust pins and needles through his hand and nostrils.” In addition, two voices were perceived to come out of him, although his mouth did not move; on occasion, he himself also spoke (in his own voice and moving his mouth) to participate in the conversation.<sup>635</sup>

The narrative of Dinham’s torments focused largely upon the conversation between the two voices (understood to be spirits), which played itself out over several episodes. Between episodes, the narrative noted the responses of authorities to what was said, and in particular it recorded attempts to apprehend the accused witches in response to the information provided by the voices during Dinham’s trances.<sup>636</sup> One of these voices was understood to come from a spirit with a voice “pleasant and shrill, which they term ‘bon gen.’” and the other from a more obviously evil spirit with a voice “deadly and hollow, which they term ‘mal gen.’”<sup>637</sup> During the conversation, the evil spirit had information about the two witches which he withheld from the pleasant spirit. In a pattern that repeated several times, the pleasant spirit desired information from the evil spirit and was denied. Then, the pleasant spirit prompted Dinham to ask the same question to the evil spirit. Dinham did so, and the evil spirit slowly gave up the requested pieces of information. Although the pleasant spirit often seemed to have Dinham’s interests in mind, and at one point even engaged the other in a battle over Dinham, it nevertheless seemed neither spirit was entirely good. The evil spirit at one point explained to the pleasant spirit that the accused witches “were bound to us, and we to them” and further detailed that the accused came

---

*Shakespeare’s England*, 121-123; Penuel, “Male Mothering and *The Tempest*,” 117; and Holmes, “Women: Witnesses and Witches,” 125.

<sup>634</sup> *Guide* recorded that the symptoms of bewitchment were upon “some” people. Bernard, *Guide* (1630), Sig. A3v.

<sup>635</sup> Although several works on witchcraft—at least as early as Thomas Wright’s 1851 *Narratives of Sorcery and Magic*—have pointed out similarities between this and another account from France in the situation related to Louis Gaufridy, this narrative is different enough that it should not necessarily be read as a mere copy of the earlier event. For further comparison, a somewhat similar supernatural conversation reported to have taken place between spirits possessing a William Ringe: see Macdonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 200-202. On possession and witchcraft in early modern Europe, see also Levack, “Demoniac Possession in Early Modern Scotland,” 166-167.

<sup>636</sup> More generally on witchcraft accusations and narratives of bewitchment, see Rushton, “Texts of Authority: Witchcraft Accusations and the Demonstration of Truth in Early Modern England” and Gibson, “Understanding Witchcraft.”

<sup>637</sup> BL Add. MS 36674, fol. 189r.

to be witches through a bond passed through the female line which included “eight seals, bloody seals; four dead and four alive...”<sup>638</sup>

The pleasant spirit frequently questioned the evil spirit. Sometimes these questions were in regard to information about the accused witches—information onlookers used as clues leading them to apprehend the accused. Greedie was quickly arrested at her house following the disclosure of her name and the color of clothing she was wearing, but Bull was more difficult to capture. Authorities located him once in a field, but he was driven away by a hound before being apprehended; later he was found lying in a ditch between two fields, but he escaped through a hedge; he was finally arrested in a bed in his home. In each instance, the authorities were said to have located him using information gained through Dinham.<sup>639</sup>

In addition to disseminating information about the accused, the spirits, and in particular the evil spirit, were portrayed as being in charge of Dinham’s trances. They occasionally announced when the next one would occur: at one point, the pleasant spirit asked a question to the evil spirit, who agreed to answer in six days. The text noted that Dinham was tormented again at that time, and the conversation continued where it had left off. Later, the spirits bartered over the number of additional times that the evil one would torment Dinham.

It also seemed that Dinham himself had some sort of power or influence over the evil spirit, and that this power was of a greater degree than the pleasant spirit could exert. When the pleasant spirit asked questions of the evil spirit, the evil spirit regularly refused to answer—even saying “I am bound not to tell” and “I may not.” Yet when the pleasant spirit prompted Dinham himself to question the evil spirit and Dinham (in his own voice) did so, the evil spirit regularly capitulated. Although the evil spirit was said to speak falsely and thus could be seen as wrongly asserting his inability to provide certain information, it is interesting that he repeatedly asserted his inability to do so to the pleasant spirit, and yet repeatedly did so when prompted by Dinham. It was as if there was some sort of power sharing or imbalance: although the spirits possessed Dinham and ruled over his trances, he displayed power over them in persuading or compelling the release of information.

---

<sup>638</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 190r.

<sup>639</sup> *Ibid.*, *passim*. The first mention of Bull’s location places him at a tavern in Yeohull, Ireland, but it is not recorded whether the authorities went there after him; the locations of the fields and house where they pursued and later found him are unclear.



During Dinham's third recorded trance, it seems that the pleasant spirit intended to expose the identity of the evil spirit as Satan; however, clues throughout the text did not make either spirit's identity entirely obvious. Following the evil spirit's disclosure of the name of Edward Chilcott (a Christian whom he had "destroyed" and who, the text noted, "died very strangely about one year since"), the pleasant spirit abruptly changed the topic, asking "Why didst thou set our Savior Christ upon a pinnacle and tempt him to fall down and worship thee?" The evil spirit responded "Why? If I had won him all the world had been mine."<sup>640</sup> Keeping in mind the biblical accounts of Christ's temptation by Satan, it would seem that the question meant to identify the evil spirit as Satan.<sup>641</sup> In asking about the evil spirit's temptation of Christ, the pleasant spirit used the term "our Savior." This complicates any analysis of the spirit's own identity, as Christ was not usually said to be the savior of (either good or evil) spirits. Later, when the pleasant spirit used the Latin word "laudes," this evil spirit was rather humorously ignorant of it, instead repeating the word as "ladies."<sup>642</sup> Satan was generally understood to have great knowledge, so it is strange he would be portrayed as ignorant of Latin. Indeed, one of the most obvious marks of possession was said to be a supernatural ability, given by the Devil, by the possessed to speak in Latin or Greek.<sup>643</sup> Perhaps this seeming ignorance of Latin was also assumed to be a deceit.<sup>644</sup>

If Dinham was inventing and ventriloquizing these conversations, one might view any theological inconsistencies as mistakes in his performances. Yet because Bull and Greddie were found guilty, it appears that contemporaries did not widely understand his performances as fraudulent. For those individuals, any inconsistencies that appeared may have been explained within a broader theology of the supernatural. Evil spirits were known to be deceptive, and the dialogue at one point specifically mentioned the evil spirit having lied. Because of this, and because the two spirits seemed so frequently to be at odds, it is possible that all these inconsistencies were seen as part of a large-scale demonic deceit to confuse observers into thinking that one of the evil spirits was actually good. Finally, it is possible that this account contained copy errors—for instance, perhaps the pleasant spirit's use of the phrase "our Savior" should have been attributed to Dinham.

---

<sup>640</sup> Ibid., f. 190v.

<sup>641</sup> Cf. Matt. 4 and Luke 4.

<sup>642</sup> BL Add. MS 36674 f. 191v

<sup>643</sup> Bernard includes this in his survey of supernatural abilities: *Guide*, 50.

<sup>644</sup> Cf. Almond, *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England*, 30.

The deposition proceeded as a mere record, without attempting to explain or interpret events. After several episodes in which the spirits conversed and the authorities attempted to track the accused using revealed information, the narrative turned to a climactic battle for Dinham's soul and a demonstration of the evil spirit's growing inability to fight against God's power.<sup>645</sup> The battle was apparently played out physically inside Dinham, who writhed greatly. It stopped when the pleasant spirit, fighting on Dinham's behalf, conceded on the grounds that to continue the battle would have "torn him [Dinham] in pieces." The evil spirit then noted that if the pleasant spirit had not conceded, Dinham's "guts should have rotted in his belly, his tongue have fallen out of his mouth, and his eyes of his head"; the pleasant spirit reminded him, however, that even if all this had happened, the evil spirit could never have Dinham's soul, which was in God's possession. After bartering about the number of times the evil spirit would again torment Dinham, the pleasant spirit agreed that "If thou wilt answer me 3 questions I will seal and go with thee." The evil spirit easily answered the first two questions, affirming that God made the world and that God made mankind. However, the third question, "Wherefore was Christ Jesus his precious blood shed?" caused the evil spirit to reply, "I'll no more of that" and to cause a violent convulsion in Dinham that landed him partly out of the bed. At this, the evil spirit threatened Dinham, telling him not to go to church, but the pleasant spirit told him not to fear to do so.

The document recorded that on the way to and from church, Dinham was taken by violent fits at a bridge and both times narrowly escaped plunging himself into the water (though possessed before and after attending, the demon left him during church). In addition, during Dinham's penultimate torment, he clung desperately to a Prayer Book as a sort of Christian token that the evil spirit attempted (through a beating up and down in Dinham's stomach) to throw out of his grasp amid taunts from the pleasant spirit. Ultimately, all present in the room noticed "a trumpet sound so plain as all they in the room heard it to make the sweetest music that ever was heard" and then heard the evil spirit disclose Bull's whereabouts.

"After a season" Dinham was tormented again. On a question from the pleasant spirit, the evil spirit provided Bull's location, and the deposition noted that at this time the authorities were able to apprehend him. After a brief exchange of threats, the evil spirit concluded, "Well now fare well, I will no more torment thee, but the spirits of Bull and Greedie shall torment thee

---

<sup>645</sup> Ibid., 191r.

ever” and Dinham, “groaning exceedingly” and nearly tearing himself to pieces “came to himself again, not remembering any thing that had been done or spoken in, by, or of him, during the times of his trances, but only he felt his body sore and pained.”<sup>646</sup> The deposition ended by stating that Bull and Greedie were also indicted for bewitching “a gentlewoman which is taken with a shaking in one side, crying always ‘Bull, Bull, Bull’” as well as “a man who is tormented like the other, but he only spoke to and for himself in his own proper voice, seeming to contend with the Devil exceedingly.”<sup>647</sup>

It is worth noting that in many respects the events surrounding Dinham’s possession were not merely an account of the torments of a bewitched individual and the accompanying attempts by observers to apprehend suspects. Rather, in several important senses, this was an account of an exorcism, albeit one performed—strangely and perhaps ironically—either by the possessed man himself, or one of the spirits, or a combination of both. It reflected several key points of other contemporary accounts: dialogues with spirits; the use of Scripture, religious phrases, and physical objects to identify or drive out devils; a heightening of physical torments as tensions rose toward the point of exorcism; a sudden display of light or sound upon the release of the possessed; and a demonic warning that the possessed would die unnaturally.<sup>648</sup> Catholic exorcistic practices involving priests, the use of relics, and other “superstitious” methods of exorcism had long been forbidden in Protestant England. Moreover, even markedly Protestant methods of dealing with possession, such as the methods of prayer and fasting promulgated by several puritan leaders including the notorious John Darrell, had been outlawed in nearly all situations since the Canons of 1604.<sup>649</sup>

Though it is possible that spiritual counsel was sought and not reported, the deposition has a marked absence of any spiritual leaders to direct the course of events: neither “good” witches, nor clergy, nor fasting and praying members of the godly community. Of course, observers at these events may well have been participating through private (or not so private) speaking, praying, or fasting, and they may have assisted in other ways such as providing the

---

<sup>646</sup> Ibid., 192r.

<sup>647</sup> Ibid., f. 192v.

<sup>648</sup> Regarding the warning that the possessed would die unnaturally, the warning that Dinham would die on the way to church is somewhat like the devil’s warning to John Foxe that he would choke on his food. On all points, see the accounts of exorcism in, for example, the accounts of the possession of John Foxe (exorcised by Richard Rothwell), those tormented by the Witches of Warboys, the exorcists Thomas Weston and John Darrell, and more. See also Lake’s typescript here related to Catholic and Protestant exorcistic practices.

<sup>649</sup> Freeman, “Demons, Deviance and Defiance,” 60-63.

Bible Dinham held at one point. Yet the account, in that regard, is silent: the deposition had the audience merely observe and then respond in legal ways (i.e., through attempts to apprehend the accused).

Nevertheless, many of the traditional points of exorcism occurred, and apparently did so with no external influence. The long periods of questioning and dialoguing with the spirit and the possessed individual that characterized other prominent cases were here entirely internal to Dinham himself. Still more interestingly, this appears to have been a somewhat religiously ambiguous exorcism: for instance, both the (seemingly Protestant) quoting of Scripture to silence demonic lies, and the (seemingly Catholic) use of a physical Bible as something of a charm, occurred. Perhaps this ambiguity was unsurprising, since rather than being led by any sort of confessionally-bound spiritual leader, the events appear to have been controlled by a bewitched man and a demonic (albeit pleasant) spirit.

In this situation, the unusual occurrence of having two spirits speak from within the same individual was perhaps not merely an oddity, but a necessary feature of the exorcism. It allowed the conventional three roles in an exorcism—devil, exorcist(s), and victim—to remain largely intact, and indeed to proceed with the sorts of interchange that would have been expected. Without three interlocutors, the process of the exorcism would have failed to fit conventional narratives. In addition, if Bernard's comments in *Guide* about two spirits speaking from the same individual were related to this case, we may note that the bewitched individual believed the pleasant spirit to be sent from God to help him. This would further allow the pleasant spirit to have taken the role as a spiritual leader and exorcist. Altogether, then, this case may suggest something about the difficulties and ambiguities of demonstrating—performing—possession in ways that were both recognizable as spiritual experiences and acceptable to authorities in the post-1604 political and social situations.

Bernard's publications provided some further information related to the trial. He recorded that he himself was present for some or all of the proceedings and that Judges John Walter and John Denham presided (it is unclear whether the latter was related to the bewitched Edward Dinham).<sup>650</sup> One passage from *Guide* mentioned that the reading of a document during an assize trial (a document which had similar details to Dinham's case and may well have been

---

<sup>650</sup> It is unclear whether there might be any family relationship between John Denham and Edward Dinham.

the deposition discussed above) led to one man's causing something of a commotion and then fainting:

How did a lusty young man at the assises presently faint in reading a conference of two spirits, whilst the suspected witch was at the bar, merely upon fear to be in danger to be bewitched, as was evident by his words, saying, *O thou rogue, wilt thou bewitch me too?*<sup>651</sup>

During the time of the proceedings, Bernard held the roles of both observer and participant. As an observer, he eagerly absorbed and considered the activities of the court and the participants in the trial. For instance, he noticed the way that the judges gave “holy attention to the Word delivered before you, and your worthy respect unto Gods Ministers.”<sup>652</sup> Likewise, he observed the function of the different legal personnel and considered the evidence as it was presented. As a participant, at one or more points during the assize period, Bernard seems to have met with Bull. At such a low point for Bull, there were only two real ways he could be helped: salvation or acquittal. Though Bernard and other writers on witchcraft emphasized the unlikelihood that a witch would repent, they acknowledged that this was possible; moreover, it was a common practice for a minister to meet with a condemned witch to plead with him or her to repent before death.<sup>653</sup> Bernard later noted that “My upright meaning in my painstaking with Bull mistaken, a rumor spread, as if I favored witches, or were of Master Scot’s erroneous opinion that witches were silly deceived melancholics.” It is possible that Bernard’s efforts toward Bull’s salvation were so intense as to cause people to question his belief in witchcraft. Bernard’s description in *Isle* of his distress about the poor spiritual and physical state of prisoners may indicate that merely his degree of care was perceived to be unusual and unnecessary.<sup>654</sup> Yet it also seems that Bernard to some degree questioned Bull’s guilt. His “painstaking” may have involved not merely spiritual counsel to the accused, but rather his own attempt to resolve the issue to his satisfaction: questioning Bull or others about details and perhaps sharing his thoughts with relevant authorities. Some apparently took Bernard’s actions as a desire to hinder witchcraft proceedings,

---

<sup>651</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 22. The marginal note specifies that the incident happened at the Taunton assizes, but it does not specify the date. However, the mention of a conference of two spirits makes it extremely likely it occurred at the same 1626 trial that Bernard attended. On trial procedures and the presentation of evidence, see Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 54ff.

<sup>652</sup> *Ibid.*, Sig. A4v.

<sup>653</sup> On the possibility of witches repenting, see Bernard, *Guide*, 113-114; Cooper, *The mystery of witch-craft*, 279; and Gifford, *A Discourse of the damned art of witchcraft*, 253-255. For an example of the assignment of a minister to meet with a convicted witch, see Thomas Potts, *The vvonderfull discouerie*, 86-87.

<sup>654</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, “Authors Earnest Requests.”

and may have begun to question the state of his beliefs. It is not difficult to imagine how his work in Bull's favor, in an atmosphere so emotionally charged with the fear of witchcraft, might provoke suspicions.

As a result of what became, or threatened to become, a rather scandalous set of accusations about his behavior and/or orthodoxy, Bernard presented an "upright apology against vain accusers" to Judge Denham, who accepted his explanation.<sup>655</sup> Interestingly, upon this favorable response, Bernard did not cut his losses and leave. Rather, he pushed one step further. It seems that during his time working with Bull, Bernard became so concerned about prisoners' treatment that he introduced a petition for the welfare of prisoners. This action could also have been unpopular, since public opinion, at least in Bull's case, seems to have been firmly against the accused. Moreover, although Denham ended up seconding Bernard's petition, it could have been seen as an attack on the way that local authorities had performed their jobs. Following such a public misunderstanding about his activities, introducing this plea was not an obvious move for someone in Bernard's position; rather, it seems to have been a step prompted by his conscience.

During his time visiting with Bull and perhaps other prisoners, Bernard developed or strengthened a conviction that they were wrongly treated—both generally ("the state of poor prisoners") and in particular spiritually ("their souls' safety is neglected"). His pastoral works frequently highlighted the need for pastors to identify the spiritual and intellectual needs and abilities of those to whom they ministered.<sup>656</sup> In the case of his relationship with Bull, this time-consuming process, which may have involved multiple meetings and a growing interpersonal relationship, likely afforded Bernard a degree of emotional connection with Bull alongside a concern over his soul. As we will see, Bernard would take up this issue again, more publicly, in *Isle*.

The outcome of the trial was sober on all counts. Bull and Greedie were condemned and executed.<sup>657</sup> Due to his attentiveness with Bull and the rumor that spread, Bernard developed something of a social stake in the process and the way his participation was portrayed; though he

---

<sup>655</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, n.p. "Authors Earnest Requests."

<sup>656</sup> He was by no means alone in his concern for prisoners' spiritual well-being; cf. Lake and Questier, "Prisons, priests, and people."

<sup>657</sup> Although verdicts did go both ways in witch trials, it is important to note that the legal system focused upon prosecutorial evidence and the "inferior position of the defendant was manifested in many procedural disadvantages." Darr, 62ff.

received some favor from Judge Denham, he nevertheless retained something of a damaged reputation. Finally, it is not clear that the execution of the witches resolved the issues at hand to the satisfaction of the community or to Bernard. In particular, some of the allegedly bewitched persons continued to have “strange fits” even after the witches were killed.<sup>658</sup> This may have troubled all those who had a hand in the convictions because it suggested that the executed parties had not, in fact, caused the phenomena for which they had been accused. Whatever estimation Bernard made of Bull’s guilt before the execution, he seems to have been further troubled by these events afterward. Indeed, they were one of the key reasons he gave for embarking on the study of witchcraft that led to *Guide*.

### *The Isle of Man* and the 1626 trial

As we will see, Bernard was eager to spread his ideas regarding witchcraft, and a defense of his own position, through the publication of *Guide*; however, as he worked on this treatise he was simultaneously composing another, very different work that also had clear ties to the trial of Bull and Greedie: *Isle*.<sup>659</sup> As it turned out, *Isle* was the first of the two to be completed, licensed, and published. It quickly became Bernard’s best-selling and best-known work, seeing publication more than ten times in his lifetime and continuing to appear in print even into the eighteenth century. It has received some scholarly attention in relation to its place within the development of different literary forms; however, it has not yet been fully considered in the context of the 1626 trial, which was key to his aims for the work and his own interests in creating it.<sup>660</sup>

---

<sup>658</sup> It is possible that the bewitched Edward Dinham may have himself later been accused of witchcraft: see Casaubon, *Of Credulity and Incredulity in things natural, civil, and divine*, 170-171; and Notestein, *A history of witchcraft in England*, 402-403.

<sup>659</sup> As we will see, he was so eager to put his ideas about witchcraft in print that he included a summary of them and a mention of the forthcoming *Guide* in the fore-section of *Isle*.

<sup>660</sup> The work is noteworthy for many reasons, including that it was one of the earliest allegorical works produced in a puritan context, it influenced certain later authors such as John Bunyan, it includes a markedly early discussion of prison reform, and it contains an defense of the use of humor and imagination in a godly religious context. A few scholars have given some attention to this work, primarily in terms of its relationship to Bunyan’s works, but also for its own merits. Cf. Hill, *A Turbulent, Seditious and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church*; Stranaham, “Bunyan and the Epistle to the Hebrews”; Muller, *Richard Bernard: The Isle of Man (1626)*; Hyman, *Richard Bernard: A study of The Faithful Shepheard, The Isle of Man, and Ruth’s Recompence* Columbia University; Sharrock, “Bunyan and the English Emblem Writers”; Taffel, “Richard Bernard: Puritan Divine.” In regard to Bunyan, see also T. S., *The Second Part of the Pilgrims Progress*, which mentions Bernard’s work. Though it was innovative in its historical context and popular for quite some time, *Isle* is rarely recognized by modern scholars for its literary value; as Jules Paul Siegel has characterized: “From the pen of Richard Bernard, Rector of Batcombe in Somersetshire, came another well-read piece of didactic fiction, *The Isle of Man*, a clumsy allegory treating of the search and trial of Sin in Soulestown, the capital of the Isle of Man. Sin is eventually captured, turned over to the Jailer, Mr. Newman, and finally arraigned,

*Isle* can be linked to the 1626 trial in several ways. The work appeared in print shortly following the trial, and both the dedicatory epistle and the prefatory “Author’s Earnest Requests” make reference to it. It mentioned several authorities involved with the trial, including western circuit court judges Walter and Denham (who presided at the trial and to whom Bernard would dedicate *Guide*) and Robert Philips (the sheriff at the trial). In addition, it described the situations of Bernard being accused for showing care to Bull and the subsequent appeal to Judge Denham and others about the situation of prisoners.<sup>661</sup> Given the location of the appeal for the physical and spiritual state of prisoners in *Isle*’s dedicatory epistle—an appeal quite progressive for its time—it seems that Bernard’s opinions on this subject were also influenced by, or at least related to his experiences at the trial.<sup>662</sup>

Bernard used the prefatory materials in this work to provide something of a summary and preview of the content of *Guide*, which had not yet received licensure at the time of *Isle*’s first printing. In doing this, he made something of an effort to relate the contents of *Guide* to the allegory; however, his primary goal seems to be an attempt to send forth the core of his ideas for grand jurors here, in case the publication of *Guide* would be denied or delayed:

Thou hast here towards the end of this discourse, the trial and judgment upon four notorious malefactors...There should have been, at the assizes with these, the arraignment of certain suspected witches: but this was prevented, because the grand-jury gentlemen could not agree to bring in their *billa vera*: for that they made question of divers points, whereof they could not be resolved at that present.

1. Whether the afflicted did suffer by only some violent diseases in nature...which for want of a judicious physician they could not discern.
2. Whether the afflicted were a counterfeit...

---

tried, and sentenced. Replete with over seven hundred characters, quotations from the scriptures, and bristling with anti-papal bias, the book hardly convinces; nevertheless, it *is* fiction, and it enjoyed something of a vogue in both old and New England,” Siegel, “Puritan Light Reading.” Regarding the work’s anti-papal bias—which is quite clear not least of all due to a portion of the work in which the Catholic faith was tried and condemned in the same court which had tried the sinful heart—it is significant that Bernard published *Isle* just at the end of his period of anti-Catholic writing (see Chapter 5). The fact that Catholic practices were associated not only with superstition but also with ungodly means of exorcism may be particularly tied to Bernard’s experiences at the 1626 trial, as well.

<sup>661</sup> He further mentions Master Symmes, who had taken over duties as Sherriff since the trial; Bernard seemed pleased with the change, noting Symmes’ “religious affection, tender mercies, and powerful habilites.” Bernard, *Guide*, “Author’s Earnest Requests.” It is not necessary to assume that Bernard was involved in an official capacity with the trial, though it is possible that he was; for instance, he might have given a homily that preceded judgment (on which convention, see Baker, “Criminal Courts and Procedure at Common Law,” 42).

<sup>662</sup> On early modern prisons, punishment, and the dangers thereof, see Lake & Questier, “Priets, Prisons and People” and *Antichrist’s Lewd Hat*; Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 73; Rushford, “Burnings and Blessings,” 95n; and Macfarlane, “Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart Essex,” 76. Rushford notes that 244 prisoners died in Kentish jails between 1580 and 1625—which made up just a portion of the “incredibly lethal” English prisons, while Macfarlane records that “gaol fever” caused the deaths of at least 36 accused witches in Essex during the period 1560-1680.



3. Whether being a disease supernatural, yet might come upon the afflicted by the operation of the devil, without the association of a witch...
  4. Whether they might proceed upon mere presumptions against the suspected, or rather stay till they had more certain and grounded proofs?
  5. Whether they could (none of them being read in any learned tractates touching the practices of witches) rightly examine the suspected to find out a witch, and so bring him or her deservedly under the power of authority?
- If there come forth, by the leave of authority, a *Guide to Grand-Iury Men* in cases of witchcraft; my suit is, that they would be pleased to accept of my well-meaning therein. In which all these points before are fully handled...<sup>663</sup>

Dedicatory epistles were usually dated after receiving licensure, so Bernard was able to slip his ideas about witchcraft into the prefatory portion of *Isle*, safeguarding this statement of his position on witchcraft against any possible hindrance from publication in the full volume of *Guide*. This demonstrates the awareness he had of the possibility that the authorities might not appreciate his approach (which, again, had been perceived by some as problematic) as well as the eagerness with which he sought to share his ideas. Moreover, both the strong impressions left from the 1626 trial and the potential fates of currently imprisoned persons stood at the forefront of his mind:

The death of five brethren and sisters, lately condemned and executed for witches, one more yet remaining, formerly brought before a judge, and now in danger to be questioned again, hath moved me to take this pain...  
 The state of poor prisoners is well known, and how their souls' safety is neglected: and yet our Savior gave such a testimony to a penitent thief, as he never gave to any mortal man else; for he told him, that he should be that day with him in Paradise.  
 How blessed a work would it be, to have maintenance raised for a learned, godly, and grave divine, that might attend to instruct them daily...<sup>664</sup>

Since *Guide* was so clearly connected with Bernard's experiences at the assizes, the fact that *Isle* reprinted many of these ideas also connected it, in a second-hand way, with the trial. Yet the most prominent way that the trial influenced this work was undoubtedly Bernard's use of legal processes as the predominant theme of the allegory itself. While apologizing for his unstudied background in legal procedures, Bernard attempted to re-create a search for criminals, collection of evidence, and trial with a significant amount of detail. Adopting the frame of the story in the dedicatory epistle, he described:

---

<sup>663</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, "Authors Earnest Requests." He goes on to summarize the work itself.

<sup>664</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, "Authors Earnest Requests." I have been unable to locate records for the trial of the siblings he references.

In my traveling, I came to the county town, or chiefest seat there, called Soul: where I rested for some time, because it fell out to be the assize week for all that island. Where I specially marked how in all things they proceeded against malefactors, according to the laws of England: in this only lieth the difference: there is never but one judge, whereas we have ever two appointed in every circuit...<sup>665</sup>

In *The Faithful Shepherd*, Bernard had emphasized the importance of a minister's being familiar with a variety of subjects, from husbandry to divinity, so that he could easily converse with parishioners and so that when he explained the scriptures he could create metaphors that his hearers would understand. For this reason, and perhaps also due to his own curiosity, it seems that he carefully absorbed the events that unfolded before him during the time of the trial. The details he later included in the legal proceedings in his allegory demonstrate that he watched the events with care and attention. Although he apologized for errors due to his lack of knowledge, he was careful to include specific jobs, actions, characters, and phrases that reflected a familiarity with the legal process.<sup>666</sup> Moreover, given the godly goal to turn any occasion into an opportunity for personal spiritual growth, it seems likely that Bernard developed this allegory out of certain occasional meditations that he himself had at the trial.

The body of the work itself was in two parts. In the first, Bernard described how the notorious malefactor, Sin, was pursued, caught and imprisoned. In the second, there was a trial of sins, featuring in particular Old-Man, Mistress Heart, Willful Will, Covetousness (with Idolatry), and Papistry.<sup>667</sup> He laid out both portions of the work in a straightforward way, and the majority of the work's content was not given to narrating events but rather to introducing characters or objects and describing their relationships and characteristics. The following passage, from the trial in the second part of the work, was typical of the whole:

These two [rebels] were Covetousness and Idolatry, capital thieves, pestilently mischievous against God, his worship and service, against the church and against the common-weal.

Covetousness was joined with Idolatry, because he is also called Idolatry. Now all other prisoners removed, and the judge with the bench ready for these, the clerk willeth the crier to command the gaoler to set Covetousness to the bar, which the gaoler doth forthwith.

---

<sup>665</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, n.p. Dedicatory epistle. Later in the prefatory materials he requests "to all that profess the law, that if in this allegory, fetched from such terms, as be better known to them, than to my self, I do mistake, they would be pleased to pass over that, and make use with me of the spiritual sense, which is the drift of my labor herein."

<sup>666</sup> He asks pardon from any professors of the law who may notice him erring in the use of particular terms and ask them to "pass over that, and make use with me of the spiritual sense, which is the drift of my labor herein." Bernard, *Isle*, "Authors Earnest Requests."

<sup>667</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), 122.

Then saith he unto him, Covetousness hold up thy hand and hear thy indictment. Covetousness; thou art here indicted by the name of Covetousness, in the towne of Want, in the county of Neverfull, that from the day of thy first being thou hast been the root of all evil, having made some to play the thieves, others to commit treason against our sovereign lord the king; others to murder innocents for their inheritance. Thou art also here indicted for bribery, extortion, oppression, usury, injustice, cousenage, unmercifulness, and a multitude of outrageous villanies...<sup>668</sup>

Here and throughout the work, Bernard relied heavily upon lists, which explained several facets of a particular religious topic. Some of his lists, as above, came in indictments or evidence in a court scene. Other lists appeared as characters in the work: for instance, Mistress Heart was accompanied by eleven maids, the “eleven passions of the Heart,” which Bernard enumerated and described over several pages.<sup>669</sup> His goal of spiritual self-knowledge was always at the forefront of this work, as his narrative helped readers understand a variety of concepts central to Christian belief and behavior that were entirely consistent with the rest of his work. Through the allegory, he explained how sins were linked with other sins, ways of discovering sin in one’s heart, the role of the conscience, the sinful nature of the heart, the role of religion, and more—all of which were points of central interest for Bernard throughout his pastoral ministry.

*The Isle of Man* proved extremely popular; within “scarce half a year” after its first publication Bernard was already revising a fourth edition.<sup>670</sup> Yet it also seems to have generated more criticism than he had anticipated, which prompted him to defend his work more forcefully. In the revised edition, Bernard appended several pages explaining more specifically his goals for the work and its allegorical format. Responding to “such as censure this book” he listed over forty spiritual principles, their allegorical representations, and the portion of the work addressing them, for example:

That which is most hurtful to man is sin: set out under the name of a notorious malefactor, pag. 2. to 10.

...

That sins once entertained into the heart, do there find matter of nourishment, there to abide and rest: set out by an hostess entertaining plentifully her guests, from a table well furnished, diligent attendance, lodging rooms and beds, p. 71 to 80.<sup>671</sup>

---

<sup>668</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), 184-186.

<sup>669</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), 64-68. This tendency to enumerate and parse concepts within the allegory in some ways resembles features of Ramist logic. Many puritan divines favored this form of logic, which involved a methodology based on dividing things into their subordinate components. For a broad look at the way Ramist thought could influence godly works, see McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins’ Theology*.

<sup>670</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), n.p.

<sup>671</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), Sig. A2v.

This revised edition enhanced Bernard's educational purposes by way of additional marginal notes.<sup>672</sup> Though some of these were most helpful for locating concepts within the work, others restated ideas from the text in a particularly clear or succinct way. For instance, in the dedicatory epistle mentioned above, near the words "*Nosce te ipsum*" in the fourth edition, a marginal gloss read, "The scope of this book for one to see and know himself."<sup>673</sup> Bernard did not want anyone to miss his purpose.

In this expanded defense of the work, Bernard also explained more clearly his choice of an allegorical format. He answered objections about the material on several grounds, including that biblical authors used metaphors and allegories, and that allegory did not detract from the seriousness of the matter discussed. Yet beyond showing that there was no harm in allegory, Bernard suggested that this format actually increased benefit because those without a religious bent might pick it up for the sake of enjoyment and then find themselves falling into a meditation on the book's spiritual content.<sup>674</sup> He proceeded with a metaphor in which the spiritual content of the work was a boy, and he as a father figure had chosen to clothe his child in an unusual genre. The passage is worth quoting in full:

Well, I have clothed this book as it is: It may be some humor took me, as once it did old Jacob, who appareled Joseph differently from all the rest of his brethren in a party coloured coat. It may also bee that I took (as Jacob did in his Joseph) more delight in this Lad, then in twenty other of his brethren borne before him, or in a younger Benjamin brought forth soon after him.

When I thus did apparel him, I intended to send him forth to his brethren, hoping hereby to procure him the more acceptance, where he happily should come: and my expectation hath not failed; deceived altogether I am not, as was Jacob in sending his Joseph among his envious brethren. For not only hundreds, but some thousands have welcomed him to their houses. They say they like his countenance, his habit and manner of speaking well enough, though other too nice bee not so well pleased therewith.

But who can please all? or how can any one so write or speak, as to content every man? If any mistake me, and abuse him in their too carnal apprehension, without the truly intended spiritual use, let them blame themselves, & neither me nor him: for the fault is their own, which I wish them to amend?

You that like him, I pray you still accept of him for whose sake, to further your spiritual meditation, I have sent him out with these contents, and more marginal notes.

His habit is no whit altered which he is constrained by me to wear, not only on

---

<sup>672</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), n.p.

<sup>673</sup> Bernard, *Isle* 1627), Sig. A2v.

<sup>674</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), n.p.

working days, but even upon holy days and Sundays too, if he go abroad. A fitter garment I have not now for him: and if I should send out the poor lad naked; I know it would not please you.

This his coat, though not altered in the fashion, yet is it made somewhat longer. For though from his first birth into the world it bee scarce half a year, yet he is grown a little bigger; but I think him to become to his full stature: so he will be, but as a little pygmy to be carried abroad in any man's pocket.

I pray you now this fourth time accept him, & use him, as I have intended him for you, and you shall reap the fruit, though I forbid you not to be Christianly merry with him.<sup>675</sup>

Here, Bernard was particularly candid about the enjoyment he felt in writing this allegory, as well as the pleasure he anticipated readers would take in it. Unlike Jacob, who did not anticipate the poor reception Joseph would have in his special coat, Bernard insisted he was not entirely wrong, since this work's dressing had procured favor among many (though not all) who had become familiar with it. Moreover, Bernard anticipated that readers would carry it with them and read it frequently—even on holy days and Sundays. This was an important statement of the religious merit of the work, as Bernard held strongly to the belief that the Lord's Day was to be reserved strictly for religious pursuits.<sup>676</sup> Indeed, Sabbath observance was becoming one key way to distinguish the godly from other members of the national church. For this reason, when Bernard stated that his allegory was appropriate for all days, he clearly reinforced that at its core it was a religious, rather than an entertaining, work (even though it was appropriate to be "Christianly merry" with it). This passage also suggested that upon using the book as intended, readers would "reap the fruit" of it. Drawing upon a common biblical image, Bernard ended by again emphasizing the way in which the work would spiritually nourish readers or hearers.

*Isle* was a distinct product closely connected to the events of 1626. It had personal meaning for Bernard as a creative work he saw as a "son" and as a product of his own meditative thoughts related to the trial. Nevertheless, *Isle* also remained consistent with the goals for the reformation of the church that he pursued as an author-minister and reflected several of the tendencies and practices appearing in much of his other work. We can clearly see one instance of this in the way that *Isle* prominently included concepts he discussed at length elsewhere. Notably, this included the trials of covetousness (coupled with idolatry) and Catholicism toward

---

<sup>675</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), n.p.

<sup>676</sup> This had been a contentious issue since in 1618 James I enumerated several recreations that were lawful on Sundays, much to the distaste of godly ministers who felt the day should be focused on the Lord rather than on personal enjoyment. Cf. James I, *The Kings Maiesties declaration to his subiects, concerning lawfull sports to be used* (London: Printed by Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill, 1618).

the end of the second book. The former prefigured some of the concepts about which he would publish in *Ready Way* in the 1630s, and the latter reflected the anti-Catholic concerns which appear throughout much of his religious-educational program and which had been particularly prominent during his period of anti-Catholic publishing to 1626 (see Chapter 5).

*Isle* also reflected other aspects of Bernard's ministry in the way he regularly integrated other religious concerns within the main allegorical narrative. In addition to his discussions of Catholicism and covetousness, throughout the work, he mentioned other concerns which were more or less closely related to his main focus of devotional self-examination. For instance, he discussed the correct use of the privileges of the gentry.<sup>677</sup> Or again, at one point he mentioned the age of the earth.<sup>678</sup> These were not necessary points for narrative development, nor were they directly related to his primary topic of self-examination for sin. As a result, these points again remind us that Bernard did not make sharp divisions between theological and devotional concerns, nor even between different religious topics; rather, all were related. Good doctrine supported a holy life; a holy life led one to pursue the knowledge of God; and the disciplines of reading and meditation, directed by the Spirit, could prompt many different sorts of religious and devotional thoughts at any time.

Another important link between *Isle* and the rest of Bernard's publications was that in much of his print ministry, he had displayed a continual willingness to attempt new print ventures, and even new genres, in an effort to help his readers learn concepts more effectively. His goals for *Isle* appear to have reflected many of the desires and tendencies that he displayed in nearly all his didactic and devotional works, reaching audiences at various intellectual and spiritual levels and teaching them to understand and apply the Scriptures in their own lives.<sup>679</sup>

---

<sup>677</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, 181-182.

<sup>678</sup> The topic appeared as Old-man declared that his age was 5556; the age was updated in later editions to reflect passing years. Subtracting the year of publication, this indicates that the date of his birth was 3928 or 3929 BC. Since he was writing long before John Lightfoot's better known adoption of that chronology, he appears to have followed Beroald in determining the age of the earth. Several English authors, including Perkins, mention Beroald's calculation; however, few appear to have adopted it—especially not as clearly as Bernard does here. Since there is no pressing reason within the text for Bernard to have mentioned a specific date (he could have avoided the issue altogether, or mentioned more generally that Old-Man was, for instance, over 5,000 years old) it appears that he wanted his opinion to come out on this point. That he went to the trouble of updating the date in later editions further emphasizes that he was attempting to communicate something precise in this passage. Bernard, *Isle* (1627), 141. See also Beroaldi, *Chronicum, Scripturae Sacrae Autoritate Constitutum* as well as, among other works, Perkins, *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles...*, 60-61.

<sup>679</sup> It is impossible to know what first suggested to Bernard the metaphor of a human as an island; however, this image was not unique to his work. In 1626, Thomas Adams published a compilation of five sermons he had preached in London, two of which included similar metaphors. Of these, one appears in a sermon preached at

The educational aims of *Isle* were clear even from the outset of the work, where the long form of the title explained its contents:

*The Isle of Man: Or, The Legall Proceeding in Man-shire against Sinne. Whrein, by way of a continued Allegorie, the chiefe Malefactors disturbing both Church and Common-Wealth, are detected and attached; With their Arraignement, and Iudicially tryall, according to the Laws of England. A necessarie Direction for waifaring Christians, not acquainted with those perilous wayes they must passe, before they happily arriue at their wished hauen.*<sup>680</sup>

By identifying its target audience as a broad range of “wayfaring” lay Christians, suggesting that readers may not be fully acquainted with the nature of their spiritual journey, and designating this book as a “necessary direction,” Bernard made clear that the work would perform an educational function for a broad range of readers who might not be well aware of the demands of the Christian life. The dedicatory epistle to *Isle* gave a further indication of the publication’s educational aims.<sup>681</sup> He placed the moral purpose of self-knowledge at the forefront even as he also noted the “pleasure” in the creative format (here speaking as from within the allegorical framework):

In my very entrance, and afterwards everywhere I found written that old ancient precept, *Nosce te ipsum*. This lesson I began to take out with diligent observation. And it brought to my mind the apostle’s charge, *Quisque exploret se ipsum*, which I labored to put in practice, and so besought myself in my self; for, I remembering that saying long since learned, *Orbis quisque sibi, nec te que siueras extra*. Thus my travel became very profitable to me; and the variety of sights withal procured delight, & turned my pains into pleasure.<sup>682</sup>

---

Whitehall March 29, and the other at Michaelmas—both occurring before *The Isle of Man* was registered on Nov. 4 of that year. Adams, *Five sermons preached vpon sundry especiall occasions*, 10, 73; *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, Vol. 4. It is possible that Bernard may have known Adams—or known of him—through clerical or friendship networks, or from their time at Cambridge, where Adams matriculated the year Bernard finished his MA. I am not the first to suggest a possible link between Adams’s and Bernard’s imagery: Jean L. Thomas drew a connection between their work in a discussion of their possible influence on Edward Taylor’s poetry (though he sees influence going from Bernard to Adams rather than vice versa). Thomas suggests that the image of the “Isle of Man” may actually be derived from a much older theological topoi: the “Castle of Mansoul” which dates to the twelfth century. Thomas, “Drama and Doctrine,” 454. Yet there is no necessary reason to believe that both men did not come up with similar metaphors independently from one another. Other individuals also explored this idea in ways quite separate from the work of Bernard or Adams. For instance, Thomas Bancroft had a moral but nonreligious use of the phrase in his *Two bookes of epigrammes, and epitaphs Dedicated to two top-branches of gentry*. On the use of anatomic metaphor more broadly, see Mitchell, *The Purple Island and Anatomy in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature, Philosophy, and Theology*.

<sup>680</sup> Bernard, *The Isle*, title page (1626).

<sup>681</sup> The epistle is addressed to prominent local couple Sir Thomas Thynne and his wife Catherine. Bernard continued the epistle with brief descriptions of the trials of malefactors that Bernard observed on his island, alongside acknowledgements of his dedicatees’ godly lives and prayers for their continued well-being.

<sup>682</sup> Richard Bernard, *The Isle* (1627), Sig. A2r-A3r. In the margin, the Greek γνωθι σεαυτον (“know thyself”) appears.

Lest anyone remain confused about the purpose of the work or concerned regarding its use of genre, Bernard's second epistle, an "earnest request" to readers, made it particularly clear:

FIRST, to the worthy reader, whosoever, to whom let me but say thus much of this discourse and allegorical narration; that in it *sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala nulla*: Yet if any thing may seem distasteful, let thy mind be to take it well, as Caesars was, to interpret well the seeming offensive carriage of one Accius the Poet towards him, and thou wilt not be displeased. Thy good mind will prevent the taking of an offence, where none is intended to be given. In discovery, attaching, arrainging and condemning of sin, I tax the vice, and not any man's person...<sup>683</sup>

Bernard continued this plea with a brief summary of the work that indicated the religious nature of the allegory before moving on to other matters. In this passage, he anticipated some minor opposition to his unconventional use of allegory in a religious context, particularly on two fronts: that the genre was inappropriate for religious communication, and that in attacking sin he meant to attack particular individuals. Yet the brevity with which he explained that there was some good and no ill in his use of creative literature, along with his indication that a simple reading would convince one of the value of the work, seem to indicate that in his own mind, the purpose of *Isle* was clear and the allegoric form was unproblematic in the service of a greater religious-educational project of involved assisting readers and hearers in the practice of divine meditation and of searching out their own sins. Indeed, *Guide* closely related to some of Bernard's most basic pastoral goals for individuals: growth in godliness through self-examination, and the provision of godly ministers for all populations (including jailed individuals) throughout England.

Yet in context of the trial itself, *Isle's* emphasis upon self-examination was particularly interesting. One could argue, in fact, that within the context of the 1626 witchcraft trial—which, again, Bernard himself evoked in the prefatory material—the point of *Isle* was not merely to practice meditation, nor merely to seek out one's inner sins—but in fact to use spiritual disciplines to relocate one's anxieties about evil from external phenomena to one's own heart. Or to put it another way, *Isle* sought to help readers point their efforts toward the eradication of evil not toward witches, but toward their own deceitful, rebellious, Satan-following hearts. In this theological move, Bernard was not alone:

The task of the physicians of the soul was to purge the sinner's complacency and show him how to govern his mind and body so that he was better able to withstand the infection of sin. Striving was the key to the Puritan solution to the problem of curing anxiety and despair. Preachers and casuists taught their audiences to submit

---

<sup>683</sup> Bernard, *Isle* (1627), n.p.



themselves to rigorous self-examination. To attain spiritual health and maintain it, believers had to practice ‘ the often and careful viewing of ourselves in the looking glass of the law, beholding there our most sinful and most woeful estate, and labouring ourselves to have knowledge and some feeling experience of it.’ Laymen were cautioned to be especially vigilant during periods of emotional turmoil, for passion weakened their self-control and made them vulnerable to the temptations of Satan. The Puritans’ emphasis on introspection and self-discipline caused them to reinterpret the Devil’s role in religious psychology. Although they repeated the popular beliefs that Satan introjected evil thoughts into people’s minds and tempted them to despair and suicide, they insisted that pious men and women were nevertheless chiefly responsible for their own thoughts and actions. ... There were no shortcuts to spiritual peace. Ritual exorcism and healing magic were in vain because they did not remove the ultimate cause of all human misery, sin.”<sup>684</sup>

Through his devotional goals, in *Isle* Bernard again attempted to further the kingdom of God through the reforming of the lives of individual readers or hearers, encouraging each reader or hearer to change toward godliness. If some portion of a large, popular audience would read *Isle* and be drawn—even just a bit—to meditate on the things of God or to think differently about eradicating sin from their own lives, the work would succeed as a devotional publication and as one more impetus toward a growing culture of godliness in England and beyond.

#### *Guide* and Bernard’s self-defense

*Isle* was licensed on Nov. 4, 1626 and the dedicatory epistle to the first edition was dated December 6. *Guide* was licensed on May 3 of the following year.<sup>685</sup> As with many other works, Bernard was quite clear about his purposes for *Guide* from the outset of the work. The title page provided the first indications regarding his intended audiences and the scope of his argument. It explained that the first portion of the work, Book I, gave directions regarding the identification of witchcraft for the titular grand jury members who would decide the fate of the accused, as well as to those “such as are too much given up, on every cross to think themselves bewitched.” The second portion, Book II, addressed the topic of witchcraft from a more theoretical and theological standpoint. Thus, in *Guide* Bernard sought a broad audience of readers and discussed witchcraft from a variety of standpoints.

The dedicatory epistles, meanwhile, made his purposes in composing the work more explicit. Bernard explained that because *Guide* addressed both secular and sacred topics, he

---

<sup>684</sup> Macdonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 219-220.

<sup>685</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, Vol. 4, 131, 142.

chose to compose two epistles, which would help the work gain both approval and a larger audience: “For two books have I made a double choice of patrons for protection: because a treatise of this nature, needeth shelter under both, and that which is fortified, *tam Ecclesiastico, quam seculari brachio*, will be more available, and pass more acceptably among all sorts.” Each epistle also provided further explanation of his purposes and motives.

In the first epistle, to Judges Walter and Denham who had sat at the trial, he wrote:

The occasion offerred and the reasons drawing me to this study, were the strange fits then, and yet continuing upon some judged to be bewitched by those which were then also condemned and executed for the same: My upright meaning in my painstaking with Bull mistaken, a rumour spread, as if I favored witches, or were of master Scot’s erroneous opinion, that witches were silly deceived melancholics.

This my labour in all these will clear me...<sup>686</sup>

This suggested the most personally significant of *Guide*’s purposes: it would be Bernard’s public defense of his actions and his public statement of his views—now with even more weight due to the large amount of research he had compiled. Having been troubled externally by individuals about his activities, and having been troubled internally about the way that experiences should be reconciled with his beliefs, he embarked on an extensive course of study. *Guide* was a defense and renewed statement of his own beliefs.

When people began questioning Bernard’s beliefs about the supernatural, he had much to lose: for many years he had been developing his reputation as a godly minister, and charges of unorthodox beliefs could strike at the heart of his ministry. A damaged career might have placed his flock in a spiritually precarious position as well as limited his work in assisting with the continuing reformation of England in personal ministry and in print. Happily for Bernard, he had certain ways in which to defend himself. During the trial, he seems to have made good use of personal help, appealing to Judge Denham directly for assistance. After the incident, we find that he also made good use of the press by tailoring *Guide* to act as a public defense of his position.

In this regard, we may note that Bernard carefully situated *Guide* against the views of Reginald Scot, who in 1584 published the “most skeptical work on the subject” of witchcraft that was to appear throughout this period.<sup>687</sup> As Simon Davies has recently suggested, Scot’s view was not always so far divorced, in terms of practice, from the views of other, more mainstream

---

<sup>686</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, Sig. A3v.

<sup>687</sup> Davies, “The Reception of Reginald Scot’s Discovery of Witchcraft,” 380.

demonological writers; in that regard, Scot's skepticism did not place his work outside the realm of theological discussion. To the contrary, Davies has found that no other English witchcraft treatise was more widely cited than Scot's—though of course, citations were not always favorable and the fact of his skepticism made him an obvious foil against which many authors chose to display their opinions.<sup>688</sup>

Bernard took just that approach. Because of Scot's ubiquity in demonological discussions, it would have been difficult for Bernard to ignore his work. Moreover, since some had suggested that he was of "Master Scot's erroneous opinion," it made sense for Bernard to meet Scot's work head-on. Accordingly, he bookended *Guide* with denunciations of Scot's skeptical position; at the end of the work, following a list of ways the devil attempted to copy the works of God, Bernard explained:

The end of publishing these...is to show some ground of those things which we find related in the writings of men, and to be done between witches and devils, which otherwise may seem to be beyond all credit, & to be rejected as fabulous; which if *Wierus*, *Scot* and others had known, & diligently weighed, they had not so lightly esteemed of the true relations of learned men, and imputed the strange actions, undoubtedly done by witches and devils, only to brainsick conceits and melancholy.<sup>689</sup>

Yet though he positioned himself as clearly opposed to Scot, elsewhere in *Guide* (and, as Davies has observed, like other writers of many stripes) Bernard was willing to use Scot as a source to demonstrate various points and provide examples.

This use of Scot matched Bernard's use of many other reference materials—which was a second key aspect of his self-defense. Comparing the number and variety of sources he cited to other demonologists' citations, Bernard had a remarkably well-researched use of both academic and popular works related to witchcraft.<sup>690</sup> Along with citations from biblical passages—which his training in divinity at Cambridge qualified him to interpret—he cited a variety of intellectual works, allowing him defend his position by showing that other respected authors had come to the same, or similar, conclusions about these issues as he did. As we will see, his work in many ways resembled that of the earlier godly writer George Gifford. He also cited works of medical scholarship, notably that of physician and author John Cotta, which provided a respected framework for the analysis of physiological phenomena. A portion of Bernard's work essentially

---

<sup>688</sup> Davies, See also Davies, "EEBO-TCP," 1.

<sup>689</sup> Bernard, *Guide* (1630), 266.

<sup>690</sup> Davies, "EEBO-TCP," 4-5.

summarized Cotta's conclusions for a slightly less academic audience.<sup>691</sup> In Cotta's academic work on witchcraft, one finds what has been characterized as a "rather unexpected mix of doctrinal conservatism and incisive skepticism...typical of Cotta's thinking and style, but often missed by casual readers."<sup>692</sup> Yet even if Cotta's thought may seem unusual to today's readers, Bernard (and others<sup>693</sup>) found it a workable approach to a complex problem. As Marion Gibson has reminded us, even in an age full of fear of supernatural evils, magistrates could be quite reluctant to bring accused witches to trial; Bernard and Cotta picked up on this reserved and measured approach.<sup>694</sup>

In terms of its uses for witch trials, *Guide's* dependence upon the writings of a physician was significant. Witch prosecutions often revolved around illnesses, and physicians were often called as expert witnesses to prove that particular illnesses were supernatural.<sup>695</sup> By aligning his work with Cotta's, Bernard equipped his audience with a medical authority whose conclusions about seemingly unnatural occurrences might allow them to better evaluate any allegations of supposed supernatural illnesses.

As with his other publications, Bernard relied heavily on Scripture, both for foundational principles and for specific examples throughout, and he also made reference to a range of secondary works. Perhaps even more than his other publications, *Guide* drew upon a very large range of supporting sources. *Guide* drew widely from intellectual and theological works as well as from popular printed reports of phenomena. It cited works from the continent as well as Britain, and it cited works whose authors hailed from several different confessions. In other words, his research was particularly wide-ranging: the works he cited were both academic and popular;

---

<sup>691</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, Sig. A3v-A4r. On the various views of witchcraft in this period, including those of key thinkers such as Cotta, Scot, and others—including Bernard's position, which falls within the range of orthodox Protestant thought at the time—see Clark, *passim*. cf. Peter Elmer, "John Cotta," *ODNB*. David Wootton's discussion of Scot's position is also important: following Clark, Wootton emphasizes that Scot's disbelief in certain spiritual realities was nevertheless strongly theological: Wootton, "Reginald Scot / Abraham Fleming / The Family of Love."

<sup>692</sup> Pettigrew, "Profitable Unto the Vulgar: The Case and Cases of John Cotta's *Short Discoverie*," 122.

<sup>693</sup> Cf. Macdonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 207-209.

<sup>694</sup> Pointing out that not only demonologists but also modern theorists depend upon the sensational accounts of witchcraft pamphlets, Gibson suggests that "witch-hunting" may be a term of little use in the period. Discussing a pamphlet by Richard Galis, she notes it "is remarkable for the degree of dispassion and reluctance shown by magistrates repeatedly asked to question and commit suspected witches for trial. Another example...often cited for its horrible instances of cruelty and stupidity...is also a striking example of godly (i.e., 'puritan') people trying desperately to avoid scapegoating others for the illness and disorderly behaviour of their children..." Gibson, "Introduction," xi-xii.

<sup>695</sup> Macdonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 198-217; Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 62.

both contemporary and historical; of both English and continental derivation; both Protestant and Catholic.

Regarding intellectual works, although he made a point at the outset to align his work with Cotta and in opposition to Scot, his most frequently cited materials were the demonologies by Jean Bodin and Martin del Rio—two prominent continental and Catholic authors.<sup>696</sup> Yet primarily, rather than taking the conclusions or religious judgments of these authors, he mined them as news sources. This allowed him to describe and address a larger range of phenomena than he would otherwise have been able to do. By citing Catholic authors in specific ways, Bernard also gained a certain amount of theological leverage in favor of Protestant procedures; for instance, he pointed out that “even Bodinus a papist” witnessed that exorcism was only to be by prayer and fasting.<sup>697</sup> Bernard also cited Protestant authors, including Perkins, Gifford, and several others, with some frequency; this added not only further examples of phenomena to discuss but also further weight to his Protestant perspective.

Along with these intellectual works, Bernard cited numerous popular accounts of supernatural activities, including those in the many inexpensive pamphlets marketed at this time to broad, popular audiences which tended to emphasize the sensational nature of reported phenomena. On the one hand, Bernard here again gained a broader list of phenomena to analyze in his book. Yet by adopting these sensational popular accounts, he also further demonstrated his belief in the activity of evil spiritual forces on earth. By taking seriously even these ephemeral and sensationalized works, Bernard further asserted that he was no skeptic. In order to assert his orthodoxy, it was to Bernard’s advantage to align himself with as many commonly accepted works on witchcraft as possible. Since (as I describe in other chapters) he was regularly attentive to citation and attribution, it is further unsurprising that *Guide* was peppered with references to works of all genres.

It is also worth noting that in addition to motivating Bernard to research and write *Guide*, the trial seems to have influenced his thoughts about witchcraft—and thus the content of *Guide* as well. In particular, there are several passages that mention how and why spirits can speak out of

---

<sup>696</sup> Bodin’s *De la demonomanie des sorciers* is of some comparative interest with *Guide*. Both men claimed in their introductions to have written their work following personal involvement with a witchcraft trial; both wrote in the vernacular rather than Latin; and both included not merely theoretical and theological discussions, but also legal instructions to be used in trial settings. I am grateful to Jennifer Maguire, who is currently researching the *Demonomanie*, for helping me understand the context of Bodin’s writing.

<sup>697</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 66 (misprint for 72).

a human, including general discussions of demonic activity and ventriloquism as well as specific discussions of situations that closely resembled the events that occurred with Dinham:

Quest. 5. *May not a Devil and a good Angel be together in one man?*

Answer. I think not...

Object. *But it will be said, that two have been heard sometimes to speak in one man, one like a Devil, in a great voice, and another pleading against him with a small voice.*

Answer. What then? I. May not one devil counterfeit two voices, as well as one man can, very artificially, three or four, one after another? If they speak at once together, there is two; but it cannot be concluded, that there are two, because of the change of voice, one speaking after another. Secondly, if two be supposed, they may both be devils, for all their pleading...<sup>698</sup>

Although this passage later refers to a similar incident that happened in France published in *The Admirable History of a Magician*, it is likely that Bernard was drawing upon local experiences as well.<sup>699</sup> Bernard concludes quite interestingly:

The pretended good Angel is the worse Devil, soothing up the vain man in a foolish conceit of Gods great favor, as having an Angel sent for his soul's safeguard, as if he were so precious in God's eyes, to witness him to be his by an Angel, to whom the Lord hath not vouchsafed his Spirit to witness his Adoption, in the work of regeneration. A very illusion.<sup>700</sup>

This in particular does not appear to be a description of the French case—not least of all because of the gender of the pronoun used; the French case dealt with bewitched women, and with Bernard's careful attention to detail it would be uncharacteristic for him to make changes if he meant this description to relate to that case.<sup>701</sup> Bernard may have been speaking generally here, but most likely, he was recalling the Dinham case. If so, it is interesting that he seems to think quite poorly of the possessed individual, whom he characterized as a “vain man” wrongly believing that the good spirit was evidence of God's favor upon him. Altogether, it is impossible to separate *Guide* from the trial itself and its calling into question Bernard's public reputation as a minister. Both of these experiences influenced the development, purposes, and published form of the work.

---

<sup>698</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 67, 62, 63 (misprint in text for 67-69).

<sup>699</sup> That he was willing to cite personal information was clear on page 134 as he mentioned a conversation with a Master Edmunds of Cambridge.

<sup>700</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 63 (misprint for 69).

<sup>701</sup> On the French case, see “Gaufridi, Louis” in Burns, *Witch Hunts in Europe and America: An Encyclopedia*, 106-107; and Michaelis, *The admirable history of the possession and conversion of a Penitent woman*.

*Guide* and Bernard's message for those too inclined to identify phenomena as bewitchment

*Guide* was a demonstration of Bernard's orthodoxy, but it was also a prescriptive statement for the beliefs and behavior of others. Knowing the importance not only of content but also of form, it is important to observe that *Guide*'s composition accommodated a broad audience. Its small octavo size, which could be bound in a lightweight limp vellum cover with ties (found on several extant copies)—indicated portability and suggested reading in hand more than scholarly analysis at a desk. In addition, although its citations were numerous, these were largely confined to the margins—indicating a desire to show a studious background without assuming that the reader would be familiar with the contents of other scholarly works. Finally, and perhaps most interestingly in light of Bernard's other works, *Guide*'s structure reflected several aspects of his didactic, pastoral literature. For instance, *Guide*'s short chapters, use of short lists, relatively brief responses to questions or objections, and relegation of academic citations to the margins resembled popular devotional works such as *Staffe of Comfort* and *Ready Way to Good Works*. In contrast, his works for a learned audience such as *Plaine Evidences* and *Rhemes Against Rome* displayed features such as longer chapters, detailed discussions of biblical, theological and classical texts, and a structure resembled academic disputation—features largely absent from *Guide*. Nevertheless, Bernard in general wrote authoritatively, with many citations to support each of his claims. He maintained a convinced and authoritative tone throughout, although he was willing to signal a few matters as doubtful.<sup>702</sup> Altogether, his intended audience in *Guide* appears to have been broad, and his purposes both personal and pastoral: first, as we have seen, to clear himself, and second, to provide information that would help individuals in several different situations.

A significant portion of *Guide* addressed topics that would be useful for the instruction of those whom Bernard thought too likely to attribute unexplained phenomena to witchcraft. In practice, this part of the work both led to the sort of self-examining, God-focused spirituality that Bernard had promulgated in *Isle*, and limited the sorts of indictments, types of evidence, and assumptions about guilt that could influence the verdict of witchcraft trials. Bernard's main point in the first book was to show, as he put it in the table of contents, "That God's hand is in all

---

<sup>702</sup> For instance, in answer to the question "May not a Devil and a good Angel be together in one man?" he responded "I think not..." *Guide*, 67.

crosses, who ruleth over Devils, and over all their instruments.”<sup>703</sup> In this section, though he affirmed that witches existed and might be in league with the devil, he used a variety of sources to explain that events ascribed to witchcraft could often be explained by natural causes or as altogether counterfeit. Even when a problem was supernatural, it might be due to evil spirits but without any related witchcraft; moreover, it was always the result of God’s ordinance. Importantly, he asserted that because the devil had power—not witches—any attempts to bewitch others were not actually witches’ work, but the devil’s. Among his evidence was the fact that the Bible never ascribed to witches the power to bewitch others.<sup>704</sup> Here, Bernard sought to contextualize and limit charges of witchcraft by showing the importance of recognizing what witches could not do or had not done.

Clark has noted that theological writings about witchcraft largely eschewed a focus on the practical or physical matters of witchcraft (such as sabbats and orgies—matters sometimes sensationally described in popular conversation and cheap print) and instead emphasized the internal aspects of the sin, seeing it as a sort of idolatry and therefore as a breaking of the first commandment.<sup>705</sup> Across Protestant European demonological works there was a consistent and focused emphasis upon God’s sovereignty over all things, including the works of the devil and other evil forces.<sup>706</sup> As a result, Protestant writers encouraged that even if demonic activity was suspected, the afflicted should focus upon God and their relationships with Him rather than upon

---

<sup>703</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, n.p. On this view, which was common among many religious thinkers; see Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 448-456.

<sup>704</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 79-81. His views on the efficacy of witchcraft in the world are a bit difficult to parse throughout the work; he ascribed the ultimate source of witches’ power to other sources, and he doubted their involvement in many commonly-observed phenomena; yet he did not go so far as to deny that they could affect the world in some ways. For instance, he said good witches are “almost all healing witches, and cannot do to man, or beast any hurt, except they procure some other to do it, yet we may find, that some of these sometimes have the double faculty, both to bless, and to curse, to hurt, and to heal...” 127.

<sup>705</sup> Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 443-444, 502-508. He importantly emphasized that as it was an internal sin of the same sort as all other sins, ecclesiastical responses could be “pastoral and salvific”—something that Bernard, with Bull, seems to have truly acted upon.

<sup>706</sup> Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 445-456, 526-545. Job was seen as the key model for responding to demonic activity. In terms of comparing Catholic and Protestant approaches, it is important to note that both traditions drew upon Augustine. Eschewing a dualistic Manichaeism that would have seen the Devil as a potential threat to God’s power, both Catholic and Protestant authors emphasized God’s sovereignty in all things. “Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the issue occupied Catholic writers on witchcraft to quite the same extent as their Protestant rivals.” Yet while emphasizing large similarities, Clark is right to point out that Catholics and Protestants differed in the key area of what the God-ordained apparatus for dealing with witchcraft actually was. This difference was coupled with the general Protestant understanding that many Catholic practices were superstitious and that the Catholic church was diabolical and led by a papal anti-Christ. Thus, even though a modern scholar may identify many affinities in cross-confessional works on witchcraft, godly Protestants of the day would not have seen their Catholic demonologist counterparts as allies.



the witch or demon who was acting under His sovereign power. Thus when (for example) Bernard exhorted in *Guide* that “God’s hand is first to be considered in all crosses, whatsoever the means be, and whosever the instruments: for he ruleth over all” he was merely echoing and consolidating a common theological tradition that many clerics felt needed to be emphasized in order to combat “popular misapprehensions about the origin and purpose of misfortune and about the powers of witches.”<sup>707</sup> Clark further observes:

For the most part, the aim was to change radically the consciences of the general laity and to do this by clerical means. Bernard was probably being more perceptive than he intended when he remarked that ‘such as little dream of witches, and lightly regard them, are hardly any time or never troubled with them.’ But the pastors who wrote demonology felt strongly that it was only because ordinary men and women usually interpreted misfortune as a physical hurt brought by malevolent neighbours that they were so often convinced that it was caused by witchcraft. This distracted them from the real significance of their afflictions...<sup>708</sup>

There is no need here to assume with Clark that Bernard was “more perceptive than he intended” in saying that those who do not look for witchcraft were rarely troubled by it; precisely that message was consistent with his entire perspective on witchcraft. Indeed, any strange physical symptoms would be dealt with only by the use of godly means (prayer, Bible reading, introspection to identify personal sin, and the like) and witches would be identified and punished upon their own desire to seek evil power. Other than Bernard, among the key writers to try to make this clear to a popular audience was George Gifford, a godly minister who used a dialogue to communicate the importance of knowing and responding to God’s sovereignty over witches and demonic activity, as well as of avoiding all forms of magic.<sup>709</sup>

In *Isle*, Bernard emphasized private self-examination, confession, and repentance from sin; here he again fell squarely within this strain of divinity, emphasizing that no matter the obvious cause of an affliction, godly people should focus their attention and efforts upon their own state before God: not on the less powerful Satan, and certainly not on the ultimately powerless witches:

II. Being afflicted, not to curse or blaspheme, as Satan labours to make men do, and as the wicked will do; nor to be furiously enraged against suspected instruments, as vain, dissolute, and irreligious people commonly do, which desire forthwith to be

---

<sup>707</sup> Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 448-449.

<sup>708</sup> Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 450.

<sup>709</sup> Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 450-451, 461-464, 512-517, 524-525. I am grateful to Peter Lake for sharing with me some of his research on George Gifford and on witchcraft pamphlets.

revenged on them, as if it were those only that afflicted them: But first, men ought with all reverence and fear, to acknowledge, that all that befalleth them, to be God's hand: yea, though they know, the Devil and his devilish instruments, to have their hands therein. Job in his trouble said, The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away, Job. 1.12.<sup>710</sup>

Finally, no matter the incident to which he referred, Bernard made it clear that God's favor to an individual also did not usually appear through supernatural means unique to his or her situation: rather, it appeared through his regular work of justification and sanctification. As we will see, this turn away from the supernatural and toward a focus on personal pursuit of godliness was a key feature of *Isle*. Bernard's goal was to turn his readers' and hearers' thoughts from the unusual to the usual, helping them to focus on God's work in their own daily lives. This was a theological impulse. Even though "many pastors felt the need to attend to the great number of practical, spiritual questions that arose concerning witches..." as he did in *Guide*, like earlier author-minister George Gifford, whose "puritan practical divinity led him to active discouragement of witch hunts as spiritually detrimental for his flock," Bernard too wanted to emphasize one's own heart as the center point of true religion.<sup>711</sup>

Although Bernard emphasized his belief in witchcraft, he likewise emphasized that all occurrences—both natural and supernatural—should be understood as falling under God's control and providence. Any ill circumstance had God's hand at its root, even if secondary means might also be involved. As a result, Christians should not focus on identifying secondary means of affliction (e.g. witches) but rather use the occasion of their troubles to examine their own sins and make further efforts to follow God. Moreover, even when there might be occasion to prosecute a witch, the proceedings should be filled with patience and with the knowledge that the witch, too, was human and might repent of his or her sins, which were not so different than the sins of others:

Being afflicted, not to curse or blaspheme, as Satan labours to make men do, and as the wicked will do; nor to be furiously enraged against suspected instruments, as vain, dissolute, and irreligious people commonly do, which desire forthwith to be revenged on them as if it were those only that afflicted them...

...True it is, that evil instruments are to be punished, and our patience should not hinder nor hold back the course of justice: but this is not to be looked unto in the first place, nor, the instruments to be pursued with wrath and with a revengeful spirit, as if

---

<sup>710</sup> Bernard, *Guide* (1630), 6-7.

<sup>711</sup> McGinnis, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort*, 112, 117.

they were only to be blamed, and not men themselves for their sins, procuring such evils to themselves.

...afterwards, if there be evident proof and just cause, then to proceed; Yet with charity, against wicked instruments, seeking to have them punished, for their amendment. This is religion: this is Christianlike: thus ought the afflicted to behave themselves, and not swear and stare, curse and rage, against such as they suspect to harm them, seeking to be revenged of them, plotting their deaths, and rejoicing that they have their wills, and so think all to be well: though their own ways be wicked, going on still without reformation, even to the pit.<sup>712</sup>

Though later portions of *Guide* contained strong condemnation of the practice of witchcraft, in this passage Bernard's criticisms, including his warning of damnation, were strongest toward those, even afflicted parties, who acted uncharitably towards witches.<sup>713</sup> This move signals his overriding concern with all sin as a rebellion against God.

While Bernard was orthodox in suggesting that all afflictions were due to the providence of God and that many were due to sin, he did not choose to discuss the possibility that God's sovereign will might be to afflict someone for reasons other than personal sin—for instance by discussing that Job's afflictions from evil powers were part of a larger work in the heavenly realms, or that in Matthew Jesus healed a man born blind and said his affliction had not been due to sin but rather so that God's power might be displayed.<sup>714</sup> Bernard briefly mentioned Job's case, but without a clear statement of this possibility; he may or may not have intended it to allude to it. If not, it is possible that he simply took for granted that God has larger purposes but that these would be inscrutable to human understanding without special revelation (for instance, Job was unaware of the larger purposes of his suffering, and the reason for the blind man's affliction was only revealed through a statement of Jesus himself). Since Bernard did believe that all people are sinful, he probably considered that affliction was always a good opportunity to identify and turn from personal sin, whether or not it was the primary reason for it. We may further see this type of reasoning in the way that Bernard directed third parties to respond to others' afflictions: not by condemning others but by humbling themselves:

And as the afflicted should be humbled under God's hand, so the beholders looking on their afflictions, should not sit down to censure them, because they suffer such things; as Job's friends did him; but should learn Christ's lesson, thereby to see their

---

<sup>712</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 6-10.

<sup>713</sup> This does not, however, signal any leniency toward witchcraft.

<sup>714</sup> Job 1, John 9.

own danger, and know, that except they repent, they may likewise be so tormented, and perish, Luke 13:3,5.<sup>715</sup>

In attempting to turn readers' thoughts away from a fear of evil forces and toward the biblical principles of God's sovereignty and humanity's sinfulness, Bernard again echoed the pattern of George Gifford. Gifford's work on witchcraft sought to displace a popular view of the world in which good and evil (and ultimately God and Satan) were in battle with either able to triumph. In this view, witchcraft was powerful and represented the movement of terrifying supernatural forces. In contrast, Gifford presented a view in which God was not only the undoubted future victor over evil but also the undisputed current master of all evil creatures, including Satan. Witches and all evil forces were already scheduled for defeat and had at best only a temporary, circumscribed power. Because of this view of God's unmatched power, Gifford's real concern was not with evil forces. Rather, he turned consideration of witchcraft into an opportunity to shift popular concern onto the problem of human sinfulness. He aimed to shift his readers' attention from phenomena outside their control to those things that they could control: their personal responses to sin and to God's Word.<sup>716</sup> Though the degree to which Gifford's work on witchcraft directly influenced Bernard is unclear, the men did share a common theological worldview, and *Guide* echoed many of Gifford's ideas.

Bernard sought to ameliorate public fear of witchcraft through the primary balm of reminding audiences of God's sovereignty over evil and of witches' place, alongside all humans, as sinful beings. Alongside this, he used secondary salves of pointing out how many presumed instances of bewitchment actually had explanations that did not involve witches—from non-supernatural physiological occurrences, to intentional deceit, to demonic activity that occurred without the involvement of a witch.<sup>717</sup> In regard to unusual physiological symptoms, Bernard depended largely upon Cotta, who as a medical doctor had authority in identifying natural phenomena. This section of the work again highlighted the broad nature of Bernard's audience, as he seemed to assume that many readers would be unable to access (i.e., probably neither able to gain a copy of, nor to understand) Cotta's writings:

It is the general madness of people to ascribe unto witchcraft, whatsoever falleth out unknown, or strange to vulgar sense. I will here therefore write down the particular

---

<sup>715</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 10-11.

<sup>716</sup> I owe these observations about Gifford to Peter Lake.

<sup>717</sup> Bernard again echoed several authors, including Gifford, when he discouraged the bringing of uncertain accusations against suspected witches. See Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 515-516.

instances of strange and wonderful diseases set down by a learned physician...I will here write them out, as I find them in his discourse, yet a little more distinctly, for common capacities.<sup>718</sup>

Perhaps to avoid seeming too academic for “common capacities” it is worth noting that he did not even name Cotta in the body of the text—rather, Cotta became simply a “learned physician” and Bernard his interpreter for the common intellect. Mentioning several cases discussed by Cotta, and apparently including some of his own, Bernard desired that doubtful cases be referred to learned authorities and that afflicted parties not jump to accusation. This admonition became even more significant as Bernard enumerated, in his next chapter, many instances of intentional counterfeiting of bewitchment. The rest of his work did much to show that he does not accept the idea that all bewitchment was false—and even here he provided a list of ways to differentiate between real and false symptoms of bewitchment. Nevertheless, the range of examples he provided of counterfeit phenomena may have been enough to cause a careful reader to rethink the possibility that even a convincingly supernatural occurrence could be falsely produced by the afflicted, rather than the accused, party.

Bernard’s final attempt to stop individuals from too eagerly, or wrongly, identifying witchcraft was to remind readers that evil spiritual forces were never subject to witches (indeed, the arrangement went the other way—although spirits were deceptive and might act as if witches controlled them in order to achieve their own ends). Demons and the devil did not need the agency of any witch in order to act. Even when some consenting human witch was involved, any power came not from the witch, who was a slave of the devil, but from evil forces—forces whose work had been both licensed and circumscribed by God Himself.

Combined, the arguments in Book I emphasized God’s judgment not upon witches but upon all sinful humanity. When afflicted, or when aware of others’ affliction, the only reasonable course was to remind oneself of one’s own sin, repent, and turn to God. Bernard admonished those who blamed their afflictions upon witches, characterizing them as ignorant, as theologically misguided, and as having souls in great danger:

It is an evil too common amongst the ignorant vulgars, amongst the superstitious, the popishly-affected, amongst others of a vain conversation, which are protestants at large, neutrals and heart, sensual, without the power of religion, and amongst all the generations of vain people, to think presently, when any evil betideth them, that they, or theirs, or their cattle are bewitched, that some man or woman hath brought this

---

<sup>718</sup> Bernard, *Guide* (1630), 11-12.

evil upon them. From which irreligious and uncharitable thought so prejudicial to their souls' safety, many reasons may withdraw them.<sup>719</sup>

All of this, again, was designed to lead directly to the practices of humble self-examination, confession, repentance, and love of God that were the hallmark of puritan godliness and, Bernard believed, the heart of true religion. Only by placing beliefs about external evil in a correct perspective could individuals rightly pursue God and heaven. In this way, therefore, *Guide* was directly in line with the aims not only of *Isle*, but also of all Bernard's devotional works.

*Guide* and Bernard's message for those who could help eradicate witchcraft from society

In a sense, Book I had condemned those too fearful of witchcraft, and too inclined to prosecute witches, as being more concerned with avoiding physical and temporal affliction (which some attempted to ameliorate by revenging themselves upon accused witches) than with using their affliction as an opportunity to examine their own hearts for sin. Interestingly, Book II, a portion of which censured those who tolerated witchcraft, took up the other side of the same coin. Bernard suggested that this group, too, was overly concerned with avoiding physical affliction, and relatively unconcerned with spiritual matters. They simply accomplished their end in a different way: by seeking, or allowing, "good" or "white" witches to practice their arts. In this regard, Bernard's goal in Book II was once again to point out the sinfulness of individuals and urge them to turn their hearts to God—but in addition to help all individuals eradicate witchcraft from society, either by not supporting it personally or by acting within certain official capacities.

Bernard clearly stated his goal for Book II early in *Guide*—in the second dedicatory epistle. There was to be no mistaking his purpose:

Bad witches many prosecute with all eagerness; but magicians, necromancers, (of whom his late Majesty giveth a deadly censure in his *Daemonologie*) and the Curing witch, commonly called, The good Witch, all sorts can let alone: and yet be these in many respects worse than the other. Would God my endeavors might so prevail with Churchwardens who are bound by solemn oath, that they would make conscience to present unto you the Ecclesiastical Judges, both the witches themselves, as also all such as resort unto them.<sup>720</sup>

---

<sup>719</sup> Bernard, *Guide* (1630), 75-76.

<sup>720</sup> Bernard, *Guide* (1630), Sig. A5v.ff.

There may be doctrinal similarity between Bernard's assertion here that "good" witches were more dangerous than "bad" witches and his assertion in *Key* that church papists were more dangerous than recusants. It seems he held a general assumption that evil within certain social arenas was more insidious, harder to avoid, or more difficult to identify, than evil outside those spheres.

Book II's function of identifying witchcraft as evil had two uses. As we have seen, it showed Bernard as acknowledging and decrying witchcraft. Yet more significantly in terms of Bernard's desire to change the views of his readers, *Guide* made a special effort to point out that all types of witches were evil—not merely the "bad" witches that society was eager (as Book I suggested, far too eager) to prosecute, but also the "good" witches that Bernard believed were too often permitted to continue in their evil ways. Unlike those "ignorant" individuals who accepted "good" witches, Bernard argued that the evil of witchcraft was not dependent upon its result. A positive end from witchcraft did not make its evil means any less an act of rebellion against God. Thus, following Bernard's discussion about the existence, behavior, and sinfulness of witches, Bernard explained particular behaviors and dangers of "good" witches, their sinfulness in seeking unlawful power, and the sinfulness of those who turn to them, rather than God, for any reason.

As a minister, Bernard could appeal to individuals to pursue godliness in their own hearts. Yet he could also call individuals, especially those in positions of responsibility such as churchwardens—to report the activities of white witches. In this, he was not only promoting a form of godliness but also supporting the *de jure* (and at some point, he hoped, also the *de facto*) enforcement of the laws of the realm. As such, he could make a twofold request to lawmakers, law enforcers, and others to obey both God and the sovereign in this matter.

Finally, the fact that *Guide* addressed juries in particular was significant. In addition to the titular members of grand juries (who decided whether cases would go to trial), it also gave some attention to others involved in trials. This focus on legal proceedings demonstrated Bernard's concerns with the current state of witch trials, including the number of wrongful charges brought against witches and the acceptance of faulty or indeterminate evidence against them. As a minister, Bernard held the roles of caring for the physical and spiritual well-being of all people—including accused criminals—and of attempting to encourage the society to apply biblical principles to all its functions. Because Bernard did not feel that accused witches were treated

fairly in many trials, his calling therefore provided both motivation and forum for him to attempt to make amends.

In order to stem the tide of what he saw as witch convictions on poor evidence, it seems that Bernard decided the best course of action was to target the grand jurors who decided whether a case would go to trial at all. In this regard, *Guide* functioned as a manual for those free men who were qualified to serve on grand juries who may have found themselves rather unexpectedly given the sober task of determining whether supernatural forces were at work in a particular instance—something that required both legal and theological knowledge for which their regular work may not have prepared them.

Bernard did not give primary attention to Justices of the Peace, who initially determined whether legal procedures should continue against an accused person, nor to members of the petty juries that actually tried assize cases, nor to the assize judges who directed the prosecution at trials and sentenced convicted criminals. In contemporary legal procedure, JPs oversaw the “first of three procedural crossroads” to determine guilt, but at least in theory their judgment required a lesser level of persuasion than that of the grand and petty juries in later stages.<sup>721</sup> Likewise, the petty juries at a trial could be strongly influenced by the judge, who “operated more like a modern prosecutor than a neutral referee,”<sup>722</sup> and by the body of prosecutorial evidence. This evidence was not intended to provide a balanced case but to “systematically collect and present evidence upon which the guilt of the accused could be based” and which rarely saw interpretation by legal experts.<sup>723</sup> These problems were compounded by the speed at which each case during a session had to be decided.<sup>724</sup> Because *Guide* focused upon grand juries, it seems

---

<sup>721</sup> Generally on the court system and assize trials, see Baker, “Criminal Courts and Procedure at Common Law”; and Barnes, “Introduction.” More specifically regarding trials for witchcraft, see Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, chapters 1-2; and Rushford, “Burnings and Blessings,” 91-100.

<sup>722</sup> Rushford, “Burnings and Blessings,” 99. Judges could attempt to affect juries’ decisions to different degrees. Darr, 68-69.

<sup>723</sup> Rushford, “Burnings and Blessings,” 97-98. Even when legal counsel was available, defendants did not have access to representation; cf. Barnes, “Introduction,” xxxiii-xxxiv; Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 62.

<sup>724</sup> Regardless of the number of cases to be tried, courts sat for a set number of days each session. Somerset and Devon were among counties singled out as having extreme numbers of prisoners, thus further stressing the time-limitedness of the system. Yet as Rushford suggests, this problem may have assisted the development of a more robust plea-bargaining system that actually benefited several confessing witches. In terms of the ability of petty juries to decide cases well, it is significant that jurors typically decided multiple cases at one time and—compounding their difficulties—were sequestered without food or drink when deciding on a verdict. Darr explains, “The result of all those inconveniences and disadvantages was that many tried their best to avoid jury duty. Even constables and grand jurors who were present at court could be drafted to the petty jury. Whoever chanced to be in court as a witness, a spectator or a party risked being snatched up to jury service, a concern that led some victims to refrain from prosecution.” This issue was well known to contemporaries; the Burghley papers (printed in Barnes, Appendix



Bernard was aware of the tendency of juries at assize trials to follow the line of presented evidence. He does offer three questions at the conclusion of his work addressed to petty juries; the brevity and directness of these questions again suggests a recognition that they would not have the time for study or reflection that grand jurymen did.<sup>725</sup>

Although like petty juries, grand juries only reviewed prosecutorial—not defensive—evidence, they did hold power to sift this evidence in order to decide upon which charges the accused would be indicted and which cases had enough proof to proceed. In all of the proceedings the burden of proof was upon the prosecution’s ability to bring conclusive evidence; relatively little consideration was given to the defense.<sup>726</sup> This facet of the legal process aligned with the sorts of evidence *Guide* addressed and the types of counsel it provided. Yet as Orna Darr has pointed out, in cases having “no direct evidence, the triers of fact had to rely on the next best thing—assumed facts—presumptions that were built on the foundation of circumstantial evidence.”<sup>727</sup> This reality was to Bernard’s great disapproval. In summary, grand juries might have the opportunity to reflect upon evidence in a way not generally available to petty juries during assize trials; their legal requirements for evidence to move a case forward were more stringent than those for JPs, and they had less of the prosecutorial role of assize judges. For these reasons, it would make sense for Bernard to target this group.

Having chosen grand jurors as the titular target for his attempts to reform witchcraft trials, Bernard began Book I (as we saw) with a call to attribute more supernatural power to God than to witches and to realize that many assumed instances of bewitching were natural phenomena. This was in part a general direction to all who were fearful of witchcraft, but its prominent place in a work so clearly positioned to speak to grand jurors would also instruct their view of evidence: they of all people should not be quick to assume that witchcraft was a cause—and certainly not the primary cause—of any malady. Later in the work, however, Bernard was more specific, for instance proceeding with strong language to instruct them regarding their determination to bring a *billa vera* or an *ignoramus* upon various evidence:

---

I) contain instructions noting “by experience it is founde that towarde the ende of the assises as they nowe be it is harde to finde a jurie for the triall of any one cause.” Barnes, “Introduction,” xiii-xiv, xvii-xx, 54-55; Rushford, “Burnings and Blessings,” 98-99, Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 58-59, 68-69.

<sup>725</sup> “They in a case of Witchery are ever to enquire three things. I. Whither the party accusing be bewitched? II. Whither the party accused be a witch? III. Whither this same hath bewitched the other. Without the consideration of these three, they cannot well give in their verdict.” Bernard, *Guide*, 257-258.

<sup>726</sup> Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 70.

<sup>727</sup> Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch*, 67.

...unless the Witchcraft be very clear, they may be much mistaken; and better it were, till the truth appear, to write an *Ignoramus*, than upon oath to set down *Billa vera*, and so thrust an intricate case upon a Jury of simple men, who proceed too often upon relations of mere presumptions, and these sometimes very weak ones too, to take away men's lives.<sup>728</sup>

At one point in the work, Bernard stated that he hoped to make the ideas of Cotta more accessible: "I will here write them out, as I find them in his discourse, yet a little more distinctly, for common capacities."<sup>729</sup> A later comment also reinforced this, suggesting that Bernard was thinking of grand jury men who, "none of them being read in any learned tractates touching the practices of witches" must still make good judgments.<sup>730</sup> He further echoed his other instructional works as, over several pages, he directed how "the Gentlemen of the Grand-Jury, before they write *Billa vera*, are with all serious attention to look upon the seeming bewitched, and to ponder all the circumstances, lest they be deceived by a counterfeit..." and then proceeded to offer a program of questioning and demanding evidence (numbered in several different lists) that jury members could employ.<sup>731</sup> The small, portable format of the printed edition echoed this purpose, as the work could perhaps be referenced during proceedings. In addition, at the end of *Guide*, Bernard included a brief list comparing the acts of God with the acts of Satan. In this he not only continued his regular practice of attempting to communicate concepts through lengthy lists and charts (and his frequent tendency to append a small, related work at the end of a larger) but more specifically provided a brief and accessible reference within the volume.

Altogether, in *Guide* Bernard attempted to leverage, and to work within, established religious and social structures to ensure that witchcraft was eradicated in a godly manner. He exhorted that all attempted acts of witchcraft, and all resorting to witches, be seen as sinful and punished accordingly, hoping not only that individuals would cease supporting "good" witches but also that authorities such as churchwardens would take seriously their duty to report such activities. In addition, he sought to ensure just legal proceedings against accused witches by educating grand juries (and to a lesser degree, petty juries) about the nature of witchcraft.

In this, *Guide* was similar to several of Bernard's other semi-political publications—among which were his anti-Separatist works which engaged religious opponents in a religious and

---

<sup>728</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 24-25. Darr discusses *Guide* more specifically, as well: 52-53.

<sup>729</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 11-12.

<sup>730</sup> Bernard, *Isle*, n.p., "Authors Earnest Requests."

<sup>731</sup> Bernard, *Guide*, 39-52.

academic polemic debate; his anti-Catholic works, including *The Bible-Battells*, which addressed King Charles and sought to influence policies related to international warfare; his publications related to Laudian policies; his unpublished works on congregationalism addressed to New England religious leaders; and *The Faithful Shepherd* and other works for ministers which sought to help them effectively pursue their calling. In *Guide*, Bernard's desire was to more closely align the legal treatment of witches with godly procedures by protecting the innocent, showing compassion to the guilty, and showing equal distaste (and equal responses by authorities) for all forms of evil. Although *Guide* was distinctly different from his other works in topic, the fact that he wrote boldly about social and legal issues and attempted to leverage his position as an author-minister to effect real change in the treatment of witches was fully in line with the way he pursued various religio-political agendas throughout his career

#### Responses to *Guide* and *Isle*

*Guide* thus sought a broad audience—not only individuals who could learn not to be fearful of being bewitched but also officials who had responsibilities in legal proceedings. It seems that Bernard reached many portions of his target audience. It continued in print for some time—with a second edition in 1629 and a reprint in 1630—that suggest reasonable interest shortly following initial publication this period.<sup>732</sup> Bernard's readers included John Stearne, protégé of Matthew Hopkins, who used *Guide* as a model for his *A Confirmation and Discovery of Witch Craft*.<sup>733</sup> It is hard to say how much of a practical effect *Guide* had on grand juries or witch trials; yet it is worth noting the 1636 trial of Elizabeth Stile in Somerset. As the assize order explains:

Whereas Elizabeth Stile, widdowe, was indicted att this assizes for witchcraft and upon her tryall was acquitted, and forasmuch as it appeared to this court that she was maliciously prosecuted by her adversaries, it is ordered by this court att the humble request of the said Elizabeth that she shalbe admitted *in forma pauperis* to bringe her accion against Nicholas Hobbes and all or any other of her prosecutors. And Mr. Glanville, Mr. Rolles, Mr. Fynche, and Mr. Morgan are assigned to be her councill, and Mr. Champion to be her attorney therein.<sup>734</sup>

---

<sup>732</sup> All editions were printed by Felix Kingston for Edward Blackmore, which suggests that it sold well.

<sup>733</sup> Malcolm Gaskill, *Witchfinders* (London: John Murray, 2005), 269.

<sup>734</sup> Barnes, "Introduction," 28.

This sort of acquittal could be in line with the restrained belief in witchcraft encouraged by Bernard, Cotta, and other religious writers. In that regard, it may be possible to think that *Guide*, or other works like it, had an influence: as Jan van Dijkhuizen has noted, “after Richard Bernard’s *Guide to Grand Jury Men* (1627), the publication of demonological treatises came to a temporary halt, which lasted until the early 1640s, and the number of witchcraft accusations decreased.” Yet as he further explains, these publications’ effect is difficult to calculate because they were produced more or less concurrently with a general increase in skepticism and decrease in popular accusations of possession and witchcraft; the last English possession pamphlet dates from 1622, and *Guide*’s 1626 publication made it the last witchcraft treatise in this period—indications of a waning interest in these supernatural events in pre-civil-war England.<sup>735</sup>

Thus, we should be slow to attribute any clear pattern of influence from *Guide* to legal change; readers and even reprints may indicate the way in which *Guide* reflected, rather than led, current trends away from certain types of witchcraft trials or evidence. Interestingly, however, *Guide* did gain an appreciative audience in somewhat different social contexts. Later in the seventeenth century it would be used during and after the infamous American trials in Salem, and it was called a “solid and wise Treatise” by Increase Mather.<sup>736</sup> It also reached north to Scotland, where John Bell of Gladsmuir would cite it several times in his 1697 *Witch-Craft Proven*.<sup>737</sup> In terms of reprints, and compared with Bernard’s other works, *Guide* was a successful publication. Yet it was outshone by *Isle*, which saw more reprints than any of Bernard’s works, both in his own time and far into later years; it was in a revised fourth edition within a year of initial publication, in its eleventh edition within Bernard’s life, and was regularly published into the eighteenth century. Moreover, as perhaps the earliest allegorical work produced by a godly author, the work had literary influence on subsequent publications.<sup>738</sup>

In this chapter, I have suggested that *Guide* and *Isle* both contained echoes of concerns and tactics that Bernard incorporated across his corpus, yet that each work was particularly connected with the 1626 trial. By placing the works in this context we can more fully understand their development and content. Yet we must likewise view them in terms of Bernard’s long-term, overarching goals as an author-minister toward the reformation of the national church and of the

---

<sup>735</sup> van Dijkhuizen, *Devil Theatre*, 4. As he notes, this decline has been explained in different ways, including through the rise of Arminianism.

<sup>736</sup> Reis, *Damned Women*, 78. Mather, *Cases of Conscience Concerning Evil Spirits*, 252.

<sup>737</sup> Larner, “Two Late Scottish Witchcraft Tracts.”

<sup>738</sup> This probably included, as several authors have suggested, an influence on Bunyan and his *The Holy War*.

individuals within it. Only by considering both these short-term and long-term contexts together can we properly understand the purposes behind these two unusual publications. This contextual perspective allows us to avoid tendencies to see these unusual publications as aberrations or curiosities, and rather to understand them as integral parts of a coherent author-ministerial program.

## CHAPTER 7

### MANUSCRIPT, PRINT, AND RESTRICTIONS WITHIN THE NATIONAL CHURCH, 1630-1641 (OR: GODLY MODERATE NON-CONFORMITY MEETS LAUDIAN MODERATE NON-LICENSURE)

In 1641, Bernard was positively jubilant upon the lifting of Laudian printing restrictions. He was also ready to condemn in extremely strong terms those church leaders who had fostered this censorship: they were not merely misguided, but evil. The following, which appeared in the dedication to the members of parliament in a work about the Sabbath he published soon after these restrictions began to loosen, demonstrated his belief that censorship had been effective, widespread, and a significant hindrance to godly religion:

...books upon books have been written, and by license passed the press, to take away the morality of the fourth commandment, never, in any age heretofore, doubted of; to make also people believe, that our Christian Sabbath hath no warrant from thence, and that it is not of divine institution...

And that they might securely go on in these their profane errors without controversy, and persuade the more inconsiderate sort, that what they have written, are truths, and unanswerable, they have stopped the means of printing sound Antidotes to their empoisoned propositions, whereupon they have been bold to insult over godly orthodox Divines, with too many words of insolency, scorn, and much contempt; which they have borne with great patience, waiting the Lord's leisure till he should be pleased in his good time to give liberty for the publishing of their learned labors, which have of long time lien by them.

And now (blessed be God) the time is come, the way is made open by your honorable wisdoms, goodness, power, and authority, for godly and learned men to discover the vain boastings, and the folly of those evil ones, to the view of all. Some of ours proceed polemically, and have made answer fully to the best esteemed of those profane writers. Some only write positively, to discover the truth, and to make it known in a plain way, that the meanest capacity may be rightly informed...

But the cause is Christ's, and so deserves acceptation and promotion: God hath appointed you at this time, as his worthiest and meetest instruments for this end: I cannot therefore seek for other patrons in exalting the honor of Christ, which by these men hath been so dishonored, and his people so abused. For the redress whereof, as you have nobly begun, so to proceed on to do ever valiantly in the best service of your God, there shall not be wanting the hearty and earnest prayers...<sup>739</sup>

This passage is suggestive of broader themes within Bernard's ecclesiology. As we have seen, from the time he re-conformed under Archbishop Matthew through the 1620s, he was a consummate godly-but-conformist member of the national church. He did not always agree with

---

<sup>739</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, a2r-a3v.

the policies of his superiors, but he remained willing to acquiesce to their orders when pressed. Yet as Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake have shown, ecclesiastical policies in this period eventually underwent a shift, moving from James's unifying tendencies of ambiguity, compromise, and inclusiveness, to Charles's pursuit of uniformity and order along with his trend toward anti-Calvinist partisanship. Few Caroline initiatives were new, but their more programmatic enforcement allows us to identify a marked difference in ecclesio-political styles.<sup>740</sup> From approximately 1630 through the re-assembling of parliament in 1640, new ecclesiastical restrictions and more extensive enforcement of existing statutes made Bernard's position of godly conformity increasingly difficult to maintain.

In this chapter, I narrate Bernard's print and parish work in the 1630s in order to make two intertwined arguments. First, I demonstrate (echoing my work in previous chapters) that the content of Bernard's publications in this period had close connections with his parish and ecclesiastical activities. Second, through a close look at Bernard's authorial work, I argue that he attempted to continue the same sort of publishing career under Laudian censorship that he had in previous decades.

By doing the latter, I refine our understanding of the existence and function of censorship in Caroline England. Several scholars, such as Kevin Sharpe, have downplayed the significance of censorship in this period. Those who take this perspective often do so by focusing upon illicitly published works that were authored, printed, and/or distributed by individuals willing to risk the censure of the state; this does not properly attend to the impact of censorship on individuals unwilling to risk retribution from religio-political authorities.<sup>741</sup> Yet as Anthony Milton has pointed out, a focus upon illicit publishing is problematic because "by publishing in this illicit fashion authors were effectively resigning their right to be considered as spokesmen of the orthodox mainstream."<sup>742</sup> Even if one might be convinced that "censure by the authorities...failed to thwart publishing by those who were bent on opposing the authorities" this still implies a silencing of those who could not, or would not, bring themselves to that kind of rebellion.<sup>743</sup> In contrast, once they knew that their works had little chance of publication, many moderate puritans self-censored and stopped submitting their works for publication. Instead of

---

<sup>740</sup> Fincham and Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I"; and Fincham, "Episcopal Government, 1603-1640."

<sup>741</sup> Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 644-654.

<sup>742</sup> Milton, "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England."

<sup>743</sup> Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 652. He cites Olander.

the press, Milton suggests, these individuals turned to the circulation of manuscripts. Bernard was among those upon whom Milton notes that “direct editing or suppression appears to have been inflicted.”<sup>744</sup> Moreover, regardless of the reality, it is significant that Bernard *believed* that he and other godly ministers were being censored (see the quotation at the beginning of this chapter).<sup>745</sup> Bernard was certainly among those who might have self-censored during this period.<sup>746</sup>

While I take Professor Milton’s important point that many godly authors self-censored by turning to manuscript, rather than print, publications, using Bernard’s case I emphasize the caveat that some godly authors, especially those like Bernard with interests in continuing to conform, did not see the Laudian press as entirely inaccessible. Such a perspective, I will show, led Bernard to continue pursuing print publication throughout the 1630s. Bernard remained committed to an official position of conformity throughout his career. Nevertheless, both in his personal ministry and his writing, he continued to innovate and to push the boundaries of the acceptable in order to achieve an elusive harmony between his own theological and religious goals, on the one hand, and his commitment to the national church, on the other. Rather than retreating from a public print ministry toward a sort of self-censorship, throughout this period Bernard retained an active program of writing and of seeking publication. Although the circumstances of the 1630s necessitated some changes, Bernard pursued continuity and even—to a degree—compromise as he sought to continue the same sort of godly ministry, both in parish and print, that he had fostered over the course of his career.

---

<sup>744</sup> He makes reference to certain Hartlib documents I discuss in this chapter. Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy,” 644.

<sup>745</sup> He was in good company in this conclusion; cf. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, 220-221.

<sup>746</sup> We should note that Bernard occasionally did turn to manuscript authorship without attempting to publish. For instance, in 1637 he sent two manuscript treatises to Cotton and other leaders in New England in an attempt to semi-privately correct certain ecclesiastical practices. Pilgrim Hall Museum, Plymouth, MA, Cotton MS. This treatise, which addresses church covenants, may have circulated in England and reached Hartlib, who noted “MS. illud de foedere is said to bee Mr Bernhards.” HP 29/3/26B, 27A, 29A. In addition, Samuel Hartlib’s notes mention a manuscript catechism of Bernard’s. If this catechism was distinct from some edition of *Common Catechisme*, it would likely be a case in which he would logically have chosen to self-censor: with the episcopal crackdown on parish catechetical activity under Curll, Laud, and Piers, it would have been difficult for him to defend attempts to publish another catechism “Richard Bernhard of Batcome hase a MS. *Catechismi Questiones* vpon the V. Cap. *Catechismus* more Martiniano. Welles.” HP 29/3/22A.



## Bernard's situation in the early 1630s

Bernard's day-to-day work in the 1630's was largely similar to that which he had pursued throughout his career. He still gave his time to preaching, catechizing and ministering within his parish as well as to completing both new and revised publications for the press.<sup>747</sup> Yet alongside such continuities, there were significant changes afoot. Some of Bernard's closest allies in the church hierarchy had died, including Arthur Lake in 1626 and Tobie Matthew in 1628. These men were replaced, in general, with individuals less favorable toward Bernard's godly program, including William Piers, who was translated to Bath and Wells in 1632 and would become a strong supporter of Laudian policies. According to the parliament that later condemned him, Piers's activities during his time as bishop included his suppression of lectures and Sunday afternoon sermons throughout the diocese; his prohibition against explaining catechism questions or using catechisms other than the one in the prayer book; his encouragement of rites and wakes on the Sabbath; and his erection of altars and other "Innovations in the Rites and Ceremonies of the church...tending to Popery and Superstition." Moreover, he "vexed and molested in his ecclesiastical courts diverse of the clergy and laity of his diocese for trivial and small matters; excommunicated and vexed diverse churchwardens..."; pressed the "Ex Officio" oath upon

---

<sup>747</sup> In the 1630s, Bernard's devotional and pastoral works for the press included *Common Catechisme* (first published 1630; corrected and enlarged 1632; reprinted throughout the decade), *Creede* (1630), and *Ready Way* (1635). In addition, as I will show, during this time he was also at work on what would become the massive 1644 volume including the texts of *Thesaurus* and *Abstract*. Though these works became somewhat controversial in that as they fell to Laudian censorship, at least at the outset Bernard may have considered them to be more generally pastoral than directly anti-Laudian. Reader Samuel Hartlib noted that Bernard was well begun on this work as early as 1634, although the very large project certainly took a large amount of time—likely years, considering the other activities in which he was involved. Because he seems to have received his information about Bernard second-hand (often through a Mr. Byfield), his information is on occasion slightly mistaken or delayed; however, the gist of his information was largely correct. There is, for instance, a 1634 entry in Hartlib's journal in which "Mr. Bernard of Barkham is making a very profitable Concordance Alphabeticall. Mr. Byfield thinks hee is gone over halfe the Letters of the Alphabet." Shortly after this, he recorded: "Topica Theologica may bee perfected by Mr Rich. Bernard or Hazard or Lovel...It is a great worke and I feare rather to bee desired then expected in this perverse Age." By a note of January 1635, Hartlib had correctly identified Batcombe as Bernard's home, rather than the earlier "Barkham"—which may have been a misspelling or a misunderstanding of Batcombe, or may have been a conflation with Allhallows Barking, curacy of a Mr. Lovel whom Hartlib had mentioned in the same note. Again some time later, Hartlib refined his report from Byfield that Bernard was halfway through the concordance, to the information that he was to G or H. Some of Hartlib's information was quite timely: in a note written after July, 1634, he reported that Bernard had made "an exact Treatise for Charity or Liberality the completest that ever hase beene written"; and indeed Bernard's *Ready Way* was licensed that year. HP 29/2/6A-7A; 29/2/35B-36A. The Mr. Byfield mentioned was perhaps Adoniram Byfield, who moved in the same networks as John White; it was in White's town of Dorset that Bernard addressed the ministers. It is also possible that Hartlib's contact was Richard Byfield, who himself wrote on the Sabbath and is also mentioned in Hartlib's papers. HP 29/2/35B-36A. On Adoniram Byfield's networks see Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 233; and "Summoning an Assembly" in *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly* Vol. 1, 16-19.

diocesans; took money unfairly; displayed corruption in the placements of ministers in benefices; tampered with records of testimonies taken before him; acted as a “a countenancer of those who are negligent” and “hath vexed and persecuted...Mr. Bernard...and many other good and painefull Ministers...” among other troublesome activities.<sup>748</sup>

Yet the programs of William Laud (appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in August 1633) and of Charles himself were to be even more significant for the national church; these, too, propounded significant changes for the godly. From as early as 1627, communion tables in some parishes and college chapels were beginning to be voluntarily railed and turned altar-wise in response to the beginnings of the “Laudian style” of the Caroline church.<sup>749</sup> Changes were slow, but by late 1633 the components were in place to firmly establish several such Laudian ecclesiastical policies. These included not only the landmark St. Gregory’s judgment (which Piers may have had as early as that December and which he promptly began incorporating into his diocesan administration) but also the re-publication of the Declaration of Sports, which—much to the disapproval of the godly—affirmed the set of recreations lawful for English subjects to participate in on Sundays.<sup>750</sup> At varying times, and to varying degrees, these and other changes began to affect Batcombe and Bernard.

### 1633 and the question of the Sabbath

On October 18, 1633, Charles re-published the Declaration of Sports. The issue was contentious throughout the realm due to the fact that godly members of society supported a tightly circumscribed set of activities on the Lord’s Day and desired to censure what they saw as pleasure-focused recreations, many of which might lead to other sins. Somerset became a key area of contest on this issue, both because it was the new seat of Piers, one of the “most enthusiastic protagonists of the book” and also because it had been the site earlier in 1633 of an order for the suppression of wakes—which the new order now explicitly allowed.<sup>751</sup> Like many other godly divines, Bernard believed that the Bible restricted the set of activities appropriate for

---

<sup>748</sup> A first name is not given here, and others with the last name Bernard were active in the diocese at that time; however, given the situation and Richard Bernard’s prominence, it would be likely to refer to him. *Articles of Accusation and of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England Against William Pierce*, 7.

<sup>749</sup> Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 189.

<sup>750</sup> Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 191-202. *The Kings Maiesties declaration to his subiects, concerning lawfull sports to bee used*. See also Parker, *The English Sabbath*.

<sup>751</sup> Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, 180-195 (quote on 181). See also Barnes, “County Politics and a Puritan Cause Celebre: Somerset Churchales.”

the Lord's Day to worship, meditation, singing, reading, laying aside money for the poor, and other activities that tended toward the increase of devotion to God. He was, therefore, understandably concerned with the Declaration.

Bernard responded quickly to the Declaration both through his personal ministry and through his writing. On January 31, 1633/4, he met with the ministers of Dorset and asked them several questions about the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. Local resident William Whiteway recorded Bernard's questions in his commonplace book.<sup>752</sup> Whiteway recorded two sets of questions: ten about the Sabbath and six about the Lord's Day. The former were more specifically in regard to the implications and practice of the fourth commandment, including: its relationship to the seventh day; the nature of the words "annexed" to the commandment; whether "in it thou shalt do no work" was a command; whether the fourth commandment "can be proved to be from the beginning"; whether "any part of this command be ceremonial, or whether wholly moral"; what is the "principal matter of the command"; how it was kept "morally, how ceremonially & how superstitiously"; whether the seventh day was changeable; and (pointedly) "Whether any sports were used on that day in Israel." In turn, Bernard's questions about the Lord's Day were in regard to its relationship to the fourth commandment; its institution; its time of beginning, the nature of its being "set apart"; the recreations lawful on the day; and how it had been kept "from the beginning to this day in the church."<sup>753</sup>

These questions suggest Bernard's eagerness to help himself and others, including these Dorset ministers, solidify their theological positions related to the issue. Only questions are recorded in Whiteway's book, but Bernard would provide answers to these and other questions in his *Threefold Treatise of the Sabbath*. Although the treatise was not published until 1641 and internal evidence allows us to date the final version of the printed text to no earlier than 1636, he may have completed much of the manuscript earlier—even directly following the beginning of this controversy in 1633-4. Among evidence supporting an early date for the initial text of *Threefold Treatise* is a note by Diarist Samuel Hartlib some time after 11 July, 1634—perhaps six months to

---

<sup>752</sup> CUL, MS Dd.11.73., 87-88, "Certain questions propounded by Mr Bernard Minster of Batcombe unto the Divines of Dorsetshire, concerning the Sabbath Day, or the Lords Day, January the 31, 1633" in the Commonplace Book of William Whiteway. The questions begin on 88 and then continue on the bottom portion of the preceding page. Whiteway's book records a variety of types of information; among the significant ecclesiastical issues he saw fit to record were the censures suggested for Mr. Shervill (which, perhaps significantly, were in response to his activities regarding church decorations) in 1632 and also a libel of 1628 ("The wisest king did wonder...").

<sup>753</sup> The list ends with the note, "I desire answers with proofs for all these," which may have been Bernard's exhortation or Whiteway's response to the questions.

a year after the meeting with the Dorset ministers—that Bernard had composed a manuscript treatise of the Sabbath.<sup>754</sup> When *Threefold Treatise* was finally published in 1641, Bernard specifically described the effect of licensing restrictions on Sabbatarian works. Moreover, Bernard had the work to press very soon after printing restrictions were lifted, and a lengthy work such as *Threefold Treatise* would be difficult to submit with such speed unless he already had much of the manuscript ready. I will further address these issues later in the chapter; I turn now to an equally pressing issue at this time for Bernard: the 1634 visitation.

#### The 1634 visitation, part I: A bit of parish trouble

The 1630s saw ascendant Laudian leaders in the national church begin to expand and enforce a program that inhibited certain aspects of the sort of godly ministry that Bernard—and those like him—had pursued for years. Some of the changes that were most problematic for the godly included requirements on a strict adherence to the Book of Common Prayer, a focus on ceremony within the functions of the church, and an “Arminian” or non-predestinarian soteriology. Puritan ministers (and author-ministers) who remained within the national church chafed against these and other restrictions, which were enforced within their parishes by their bishops and in print by strict licensing practices. Relatedly, this decade was also difficult in so far as it saw several flare-ups of intra-parish issues. As godly ministers fell out of favor with an increasing number of Laudian church leaders, it created a space for parishioners who disliked their ministers’ style of ministry to effect changes. By presenting their ministers to the bishop for actions of non-conformity, parishioners could attempt to force religious changes to occur within their parishes.<sup>755</sup>

It is against this background that I now turn to a close study of the way that Bernard responded both in parish and in print to a particular group of parish troubles. During the 1634 visitation, Bernard and his associate Nicholas Paull, who was curate of Upton Noble within the parish of Batcombe, were both presented for several issues that demonstrated their departure from practices required by the Laudian episcopate: Paull was presented for failing to read the

---

<sup>754</sup> HP 29/2/35B-36A.

<sup>755</sup> “Presentations” before the bishop or archbishop were a formalized way of bringing complaints and reporting on conformity; after the presentations in each parish, the cases would be heard and decided. These often occurred during a “visitation” in which the bishop or archbishop required certain reports from parish authorities, and others would be brought voluntarily.

litany before prayers, leaving out part of the evening prayer on Sundays and holidays, and failing to wear his surplice at prayer time; Bernard was presented for his catechetical practices, for meeting privately with certain parishioners, and for several issues related to the church building and the communion table.<sup>756</sup> These presentments indicate that Batcombe in the 1630s was home to a rigorous brand of godly ministry. Although this sort of leadership was nothing new to the Batcombe parishioners (it had existed under Bernard's predecessor James Bisse as well as more than twenty years under Bernard himself), not everyone had come to appreciate the forms of discipline and exhortation that accompanied a godly ministry. Rather, Bernard had a style of ministry that, for at least some parishioners, had gone too far.

The visitation provided an opportunity for James Aishe, a prominent and wealthy parishioner, to air his grievance that Bernard had "particularized" the application in a sermon to certain sins he saw in Aishe. Bernard was presented on the accusation that he would at times preach directly against certain parishioners, including Aishe. As we saw in Chapter 3, for Bernard a key part of the sermon was application: a minister's duty was not only to provide intellectual instruction but also to help his parishioners see how the Scriptures had a very direct relevance upon the way they lived each day. Coupling this with the close awareness that Bernard believed ministers should have of their parishioners' spiritual states, it is possible to see how his pastoral ministry could be perceived as personally invasive—and how parishioners who were uninterested in adopting this form of godliness might respond to his ministry by taking offence. In fact, since the beginning of his pastoral ministry Bernard had long been aware of the potential for sermons to give offense, but he saw offense-taking as an improper response to the application of a sermon:

The use [of a text in a sermon] being made aptly, next and immediately follows the application, which is not the using of doctrines to several estates: for use and applications so are made almost one, which in nature are plainly distinct. But application is a nearer bringing of the use delivered, after a more general sort, in the third person, as spoken to persons absent; to the time, place, and persons then present: and uttered in the second person, or in the first, when the minister, as often the apostle doth, will include himself with them.

This is lively set forth unto us in the speech of Nathan and David together...

This is the minister's duty... This home-speaking is the sharp edge of the sword, the word of God; this bringeth the uses to their proper places, as salves clapped to the

---

<sup>756</sup> Paull was a close enough associate, and clearly involved enough with the concerns of the godly, that in Bernard's absence in September, 1635, he attended Bernard's study and sent a letter and book to John White on Bernard's behalf; on this incident, see below.

fores of such patients, as ministers then have in hand. This indeed is it, which makes faithful ministers' teaching, unsavory to carnal and evil men: And by this they are said to name men in the pulpit, & gall some personally: when no man is named: but the use of correction of some vice is made in the second person to the hearers.<sup>757</sup>

Several parishioners appeared as witnesses in the case. Richard Jordan (probably the same individual who had been cited for disruptive behavior in church<sup>758</sup>) reported that “the said Mr Bernard hath inveighed against him this deponent” but was unsure whether Bernard had ever done so against Aishe; however, one individual was prepared to affirm that he did hear “Mr Bernard in his sermons to deliver words, whereby this deponent believes that he did particularize the said James Aishe.”<sup>759</sup>

Having become aware of these tensions, and shortly before he and several Batcombe parishioners were to appear before the bishop, Bernard chose to address the issue from the pulpit. Here, very clearly, we can observe a situation in which Bernard used his regular ministerial duty of preaching in order to address a particular issue of concern within the parish. On October 12, he preached of “apostasy and falling from grace,” and in the application of the passage he instructed his auditory that “it was the minister’s duty to reprove generally nations, cities, towns, then particularly particular persons, as by the example of Nathan to David.”<sup>760</sup> In this, Bernard echoed the same sort of belief he had held about pastoral ministry throughout his career—indeed, he had previously used the example of Nathan and David to illustrate pastoral reproof in *The Faithful Shepherd* (first published many years earlier). He further explained that one could not say that the minister intended to particularize simply because his sermon hit close to home, nor because one parishioner went out of his way to apply a sermon particularly to another:

Now the minister is said to particularize when he does not, for instance if a minister do see a man to live in some notorious sin, and does privately reprove him for it, and the party offending does yet continue in his wicked course of life, then if the minister does afterward preach against such a sin, the party will be ready to say that it was spoken of him, although he were never meant, so also when a man shall come to an other man, when he comes out of the church, and strike him on the shoulder, and say

---

<sup>757</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull Shepherd* (1621). The 1621 edition has some key differences from earlier versions—for instance, he adds the word “simply” to the phrase “which is not simply the using of doctrines,” 327-329.

<sup>758</sup> See the Biographical Sketch. SRO D/D/Ca 297, Batcombe 1634.

<sup>759</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fols. 56v-58r. The record uses both the names Iacobus Millerd and Iohan Millerd here. On this series of accusations see also Haigh, *The Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven*, 23-24, and Steig, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 202-203.

<sup>760</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fol. 61r. The sermon was thus shortly before his presentation on October 31.

you have been met withal, or spoken of today: I said it is that man who struck him on the shoulder, that doth particularize, and not the minister<sup>761</sup>

In this, Bernard was probably referring to activities known to occur within the parish. And so they did; in fact, just following the above sermon, parishioner Richard Britten had a conversation with Samuel Millerd (or Millward) almost exactly as Bernard had described:

...in the afternoon he [Britten] met with Samuel Millerd in the street, as he was going to the church, and said “We had a very good sermon today to advice us to take heed of apostacy; God give us grace to follow it.” Unto the which words the said Millerd answered “Amen.” Then the said Richard Britten also said unto Samuel Millerd aforesaid, “Are not you ashamed of what you have done to be the means to hinder the teaching of the catechism whereby we and our children have received so much benefit: you that have been a professor of religion, and to fall away: Look to your conscience in what you have done.” Then the said Millerd said unto him, “Will you speak these words in another place?” And he very peremptorily answered that he would speak them again in another place: and said, “Call witnesses; I will now speak the same again.” And then they parted one from the other.<sup>762</sup>

In addition to Millward’s involvement in the catechetical controversy that Britten mentioned here (the precise actions are unclear, but it seems that he spoke out as a sort of informer against certain nonconforming catechetical activities that Bernard was leading or allowing within the parish), Millward also later asserted that Bernard was known to preach against parishioners. He explained that Bernard once approached him and entreated him to take his side on “a difference between him [Bernard] and others.” After he refused to take the minister’s side, Millward testified, Bernard “preached the next Sunday following, that some were so far from taking part in a good cause, that they would rather run about for a morsel of bread and a meal’s meat...the said Mr. Bernard confessed afterwards that he meant him in his said sermon.”<sup>763</sup> Regardless of the precise circumstances, this case demonstrated the difficulty that parishioners could have of separating self-knowledge of one’s own spiritual and social positions, the words of a minister, and the accusations of fellow parishioners—especially given the close knowledge that pastor and people had of one another within a parish.

This complex set of accusations suggests several questions. Did Aishe have a clear grievance against Bernard, or was he unfairly taking offence? If Millward was so against his

---

<sup>761</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fol. 61r (i.e., p. 121).

<sup>762</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fol. 61v (i.e., p. 122).

<sup>763</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fol. 57r (i.e., p. 113).

pastor's sort of godly ministry, why would Bernard have even tried to persuade him to take his side in a dispute? How specific had Bernard's words been when he supposedly particularized? It would be difficult, and not particularly useful, to attempt to unravel the complexities of this set of disputes. Yet this controversy does highlight that parish issues influenced Bernard's pastoral work, especially his discussion of the application of a sermon text.

The application was designed to take a passage of Scripture and demonstrate practical ways to apply it to various parts of life; yet when needed, the minister could essentially reverse this system by choosing a passage that allowed him to address to current events in light of the Bible's teachings. Moreover, even if the passage was not deliberately chosen, an application could easily be made to focus on some pertinent issue. From Bernard's perspective, doing this fell clearly within the scope of a minister's duties to know his auditory, to expound the Scriptures, and to apply them to his parishioners' lives in practical ways. On the other hand, assuming that some parishioners saw even general exhortations toward a certain style of godliness as overly precise, it is easy to see how they could interpret a sermon directed at particular types of issues as meddlesome or even malicious. Bernard's parish ministry was a product of its context, and he could and did use his position as a minister to address parish issues—here, through his regular preaching ministry, but also (as we shall see) in print. It is possible to see his tendencies toward this in his biblical exegesis, as well: he sometimes leaned toward making moral judgments about circumstances that the original text left somewhat ambiguous. One example of this appeared in his 1628 *Ruth's Recompence*. In his discussion of the first portion of Ruth, he judged Orpah's motives in returning to her country: although the Scripture merely recorded her words and actions, Bernard attributed these actions to sinful inward attitudes.<sup>764</sup> Of course, Bernard's interactions with this written text were not necessarily identical to his interactions with his own congregants; however, his tendencies toward making judgments about motives and interpreting situations with a broad moral brush may have affected his thought and practice to such a degree that he did tend toward an over-judgmentalism or an eagerness to expose faults. Yet we should not be quick to assume Bernard's ministry was judgmental and condemnatory. Not only in his manual for pastors but also in a sermon about the way that pastors should present ideas to their congregants, he continually emphasized knowing the state of one's audience in order to provide well-informed and pertinent spiritual assistance. Although that meant warning the unrepentant

---

<sup>764</sup> Bernard, *Ruths Recompence*, 72-86.



with words of God's judgments, it also meant comforting the sorrowful and weak by speaking of God's comforts. Indeed, he displayed just that impetus in *Staffe of Comfort* and other works. As such, Bernard himself saw the sharp warnings and denunciations of sin from the pulpit as a sort of tough love meant to call his parishioners to repentance; many, unfortunately, did not appreciate his methods.

Certainly, longstanding intra-parish conflicts, disagreements over religious activities including catechism, some parishioners' distaste for Bernard's ministry, and the opportunity to effect change through the new episcopal leadership all combined to produce this series of presentments. Yet it is probable that the hard feelings fostered by these conflicts also stemmed from another issue of concern: money. Of course, financial provision remained a central issue in the operation of almost any parish.<sup>765</sup> Among other things, church income supported the maintenance of the clergy, paid for the upkeep of buildings and lands, and provided for the needs of the poor. Finances had been a large concern for Bernard at several points, and as a cleric from humble backgrounds, his entire career had depended upon the generosity of well-to-do benefactors. It is certainly not without reason that throughout his life he continued to acknowledge the benevolence of the Wray family, who had financed his education, nor that he communicated the importance of generosity at several times, including the extended discussion of giving in *Two Twinnes* as well as more abbreviated comments in other publications such as *Staffe of Comfort*.<sup>766</sup> Yet several sources suggest that this perennial topic of interest may have hit a fever pitch during—and indeed been a key part of—the particularization conflict.

There are several reasons that parishioners may have been less inclined to generosity, or less sure of their own financial state, during the 1630s. For Batcombe's wealthy clothiers, the economic depression of the wool industry in the 1620s was surely still a strong and unpleasant memory.<sup>767</sup> Moreover, growing taxation, including calls for ship money, had begun affecting areas including Somerset. While it is difficult to know precisely how much taxation affected the day-to-day financial situations of certain individuals, we do know that in 1637 James Millward, then constable of Batcombe, was required to levy £30 and gave notice to several "sufficient men" in the area that they would each be responsible for a certain rate. Yet James Aishe, whose estate

---

<sup>765</sup> On parish economics in general, see Steig, *Laud's Laboratory*, Chapter 5.

<sup>766</sup> Dedications to members of the Wray family occur in *Terence*, *Separatists Schisme*, *Ruths Recompence*, and *Ready Way*.

<sup>767</sup> Cf. James I, *A proclamation for the preuenting of the exportation of woolles...* On industry and textile manufacture in early modern southwest England see, among other works, Horn, *Adapting to a New World*, 73ff.

was assumed to be worth no less than £15,000, took exception to the £5 allotted to him. Asserting that the assessed rate was unfair because it charged a higher percentage of the rate to inhabitants of the wealthy hamlet of Westcombe, a part of Batcombe parish that Aishe insisted was distinct, he went over Millward's head to Sherriff William Basset, whose decision led Millward to petition the Privy Council.<sup>768</sup> The case was ultimately decided in Millward's favor: Aishe was ordered to pay the original £5 as well as the charges incurred by Millward in dealing with the case, including travel to appear in court in London.<sup>769</sup> A similar issue was addressed at the October 1636 Quarter Sessions, when three local knights were assigned "to examine the differences and to compose and reconcile the difference between the inhabitants of Batcombe, Wescombe and Spartgrove concerning the inqualitie and disproporcon of their rates, etc."<sup>770</sup> This presents us with the entirely unsurprising conclusion that none of Batcombe's wealthy citizens wanted to pay more than their fair share of taxes, but it also highlights that these issues were of particular concern—even dispute—in Batcombe at this time.

Yet secular taxes were not the only way that a parishioner's pockets might grow lighter. There was also the obligation and opportunity to give to the church, and just as with taxation, many parishioners did not want to give too much. Batcombe clothier Phillip Bradford, who died not long after Bernard's time in Batcombe, seems to have been one who was not overly generous toward religious causes in his will: he bequeathed over £1800, plus substantial movable and immovable property, to children, friends, and relatives—while leaving only £5 to the Batcombe poor and £2 to the church.<sup>771</sup> Of course, not all wealthy citizens were reluctant to give: James Bisse, who funded the 1629 addition of a porch onto the church, and Edward Bisse, who contributed a stipend to a preaching minister and funded the education and clothing of six poor

---

<sup>768</sup> TNA SP 16/354 fols. 174, 345r. Millward and his supporters (Samuel Millward, Edward Curle Sr., Edward Cull Jr., John Short, James Bisse, Edward Bisse, and others) asserted that the rate assessed upon Aishe was fair, as Aishe was more than able to pay the rate from his estate worth at least £15,000. Moreover, Westcombe's land valuations were £400 per annum higher than Batcombe's, and the two areas "time out of mind have been one entire parish and tithing." Millward's petition also reflected that other Westcombe inhabitants had been willing to pay their rates until, following Aishe's lead, they refused on the same grounds. Moreover, Millward explained, to demand separate, equal sums from each "would be a burden insupportable upon Batcombe." None of the petitioners were disinterested parties, as the rates assessed to them depended partially on the outcome of this case.

<sup>769</sup> TNA SP 16/354 fol. 174v, and TNA SP 16/361 fol. 25r. His total expenses were recorded at £8 17s 6d, which more than doubled the sum Aishe had to pay. The record of Millward's expenses provides some information about the cost of travel to and from Batcombe and certain services. He spent £3 traveling to and from London, compared to 16s for "several" shorter journeys to visit the sheriff.

<sup>770</sup> *Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset*, Vol. II, 283.

<sup>771</sup> SRO A/AZA/5.

children, are notable counter-examples.<sup>772</sup> Given these actions and their relation to his godly benefactor Philip Bisse, it is unsurprising that Bernard counted the Bisses among his “good friends.”<sup>773</sup>

While a desire to retain as much money as possible for one’s own interests was standard in Batcombe as in other parishes—especially considering the downturn of the 1620s—in 1634 there seems to have been a move among several parishioners to give even *less* than required. As a result, several delinquent individuals were presented for failing to pay the assessed rate of tithe to the church. In this instance, Aishe was again involved and again protested that his rate (6s 8d) was unfair. He complained that most parishioners hadn’t consented to that rate, and even if they had, no one had told him.<sup>774</sup> James Millward (2s), William Ames (3s), Mary Sherborne (1s), John Hicks (6d) and Margaret White (1s 4d) had also failed to pay. The act book did not record the reason for all these delinquencies, but the timing of this incident and the inclusion of Aishe and Millward very suggestively associate it with the particularization controversy. Moreover, there is no indication given that any of the individuals listed was unable to pay the assessed rate, and (as we have seen) just three years later at least two of them were able to deal with a much larger financial burden. For these reasons, it is possible that this failure to tithe may have been a response to personal grievances against Bernard—either simply to express displeasure or as an attempt to force changes within the parish. Alternatively, it is possible that the original sermons in question had been about financial issues and that Bernard had spoken in a way that led Aishe to feel unfairly singled out due to his prominent economic position; this could have led to the particularization charges.

Whatever the relationship with the particularization controversy, it is clear that parishioners’ reluctant giving was causing serious problems, both for the maintenance of the church and the relief of the poor. As Millward had noted, the residents of Batcombe were “for

---

<sup>772</sup> Though generous, James Bisse may have had a personal interest in improving the church, as his family owned the advowson. Yet he did involve himself with other charitable causes—for instance, he was among the visitors and overseers (along with Bernard’s acquaintance Sir Edward Rodeney and others) of Hugh Sexey’s hospital in nearby Bruton, which was charged with the care of twelve poor, elderly residents: Cf. SRO D/D/SE 38/8 and SRO DD\SE/20 9; J. H. Betsey, “Hugh Sexey,” *ODNB*; Pevsner, *The Buildings of England, North Somerset and Bristol*; and Kelly, ed., *Somersetshire*, 61-63. On the death of James Bisse in 1643, the advowson passed to his daughter, Eliza Orange; *Handbook for Travelers in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, and Somersetshire*, 407.

<sup>773</sup> Bernard, *Staffe of Comfort*, Sig. A2r.

<sup>774</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 297.

the most part poor men.”<sup>775</sup> Although it is not clear precisely how well the needs of the poor were being met, as a qualitative measure we may note information related to two Batcombe widows. In 1624, spinster Elianor Carrier took some wool to widow Rebecca Reines for dyeing; while there, Reines persuaded Carrier to steal cheese from her mistress. Carrier brought her both cheese and wool.<sup>776</sup> The fact that the stolen goods were practical items may suggest some level of need. In a more unusual situation, in 1634 widow Agnes Johnson was presented for removing her late husband’s tombstone of marble and brass and replacing the monument with handwritten information about his name and time of death. This suggests a financial motive and may indicate that she had economic needs she could not otherwise meet.<sup>777</sup>

Although the above examples are merely illustrative, in 1634 the low rate of giving was explicitly blamed for an inability to properly maintain church property. The walls and ceiling of the church porch, as well as the bounds of the churchyard, were in decay and the communion table was “faulty, being almost decayed with wear.”<sup>778</sup> When questioned, churchwardens Edward Curle and Robert Norton replied that want of money had kept them from addressing these issues. Likewise, regarding a similar presentation for failing to pay the sexton’s wages for the past half year, they again blamed parish income and explained that they had been unable to execute this duty because “diverse of our parish doth refuse to pay their rates to the church, out of the which the said sexton’s wages are to be paid.”<sup>779</sup>

To summarize, Batcombe had probably never been a bastion of sacrificial generosity, but 1634 saw a particularly significant refusal of parishioners to tithe—and this, in turn, essentially shut down several major functions of the parish. Knowing this, and having seen Bernard’s tendency to respond to issues of concern both in his personal activities and in print in several other arenas, we should not be surprised that he set to work to correct this parish issue on both fronts. It is not clear precisely how he addressed the issue in his personal ministry, but we have a few indications. First, he later stated that he had used arguments for generosity that were “with many happily successful” in stirring up good works, especially in his encouragements to lay aside

---

<sup>775</sup> TNA SP 16/356 fol. 173r. He made this comment by way of comparing Batcombe proper to the wealthy hamlet of Westcombe when attempting to show that Aishe’s rate of taxation was fair.

<sup>776</sup> SRO Q/SR 51/41.

<sup>777</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 297, Batcombe 1634. The record indicates twenty pence was received from Dr. Duck for mending the tomb; perhaps he intended his gift to relieve her burden.

<sup>778</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>779</sup> *Ibid.* The fact that the churchwardens note that individuals “refused” (rather than “failed” or another such term) to pay further supports the assertion that there was a controversy associated with non-payment of tithes.

funds each Sunday in order to give.<sup>780</sup> At some point in or before 1634, Bernard also had the value of the advowson that his predecessor Phillip Bisse had purchased (something he did in order to ensure that godly ministry continued) painted on the wall over Bisse's grave.<sup>781</sup> This action may have been intended to make a public statement about the value and honor of giving generously to the Lord's work.

Moreover, he seems to have composed his publication about the mandate for Christians to give, *Ready Way*, as an outflow of his concern with these parish situations. Indeed, he seems to have authored this work during the heat of the trouble: it received an imprimatur in early August 1634, and its two dedicatory epistles were dated from that October. In addition to a link between print and parish simply upon the grounds that there was a problematic financial situation in Batcombe at almost exactly the same time that Bernard was producing this work, the connection is even stronger. Bernard explained in *Ready Way* that he was publishing the same arguments which he had already used and found successful.<sup>782</sup> Moreover, the work gave nearly three pages to describe the same act of Phillip Bisse that he had painted on the church wall, as well as other examples of generosity from Batcombe and nearby communities.<sup>783</sup> Altogether, both in timing and content *Ready Way* reflected Bernard's parish experiences.

Nevertheless, these experiences did not limit the scope of *Ready Way*. To the contrary, it demonstrated interests beyond Batcombe in desired outcome and in inspiration. It was designed to encourage and to honor regular giving by all Christians as well as extravagant giving by wealthy Christians. Bernard began with a theological basis for this, explaining the biblical motivation for charity and how people of different means should think about giving. His exploration of the subject included (among others) chapters dedicated to the ways that women should understand giving, the correct motives for charity based upon each member of the Trinity, and preparing to do good works even in affliction.<sup>784</sup> He also discussed giving from a both a theological basis (addressing general principles) and a practical basis (providing examples of how, and how much, others had given).<sup>785</sup> His explanations drew upon the Scriptures as well

---

<sup>780</sup> Bernard, "Epistle dedicatory," *Ready Way*, n.p.

<sup>781</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, fol. 57r. (i.e., p. 113). Cf. Stieg, *Laud's Laboratory*, 102.

<sup>782</sup> Bernard, "Epistle dedicatory," *Ready Way*, n.p.

<sup>783</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 316-319 (for Bisse), 300-395, and elsewhere.

<sup>784</sup> His statements about women were based upon the idea that the sexes were spiritually equal but of different rank within the household. As such, women had a responsibility to give just as all Christians do, but should take care to do so in a way that respected the prerogatives of the household leader (usually, a husband).

<sup>785</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 218-219; 266-274; 300-387.

as Aristotle, the schoolmen, and other theological works. Just as he believed a faithful parish minister should give attention to specific applications, so Bernard in this work provided guidance about giving by way of instruction and example. In particular, although the work honored regular giving by all, Bernard drew considerable attention to the extravagant giving of certain wealthy individuals.

The long chapter containing examples of charitable giving illustrated specific ways that giving could achieve different ends, and Bernard used examples from his own experiences as well as those which came to his attention through conversation or reading. For instance, in showing how one should “be ready to give freely and liberally towards the maintenance and plantation of the ministry in those places, where both men and means are otherwise wanting or insufficient,” he provided the personal examples of the generous giving of his own Worksop parishioners, the lady Darcy, and Bisse’s purchase of the Batcombe advowson alongside other examples of similar giving (using names and locations, and citing references, where possible). Other times, apparently not having a clear example from experience, he again took advantage of extra-parish sources in order to complete his argument.<sup>786</sup>

As was his custom, Bernard made good use of marginal spaces to provide a variety of information throughout the work; typically, both he and other authors used this space for cross-references, brief clarifications, and bibliographic information indicating the sources of his ideas. Yet at certain points in this work, he pushed the boundaries—both literally and figuratively—of the use of marginal spaces, taking them from brief notes to more extensive discussions that actually changed the layout of certain pages. Although moving margins was by no means unique in this time, it again shows that rather than feeling bound by conventions and creating works to fit within them, Bernard innovated beyond these conventions.

In *Ready Way* Bernard gave pride of place to acts of charity that further spiritual well-being, but he was also thoughtful about physical welfare, which he integrated with opinions about improvements that could be made not only by individuals but also by society. For instance, he favored forgiving debts rather than sending the poor to prisons because, though legal, it was caused by the sin of usury and kept prisoners from being productive members of society; similarly, he favored the use of houses of correction, which kept inmates from idleness.<sup>787</sup>

---

<sup>786</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 309-320 (320 appears as 220 due to an error).

<sup>787</sup> Although it was never the subject of a work in itself, Bernard demonstrated a pastoral concern for prisoners in more than one publication, with serious consideration to their plight given not only here but also in the dedicatory

He also encouraged general processes that could help the poor, such as selling grain in times of dearth. Indeed, he encouraged readers to help any oppressed by many different means, including non-financial contributions such as petitioning on their behalf and by stopping the spread of Catholicism (which, of course, could oppress many).<sup>788</sup> Favoring the relief of the truly poor rather than those who choose to be idle, Bernard provided a large variety of examples of how to help the poor within the norms of English society—including an exhortation to make better use of those means already available for poor relief such as the fining of individuals for offences such as swearing and drunkenness.<sup>789</sup> While the first portion of the book was given to theological principles, and the second part largely to practical examples, the final part was given to the prevention of objections. Bernard responded to objections about the deservedness of the poor and possible exceptions that one might suppose would excuse them from giving. Yet here, as earlier in the work, Bernard consistently encouraged charity from all but the utterly destitute.

Although *Ready Way* looked beyond his own parish, Bernard's pastoral ministry clearly influenced the work. In addition to his contextual desire to encourage giving in 1634 Batcombe, his parish work also equipped him to provide effective (and affective) descriptions of giving from his own experiences alongside those from accounts he heard or read. Moreover, it is clear that he cared deeply about the needs of working poor and imprisoned individuals; parish ministry placed him in a position to be acquainted with their situations. Finally, his training as a parish minister provided the theological background and religious authority for him to produce the sort of exhortative and authoritative message that he does in this book. It would be difficult for a non-minister to make the sort of appeals that Bernard made here with an equivalent knowledge, passion and influence. As such, parish ministry provided not only the initial impetus but also the means by which *Ready Way* was created. In other words, together with the evidence we have of his responding in the pulpit to parish issues, the situation in 1634-5 Batcombe again allows us to observe a parish-pastor-publication connection within an author-minister's work.

---

epistle to the *Isle of Man*. In both works he emphasized the need for spiritual as well as physical care of inmates. In several paragraphs in *Isle*, he discussed how those holding this very low position may be at a place where they can finally see a need for God's grace, and he offers some ideas to enhance both the physical and spiritual care of inmates. Various scholars have highlighted the progressive nature of Bernard's ideas in this area, and it is certain that he cared deeply about this cause and had given it some serious thought.

<sup>788</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 370-374.

<sup>789</sup> Bernard, *Ready Way*, 386-387.

## The 1634 visitation, part II: The “Laudian style” comes to Batcombe

During the same visitation in the fall of 1634, Bernard was presented for reasons beyond the intra-parish particularization dispute: he was brought forward for nonconformity.<sup>790</sup> Among the articles of presentment was the issue of the appearance of the Batcombe church and its grounds; Bernard and the churchwardens were to make several changes. Certain repairs that were ordered would not have been theologically problematic for Bernard (although they were difficult given the financial situation of the parish). Yet other instructions did have clear theological implications. Among these were several changes that tended toward reframing worship around ceremonies and making fewer accommodations for one of the most central aspects of godly worship—preaching. While Bernard’s godly theology led to an emphasis on a plain church setting and a plain liturgy commodious for sermons, the Laudian perspective emphasized the “beauty of holiness” not only in decoration but also in formal ceremonies. In the presentment Bernard was ordered to change several aspects of the church building which would make them reflect the latter: “That they alter the painting of the arches of the church, being done with colors too light and wanton, make the same over with more grave and civil colors better befitting a church” and “That the seats increased taking away the breadth of the alley; and the seat taking up the way near the south door be reduced to their old form and state, and the alleys left as large as they were in former time.”<sup>791</sup> Bernard and the churchwardens were to discontinue the use of additional seating in the church aisles—which had perhaps been permitted in order to make it easier for congregants to hear sermons—and remove the light colors from the walls, which had perhaps made the building brighter for the ease of sight.<sup>792</sup> These instructions tended toward reframing worship around ceremonies and appearances.

They came alongside instructions related to the extremely fraught issue of communion. Bernard was ordered to remove the seats around the communion table and rail it in. This reflected a theological understanding of the sacrament that emphasized the priest’s role as a mediator and the altar-like function of the communion table. Most godly ministers, in contrast, wanted the table to be positioned not altar-wise but table-wise, allowing full access to the table to

---

<sup>790</sup> His associate Nicholas Paull was simultaneously presented for certain nonconformist actions. SRO D/D/Ca 299, 111-112. The nonconformity charges were not isolated from the parish disputes; indeed, the parishioners seem to have taken some advantage of Bernard’s lack of favor with Laudian authorities.

<sup>791</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, page 113ff.

<sup>792</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, page 113ff.



all communicants.<sup>793</sup> Details of sacramental arrangement were problematic throughout this period; notably for our case, attempts at change met with a riot in the nearby parish of Beckington.<sup>794</sup>

A final theologically-inflected set of changes had to do with requirements to remove or replace certain inscriptions from the church walls. There were a variety of these instructions, and they had different effects.<sup>795</sup> One key portion of these included the significant theological controversies over the allowance of certain recreational activities—especially activities permitted on Sundays. The Batcombe church was no longer to have a statement on or near the monument of previous rector Philip Bisse that he had been an enemy to “heathenish revels”; and it was no longer to have on one of its walls a particular text from Isaiah.<sup>796</sup> The former certainly related to the contemporary controversies over revels and churchales, which had been recently allowed by church authorities.<sup>797</sup> Although Bernard may have wanted to publicize Bisse’s godly activities in order to make a godly statement against ungodly behavior, changing this information would likely not have been a sticking point for him, since the making of monumental inscriptions would have fallen within the area of *adiaphora*. Yet the latter issue was more problematic. Bernard was to replace the text of Isaiah 58:13-14 with some other, more appropriate, passage. This passage, which at least one source indicated had been in place from before Bernard’s time, reads:

If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: Then shalt thou delight thyself in the LORD; and I will cause thee to ride

---

<sup>793</sup> Among many sources, see Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, and Lake, “Laudian Style,” in *Early Stuart Church*.

<sup>794</sup> Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory*, 297ff. Bernard named Beckington’s minister, Tobias Walkwoode, as a godly brother in the ministry; Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* 1621, dedicatory epistle.

<sup>795</sup> Other directions included striking the names of the churchwardens from above the church door and removing a statement of the amount of money that the church’s previous rector, Philip Bisse, had paid for the advowson from above his monument in the chancel. Bernard had painted the value of the advowson of Batcombe over Bisse’s grave; this move was rather unusual, and for that reason it is difficult to situate the direction to remove it within broader issues. As I have described in earlier chapters, Bernard held a particular reverence for generosity toward the church, and especially toward the provision of ministers. His respect for Bisse’s generous giving also appeared elsewhere in the same monument by honoring his gift of books to Oxford University—a statement that is not mentioned in the presentment. Yet we should also note that Bernard did record not only Bisse’s gift but also the amount in the 1635 publication *Ready Way*, which did receive the imprimatur from one of Laud’s chaplains. Here, then, the issue may have been more about the appearance of the church than about some danger in spreading the content of the message—unlike the issue over the Sabbath. Cf. *Ready Way*, 315-319. It is also not entirely clear what effect removing the names of the churchwardens would have (nor, indeed, whether this was a new innovation under Bernard).

<sup>796</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299 113-114; Prynne, *The Unbishopsing of Timothy and Titus*, 143; *Articles of Accusation and of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England Against William Pierce...*, 5.

<sup>797</sup> Parliament, *Articles of accusation and impeachment of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England against William Pierce...*, 4-5. See also Barnes, “County Politics.”

upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.<sup>798</sup>

Whether or not Bernard ordered the placement of this text, he must have appreciated its presence because he saw keeping the Sabbath holy as a moral duty and believed it was necessary to limit activities of personal pleasure on this day.<sup>799</sup> Yet in its particular religio-political context, it would be difficult to deny that the public display of this verse made a public statement against the king's Sabbath program as outlined in the Declaration of Sports. The church authorities who deemed it unfit for display certainly thought so. In fact, William Prynne later recorded that Bishop William Piers went so far as to call this passage "a Jewish place of Scripture, not fit to stand or be suffered in the Church."<sup>800</sup> Of course, Piers was not attempting to excise the Old Testament from the church: he objected not to the passage's existence but rather its application. He would not countenance the publicization of texts that might be seen as promoting an overly rigid and Sabbatarian approach to Christianity any more than he would allow disobedience in the performance of the sacrament of communion.<sup>801</sup>

Although they seem to have capitulated on issues of less theological moment, Bernard and the churchwardens dragged their feet on issues related to the Sabbath and the altar. They failed to blot the Isaiah passage from the church wall and to rail the communion table even as they were presented again in February 1634/5 and in April 1635.<sup>802</sup> At the latter of these, churchwarden Edward Curle was singled out for being "negligent and careless in executing his office of churchwardenship."<sup>803</sup> Prynne recorded that even on pain of excommunication, the churchwardens were so stubborn that Piers was forced to make an issue of the situation. In the end, Piers hired a plasterer to ensure that the wall painting was changed.<sup>804</sup>

---

<sup>798</sup> King James Version. See also Prynne, *The Unbishops of Timothy and Titus*, 143.

<sup>799</sup> William Gibson attempts to make a similar point in *Religion and the Enlightenment, 1600-1800*, but the facts and the approach to Bernard and his work are significantly flawed.

<sup>800</sup> Prynne, *The Unbishops of Timothy and Titus*, 143.

<sup>801</sup> Stieg, *Laud's Laboratory*, 297.

<sup>802</sup> SRO D/D/Ca 299, 150, 161.

<sup>803</sup> Ibid. At the earlier, both Curle and Robert Morton were presented; it is unclear why Curle was understood to be the main culprit in the latter instance.

<sup>804</sup> See also Parker, *The English Sabbath*. A description of this situation appears in *Articles of Accusation and of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England Against William Pierce...*, 5; and Prynne *The Unbishops of Timothy and Titus*, 143. The copy of this work in the Union Theological Seminary library which is available through Early English Books has a manuscript correction of Prynne's text. The text reads that upon the refusal of the churchwardens, "the bishop like an heroic prelate rode thither in person with a plasterer to see it wiped out himself..." The handwritten change strikes out the words "in person" and adds that Piers "made his chaplain" go to Batcombe with the plasterer.

Piers' pursuit of uniformity in Batcombe was hardly the worst of his concerns at this time. He also had to ensure that the Declaration of Sports was read—as ordered—in each church. This was particularly problematic in parishes with godly ministers. In their view, announcing from a church—a place that indicated spiritual authority—that citizens were permitted by the King to participate in activities that violated the fourth commandment would be an improper capitulation to an ungodly directive. Yet ministers who refused to permit the reading faced dire consequences that would be harmful to their ministries.

Meanwhile, Piers's troubles expanded: along with rioting in Beckington related to the sacrament, the years 1634-8 saw continued trouble and intractability with certain parishioners.<sup>805</sup> Perhaps even more to Piers's displeasure and embarrassment, the case attracted national attention. He was surely upset with the slowness to obey of various parishioners and officials across his diocese. Further, it was just this sort of resistance to the policies of the national church, along with illicit printing and other activities, that encouraged Laud and those around him to see the activities of the godly not as isolated incidents of nonconformity but as a coordinated and potentially subversive group. They were not entirely mistaken.

#### 1635 and the silenced ministers

The godly ministers who were unable to adopt a position of theological conformity to Laudian policies soon found themselves silenced, deprived of both their platform for ministry and their financial means.<sup>806</sup> Although Bernard himself continued to conform, he and other members of the godly community provided emotional, spiritual, and financial support to these ministers. Our clearest evidence of Bernard's participation in this work comes in a letter that was seized from the study of John White, ejected minister of Dorchester. White was a longtime friend of Bernard, and it was in his parish not long before that Bernard had spoken to ministers about

---

<sup>805</sup> Following the 1637 riot, the guilty parties were ordered to make their submission to Piers on a market day “at such time and place and in such manner as his lordship shall think fit; and such and so many of them as his lordship shall appoint are likewise ordered to make their submission to his lordship in the open assizes to be holden for this county in such manner as his lordship shall think fit” at the assizes on 5 March, 1637/8. Yet at the following year's assizes on 11 March 1638/9 some of the rioters had not yet made submission as ordered. These were required to do it or to answer for their contempt at the next assizes; a “form of submission” with the proper wording is included, perhaps because some did not fully confess to Piers' satisfaction. At least one rioter, Thomas Holmes, was ordered the following year to do so again or to be presented at the next assizes to answer his contempt. Barnes, ed., *Somerset Assize Orders 1629-1640*, items 123, 143, 147, 161.

<sup>806</sup> See Webster, *Godly Clergy*.

the Sabbath question.<sup>807</sup> On Sept. 8, 1635, Nicholas Paull, curate of Upton Noble within Batcombe parish and a godly associate of Bernard's, was attending to Bernard's matters while he was away. Upon receiving a message from White to Bernard, Paull sent "things" that Bernard had set aside for White and replied with a brief message:

Sir,

I have sent you, I hope, those things which you expect, & Mr Bernard appointed. He is now from home, yet wisely prognosticating what might happen in his absence, he told me that you had a purpose to send over very shortly for a book, which he himself laid aside in his study for that purpose, and I have sent by your messenger. We are not forgetful of you at Dorchester, & we humbly desire you to remember us in your daily devotions ...And I think I may very seasonably & pertinently use Saint Paul's obsecration to the Thess[alonians]: Pray for us that the word of the Lord may have free course, & be glorified, even as it is with you, and that we may be delivered from absurd & unreasonable men...<sup>808</sup>

Tom Webster has pointed out not only the "cryptic" nature of the note but also the "equally cryptic" accounts on it (a list of what seem to be sums of money appears on the page) which may suggest Bernard's involvement with providing financial assistance to godly ministers.<sup>809</sup> To this we should also add that while Paull mentioned only a book, he said he was sending "those things"—plural—that White expected. Perhaps information or money was indeed tucked inside the book that Bernard had set aside.

The tenor of the age was apparent in Paull's closing, in which he desired deliverance from "absurd and unreasonable men." Although this was part of a quotation from 2 Thessalonians 3, the choice of passage was telling: many Scripture passages discussed prayer and the movement of the gospel, while far fewer had the potential for the contemporary implications of this passage's condemnation of unreasonable men. Thinking of the troubles that Batcombe parish had seen over the last year or two in terms of the practice of godly ministry, it is entirely likely that Paull did see certain men—perhaps ecclesiastical superiors, perhaps fractious parishioners like James Ashe—in this light. Yet it is further interesting that he used "absurd and unreasonable" rather than the harsher terms "unreasonable and wicked" or "unreasonable and evil" which appear in the King James and Geneva translations respectively. This may reflect a personal reluctance at this stage to assign judgment upon the motives or souls of their "absurd" persecutors, or it may

---

<sup>807</sup> In 1621, Bernard listed White among his brethren in the ministry. Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621).

<sup>808</sup> The missive is addressed to "the reverend and my very good friend Mr White" indicating that Paull, like Bernard, was close to White. See also Rose-Troup, *John White: The Founder of Massachusetts*, 300-301. On Alleine see also Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*.

<sup>809</sup> Webster, 266-7. The outside sheet of the letter contains a very small and brief list of names and amounts.

show a carefulness to avoid particularly incendiary statements if the letter should happen to be intercepted. Although Paull authored this letter, it is important to recall Bernard's involvement here: "wisely prognosticating" needs, preparing his friend to administer help in his absence, and laying aside materials that might be required.<sup>810</sup>

Not long after this letter was sent, there appeared further evidence of Bernard's involvement with godly networks through his use and distribution of an anonymous work, later attributed to Henry Burton, entitled *A divine tragedie lately acted, or a collection of sundry memorable examples of Gods judgements upon Sabbath-breakers and other like libertines...*<sup>811</sup> Shortly after the work's publication, the godly (and very wealthy) Somerset clothier John Ashe received 200 copies to sell for 8d each.<sup>812</sup> Ashe distributed the work to a variety of individuals within his network, including several in and near Batcombe. Many who received it passed it on to others, and the book proceeded through the network of the Somerset godly.<sup>813</sup> Bernard was among those who received a copy of the work from Ashe, and he in turn lent it to Edmund Morgan, rector of Pill. Interestingly, the work was briefly displayed in the window of Batcombe resident William Bord's house; this may suggest an even more public awareness of its existence than the personal sales and lending network might indicate.<sup>814</sup> As Jason Peacey has observed, all of this was to the displeasure of Laud, who was concerned about the strength of the puritan faction and the extent of the cooperative network of the godly—a network which does seem to have influenced the work's distribution. Though it is not clear whether Bernard was aware that Burton wrote *Divine Tragedie*, the two men may well have known one another and certainly had mutual friends; their studies at Cambridge overlapped in the years 1595-1598, and both participated in the circle of Isabel Bowes during their early careers.<sup>815</sup>

Regarding the reputation and investigation of *Divine Tragedie*, one individual noted accusations that the events related in it were based on hearsay rather than truth: "...the Judg now

---

<sup>810</sup> On this situation see also Underdown, *Fire From Heaven*, 174-175.

<sup>811</sup> *A divine tragedie...* (1636). The Short-Title Catalogue suggests that Felix Kingston may have printed the London edition.

<sup>812</sup> Not to be confused with the James Ashe (Aishe) whom I discuss in other chapters. Cf. John Wroughton, "Ashe, John," *ODNB*; and "\_\_\_ to John Winthrop," *Winthrop Papers*, Vol. 3, 397-403, 400.

<sup>813</sup> Peacey, "The Paranoid Prelate: Archbishop Laud and the Puritan Plot" in *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern Europe*, 121.

<sup>814</sup> WP vii, fols. 85-92.

vii, fols. 85-92; Bord testified in November 1636 that the book had been in the window of his house (perhaps also serving as a shop) about a month prior for about two days; fol. 81v.

<sup>815</sup> See the Biographical Sketch. Burton, *A Narration of the life of Mr. Henry Burton*, 1; and Kenneth Gibson, "Burton, Henry," *ODNB*.

lately in open Assises boldly affirmed that all the Instances were eyther altogether or in part lyes, and bad any one in the Audiance to say the contrary, if he could.”<sup>816</sup> Along with publicly decrying the work, authorities made examples of parties involved in its distribution. For his part, John Ashe was “bound ouer for it by his Bishop to the Assises, and about 20 more of ministers and others, and besides much spoken by the Judg vnto him and of this matter. He told him that he pittyed him, being one that did soe much good in his Countrey, as setting a 1000 poore people on worke, but he would be made an example to the whole kingdome.”<sup>817</sup>

While Peacey suggests that Laud’s interest in the distribution of *Divine Tragedie* had less to do with the spread of specific ideas and more to do with the cooperation or collaboration of those within the network, the opposite was likely true of Bernard. Though his interest in *Divine Tragedie* may have been increased due to its godly source (he testified that he did not know the author’s identity, but he did at least know the distributor, Ashe); its topic must have been a key interest. At the time he received the work, he was in the throes of dealing with the fallout from the reissue of the Book of Sports, the requirement that it be read from pulpits, and his own bishop’s attack on the way that the Sabbath was depicted on the walls of Batcombe church. Of course, these were only a few of a much larger range of concerns; at about this time he was engaging John Cotton and the New Englanders about their practices of a covenanted church membership and a limited administration of the sacraments.<sup>818</sup> However, most importantly for our purposes in this chapter, at this time Bernard was developing the ideas that would ultimately become *Threefold Treatise of the Sabbath*.

Bernard’s continued effort to conform—and print—in the 1630s

The remarkable thing about *Threefold Treatise* is that it seems to be Bernard’s good-faith attempt to reconcile godly and conformist responses to the Sabbath. He certainly understood, as Kenneth Parker has discussed, that there were a variety of possible positions on the Sabbath even within Laudian elements in the church.<sup>819</sup> Bernard was therefore able to assert the Sabbath as a moral duty not only as part of his own godly worldview but also as part of an accepted doctrine

---

<sup>816</sup> “\_\_\_ to John Winthrop,” *Winthrop Papers*, Vol. 3, 400.

<sup>817</sup> “\_\_\_ to John Winthrop,” *Winthrop Papers*, Vol. 3, 400-401.

<sup>818</sup> Though distinct, Bernard’s concerns with New England and his and Ashe’s involvement with *Divine Tragedie* were related in that they were both central concerns within the godly community in this period; one letter writer noted both as key concerns: “\_\_\_\_\_ to John Winthrop” *Winthrop Papers* Vol. 3, 399-401.

<sup>819</sup> Parker, *The English Sabbath*.

within the national church in this period. Attempts to harmonize godly and conforming positions appear throughout, and especially in the final section.

The treatise was broken into three sections, examining in turn the “Patriarchal” “Mosaical” and “Christian” Sabbaths. Bernard spent much of the first two sections expounding ideas related to the idea that the Sabbath was a moral duty and that it was established from the beginning rather than specifically for the nation of Israel under Moses.<sup>820</sup> Accordingly, much of the first section was taken up with aspects of the argument that the Sabbath was bindingly instituted in Genesis 2—a principle that was key among his questions to the Dorset ministers. In the second section, much of his argument focused upon the morality rather than the ceremoniality of the fourth commandment itself, although acknowledging certain aspects of its ceremonial observance in Israel—again issues he had raised in Dorset.<sup>821</sup>

Bernard put his conformity on display throughout *Threefold Treatise*, highlighting it in both general and specific ways, renouncing the teaching of certain groups and emphasizing his agreement with church policies. Given the recent loosening of restrictions on celebrations such as churchales—which, by and large, the godly saw as worthy of condemnation on theological grounds—it is noteworthy that Bernard emphasized feasting and even merriment as lawful on the Sabbath. In doing so, he stretched as far as possible to find a way to support official church activities while still following the godly practice of ensuring that there was Scriptural precedent for all activities. To do this, he went so far as to reference the book of Judith to support his conclusion; it was unusual for Bernard to quote from the Apocrypha, so his use of it here indicated a strong effort to find any possible evidence to corroborate the position that the national church had essentially forced him to adopt.<sup>822</sup>

In addition to harmonizing his own godly views with those of the Caroline church, he made a point to renounce the teachings of various individuals and groups—Anabaptists, Familists, Traskists, and others—whose theology fell outside that accepted by the national church. His mention of these groups was particularly significant because he had been briefly

---

<sup>820</sup> He does touch on several other issues in turn. Among these are, for instance, an argument against an “Anticipation or Prolepsis” in the establishment of the seventh day; ways that the other commandments can refine understanding of what is meant by the fourth commandment; an explanation of what type of Sabbath-keeping may rightly be called Judaizing; and more.

<sup>821</sup> CUL Dd.XI.73; Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 62, 110. He also focused on why the day was changeable.

<sup>822</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 102.

associated with Separatists, and with Traske himself, some years before.<sup>823</sup> In order to walk a thin path between godly doctrine and conformity, it was important for him to affirm his orthodoxy in as many ways as possible. Much self-definition in this period was done by emphasizing the deviance or difference of others in order to suggest one's own rightness or conformity; this is precisely what Bernard was doing here.

He came close to a fully conformist position. He could agree with the Laudian authorities on several points, and he did so whenever possible by citing a variety of types of religious texts—both Scriptural and ecclesiastical. And again, he was willing to go out of his theological way to make such arguments: locating instances of Sabbath feasts in the Apocrypha was, otherwise, quite low on a godly to-do list. Ultimately, however, he could not reconcile his own beliefs with the complete list of activities that the Caroline church permitted on the Sabbath as outlined in the Book of Sports. When these impasses arose between his own theology and the doctrine of the national church, Bernard remained reluctant to contradict authority. He did not condemn the church or discuss his doctrinal differences. Instead, he provided an alternate version of what the church actually taught by selectively drawing from accepted church authorities. He furthered his own appearance of conformity by using ecclesiastical documents with which he was in agreement and then piecing these together in ways that seemed to support his position. Although aware of this tension himself—he must have been in order to perform this sort of redaction—he did not admit to it in *Threefold Treatise*.

Peter Heylyn was concurrently performing a similar (Laudian) makeover on the work of John Prideaux, putting forth a “grossly distorted” version of his position on the Sabbath.<sup>824</sup> This same tactic was particularly attractive to Bernard because it was perhaps the only way that he could find to reconcile the two sets of beliefs that he had held in an uncomfortable tension for so long: that the national church was a true church and that a godly interpretation of the Scriptures was correct. By the 1630s, Bernard had supported and identified with a variety of godly individuals who were out of step with the national church. Yet he himself continued to insist that the Church of England was a true church—as he did even in a 1637 letter to John Cotton in New England.<sup>825</sup> It seems his main strategy for continuing to harmonize these increasingly

---

<sup>823</sup> Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 145.

<sup>824</sup> Parker, *The English Sabbath*, 196-198.

<sup>825</sup> PHM Cotton Family MSS, John Cotton Papers.



irreconcilable commitments was to selectively affirm different parts of church doctrine with which both he and the church were (at least theoretically) in agreement.

For instance, Bernard did not find in Scripture any evidence that dancing might be lawful on the Sabbath, so he ignored the fact that the Declaration of Sports allowed dancing and simply turned to emphasize the words of other church authorities who had condemned it.<sup>826</sup> Perhaps the clearest example of this is the curious section in which he summarizes the teachings of the Book of Sports and the monarchy. It begins:

King James, the learnedest King that ever this Nation had, at the entrance of his reign, sent out his royal pleasure by Proclamation, in which we may observe; First, that he calleth the day, again and again the Sabbath day: Secondly, the drift of the Proclamation was both for the better observing of the day, and for the avoiding of all impious profanation of it: Thirdly, that he forbade Bear-baitings, Bull-baitings, Interludes, Common Plays, and other like disordered or unlawful exercises or pastimes.

Here, he outlined some of the key points he had already addressed in the work: that the necessity of Sabbath observance existed, that it was appropriate to term it the “Sabbath,” and that it must not be profaned. Regarding the particulars of non-profanation, Bernard wanted to disallow more activities than James, but he was certainly in agreement with the activities that James named as forbidden. Moving on, Bernard ignored certain activities that James permitted and instead turned his attention to political decisions that also supported his godly agenda:

After this in the Conference at Hampton Court, when the great scholar Doctor Rainold desired a straighter course for the Reformation of the abuse of the Sabbath; there was found a general unanimous consent thereto of the King, of the Prelates, and of that honorable Assembly met then in that place.

Furthermore when the Parliament was held, and a convocation of the reverend clergy the same year, the pious canon before mentioned, agreeing almost verbatim with the Queen’s injunction, was them framed, for the keeping holy the Lord’s day with other holy days: Also in the selfsame year at the commencement in Cambridge, as before hath been noted, a doctor held this thesis, *Dies Dominum nititur verbo Dei*, and so determined by the Vice-Chancellor.

Lastly, as before in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, so in King James his time, large treatises of celebrating the Lord’s day were published under authority licensing the same; among which was the *Practice of Piety* by a bishop, and Bishop Downham’s exposition upon the Commandments; to mention no other of lower rank, though some of them learned and reverend divines.<sup>827</sup>

---

<sup>826</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 104.

<sup>827</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 168-9.

Backing up his gloss of James, Bernard adopted scholars, parliament, bishops, and others—even the late queen—for his cause. Wanting to make it seem as if the only tenable position was the one presented in *Threefold Treatise*, he gave as much evidence as possible that the Sabbatarian view presented in it was, in fact, the same view held by nearly all the recent authorities recognized by the national church. Then, he turned to the present:

King Charles, our now gracious sovereign, hath with the flower of this whole land, by act of parliament declared himself with them concerning the holy observation of this day: First, in giving it the title of the Lord's day, Secondly, in affirming that in the keeping of the day holy, it is a principal part of the true service of God: Then undoubtedly, he highly pleaseth God, who keepeth wholly the whole day: For by the judgment of the King, and the whole state, such a one as keepeth it is performing a principal part of the true service of God: Thirdly, in prohibiting on this day all meetings, assemblies, or concourse of people, out of their own parishes, for any sportes or pastimes whatever; all bear-baitings, bull-baitings, common plays, interludes, or any other unlawful exercises or pastimes. Also that no carrier, waggoner, wain-man, car-man, or drover, travel on the Lord's day: Or any butcher by himself, or any other, with his privy and consent, kill or sell any victual on that day.

Hereto may I add our common law, by which as the sages in the law have resolved it, That the day is exempted from law-days, public sessions in courts of justice, and that no plea is to be holden, no writ of a *scire facias*, must bear date on a Sunday, for it do, it is an error: so a fine levied with proclamations, if the proclamations be made on this day, all of them are held erroneous acts: And all this was for the solemnity of the day, as also the intent that the people might apply themselves to prayer, and God's public worship and service. Thus we see the honorableness of this day, and the high esteem thereof, as it hath been, and still ought to be in our kingdom amongst all faithful Christians.<sup>828</sup>

Here, Bernard associated Charles's views with those he had just outlined of other past and present church leaders and even portrayed them—almost—as godly. As he had done with James's words, Bernard presented only those aspects of Charles's declaration with which he agreed, and he made a point to mention the legal status of the Sabbath. To take a more extreme reading from the context of Charles's fraught relationship with various arms of government, it is possible this passage even hinted at leveraging pressures of law and government against royal policies that might contradict what Bernard essentially presented as a mandate for the Sabbath from all parts of church, government, and commonwealth.

Having presented these views in support of certain restrictions on the Sabbath, Bernard was still face to face with the unfortunate fact that the Declaration of Sports was not in full

---

<sup>828</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 169.

agreement with the way he understood the Bible, although he never acknowledged it in so many words. Hinting back to the tradition of Christian monarchs following the counsel of church leaders—and in a tightly veiled way, perhaps, acknowledging that Charles had not done so in this matter—he wrote: “It cannot be, but where Emperors and Kings have taken care for keeping holy the Lord’s day, that they had the judgment of the godly Divines in their times: But to clear more this point, let us see what hath by the learned been decreed concerning this...”<sup>829</sup> Of course, persuading Christian monarchs to listen to church leaders had been fraught throughout Christian history, including the history of post-Reformation England.<sup>830</sup> Nevertheless, Bernard made the effort, and the next chapter defended his less permissive reading. He did this by referencing no fewer than fifteen councils and synods that had ruled on Sabbath activities. Among them, he mentioned that the Council of Carthage forbade shows and plays on the Sabbath, while certain others exhorted that only sacred activities were permissible on the day. One ruled: “Let them practice nothing but that which favors of piety, and there are prohibited profane Assemblies, riotous Feasts, Dances, Morrices, disguises, Stage plays, and going to Alehouses.”<sup>831</sup> In his other examples, he provided further evidence of consular decisions against the use of dice, tables, dancing, cards, and more.<sup>832</sup> Moving on to other church authorities, in the following chapter Bernard summarized arguments from popes, archbishops, bishops, and learned divines in favor of his interpretation:<sup>833</sup>

...In Pope Eugenius his time the princes and prelates (as Doctor Heylyn confesseth) did agree together to raise the Lord’s day to as high a pitch as they fairly might, and a canon was made by that pope in a synod at Rome 800 years ago to forbid...vain sports on the Lord’s day, and other festivals...

...By the canon law grinding hath been inhibited, and by the same Laws traveling hath been forbidden, and counted a mortal sin: See at large Doctor Heylyn out of Tostatus, the strictness of the observation of the Lord’s day and holy days...

...Our last Archbishop Doctor Abbot so honoured the Lord’s day, as he by his chaplains licensed diverse treatises for observation of the Lord’s day: and when a minister presented him with a book to be licensed, which was made for liberty on that day, he took it of him, and before his face burnt it in the fire.

---

<sup>829</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 170.

<sup>830</sup> Memorably so in Elizabeth I’s relations with Archbishop Grindal; see Patrick Collinson, “If Constantine, then also Theodosius.”

<sup>831</sup> The Concilium Bituriense: Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 171.

<sup>832</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 170-171.

<sup>833</sup> On the way that godly writers could admit agreement with Catholics on certain issues, see Milton, “A Qualified Intolerance.” His use of Catholic authors here may suggest the question of why Protestants could miss such a clear doctrine when even Catholics could identify it correctly.

For bishops, S. Ambrose telleth us, it is well known, saith he, how carefully the Bishops do refrain from all toying, light, and filthy dances, if at other times, then on the Lord's day. Bishop Babington on Exod. 16. saith, that drinkings, dances, wakes, wantonness, bear-baiting, and bull-baiting were wicked profanation of the Lord's day. Bishop Downham on the commandments saith... They that defile it with drunkenness and the like, make it a Sabbatum Diaboli: and they that profane it with sports, make it Sabbatum aurei vituli...

... Vincentius Bellovecensis and Bellarmine have condemned stage-plays, interludes, masques, mixed-dancing, which they call lascivious, to be especially on the Lord's day most execrable. Alex. Fabricius in his *destructorium vitiorum* pars 4 saith, That the Sabbath by dancing is profaned. So did the godly Albigenes and Waldenses...

I will end only with the harmony of confessions, where it is said, that the Lord's day ever since the apostles' time was consecrated to religious exercises and unto holy rest.<sup>834</sup>

It cannot be a coincidence that dancing, wakes, and other activities the Declaration of Sports permitted continually came up in his summaries of leaders' decisions and opinions. Bernard was raising the stakes of the Caroline church's position on the Sabbath. Although he provided a clear way out for them by suggesting their general agreement with the more restrictive interpretation of the Sabbath, he also presented arguments that depicted the allowance of dancing, wakes, and other activities as spitting in the face of the entire Christian tradition. As always, Bernard's arguments were annotated in the text and margins; here, even more than in some of his other works, Bernard had much to gain by demonstrating that the ideas in this work were not his own.

The passage even turned the Laudian regime on itself by citing Peter Heylyn—the great Laudian defender of the permissive Sabbath—and making him seem to support a godly perspective. Bernard was a great reader, so he probably knew of Heylyn's recent reworking of Prideaux's position in a similar way, making Prideaux seem to support a Caroline Sabbath—in this regard, Bernard's use was perhaps a rather clever attempt to give Heylyn a taste of his own medicine.<sup>835</sup>

Also of note in the above passage is the anecdote about Abbott refusing license to works that promoted liberty on the Sabbath. Bernard used it to depict the danger that the godly Abbott saw in incorrect theologies of the Sabbath; yet it also tells us something about Bernard's view both of the Sabbath and of publishing. Even recognizing his strong words in the 1641

---

<sup>834</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 172-175.

<sup>835</sup> On Heylyn, see Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*, and "Peter Heylyn," *ODNB*. Mentions of Heylyn appear elsewhere in *Threefold Treatise*, as well.

dedicatory epistle against the Laudian censorship of Sabbatarian books, we must remember that Bernard was no proponent of simply a free press. Only the censorship of profitable books—not censorship in general—was condemnable. The anecdote also depicted the great danger that he believed, like Abbott, that a liberal view of the Sabbath could bring. Beyond a refusal to license, burning was reserved for books containing particularly dangerous ideas. Bernard’s inclusion of this anecdote clearly indicated the theological ills he wished to associate with such teachings.

In the final chapters of *Threefold Treatise*, Bernard moved from the more general descriptions of the Sabbath that had taken up bulk of the work to a more pointed exposition of the way the Sabbath should be observed. Making no outright criticisms of the King or the national church, he allowed it to seem that he agreed with both. Yet in circumvention of this, he actually provided a particular reading of the Declaration of Sports that made the king appear to agree with a godly interpretation of the Sabbath—that is, with the particular godly interpretation that Bernard had constructed from a large variety of church authorities. In other words, in *Threefold Treatise* Bernard made a clear effort to construct a conforming-but-godly view of the Sabbath while simultaneously challenging the Caroline church to take his position or to admit that they had run outside this orthodox theological tradition. Lest this challenge be too overt, he soon returned to attempting to create a harmony between his godly interpretation of the Sabbath and the King’s Declaration. One sees this quite clearly in Chapters 24-26 of the third section, in the careful way in which he borrowed from the godly (but in the opinion of the Caroline government, subversive) text on the Sabbath, *Divine Tragedie*. As he demonstrated in *Guide*, Bernard had an appetite for popular reports of supernatural activity that he could use as practical examples in his writings. Since *Divine Tragedie* dealt specifically with practical examples of the results of ignoring the fourth commandment, it was useful for developing arguments in favor of keeping the Sabbath. The Laudian inquest into the spread of *Divine Tragedie* had inquired about Bernard’s possession and reading of the work, but from *Threefold Treatise* it is clear that he did more than simply possess and read. The resemblance between the cases cited in *Divine Tragedie* and several of those in Chapters 24-26 of *Threefold Treatise* is unmistakable, with the use of corresponding episodes and, frequently, identical wording indicating his use of the source:

[*Divine Tragedie*.]

In Yorkshire at a Wake, in the Parish of Otley at Baildon, on the Lord’s day, two of them sitting at drink, late in the night, fell out and being parted, the one a little after finding his fellow, sitting by the fire with his back towards him, comes behind him, and with a hatchet chins him down the back, so as his bowels fell out; the murderer

flying immediately, and being hotly pursued, leapt into a river, and so drowned himself. O fearful fruits of carnal liberty!<sup>836</sup>

[*Threefold Treatise*:]

At a Wake on the Lord's day, among others, two sitting and drinking, till late at night fell out, but at first they were parted a while, after commeth one of them in again, and seeing the other sitting by the fire, with his back towards him, commeth behind him, and with an hatchet chineth him down the back, so as his bowels fell out: the cruel murderer flying, and being hotly pursued, leaped into a river and drowned himself.<sup>837</sup>

Interestingly, while *Threefold Treatise* clearly drew upon *Divine Tragedie*, Bernard never cited or made specific reference to it. This was certainly an intentional omission. His lack of citation to this one publication was in sharp contrast to the careful and thorough citations he included throughout his corpus and specifically in *Threefold Treatise*—indeed, even in the other examples in these same chapters.

Bernard did not merely fail to cite *Divine Tragedie*: he also stripped all identifying information—names, locations, etc.—from the anecdotes he took from the work. Perhaps he felt that a too-specific account would cause people to question his source, which he would have wanted to avoid in this instance. This process may have made the source more difficult to trace, and the vague information could suggest to readers that the incidents were unpublished reports that came by word of mouth rather than personal research. Again, it is noteworthy that Bernard cited the sources of the other examples he used; the one glaring omission was any reference to *Divine Tragedie*.<sup>838</sup> Although anyone comparing the two copies would have no trouble identifying the connection, Bernard seems to have wanted to keep its use in the shadows. Nevertheless, the inclusion of *Divine Tragedie* demonstrates Bernard's active choice to retain information he gained from the work while attempting to distance himself from the illicit publication itself.

Bernard would have been loath to publicly associate himself with the (always potentially subversive) contents of unlicensed print. This would have been a concern not only for his own publications but also for those to which he made reference. Accordingly, it is not surprising that the citation-heavy Bernard chose, here, to distance himself from the questionable work. Beyond

---

<sup>836</sup> *Divine Tragedie*, 22. There are variant texts; this is example 42 in the full version and example 11 in another version.

<sup>837</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 180.

<sup>838</sup> Most of the examples Bernard took from *Divine Tragedie* are concentrated in just a few chapters of *Threefold Treatise*. These chapters cover (respectively) “immediate” judgments (including the first example in the quoted section), “mediate” judgments (including the middle three examples) and “casual” judgments (including the final example). By far, the highest percentage of examples from *Divine Tragedie* appear in Chapter 25 on mediate judgments—perhaps because he had trouble finding this type of example in other works.

being unlicensed, the work was anonymous; as such Bernard may have felt that this omission indicated that the author did not desire—or deserve—such recognition. Moreover, even if he might have been willing to cite certain unlicensed or anonymous materials, Laud’s inquest into the distribution of *Divine Tragedie* left no question of its status before the ecclesiastical authorities. Ashe, who had distributed the work in the Batcombe area, certainly got the message: he burned extra copies of the work.<sup>839</sup> Bernard, whose entire career had depended on his keeping abreast of the ideas and inclinations of his superiors, certainly also understood this.

Yet the most important aspect of Bernard’s use of *Divine Tragedie* for our purposes is the observation that he chose only to include incidents that illustrated divine judgment on those who went beyond the legal allowance for Sabbath activity, i.e., beyond the Book of Sports. Although the source included ample examples of individuals who encountered God’s judgment for Sabbath-breaking activities that were technically legal, Bernard selected only examples in which Sabbath-breakers were also doing illegal activities—and he clarified this throughout:

A man on the Lord’s day though entreated to the contrary by his wife, would take his hatchet and shovel to make an end of his work left before undone: but he was suddenly struck dead in the ditch and so ended his work and life together. ...

Some on the Lord’s day would go to bowls (a forbidden game to the common sort) at which play two falling out, the one threw a bowl at the other, and struck him so on the head, as the blood issued out, of which blow he died shortly after.

Certain youths (contrary to the order in the declaration) would go out of their own parish on the Lord’s day, into another to play at fives, the mother of one of these earnestly dissuaded him, but go he would, and returning homewards at night, with his companions, they fell first to justling, after to boxing, so as their blood being moved one of his fellows stabbed him in the left side, and so wounded him, as he died the next day at night. ...

A wanton maid hired on the Lord’s day, a fellow to go to the next parish to fetch thence a minstrel (not warranted by the declaration) that she, and others might dance; but that night was she gotten with child, which at the time of its birth, she murdered, and was put to death for the same, confessing the occasion of her ill hap, to be her profanation of the Lord’s day. ...

Fourteen youths adventuring to play at foot-ball upon the river of Trent on the Sabbath day, when it was, as they thought, hard frozen, meeting together in a shove, the ice brake, and they were all drowned.<sup>840</sup>

Bernard frequently included examples that showed how a Sabbath-breaker doing an illegal activity was also participating in the sort of activities that a godly interpretation of the Sabbath would condemn. This is clear, for instance, in the above anecdote about the woman

---

<sup>839</sup> Peacey, “The Paranoid Prelate.”

<sup>840</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 178-183.

dancing. Although Bernard described the (illegal) hiring of someone to travel for a minstrel rather than the (legal) dancing as being problematic, there was still an implication that the dancing on the Sabbath helped lead to fornication and murder.

Throughout *Threefold Treatise* until the final chapter, Bernard attempted to walk a close line between holding a godly view of the Sabbath and yet remaining unwilling to condemn certain doctrines of the national church that taught otherwise. In other words, we may view nearly all of *Threefold Treatise* as an attempt at godly Sabbatarian conformism. This can also help us understand something of Bernard's thought process about whether to allow the Declaration of Sports to be read in his church—something he ultimately did, but which many godly ministers could not countenance. It is entirely likely that he gave the public reading of the Declaration a similar treatment to that of his book: reading it as required, but also presenting the judgments of other divines—seemingly as helpful companions, but actually as a corrective, to the document. He would not have been the only divine to take such a route: London's Stephen Denison did something rather similar in his church.<sup>841</sup>

The only exception to this pattern of conformism was in the final chapter of *Threefold Treatise*. It took something of a different tone from the rest of the work, and it may have been composed at a later date than the bulk of the contents. Reading *Threefold Treatise*, it is clear that the penultimate chapter could easily be the end of the work. It was entitled “Of the serious ponderation of these things” and began with an appeal in the second person to the “Christian Reader.” It answered common objections to Sabbath-keeping and took a tone of pleading—a common feature at the end of early modern publications. Moreover, it concluded with a comment that could very well be a final appeal left to the reader: “If any be desirous to answer these questions, let them first turn their thoughts to Christ, and hearken then what conscience will say, and thereafter make their answer.”<sup>842</sup> In contrast, the final chapter took a more aggressive tone than the preceding chapters about behavior on the Christian Sabbath and contains vehement condemnations of specific things in Bernard's own voice. He was no longer a reporter, collating various views, but rather is himself a proponent of a particular view.<sup>843</sup>

---

<sup>841</sup> Parker, *The English Sabbath*, 194-5;

<sup>842</sup> Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 224.

<sup>843</sup> Although he still cites various authorities, his own voice is stronger and more evident here. It is of further interest that a printed manicule highlights the following observation about things not to be done on the Sabbath: “Fourthly, all sports whatsoever in the Church or Church-yard forbidden by the Canons of our Church in those places; and



Altogether, it appears that Bernard composed *Threefold Treatise*, intending it for print, during the 1630s; he hoped that his conforming version of Sabbatarianism might gain the licenser's approval. Being rejected for publication in the 1630s, Bernard began or continued to spread his ideas in manuscript. Then, as printing restrictions lessened in 1641, it is likely that he added the more strongly-worded final chapter just before publication.

#### Laudian moderate non-licensure?

*Threefold Treatise* was not the only work Bernard submitted for publication in the 1630s. We must recall that he was successful in achieving print not only early in the decade with certain catechetical works, but also with *Ready Way*, which in 1634 received an imprimatur from Laud's chaplain Samuel Baker. Perhaps these successes gave Bernard enough hope that he kept writing and attempting publication throughout the period. He appears to have sought publication for at least two additional works. The first was *Thesaurus Biblicus*, a concordance-like topical reference. In this work it seems that Bernard pursued a similar strategy to the one he used in *Threefold Treatise* in that he omitted overtly puritan or nonconformist sections but still attempted to communicate a godly agenda. In this case, Bernard attempted to avoid controversial positioning by leaving the theological conclusions to readers themselves. That is, he tried the approach of composing a reference work that simply equipped readers with tools and helpful references to interpret the Bible on their own. Importantly, *Thesaurus* did not restrict itself to controversial topics—even rather mundane ones were included. Yet if we look carefully at the way that particular topics appear, it is possible to see many key elements that someone with a godly approach would have emphasized. For example, in the entries related to the Sabbath, Bernard highlighted biblical passages that pointed one toward a conservative, Sabbatarian doctrine: the limitation on activities during the Sabbath, the integration of Old and New Testament commands and restrictions, and more. It is possible to imagine how a puritan-leaning reader—and perhaps even a neutral reader—could use such passages to develop an argument that was in line with a puritan viewpoint. Yet at the same time, it is also possible to see how Bernard himself retained plausible deniability that he was supporting views out of step with the national church;

---

here, methinks, the reason is good, if sports and plays pollute an holy place, then sports and pastimes pollute an holy time." Bernard, *Threefold Treatise*, 225.

to the contrary, he was merely providing them with a compendious reference work that pointed readers to the Bible. It was an interesting and potentially successful tactic.

Unlike *Threefold Treatise*, which dealt with the Sabbath, and many of Bernard's other topical works, *Thesaurus* was not particularly timely in its content—but that was its value. This work was intended to equip anyone to make good use of the Scriptures to address the complex religious issues of these and other changing times. For an author-minister such as Bernard, now aged and nearing the end of his career, printing a work such as *Thesaurus* would have been a huge accomplishment: a tangible legacy to leave the church and a lasting piece of assistance for godly readers of the future. Samuel Hartlib had noted as early as 1634 that Bernard was well begun on the work of composing *Thesaurus*. Yet even having large amounts of notes upon which to draw, the massive project certainly took a large amount of time—probably years, considering the other activities in which he was involved. Whatever the amount of time, we have evidence, both from Bernard's own account and from Samuel Hartlib's notes, that in or before 1639 Bernard had attempted to have *Thesaurus* published. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the work did not fare well: the censors did not find it to be an innocuous reference work. Bernard later described his encounter with the censors this way: "...some who would not license this book heretofore, said, This were to make every man a preacher: and another, that it would mar their trade. These are enemies to knowledge, and have not the spirit of Moses, to wish that all the Lord's people could prophesy."<sup>844</sup>

Hartlib recorded a more extensive version of this interaction, wherein he noted that a section explaining how to use the concordance was particularly objectionable to the censor.<sup>845</sup> The church allowed certain controversial issues to be discussed in limited ways within scholarly circles that they did not allow to be brought up among laypeople unqualified to handle them. These comments from the censor and from Bernard give us an interesting perspective on what Bernard wanted for the work: he wanted not merely to make a high-level reference work, but rather to make it possible for all people to come to their own godly views. In other words, considering merely the contents, it seems Bernard might have been able to achieve licensure by publishing a less popularly accessible work—Hartlib seems to have thought this possible. Regardless, as it happened, *Thesaurus* stayed on the wrong side of the licenser's desk through the 1630s.

---

<sup>844</sup> Bernard, *Thesaurus*, "To the Studious Reader," n.p.

<sup>845</sup> HP 30/4/17A. I am very grateful to Joel Harrington for assistance with the German.

Another work Bernard may have attempted to print during the 1630s was the brief treatise *The Article of Christs Descension into Hell*. Like *Threefold Treatise*, it would not be published until 1641. Further, it, too, suggested Bernard's interest in blending a godly perspective with a conforming position. *Article* argued that the portion of the creed stating that Christ descended into Hell should be understood not as saying that his soul descended to the place "of the damned, and of the Devils" but rather that he "went to the grave or tomb" and that his soul went to the "place of the souls of the Elect."<sup>846</sup> The work was typically Bernardian in style: it comprised typographical and rhetorical variety; it was broken up into various sections; and it contained lists and multiple citations, some of which went into detail to clarify various points or arguments. It also included a chart of each article of the creed and the biblical witnesses to it (except the one in question, which "hath no witness in the historical narration in all the New Testament").

According to Bernard's explanation in the work, *Article* had its origins in a rather brief encounter.<sup>847</sup> He had received a letter asking him about the interpretation of the article stating that Christ descended into Hell. While penning his reply, a man from another parish arrived and expressed interest in the matter. After "some reasoning" together, the visitor asked to have Bernard's paper; Bernard declined but ultimately allowed him to write out some of his ideas the next day. The man returned to his own parish and brought these copies of Bernard's ideas to another man (presumably a minister) who then authored a rebuttal. It was this unidentified author whom Bernard addressed in *Article*. Bernard reproached the author for not contacting him personally before composing his answer: "...you have framed my reasons, and given answer accordingly. Had you been pleased to have willed me to have taken pains with mine own, better had you contented me."<sup>848</sup> In this account, written in the form of an epistle to his opponent, Bernard made sure to note that the unnamed visitor arrived without being summoned—in other words, that the meeting was happenstance and Bernard had not intended to use the man in order to circulate his views in another parish. Yet although Bernard suggested that he did not intend to begin a public debate on this issue, the fact that he wrote a letter in response to the questions,

---

<sup>846</sup> Bernard, *Article*, 4, 18, 22.

<sup>847</sup> The Apostles' Creed states that Christ descended into Hell; the debate over the sense in which he did this became known as the "Descensus Controversy" and was an important religious issue in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart periods—that is, before Bernard became a minister, and certainly before he published this work in 1641. See Wallace, "Puritan and Anglican: The Interpretation of Christ's Descent into Hell in Elizabethan Theology"; and Marshall, "The Reformation of Hell? Protestant and Catholic Infernalisms in England, c. 1560-1640."

<sup>848</sup> Bernard, *Article*, 1.

and that he could be importuned to share his ideas with the unnamed man even against his first instinct, indicated that he did have some interest in spreading his opinions, at least privately.

Though the identity of Bernard's opponent and the timing of the original exchanges are unclear, like many of Bernard's other publications, *Article* illustrated the interconnectedness that could and did exist between private and public—parish and print—ministry.<sup>849</sup> A minister interested in helping individuals sort through controversial religious issues could easily end up being drawn into a debate and then drawn to publication. In *Article* Bernard did not indicate an unwillingness to debate (a common rhetorical move even for eager pugilists), but he did express a wish that his full view would have been taken into account. He felt, it seems, that he had been thrown into the debate by proxy and without the benefit of his full ammunition—which in this work he hoped to provide. Author-ministers did not always choose their own battles; even those new to the print marketplace were already public religious figures, and anything they said or wrote could be used for or against them by friends and opponents who varied both in education and in scruple.<sup>850</sup>

More importantly for our purposes, *Article* suggested a continued effort to provide a perspective on religious issues that was founded upon reformed or godly perspectives but which did not overtly criticize or contradict doctrines affirmed by the national church. This appeared in several ways. For instance, Bernard emphasized the general acceptability of his perspectives by several groups:

For the article it is agreed upon, but the controversy is in the sense, what is the true and undoubted meaning thereof.

1. Our church herein hath not in the articles to which we subscribe, declared absolutely her judgment, that your exposition should be so pressed, as the one only sense and none other.
2. The orthodox churches beyond the seas have not agreed of your only sense, for any thing I know, but do leave the sense free.
3. Very great clerks, reverend divines, singularly learned, furnished every way with excellent gifts, vary in their opinions, and differ in their expounding of the article, both in our church and in other countries.<sup>851</sup>

---

<sup>849</sup> Although *Article* was published in 1641, it is possible that the initial exchange could have occurred some time earlier, and with any number of ministers. The descensus controversy was nothing new: among the public controversialists engaged with it during the early Stuart period was Richard Parkes, a minister who as early as 1604 published *A Briefe Answer vnto Certaine Obiections and Reasons against the descension of Christ into hell, lately sent in writing vnto a Gentleman in the Countrey* in response, perhaps, to the views of Andrew Willet. In dating the work's creation, it is important to note that *Article* makes reference to Ussher's *An Answer to a Challege Made by a Iesuite in Ireland*, published in 1625. Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., "Parkes, Richard," *ODNB*.

<sup>850</sup> On this see David Dawson, *Flesh Becomes Word*.

<sup>851</sup> Bernard, *Article*, Sig. Br.

He also frequently referred to the work of James Ussher, an ecclesiastical authority who took the same position on this issue as Bernard. In accordance with his usual style he cited both secondary sources and Scripture passages throughout. All of these emphasized that he was a careful researcher and theological thinker. Interestingly, in something of an uncharacteristic move, at the end of the work Bernard included the caveat that he could be in error and did not wish to hold heretical doctrines.<sup>852</sup> This could be due to the significance of the topic, since interpreting an article of the Creed related to Christ's salvific work was no mean theological endeavor. Yet it could also be a gesture towards the still-unsure climate of the age: should the work be rejected for publication, he would not want to raise suspicions about his orthodoxy. This declaration gave him a way out.

*Article* contained non-conformist (or at least non-Laudian) theological content. Yet it discussed an issue that was not currently receiving the same degree of emphasis as other issues such as church ceremony and decoration, the Sacrament, and the Sabbath. This makes it difficult to determine how controversial the work was, and perhaps more importantly, how controversial Bernard thought it would be. Even if he knew something of its potential controversy, he would have recalled his successful insertion of brief comments about the sacraments that did not align with the Prayer Book into *Common Catechisme*, which did see publication in the 1630s. This may have given him hope. In other words, it is once again entirely possible that Bernard attempted to have this work published in the 1630s, just as he had with other works throughout the decade.

Regardless of whether, when, or with what degree of hope he sought publication, the most interesting aspect of these works remains: Bernard wrote all of them with a moderate tone, reluctant to charge authorities with wrong. His commitment to remaining within the national church still strongly influenced the content of his publication. Only when it was clear that the presses and the church were again open to godly works did his full view emerge.

---

<sup>852</sup> “*Ad scrutandam veritatem, non ad errorem defendendum hac scripsi; nam errare possum, Haereticus tamen esse nolo.*” Bernard, *Article*, 39.

## To the presses!

Whatever Bernard's hopes had been during the 1630s, only after Parliament sat did he and other godly authors again have greater access to the press. Aware of these changes, Bernard himself was in London by early 1641.<sup>853</sup> In addition to his intent to publish his own works (which I discuss below), he probably traveled in order to observe and assist the nationally important activities that were beginning to occur. By 1640, he had become something of a respected elder among godly divines, and he had a wide network of both political and religious connections. The groups to which he dedicated *Threefold Treatise* provide some idea of these connections. In addition to the general dedication to nearly all of Parliament, he singled out three individual committees (for religion, for the remonstrance, and for ministers maintenance and suppression of scandalous ministers). Though the committees he chose to recognize are related to the book's topic, the fact that he was aware of their existence indicated both his careful attention to the proceedings of state and his place in a network that could inform him of such details. In addition, he dedicated the work to MPs from Somerset, notable among whom were Sir Edward Rodney, Sir Francis Popham, and Sir Ralph Hopton (whom he had mentioned in the epistle of the fourth edition of *Isle of Man*) and John Ashe (who had provided Bernard with a copy of *Divine Tragedie*); it is likely that he knew several of the others he listed, as well.<sup>854</sup>

During this time, Bernard also sat for the portrait that would be published in *Threefold Treatise* and again later in *Thesaurus*. It was an engraving by Wenceslaus Hollar that portrayed him at the age of 74. Depicted in simple garb and a sober posture, holding a book in his hands, the portrait reinforced his stature as a recognized author and an aged minister of the gospel. The caption identified him merely as “Rich<sup>de</sup>: Bernard, Vigilantissimi Pastoris de Batcombe, Som<sup>er</sup>set.” Although by this time he had become a respected leader in godly circles, a noted author, and the holder of honorary titles including Royal Chaplain in Extraordinary, the caption emphasized his role as a local minister. In addition, as was typical of several portraits of godly clergy, the image highlighted his relationship to books by its portrayal of him holding an unidentified volume in his hands, which called to mind not only the Bible but also the many

---

<sup>853</sup> The signature block in the dedicatory epistle for *Threefold Treatise* places Bernard in London on March 26, 1641. The length of his stay is uncertain, but it may have been part of a trip including his taking the work to be licensed (as it was February 8).

<sup>854</sup> He also had connections to additional MPs, such as Walter Earle, whose names do not appear in the dedication.

other works he read and published. In this way, the image suggested Bernard's scholarly pursuits and his work as an author-minister.

While in London Bernard may have sought out John Hansley, who had begun licensing Parliamentary rather than Laudian works, to see that his manuscripts were published.<sup>855</sup> *Threefold Treatise* was entered in the Stationers' Register on February 8, 1640/1 under the hands of Hansley and Man. Two other works were published on the authority of Hansley and Downes: his *Thesaurus* (including the text of *Abstract*, a work that would be appended to printed copies of *Thesaurus*) was entered on April 2, 1641 (although in fact this work would not see publication for some time; on which see below), and *Article* was entered five days later. The latter was printed with an imprimatur—also from Hansley—dated March 13.<sup>856</sup>

The final work published during this period that we can assign with confidence to Bernard is *An Epistle Directed to all Iustices of Peace in England and Wales*, a reprint of one of the dedicatory epistles that had appeared in his 1617 *Key*. The work's contents were not new, but the note on the title page that it was "presented to the High Court of Parliament by R. B." and the accompanying woodcut portrait of Charles with crown and scepter, were. Together, the title page and contents reflected patterns we have observed thus far: Bernard's presentation of the work to Parliament affirms that he spent time in London and suggests his attempt to influence matters of state. The portrait of Charles as king emphasized Bernard's continued commitment to the monarchy and the national church. The anti-Catholic contents of the work emphasized the need for political authorities to enforce religious standards and suggested that Bernard hoped for the return of the national church to a more godly, and thus in some ways implicitly anti-Laudian, position.<sup>857</sup> Yet again, this simultaneously demonstrated his commitment to accomplishing these ends within the established authority structures of church and state.<sup>858</sup>

Moreover, it is significant that the contents of *Epistle* were not new, and thus in accord with what seems to have been Bernard's rather hurried printing schedule. If he indeed had the

---

<sup>855</sup> On Hansley's shift, see Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, 107.

<sup>856</sup> The imprimatur does not appear on the *EEBO* copy, but it does appear on other copies such as BOD Pamph. D 42 (17). It is unclear why only this work was printed with an imprimatur; different publishers, different publication dates, or the nature of the content could have made a difference.

<sup>857</sup> See Chapter 5.

<sup>858</sup> Interestingly, this brief work was reprinted in 1642, probably after Bernard's death with neither the authorial attribution nor the portrait of Charles. The attribution "printed for M.S." remained the same in both editions; this perhaps may refer to Michael Sparke or Matthew Simmons. The Thomason collection for January 1642 includes the later edition of *Epistle*—that is, the one with neither portrait nor author. Yet on his copy Thomason made the note: "By Mr. Barnard of Batcome." See *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts... Collected by George Thomason*, 72.

bulk of *Threefold Treatise*, as well as his reference works, completed in the 1630s, he could bring them to press quite quickly upon learning of the looser controls on printing. The same was true for *Article*, which he also seems to have composed some time before going to London. Although Bernard could certainly have composed a new work for the important occasion of sending a message to Parliament, repurposing an earlier one—*Epistle*—allowed him to bring timely ideas to public attention that much faster.

### A new face of conformity?

By the early 1640s, Bernard had learned of the changes in church and state, made a point to involve himself by going to London, used his networks to access and influence political matters, and published several works that he had at the ready. The content of these existing works reflects the conformist position that he was forced to hold in the 1630s. Yet we can also identify in newer portions of these works, such as the dedicatory epistles, a willingness finally to speak strongly against certain Laudian policies.

Since his early days under Archbishop Matthew, Bernard had pursued a godly-yet-conforming ministry: though he encountered increasing pressure to conform to Laudian and Caroline policies with which he had significant theological disagreement, there is evidence in *Threefold Treatise* and *Epistle* that even as late as 1640 or 1641 he remained committed to the national church. Yet in and after 1641, with the tables turning, how far outside this posture was he prepared to go?

This brings us to one of the most perplexing questions about Bernard's career: did he author two anonymous 1641 publications against key aspects of the national church, *A Worke for the Wisely Considerate* and *A Short viewv of the Praelaticall Church of England*?<sup>859</sup> Both publications were, at different points after his death, attributed to him. It is a question that cannot be fully resolved

---

<sup>859</sup> One further publication, *The Anatomy of the Service Book*, has also been attributed to Bernard; however, there is no evidence to support this. The work is attributed to “DWALPHINTRAMIS” and the use of the second personal plural within the work indicates that it was written by a group. This may be a play on the more famous collective, Smectymnuus—and if so, we may note that “RB” is nowhere to be found in the acronym. The only seeming connection with Bernard that I can locate is that a copy of *Anatomy* was appended to the 1661 republication of *Praelaticall Church* (see below). Yet even if *Praelaticall Church* was Bernard's—which, as I discuss below, is itself doubtful—the title page of the 1661 publication in question does not assert that *Anatomy* is likewise Bernard's. In contrast to the lack of any real connection to Bernard, there is evidence that *Anatomy* is of Scottish origin. In *The Complete Works of Rev. Thomas Smyth*, Vol. 2, *Anatomy* appears in the index, where we find that it was “published by a number of Ministers in Edinburgh” in response to requirements about the service book. Likewise, it was republished as *The Common Prayer-Book Unmasked* in 1660, and answered shortly after by at least two writers.



on the basis of extant evidence, although in my opinion the evidence is compelling that he composed at least *Worke*. Regardless, an examination of these publications and their connection to Bernard provides a helpful opportunity to consider the way that a godly yet conforming author-minister might position himself toward the national church in this period of increasingly unclear theological boundaries. I begin by discussing *Worke* because, of the two, it is easier to construct a solid attribution to Bernard.

The first section of *Worke* addressed the place (or, rather, the lack of place) for bishops within the church. It argued against them not polemically but rather by using a careful exposition of biblical practices and only occasional commentary: this was similar to the second section of *Threefold Treatise* in which Bernard discussed Mosaic Sabbath practices. Here, in arguing for elders rather than bishops, *Worke* traced the history of church governors in the New Testament and countered arguments that might support other conclusions.<sup>860</sup> Only toward the end of a comparatively long introduction and in the following section did *Worke* begin to make prescriptive claims about what should be done—though again, only with many supporting references. In context, the plea concluding the section (“O god give thy truth acceptance in the hearts of thy people”) seems almost to indicate that a plain presentation of the preceding facts would be enough, even without polemic moves, to convince a godly reader. Though the work did not entirely depend upon this tactic, it was a balanced and comparatively non-polemical approach to a controversial topic.

The second section, entitled “A Position seriously to be considered of” provided evidence from Scripture about the importance of following God’s directions and avoiding innovation in aspects of worship.<sup>861</sup> This followed logically on the heels of the front section by implying that if bishops were not instituted by God then they should not be part of the church’s structure. Yet it went further to address what were, perhaps, the most problematic issues for the English godly throughout the early modern period: worship, ceremony, and “things indifferent.”<sup>862</sup> Using only Scripture, *Worke* argued through a progression of ten reasons that God disallowed individuals from instituting any new forms of service to God. Within this, it outlined the biblical precedents for worship (including discussions of public prayer, reading, singing, and preaching). The

---

<sup>860</sup> He argued against those who would cite Scripture (Timothy, Titus, and Revelation 2) or “human testimonies” to support diocesan bishops.

<sup>861</sup> This section title and the explanatory heading below it were adapted to compose the title and subtitle of the 1644 edition. The biblical passages used included Old and New Testament books as well as Esdras.

<sup>862</sup> Interestingly, this section used only Scripture to construct its arguments.

following passage from this list, regarding preaching, is exemplary both of the general way in which *Worke* collated Scripture to make what could be seen as a polemical point seem to be merely an enumeration of fact, and of the way in which, on occasion, *Worke* adopted a more assertive tone on key points:

5. The manner is, by either expounding the words as they read it, Neh. 8.8. or reading a text, and so preaching upon it, as our Savior did, Luke 4. 17, 21. the Apostles usually took no text, but spake as occasion offered itself, as Peter, Act. 10.34. and Saint Paul, Act. 13.16, 17.

But in expounding and preaching it was with such plainness, as they caused the people to understand, Neh. 8.8. and spake with authority, Tit. 2. 15. and with command, 1 Tim. 4.11. in demonstration of the Spirit, and not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, 1 Cor. 2.4.

6. The end, to work conversion and grace in the hearers, Jer. 23.22. Act. 26.18. I Cor. 14.26. to save themselves and those that hear them, 1 Tim. 4. 16.

7. When the sermon was ended we find that the apostle prayed, Act. 20.36.

Lastly, this preaching was constant every Sabbath day, Act. 15.21. which text is abused to prove reading to be preaching, but the plain grammatical construction of the Greek text overthroweth the falsity thereof, and discovereth the truth of preaching, when the Scriptures were read.<sup>863</sup>

Having provided arguments explaining the necessity of remaining within Scriptural guidelines for God's worship and service, *Worke* turned to the perennially problematic issue of *adiaphora* with a strong warning: "God is so far from giving man liberality in substantial things, or circumstantial necessities, that he tieth us to certain rules in things of their own nature merely indifferent."<sup>864</sup> These rules for things indifferent included an emphasis on expediency, edification, necessity, and avoidance of offence. The section concluded with wishes that any false thing be removed from worship—no matter the sources, which could even include "counsel of state," custom, "doctrine of great Churchmen" and "good intentions."<sup>865</sup>

The third and final section of *Worke* addressed the ever-controversial issue of separation; it is likely for this reason that this section contained extremely little of the author's own voice. Rather, it is almost entirely a collection of quotations and paraphrases from William Chillingworth's 1638 publication, *The Religion of Protestants*—a feature clearly advertised at the beginning of the section: "Certain Propositions gathered out of Master Ch. his Book, approved by very learned Divines, and printed by the allowance of authority." By doing this, the author of

---

<sup>863</sup> Bernard, *Worke*, 24.

<sup>864</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>865</sup> *Ibid.*, 27-29. Eleven possible sources are listed.

*Worke* could cleverly distance himself from any problematic aspects of this section (should the need to do so arise) since it merely repeated claims that had been allowed by the licensing authorities. Carefully structuring bits of Chillingworth's publication, *Worke* implicitly addressed several current issues that the godly had with the national church:

Christ hath forbidden us under pain of damnation, to profess what we believe not,  
To profess and vow by oath what we believe not, were without question damnable,  
and for our dissimulation, hypocrisy, perjury, might certainly be condemned to hell...

Certainly it is not his will that we should err with the Church, or that we should  
against conscience profess errors of it...

Not every separation, but only a causeless separation from the external  
communion of any church is the sin of schism.

They are no schismatics, who have just, great and necessary cause to separate; who  
join not with their separation, an uncharitable damning of all those from whom they  
do divide themselves...

It is no schism to forsake their communion, where I must profess my self to believe  
that which I do not believe...

The schism lieth upon her, for making our separation just and necessary, by  
requiring unnecessary and unlawful conditions of her communion.

We are obliged by Christ under pain of damnation, to leave that communion, in  
which we cannot remain without this hypocritical profession of those things which we  
are convinced to be erroneous.

The imposing upon men under the pain of excommunication, a necessity of  
professing known errors, and practicing known corruptions, is a sufficient and  
necessary cause of separation from them, who will not reform themselves, but as  
much as in them lies, hinder others from doing so.<sup>866</sup>

The original text by Chillingworth was written to demonstrate the reasons that Protestants had rightly separated from Catholics. Yet in context with the two preceding sections that were clearly of a godly nature and challenging aspects of the national church, these passages now looked toward the need for Christian believers to separate from errant Protestant churches as well. The passages of this section that condemned requiring "unnecessary and unlawful conditions" or "hypocritical profession" of erroneous teachings in order to remain in communion with the church had clear relevance to present concerns that the godly had with the national church. The section of paraphrases and quotations contained only one insertion of the author's own voice, a brief section at the conclusion of the work:

If in all these things this man [Chillingworth] hath delivered truths, it concerneth  
every man to seek for good satisfaction to his own soul concerning our Churches'  
worship, government, and manner of both. It is fearful to dally with God and a man's

---

<sup>866</sup> Ibid. 35-37.

own conscience; to be in judgment led captive by only fear of authority, is to fear man before God.

To follow others going before us, without good reason, is brutish. I shall rest, as a man on sound reason, and as a Christian upon the divine word of truth, for this satisfies a peaceable spirit led with understanding, and not with imagination.<sup>867</sup>

Again, the author of *Worke* had distanced himself from any accusation of novel theological claims by leaning on the fact that church authorities had affirmed these principles. Yet this passage made it clear that his intended application of the principles went beyond Chillingworth's to address present concerns with the national church.

Together, these three sections struck at the base of nearly the entire Laudian program, attacking both episcopacy and extrabiblical ceremonies—and then implying that the English church had driven (or could drive) godly individuals to rightly separate from its schismatic, heretical activity. These were no light criticisms of the church, and we must be careful to presume that Bernard might be the author of such a work. The final section regarding separation is a particularly prickly issue in terms of Bernard, since his early career under Matthew had so centered on his decision not to separate and his ultimate conclusion that the Church of England was, indeed, a true church. Nevertheless, there are several good reasons to associate Bernard with this publication.

Though the 1641 publication of *Worke* is anonymous, in 1644 its latter two sections were published under the title *Certaine Positions Seriously to be considered of...* and did name Bernard as author.<sup>868</sup> Though the title pages contained no real similarities, it is of key importance that the 1644 work was not re-typeset; rather, it contained the originally typeset pages that had appeared in the latter two sections of *Worke*—down to the original page numbers.<sup>869</sup> It seems that in 1644 someone retrieved unpublished copies of *Worke* and put them out under a new title page.<sup>870</sup> This suggests that the original printer or publisher may have retained original materials, which would make it likely that the 1644 publisher had access to information about the original author. In addition, though Bernard died in 1641/2, *Certaine Positions'* publication in 1644 was close enough

---

<sup>867</sup> Ibid. 38.

<sup>868</sup> Bernard, *Certaine Positions*.

<sup>869</sup> That is, the first page of *Certaine Positions* was numbered 17, which was also its position in *Worke*.

<sup>870</sup> It is unclear what happened to pages 1-17; perhaps they had gone missing or were omitted for reasons of marketability.

to his lifetime that his associates in London and elsewhere could have clarified an incorrect attribution.<sup>871</sup>

Of course, recalling the good market that unscrupulous printers made by putting out works under the names of popular authors, it is also possible that someone attempted to profit by falsely placing Bernard's name on an anonymous pamphlet. We cannot entirely rule out such an event; however, Bernard would be a somewhat unlikely choice for such an action because he was best known for his pastoral and devotional works (*Faithful Shepherd*, *Isle of Man*) rather than his polemical ones.<sup>872</sup> In terms of establishing Bernardian authorship, it is most significant that the style and content of *Worke* were entirely consistent with the rest of his publications. The pamphlet was divided into three main subsections, and it made frequent use of numbered subheadings, outline-like nested lists, and brackets encompassing similar points. All of these were standard Bernardian techniques. The tone and approach of the work were careful and academic, referring to specific sections of Scripture and of works by godly divines. The comprehensiveness and attention to detail in *Worke* were likewise Bernardian. His writing frequently demonstrated an interest in providing informative lists and tangential facts even in the midst of argumentation. We see these tendencies, for instance, in *Threefold Treatise* and in the lists within the treatises he sent to New England.<sup>873</sup> In *Worke*, a similar style appeared in Scriptural descriptions of the aspects of public worship rather than a focus only on key points of disagreement.<sup>874</sup>

The gestures towards authority throughout the work, and in particular in the final section, were also in keeping with Bernard's patterns. Throughout his corpus, he demonstrated a carefulness to demonstrate conformity with theological and political authorities both through citation and through a recognition of those things that are approved by authority. Indeed, we might call this the hallmark of his conformist-yet-godly position. In every argumentative work, Bernard included numerous citations: never did he present his own ideas without strong support. Moreover, his works demonstrated a clear understanding of and submission to ecclesiastical authorities. Even though he wrote within a godly program, he consistently dedicated works to

---

<sup>871</sup> Recent scholarship has not discussed the congruence between *Worke* and the latter portion of *Certain Positions*.

<sup>872</sup> Another, partial objection could be that even if Bernard was the author of pages 17-38, as the 1644 version asserts, he was not necessarily responsible for the first sixteen pages. Yet there is no evidence within *Worke* that it is a compilation, and the body of the whole flows reasonably well together; thus, if one concludes that Bernard wrote the latter part, there is no reason to conclude he did not also write the former.

<sup>873</sup> PHM Cotton Family MSS, John Cotton Papers.

<sup>874</sup> Bernard, *Worke*, 20-26.

authorities, made them palatable to censors, and arranged content in such a way that he was within the boundaries of the national church. Here, *Worke* did just these things. Its first two sections carefully and frequently cited Scripture and recognized theological authorities. The third section, which placed the national church in the most dire light (not merely as having bad policies, but essentially as a false church), did so almost entirely by reference to a work approved by church authorities. As such, all three sections focused not on making arguments about current events but rather on carefully relating the contents of other sources in such a way that these sources became the polemicists and the author's own voice was only occasionally necessary to interpret. As I demonstrated above for *Threefold Treatise*, Bernard's strongest steps outside the Caroline injunctions for the Sabbath were carefully cloaked under church authority; here, a very similar tactic was in place.

The evidence in support of Bernard's composing *Praelaticall Church* is not so strong, and the attribution has been an area of some debate.<sup>875</sup> The connection is based upon a 1666 edition of the publication that listed the author as "John Bernard, sometime minister of Batcombe in Somerset." This is problematic because Batcombe never had a minister named John Bernard, and it has led some to conclude that *Praelaticall Church* was not authored by Richard Bernard (and may or may not have been authored by a John Bernard living elsewhere). If Bernard did author *Praelaticall Church*, it may have contained some parts of the manuscript pamphlet against prelacy that he had composed many years earlier, before re-conforming under Matthew (see Chapter 2). Interestingly, *Praelaticall Church* did match John Smyth's description of Bernard's early manuscript in so far as it contains "divers arguments" to demonstrate the "Antichristian" nature of episcopal authority."<sup>876</sup> On this inference, the publication could have been adapted from the early manuscript and, years later, brought to press either by Bernard (who, as we have seen, was at that time pulling several works, including the previously written *Epistle*, to bring quickly to press) or by someone who held a copy that had been made when the original was circulated. Yet in either case, in this scenario the original manuscript would have had to undergo significant alterations from the original, since *Praelaticall Church* made reference to contemporary issues and

---

<sup>875</sup> For instance, Bernard's bibliographer J. R. Dredge noted "By Brook and others the following anonymous tract [short view] is given wrongly to Bernard..." Dredge, *The Writings of Richard Bernard*. See also Greaves, "Richard Bernard," *ODNB*.

<sup>876</sup> Smyth, "Paralleles, Censvres, Observations" 336.

events, such as the release of the Declaration of Sports, which occurred after Bernard would have penned the earlier manuscript.<sup>877</sup>

Another possible way to link Bernard with *Praelaticall Church* is by its association with *Worke* and its stronger (though not watertight) claim to Bernardian authorship. The two publications were associated not only in terms of their anti-episcopal topics but also their publication date and the fact that George Thomason archived them together—which could indicate that he procured them from in the same location. If so, and if being published at about the same time and place might allow us to infer a common source for the two works, then we have taken one more small step toward attributing *Praelaticall Church* to Bernard.<sup>878</sup>

*Praelaticall Church* had some, but not all, the hallmarks of Bernardian style. Like *Worke* and most of Bernard's other publications, *Praelaticall Church* was divided into logical subsections. Each one included not only a particular reason that prelacy was problematic but also a section of queries and a "humble petition" that established other possible options. This variety of rhetorical styles appearing within one work does seem Bernardian. There were also several lists and the occasional use of brackets—again Bernardian. Yet the work, especially in its later sections, lacked the attention to citation of sources that was the single most distinctive feature of Bernard's style. Knowing this, it is still possible to suggest that the work was a hasty adaptation of an earlier manuscript. Yet the more likely conclusion is that Bernard did not compose *Praelaticall Church*. Its connections to him are tangential, and given that he probably did compose the well-cited and thoughtfully-argued *Worke*, he would not have needed to simultaneously release a work on a similar topic but with less well defended ideas.

Of course, whether or not one calls Bernard the author of *Praelaticall Church*, *Worke* alone would place him on the hook for writing not only against prelacy and ceremony but also in favor of separation from the national church. This leads us to an important question: Why? Even if

---

<sup>877</sup> Some past scholars have suggested that the work in question was later published anonymously as *Twelve generall Arguments, Proving that the Ceremonies imposed upon the Ministers of the Gospell in England, by our Prelates, are unlawfull...* (1605). They suggest that this work was Bernard's and was (mis-)attributed to William Bradshaw by its inclusion in a 1660 compilation of his works. This is a mistake. *Twelve Arguments* only addresses the episcopacy directly in one of its articles and not in "divers arguments" as Smyth says Bernard's does, and Article XX of that work speaks so strongly against separatism that it would not have been likely to circulate among individuals considering doing so. Again, if Bernard's anti-episcopal book did make it to print and is extant, it is likely *Praelaticall Church*.

<sup>878</sup> *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts... Collected by George Thomason. Praelaticall Church* is numbered 36:E.206[2-3], as the section on church government was catalogued as a separate tract. *Worke* is numbered 36:E.206[4]. However, the earliest extant version of *Praelaticall Church* is Wing / 858:06. A version of this edition available on EEBO is unrevised and does not include the address to parliament that is in the Thomason version.

we recognize that Bernard composed *Worke* in something of a conforming style, we must acknowledge the radical implications of its content. Why would he go out of his way in 1641, at the age of 74, to turn from the conforming principles he had followed for nearly his entire career? Why would the author of *Separatists Schisme* now outline grounds for separation?

To answer, we must again consider the broader ecclesio-political context. As so often in his career, Bernard's activities reflected a keen awareness of the tendencies and desires of those leading the national church as well as those who might influence the decision-makers. As Jacqueline Eales has pointed out, the Long Parliament brought back many of the godly initiatives that had been squashed in the early years of James's reign. These included a widespread series of petitions and meetings against the "etcetera oath," a Petition and Remonstrance attacking the foundation of episcopacy (among whose supporters in the Commons was Bernard's friend John White of Dorchester), the Root and Branch petition and bill, and pressure for clerical reform, among other measures.<sup>879</sup> These were not side projects; rather, the wholesale restructuring of key aspects of religion was a primary focus of Parliament from the outset.<sup>880</sup> In this sense, the main subjects of *Worke*—arguing against episcopacy and against aspects of worship not sanctioned by Scripture, and then suggesting that the godly should separate from a church that refuses to reform—were not at all radical. Rather, they were entirely in keeping with the current reforms within the national church.

Bernard had retained a position of conformity for decades, but through the 1630s he had fewer and fewer reasons to believe that the national church was indeed following Christ's will. Laud and Piers were no Matthew and Montagu, and during their tenure Bernard had seen more and more of the godly aspects of the church—including the right administration of the sacraments as well as the ability of godly preachers to preach, teach, and exhort the flock according to God's Word—disappear. No wonder, then, that he would be ready to place his allegiance under new leaders of the church at the first sign of change. Far from turning against conformity, this sort of shift could fall well within Bernard's definition of conformity. He was conforming to the new leadership that was officially recognized by the government. Moreover,

---

<sup>879</sup> Eales, "A Road to Revolution: The Continuity of Puritanism, 1559-1642," 203-209. Some recent work on Bernard asserts that he was involved in a petition on the etcetera oath. Given Bernard's political sensibilities, it is entirely possible he was involved in some such effort. However, the particular incident mentioned is based on a misreading of documents from Dorset (importantly, not Somerset), TNA SP 16/467/63, 63.ii. The "Mr. Bernard" referenced is named in the same document as John Bernard of Winterborne Clenston—it is not Richard Bernard. See Greaves, "Richard Bernard," *ODNB*; Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 232n.

<sup>880</sup> Cf. Morrill, "The attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament, 1640-42."



he was conforming to the leaders whose policies most closely matched those of God's Word. In these senses, he could hardly have been more conformist.

## CHAPTER 8

### CONCLUSION

While the career of Richard Bernard is an excellent lens through which to consider the confluence between pastoral ministry and authorship in the early seventeenth century, it is by no means unique. We might take as a comparative case George Gifford, whose career, some years earlier, looked remarkably like Bernard's. The following quotation from Timothy Scott McGinnis, describing Gifford's career, will serve as an example:

...Gifford is an ideal candidate to explore Elizabethan puritan culture, since his career captures both its pastoral and political dimensions. Gifford...spent the majority of his career in a parish, but he could hardly be said to have avoided the "ecclesiastical and civil skirmishes" of the day. In fact, Gifford sought them out, believing his role as a pastor necessarily propelled him into the politics of the church. In his opinion, such skirmishes had a direct effect upon practical ministry and thus upon the spiritual condition of the common sort. Following his deprivation due to his nonconformity, he lobbied sympathetic members of Parliament for relief. He was quick to lay blame for the church's ills on the intransigence of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, led as it was by bishops far removed from the problems of the parish, and he seemed to prefer the local control that presbyterian polity offered. On the other hand, Gifford argued for the establishment when he confronted two English separatists, Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, in a two-year, written debate in which he claimed his opponents threatened to undermine lay support for the ministry by confusing the people and fomenting schism. In spite of his diverse career, or perhaps because of it, Gifford remains underrepresented in puritan historiography.

In addition to his varied political involvements, Gifford's writings represent a largely untapped resource for puritan studies. While many godly ministers tended to limit their writings to pastoral concerns, Gifford's works reflect his political interests, running the gamut from the homiletic to the polemic. *Countrie Divinitie* was his first and most popular work, but in the two decades that followed, Gifford had nineteen other published works, many of which went through multiple printings extending into the 1630s, more than three decades after Gifford's death. These include works directed against Catholics and against separatists, a dialogue and treatise on witchcraft, a catechism, and many sermon collections. The styles vary from dense, theological treatises to colloquial dialogues specifically "applied to the capacity of the unlearned," but in general Gifford tended toward practical application.<sup>881</sup>

The similarities between this description of Gifford's work, and the work of Bernard, are so obvious that readers of the foregoing chapters would find a full rehearsal of similarities tedious. There are certainly some differences; Gifford made stronger recourse to parliament, and he was

---

<sup>881</sup> McGinnis, *George Gifford*, 21-22.

less accepting of prelacy than Bernard was (at least publicly). Yet their aims and practices were united in their pursuit of political aid for ecclesiastical ends; their efforts to use many genres of print to reach a variety of audiences; their targeting of separatists, Catholics, and even witches; and more. Though Bernard was particularly prolific, he was by no means alone in his work as an author-minister. Throughout this study I have mentioned other several author-ministers and their work; there are many others whom I have not mentioned. Some, like Gifford and Bernard, functioned in an official capacity within the church; others, such as town preacher Samuel Ward of Ipswich, had a ministry that was less official but still significant.<sup>882</sup> In closing, I will briefly trace the career of one additional author-minister, which will further suggest that the type of analysis I've done in this study—considering how an author-minister's writing was intended to influence, and was influenced by, both his parish work and his situation within the national church—can be applied usefully to other careers.

My example is that of Samuel Hieron, whose career serves to further illustrate that while it had certain unique points, Bernard's career was by no means an aberration. Hieron was like Bernard in several ways—not only in his education in godly Cambridge, pursuit of pastoral ministry in a moderately rural area, and dedication to skilled preaching, but also in his commitment to (moderate non-) conformity to the national church and his intentional use of print to achieve religious goals. The son of a minister who was friends with the martyrologist John Foxe, Hieron became a fellow of King's College, Cambridge in 1593 and took a BA in 1595. After a period in London in which he gained some notoriety in powerful circles as a preacher, and yet also turned down certain preferments, he returned to Cambridge and proceeded MA in 1598 (the same year in which Bernard received his MA from Christ's). Soon taking a vicarage in Devon, he proceeded to establish a reputation as a godly preacher in a career that would last until his death in 1617.<sup>883</sup>

---

<sup>882</sup> I am grateful to Peter Lake for sharing with me his work in progress on Ward's pastoral work and publications.

<sup>883</sup> Vivienne Larminie, "Hieron, Samuel" *ODNB*. Describing Hieron's conformability, Larminie writes: "although his works confirm that 'he was not absolutely against the use of a Forme of prayer'...in his Sunday morning and afternoon services 'he never confined himself to the use of the publick liturgy, nor did he at all conforme unto the Ceremonys'... On one occasion when he wore a surplice the adverse reaction of his congregation was reported to have induced him to abandon it altogether. Such practices, together with his conviction, as expressed in *The Dignitie of Scripture* (1607), that nothing must be added to scripture, and his promotion in the west country of the millenary petition, five times led to his suspension by the normally moderate bishop of Exeter, William Cotton. Each time Sir William Strode went to London to plead on his behalf; each time, according to Quick, he returned with a discharge and a new preaching licence. Similarly, friends in Plymouth arranged for the printing and distribution of his clandestine *A defence of the ministers reasons for refusall of subscription to the Book of Common Prayer and of conformitie* [1607]." This is certainly within a similar range to Bernard's practices from the time he re-conformed under Matthew;

Among Hieron's earliest publications was the 1604 anti-Catholic devotional or didactic publication *An answere to a popish ryme*.<sup>884</sup> The long form of the title, along with the work's dedicatory epistle, explained that he was responding to a recently dispersed pro-Catholic (anti-Protestant) rhyme that several in his area of England had begun to embrace. He chose to construct his reply in the same form (rhyme) as the offending work in order to appeal to those "simply-seduced" individuals by making the "lettuce like the lips (as the proverb is) and to proportion myself to him in versing, to whom I am sure (without willful forsaking the plain truth of God, manifested in scripture) I shall never be like in believing."<sup>885</sup> He acknowledged the unusual coupling of his ministerial career with attempts at poetry; nevertheless, he chose the genre in order to accomplish specific purposes:

You will wonder, I am sure (considering my profession, to see me become a poet. And indeed I do almost marvel at it myself, knowing myself to want the two principal furtherances of poetry: the one is nature's instinct, which God in his holy providence hath denied me: the other is a certain retired freedom from all such business, which may breed distraction, which my public calling, besides private encumbrances, will not afford me. Yet notwithstanding, upon this present occasion, I have even forced myself to this straighter course of verse-making...<sup>886</sup>

This work's attention to its audience went beyond the use of rhyme and extended to include prominent use of marginal notes. In the first portion of the work, which reproduced the offending Catholic poem, the marginal notes were rather snide; later notes were more informative; yet in addition to cross-references they provided increasingly large amounts of commentary—to the degree that several pages had more notes than text, and one page was entirely notes with no text at all.<sup>887</sup> *Ryme* could be the subject of a much longer analysis, but even this brief look suggests that in the early years of the seventeenth century Hieron was beginning to display certain hallmarks of work as an author-minister: he considered his audience, sought publication in order to further his ministerial goals, tailored his publication to timely issues, and sought to create new

---

Bernard saw various presentments for nonconformity but always worked to retain his ministry within the national church, sometimes making use of powerful connections to help his case.

<sup>884</sup> Hieron, *An Answer to a popish ryme*. It appears that the "popish ryme" in question was a version of an anonymous broadside or pamphlet that had been printed some years earlier (and had indeed already seen responses such as I.R.'s *An Answere to a Romish Ryme*). Given given irregularity of distribution and other factors, it is not difficult to imagine that the original poem only began circulating in the West much later—and indeed that none of the refutations happened to make their way along with it. Yet the fact that both responses were printed by Stafford is curious—there may be several possible explanations for this.

<sup>885</sup> Hieron, *An Answer to a popish ryme*, Sig. A2v.

<sup>886</sup> Hieron, *An Answer to a Popish Ryme*, Sig. A2r-A3v.

<sup>887</sup> *Ibid.* Sig. E3r.

sorts of works—innovating in style, page layout, and genre—in order to make the publication most effective.

The same year also saw the publication of Hieron’s moderately lengthy *The preachers plea*, a dialogue in which a minister helped a Christian novice reason through several types of doubts and questions regarding Christian belief and activity and emphasized the work of the minister in helping parishioners pursue holiness. In the prefatory epistle to the “honest and well-disposed Reader” Hieron displayed a pointed awareness of his audience, a keen sense of how his publication might be perceived, and a desire to be thought to understand the conventions of the book trade:

It is the usual manner of the most which publish books, to dedicate the same to some honorable personage, or to some one of special place, partly to show thankfulness for some received favors, partly to procure credit and countenance to their writings, that under so good protection, they may the more boldly pass forth to the common view of all men. If I now vary from the general received course, think not I pray thee (good reader) that I do it in some humour, as if I either affected singularity, or mistaked the common custom: but know for a truth that there are these two causes of my so doing: The first is the obscurity of mine own condition... The second is, the nature of this present treatise...a homely and course discourse, meant only for men of the plainest fashion...<sup>888</sup>

The dialogic format of the main contents of the work, along with the many marginal references and the clear relationship between the questions discussed and issues in his own pastoral work, suggest similarities to Bernard’s work as an author minister in devotional and didactic publications such as the instructional dialogue *Weekes Worke* and the objection-answering *Staffe of Comfort*.

Hieron had still more publications that similarly united aspects of authorial and ministerial vocations. Early in his career, he published a catechism intended to be easy to understand for even beginners. It is noteworthy that the catechism, rather like Bernard’s, made it clear that it follows the official catechism quite closely, yet it differed (with clear Scriptural support) in certain key areas.<sup>889</sup> Hieron’s catechism, like several other catechisms and devotional works, became a popular “steady seller” over the next several decades from its publication.<sup>890</sup>

---

<sup>888</sup> Hieron, *The Preachers Plea*, Sig. A2r-v.

<sup>889</sup> For example, like several catechisms I discussed in Chapter 4, Hieron’s work does involve blood when discussing the meaning of baptism. Hieron, *The Doctrine of the Beginning of Christ*, n.p. Green and *EEBO* place the first edition of this work in 1606, but a *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association* Vol. 24, 488 ff., places the first edition in August 1604. The epistle to the reader is dated from 1604.

<sup>890</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, Appendix 1.

His other publications included further devotional and instructional works (including a book of meditations upon death and a set of exemplary prayers for those unskilled in the discipline), sermons, and collections of his sermons and/or works.<sup>891</sup> While the majority of his publications focused upon the devotional and didactic, following the Canons of 1604, it appears that Hieron entered into the realm of polemic and unlicensed print in order to attempt to affect change within the church hierarchy. Certain anonymous works, including the very clearly titled, *A short dialogue proving that ceremonies and some other corruptions now in question are defended by none other arguments then such as the papists have heretofore used and our protestant writers have long since answered whereunto are annexed, certain considerations why ministers should not be removed for subscription and ceremonies*, were later attributed to him.<sup>892</sup>

A 1614 epistle to the reader gave further insight into his efforts to ensure that he authored high-quality publications, yet acknowledged the ways that his ministry, which located him far from London and kept him busy, did not accord easily with publishers' schedules.<sup>893</sup> Throughout his career Hieron pursued print as a means to accomplish a variety of spiritual goals. He did so not only in general, but also in response to specific occurrences in the nation and in his own parish. His comments about his publications, often in dedicatory epistles, signaled a strong awareness of his dual vocation and of the potential ways that different types of readers or hearers might respond to his work. It isn't clear that Hieron and Bernard knew one another, though they certainly had mutual connections and lived contemporaneously in the southwest. Yet even while some influence between the two is possible, it seems more significant that a similar set of factors in each man's life—a godly theological outlook, a commitment to the national church, responses to key issues such as the Canons of 1604 and the perceived Catholic threat, a constant awareness of parish duties, and an ability to access print technology—combined for each to produce similar results.

Altogether, we find in Hieron and Bernard, along with Gifford, Ward, and others, ministers who embraced authorship within and alongside their pastoral ministry. The positions of author-ministers in regard to print and parish were fluid and complex, and as a result these can be difficult to identify without close attention. Yet I hope my study has illustrated that this

---

<sup>891</sup> For a further survey of his career, see Larminie, "Samuel Hieron" *ODNB*; Harris, "Samuel Hieron: A Devonshire Vicar in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I" and Dredge, "A Few Sheaves of Devon Bibliography."

<sup>892</sup> Hieron, *A short dialogue* (1605); and *A Defence of the Ministers Reasons, for Refusall of Subscription to the Booke of Common Prayer and Conformitie* (1607).

<sup>893</sup> Hieron, "To the Reader," *All the Sermons of Samuel Hieron*.

sort of careful analysis can enhance and extend our understanding of pastoral ministry, of religious print, and of the place of puritans in public life in the early modern period.

## REFERENCES

### Archival sources

#### American Antiquarian Society (AAS)

##### *Manuscript (digital images):*

Mather Family Papers, 1613-1819, Box 1, Folder 1, 1639.

#### Beinecke Library, Yale University (BEI)

##### *Manuscript:*

Osborn b133, Sermons [1633-1691].

Osborn b387, [Commonplace book] [c. 1630].

Osborn fb13, [Commonplace book] [c. 1625].

##### *Print:*

Zd 622 *Christian advertisements and Counsels of peace... [Separatists Schisme]* (1608).

1742 Yale Library 11.8.26, *Faithful Shepherd* (1621).

Zd 1285 *Guide* (1627).

Mhc5 B456 1627, *The Isle of Man* (1627).

1971 470 *Isle of Man* (1632).

Mellon Alchemical 85, *Guide* (1629).

Mhc5 B456 L86 *Looke Beyond Luther* (1623).

Mhc5 B456 L87 *Looke Beyond Luther* (1624).

Zd 1266 *Key* (1617).

MLx350 628b *Ruths Recompence* (1628).

MLv25 +644B *Thesaurus* (1644).

Zd 623 *Short viewv of the Praelaticall Church of England* (1641).

Z84 48d *Short viewv of the Praelaticall Church of England* (1641).

Z45 90 1 *Short viewv of the Praelaticall Church of England* (1641).

Z45 90 23 *Short viewv of the Praelaticall Church of England* (1641).

Brit Tracts 1613 B456 *Two Twinnes* (1613).

Mhc5 B456 W4 1616 *Weekes Worke* (1616).

Mhc5 B456 T4 *Threefold Treatise* (1641).

19731086 *Terence in English* (1614).

Gnt a598 *Terence in English* (1598).

Gnt a598d *Terence in English* (1614).

Gnt a598c *Terence in English* (1629).

Gnt a598F *Terence in English* (1641).



Batcombe Heritage Centre (BHC)

*Print:*

*Key of Knowledge.*

Bodleian Library (BOD)

*Manuscript:*

Rawl. letters 89, fol. 28-29. Richard Bernard to James Ussher, May 26, 1619.  
(NB: Reprinted in Ussher, *Works*, XVI, 360-363.)

*Print:*

1055 d.2 (Box B000000498452), *Thesaurus* (1644).  
4° P 18(1) Art.BS, *A short view of the praelaticall Church of England* (1641).  
A 10.21 Linc., *A short view of the praelaticall Church of England* (1641).  
Douce B 70, *A guide to grand iury men* (1627).  
Firth f.3, *The Isle of Man* (1634).  
G.Pamph. 1106 (1), *A short view of the praelaticall Church of England* (1641).  
G.Pamph. 1327 (1), *The faithfull shepherd* (1607).  
G.Pamph. 1361 (1), *A short view of the praelaticall Church of England* (1641).  
G.Pamph. 2914 (1), *A short view of the praelaticall Church of England* (1641).  
Lawn f.141, *The Isle of Man* (1632).  
Marl. M 5, *The faithfull shepherd* (1621).  
Mason AA 120, *The faithfull shepherd* (1621).  
Pamph. C 45 (4), *A short view of the praelaticall Church of England* (1641).  
Pamph. D 42 (17), *Article* (1641).  
Vet. A1 f.164 (6), *A guide to grand iury men* (1629).  
Vet. A2 f. 367, *The Isle of Man* (1627).  
Vet. A2 f.81, *The Isle of Man* (1632).  
Wood 575, *A guide to grand iury men* (1627).

British Library (BL)

*Manuscript:*

Add. MS 36674, Papers relating to witches, etc.  
Add. MS 34239, Rodney family documents.

*Print:*

1115.d.7 *Threefold Treatise* (1641)  
1116.f.16 *Article* (1641)  
1602/344. *Thesaurus* (1644)  
3103.e.10. *Thesaurus* (1644)  
3105.e.9. *Thesaurus* (1644)  
4403.d.1 *Ready Way* (1635)  
4403.d.2 *Faithfull Shepheard* (1621)

4499.b.17 *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607)  
518.a.4 *Guide* (1627)  
696.d.33 *Two Twinnes* (1613)  
8632.aaa.41 *Guide* (1630)  
C.110.f.47. *Creede, Common Catechisme, Iosuahs Godly Resolution* (1629)  
C.142.d.9.(4) *Double Catechisme* (1609)  
E.133.(12.) *Epistle* (1642)  
Mic.A.589.(6.) *Guide* (1630)  
Mic.A.847.(4) *Common Catechisme* (1640)

Cambridge University Library (CUL)

*Manuscript (digital images):*

Dd.XI.73. Commonplace book of William Whiteway.

Dr. Williams's Library (DWL)

*Manuscript (microfilm):*

Morrice MS J.

*Print:*

*Ruth's Recompence*

Samuel Hartlib Papers (HP)

*Manuscript (digital images: The Hartlib Papers, HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, [hrionline.ac.uk/hartlib](http://hrionline.ac.uk/hartlib)):*

Hartlib 29/2/6A-7A; 35B-36A.

Hartlib 29/3/22A, 26B, 27A, 29A.

Hartlib 30/4/17A

The National Archives (TNA)

*Manuscript (digital images):*

PRO LC 5/132, f. 45r.

PRO SO 3/11.

LC 5/132 p. 45.

*Manuscript (digital images: State Papers Online, 1509-1714, Gale):*

SP 16/354 fol. 174v, and SP 16/361 fol. 25r.

SP 16/354 fols. 174, 345r.

SP 16/356 f. 173r.

SP 16/356 fol. 173r.

SP 16/42 f.32

SP 16/361 fol. 25r.  
SP 16/297 f.177  
SP 16/278/51.  
SP 16/290/15.  
SP 16/467/63 and 63.2.

Pilgrim Hall Museum, Plymouth, MA (PHM)

*Manuscript (digital images):*  
PHM Cotton Family MSS, John Cotton Papers.

Somerset Record Office (SRO)

*Manuscript:*  
D\D/BP/2, Presentation papers  
D/D/Ca 297, Comperta  
D/D/Ca 204, Comperta  
D/D/Ca 297, Comperta  
D/D/CA 299, fols. 56v–58r, 75v.  
D/D/CA 309, fol. 52r Ex officio – libellus  
D/D/RG/99, Glebe terrier  
D/D/RR/28, Parish registers  
DD/RG 95 121. Glebe terrier  
D/D/Vc79 Visitation consignment book  
DD\X\PB/2/3 Sermons of Richard Alleine

*Manuscript (microfilm):*

Q/SR/17/72  
Q/SR/23/97  
Q/SR/35/93  
Q/SR/38/19  
Q/SR/41/148  
Q/SR/42/9, 36, 124-126  
Q/SR/44/64  
Q/SR/46/59  
Q/SR/48/25, 27  
Q/SR/51/41  
Q/SR/52/1a, 3  
Q/SR/56/74  
Q/SR/64/161  
Q/SR/65/105  
Q/SR/71/193  
Q/SR/72/136  
Q/SR/73/162, 166, 173-175.

Q/SR/76/50

Wells Cathedral Library (WCL)

*Print:*

A1/32 Ludolphus de Saxonia, *Da Vita Christi*  
Richard Bernard, *Thesaurus Biblicus* (two copies)

Whitelocke Papers from the Archives of the Marquess of Bath (WP)

*Manuscript (microfilm):*

Longleat, Whitelocke Papers vii, fols. 85-92.

Seventeenth century print sources

(*Digital reproductions viewed via Early English Books Online unless otherwise noted.*)

- [Anon.] *A gagge for the Pope, and the Iesuits*. London: by I. D. for Edward Blackmore, 1624.
- [Anon.] *A short viewv of the praelaticall Church of England*. 1641.
- [Anon.] *Twelve generall Arguments, Proving that the Ceremonies imposed upon the Ministers of the Gospell in England, by our Prelates, are unlawfull...* 1605.
- [Anon.] *A Reply to D. VWhite and D. Featly*. 1625.
- Adams, Thomas. *Fiue sermons preached vpon sundry especiall occasions*. London: for Iohn Grismand, 1626.
- Ainsworth, Henry. *Counterpoyson*. 1608.
- Articles of Accusation and of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England Against William Pierce...*  
London: for George Thomlinson, 1642.
- Bancroft, Thomas *Two bookes of epigrammes, and epitaphs Dedicated to two top-branches of gentry*. London: by I. Oakes, 1639.
- Bernard, John [Attr.]. *A Short View of the Prelatical Church of England*. 1661.
- Bernard, Richard. [See full bibliographical information about print works in the introductory portion of this work.]
- Beroaldi, Matth. *Chronicum, Scripturae Sacrae Autoritate Constitutum*, Anton. Chuppinum, 1625.
- Bovet, Richard. *Pandaemonium*. London: for Tho. Malthus, 1684.
- Burton, Henry *A Narration of the life of Mr. Henry Burton*. London: 1643.
- Calvin, John. *The Institution of Christian Religion*. Tr. Thomas Norton. London: by Arnold Hatfield for Bonham Norton, 1599.
- Casaubon, Meric. *Of Credulity and Incredulity in things Natural, Civil, and Divine*. London, 1668.
- Charles I. *The Kings Maiesties declaration to his subiects, concerning lawfull sports to bee used*. London: by Robert Barker, 1633.
- Clarke, Samuel. *The Lives of Two and Twenty English Divines*. London: by A.M., 1660.
- The Common Prayer-Book Unmasked*. 1660.
- Cooper, Thomas *The mystery of witch-craft*. London: by Nicholas Okes, 1617.
- Cotton, John. *The Way of the Congregational Churches Cleared*. London: by Matthew Simmons for John Bellamie, 1648.

- Curll, Walter. *Articles to be enquired of, in the first trienniall visitation, of the Right Reuerend Father in God, Walter, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.* London: by William Stansby, 1630.
- de Cro, Francois. *The three conformities.* Tr. London: by Edward Griffin, 1620.
- Dent, Arthur. *The plaine mans path-way to heauen.* London: for Robert Dexter, 1601.
- Dwalphintramis [pseud.]. *The anatomie of the service book,* 1641.
- Favour, John. *Antiquitie triumphing ouer noueltie.* London: by Richard Field, 1619.
- Gerard, Pierre. *Prepration to the most holie ministerie.* Tr. Nicholas Becket. London: by Thomas Creed for Thomas Man, 1598.
- Gifford, George. *A Discourse of the damned art of witchcraft.* Cambridge: by Cantrel Legge, 1610.
- Glanvill, Joseph. *Saducismus Triumphatus.* London: Printed for J. Collins and S. Lownds, 1681.
- Hieron, Samuel. *A Defence of the Ministers Reasons, for Refusall of Subscription to the Booke of Common Prayer and Conformitie.* 1607.
- Hieron, Samuel. *A short dialogue.* 1605.
- Hieron, Samuel. *The dignitie of the Scripture together with the indignity which the vnthankfull world offereth thereunto...* Cambridge: by John Legat, 1607.
- Hieron, Samuel. *All the Sermons of Samuel Hieron.* London: by Iohn Legatt, 1614.
- Hieron, Samuel. *An Answer to a popish ryme.* London: by Simon Stafford, 1604.
- Hieron, Samuel. *The Doctrine of the Beginning of Christ.* London: for Samuel Macham and Mat. Cooke, 1606.
- Hieron, Samuel. *The Preachers Plea.* London: for Simon Waterson, 1604.
- Holme, John. *The burthen of the ministerie.* London: by I. Danter, 1592.
- Hungerford, Sir Anthony. *The advise of a sonne, novv professing the religion established in the present Church of England, to his deare mother, yet a Roman Catholike.* Oxford: Printed by Ioseph Barnes, 1616.
- Hyperius, Andreas *The Practis of preaching, otherwise called the pathway to the pulpet.* London: by Thomas East, 1577.
- I. R. *An Answere to a Romish Rime.* London: by Simon Stafford, 1602.
- James I. *A proclamation against Seditious, Popish, and Puritanicall Bookes and Pamphlets.* London: by Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill, 1624.
- James I, *A proclamation for the preuenting of the exportation of wooles, vwoolle-fels, yarne, fullers earth, and vwoad-ashes, and for the better vent of cloth, and stufte made of vwooll, within this kingdome.* London: by Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill, 1622.
- James I, *The Kings Maiesties declaration to his subiects, concerning lawfull sports to be used.* London: by Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill, 1618.
- James I, *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, Iames...* Ed. James Mountagu. London: by Robert Barker and Iohn Bill, 1616.
- Ludlow, Edmund. *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow Esq; Lieutenant General of the Horse.* Vol. I. Vivay, Switzerland: 1698.
- Michaelis, Sebastien. *The admirable history of the possession and conversion of a Penitent woman.* Translated by W. B. London: for William Aspley, 1613.
- Montagu, Richard. *A Gagg for the new Gospell? No: A New Gagg for An Old Goose.* London: by Thomas Snodham for Matthew Lownes and William Barret, 1624.
- Morison, Thomas *Papatus, seu Depravatae religionis origo...* Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1594.
- Parkes, Richard *A Briefe Answere unto Certaine Obiections and Reasons against the descension of Christ into hell, lately sent in writing vnto a Gentleman in the Countrey.* Oxford: by Ioseph Barnes, 1604.
- Parliament, *Articles of accusation and impeachment of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England against VWilliam Pierce Doctor of Divinitie and Bishop of Bath and Wells.* London: for George Thomlinson, 1642.

- Perkins, William. *A godly and learned exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount: preached in Cambridge...* Cambridge: by Thomas Brooke and Cantrell Legge, 1608.
- Perkins, William. *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles...* Cambridge: by John Legatt, 1595.
- Perkins, William. *Of the Calling of the Ministerie two Treatises, describing the Duties and Dignities of that Calling.* London: for William Welby, 1605.
- Perkins, William. *Prophetica.* Cambridge: Iohannis Legate, 1592.
- Perkins, William. *The Arte of Prophecyng.* Tr. Thomas Tuke. London: by Felix Kyngston, 1607.
- Phillips, George. *The good sheeheardes dutie.* London: for William Leake, 1597.
- Phillips, George. *The paines of a faithfull pastor.* London: for William Leake, 1596 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Phillips, Jerome. *The fisher-man.* London: for Robert Bird, 1623.
- Potts, Thomas *The v wonderfull discoverie.* London: 1613.
- Powel, Gabriel. [Poueli, Gabrielis.] *Ordovicis Britanni, De Adiaphoris Theses Theologieae ac Scholasticae.* Londini: Robertvs Barkervs, 1606.
- Powel, Gabriel. *De Adiaphoris.* London: by Felix Kyngston, 1607.
- Prideux, John. *Ephesus Backsliding.* Oxford: by Joseph Barnes, 1614.
- Prynne, William. *The Church of Englands old antithesis to new Arminianisme.* London, 1629.
- Prynne, William. *The Unbishopsing of Timothy and Titus.* 1636.
- Rainolds, John. *The summe of the conference betwene Iohn Rainoldes and Iohn Hart...* (first published 1584)
- Robinson, John. *A iustification of separation from the Church of England Against Mr Richard Bernard his invective, intituled; The separatists schisme.* Amsterdam: G. Thorp, 1610.
- Robinson, John. *Of religious communion private, & publique.* 1614.
- Rogers, Richard. *Seuen treatises containing such direction as is gathered out of the Holie Scriptures...* London: by Felix Kyngston, for Thomas Man and Robert Dexter, 1603.
- Sclater, William. *A Sermon Preached at the last generall Assise holden for the County of Sommerset at Tavnton.* London: by Edward Griffin for Henry Fetherstone, 1616.
- Sclater, William. *An exposition with notes on the first epistle to the Thessalonians.* London: by W. Stansby, 1619.
- Sibbes, Richard. "Epistle Dedicatorie." In Thomas Gataker, *Christian constancy crowned by Christ.* London: for William Bladen, 1624.
- Smyth, John. *Paralleles, censures, observations,* 1609.
- T. I., *A Miracle, of Miracles.* London: for Iohn Trundle, 1614.
- T. S. *The Second Part of the Pilgrims Progress.* London: for Tho. Malthus, 1683.
- Tyrer, Ralph "The charge of the cleargie." In *Five godlie sermons,* 1602.
- Ursinus, Zacharias. *The Summe of Christian Religion.* Tr. D. Henrie Parry. Oxford: by Ioseph Barnes, 1601.
- Ussher, James. *An Answere to a Challenge Made by a Iesuite in Ireland.* London: for the Society of Stationers, 1625.
- Webbe, George. *Catalogus Protestantium: or, the Protestants Kalendar.* London: for Nathaniel Butter, 1624.
- Wotton, Anthony. *A Dangerous Plot Discovered.* London: for Nicholas Bourne, 1626.

#### Secondary sources and modern editions of primary sources

- Allen, Matthew. "The priest in *The Temple*: The relationship between George Herbert's English poetry and *The Country Parson*." Ph.D. Diss., University of British Columbia, 1993.

- Almond, Philip. *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England*. West Nyack, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Atherton, Ian and David Como. "The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England." *English Historical Review* 120 (2005): 1215-1250.
- Baker, David J. *On Demand: Writing for the Market in Early Modern England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Baker, J. H. "Criminal Courts and Procedure at Common Law." In J. S. Cockburn, ed., *Crime in England, 1550-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977: 15-48.
- Ball, Bryan W. *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Barnes, Thomas G. "County Politics and a Puritan Cause Celebre: Somerset Churchales." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series* 9 (1959): 103-122.
- Barnes, Thomas G., ed. *Somerset Assize Orders 1629-1640*. Frome: Butler & Tanner Ltd., 1959.
- Barratt, D. M. "Introduction." *Ecclesiastical Terriers of Warwickshire Parishes*. Vol. I. Oxford: University Press, 1955.
- Barwick, George Frederick. *A book bound for Mary Queen of Scots*. London: for the Bibliographical Society at the Chiswick Press, 1901. *Google Books*.
- Bates, E. H., Ed. *Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset: James I, 1607-1625* Vol. I. 1907. *Google books*.
- Ben-Amos, Ilana K. "Failure to become freemen: urban apprentices in early modern England." *Social History* 16 (1991): 155-172.
- Bernard, George. "The Church of England, c. 1529-c.1642." *History* 75 (1990): 183-206.
- Bodin, Jean. *On the Demon-Mania of Witches*. Tr. Randy A. Scott. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1995.
- Boulton, Jeremy. "The Limits of Formal Religion: The Administration of Holy Communion in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart London." *London Journal* 10 (1984): 135-154.
- Bradford, William. *History of Plymouth Plantation*. Edited by Charles Deane. Boston: Privately Printed, 1856. *Google Books*.
- Brady, David. *The contribution of British writers between 1560 and 1830 to the interpretation of Revelation 13:16-18 (the number of the beast): a study in the history of exegesis*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Braun, Harald, and Edward Vallance, eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004.
- Brayman-Hackel, Heidi. *Reading material in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Brayshay, Mark, Philip Harrison, and Brian Chalkley. "Knowledge, nationhood and governance: The speed of the royal post in early-modern England." *Journal of Historical Geography* 24 (1998): 265-288.
- Bremer, Francis J. *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994.
- Brown, Frederick ed., *Abstracts of Somersetshire Wills Etc*. Privately printed, 1889. *Google Books*.
- Brown, John. *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and their Puritan Successors*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896. Third edition. *Google books*.
- Brown, Meg Lota. *Donne and the politics of the conscience in early modern England*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Burgess, Walter H. *John Robinson Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers: A Study of His Life and Times*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1920. *Google books*.
- Burke, Donald. "New England New Jerusalem." Ph.D. Diss., Wayne State University, 2006.

- Burke, Victoria. "Memorial Books': Commonplaces, Gender, and Manuscript Compilation in Seventeenth-Century England." In Donald Beecher and Grant Williams, eds., *Ars reminiscendi: mind and memory in Renaissance culture*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2009.
- Burlinson, Christopher. "The Use and Re-Use of Early-Seventeenth-Century Student Notebooks : Inside and Outside the University." In James Daybell and Peter Hinds, eds., *Material Readings of Early Modern Culture: Texts and Social Practices, 1580-1730*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Burnett, Amy. *Teaching the Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Burns, William E. *Witch Hunts in Europe and America: An Encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2003. *Google Books*.
- Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Bush, Sergeant, ed. *The Correspondence of John Cotton*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Bussby, Frederick. "A history and source book on training for the ministry in the Church of England, 1511-1717." M.Litt. Thesis, University of Durham, 1952. *Durham E-Theses Online*. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9739>. Accessed March 31, 2015.
- Calamy, Edmund. *Account of the ministers*. Vol. II. London, 1713. *Google Books*.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I.* Vol. 1. London: Longman et al., 1858.
- Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire* Vol. 15: 1603. Edited by M. S. Guiseppi. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930.
- Cambers, Andrew. *Godly Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Campi, Emidio. "The Italian Convert." *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism*. Leiden: Brill, 2013. *Google Books*.
- A Catalogue of the Printed Books in the Library of the Dean and Chapter of York*. York: John Sampson, 1896. *Google Books*.
- Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts... Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661*. Vol. I. London: 1908. *Archive.org*.
- Chan, Simon K. H. "The Puritan Meditative Tradition, 1599-1691: A Study of Ascetical Piety." Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1986.
- Chi, Joseph. "Forget not the wombe that bare you, and the brest that gave you sucke': John Cotton's Sermons on Canticles and Revelation And His Apocalyptic Vision for England." Ph.D. Diss., University of Edinburgh, 2008.
- Clark, Stuart. *Thinking with Demons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Clegg, Cyndia. *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Religion of Protestants*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.. *Press Censorship in Caroline England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Cockburn, J. S., ed., *Crime in England, 1550-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English politics and the coming of war, 1621-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Collinson, John. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset*. Vol. III. Bath: by R. Cruttwell, 1791. *Archive.org*.



- Collinson, Patrick. *The birthpangs of protestant England: Religious and cultural change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Basingstoke, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cranmer to Sancroft*. New York: Palgrave, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ecclesiastical vitriol; religious satire in the 1590s and the invention of puritanism." In *The reign of Elizabeth I: Court and culture in the last decade*, ed. John Guy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia." In Andrew Pettegree, ed. *The Reformation: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies*, Vol. 3. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Godly People: essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "If Constantine, then also Theodosius." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30 (1979): 205-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lectures by Combination: Structures and Characteristics of Church Life in 17<sup>th</sup>-Century England." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 48 (1975): 182-213.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Protestant Culture and Cultural Revolution." In Margo Todd, Ed., *Reformation to Revolution*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Shepherds, Sheepdogs and Hirelings: The Pastoral Ministry in Post-Reformation England." In William J. Sheils and Diana Wood, editors, *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The theatre constructs puritanism." In D. Smith, ed., *The Theatrical City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What's in a Name? Dudley Fenner and the Peculiarities of Puritan Nomenclature." In Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds., *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honor of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Collinson, Patrick, Arnold Hunt, and Alexandra Walsham. "Religious publishing in England 1557-1640." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain* Vol. IV, 1557-1695. Edited by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Como, David. *Blown by the Spirit*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Cooper, Ian. "The speed and efficiency of the Tudor south-west's royal post-stage service." *History* 99 (2014): 754-774.
- Crawford, Patricia, and Laura Gowing, eds., *Women's Worlds in Seventeenth-Century England, 1580-1720: Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Crome, Andrew. "Friendship and enmity to God and nation: The complexities of Jewish-Gentile relations in the Whitehall Conference of 1655." In Albert Classen and Marilyn Sandidge, eds., *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2011: 749-777.
- Crosfield, Thomas. *Diary of Thomas Crosfield*. Edited by Frederick S. Boas. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Culpepper, K. Scott, *Francis Johnson and the English Separatist Influence*. Mercer University Press, .
- Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Biography*. Harlow: Longman, 2005.
- Darr, Orna. *Marks of an Absolute Witch: Evidentiary Dilemmas in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.
- Davies, Julian. *Caroline captivity of the church: Charles I and the remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Davies, R. Trevor. *Four Centuries of Witchcraft beliefs*. London: Methuen, 1947.

- Davies, Simon. "EEBO-TCP in reception studies: reading demonology in early modern England." Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford, "Revolutionizing Early Modern Studies"? *The Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership in 2012:EEBO-TCP 2012*. Online at <<http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:7bfcde6a-d889-4b29-a188-b402e22a9d70>> Accessed 3/3/2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reception of Reginald Scot's Discovery of Witchcraft: Witchcraft, Magic, and Radical Religion" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 74 (2013): 381-401.
- Dawson, David. *Flesh Becomes Word*.
- Dever, Mark E. *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.
- Dixon, C. Scott and Luise Schorn-Schutte, eds. *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.
- Dobranski, Stephen B. *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Dredge, John Ingle. *The Writings of Richard Bernard*. Horncastle: W. K. Morton, 1890.
- Dredge, John Ingle. "A Few Sheaves of Devon Bibliography." In *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*. Vol. 24. Plymouth: William Brendon and Son, 1892. *Google Books*.
- Durston, Christopher, and Judith Maltby, eds. *Religion in Revolutionary England*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Durston, Christopher, and Jacqueline Eales, eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Dwelly, E., ed., *Dwelly's Parish Records* Vol. 1. Herne Bay: Printed by the editor, 1913.
- Dyrness, William A. *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Eales, Jacqueline. "A Road to Revolution: The Continuity of Puritanism, 1559-1642." In *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, edited by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996): 184-209.
- Easton, Emily. "Mary Barnard." *Rhode Island Historical Society* XXIX (1936): 65-80. *Archive.org*.
- Edison, Edwin. *History of Worksop*. London: Longman and Co., 1854.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Ellison, James. "Measure for Measure and the Executions of Catholics in 1604." *English Literary Renaissance* (2003): 44-87.
- Elmer, Peter. "Towards a Politics of Witchcraft in Early Modern England." In Sharpe, ed., *Languages of Witchcraft*, 107-108.
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed., "Annual Accounts of the Church of England, 1632-1639" in *From the Reformation to the Permissive Society*, eds. Melanie Barber et al. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pastoral roles of the Jacobean episcopate in Canterbury province." Ph.D. Diss., University College London, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Personalities and Politics in Early Stuart England." *The Historical Journal* 28 (1985): 1001-1009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prelate as Pastor: The episcopate of James I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* Vol. 1. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998.

- Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake. "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I." *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 169-207.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars restored: The changing face of English religious worship, 1547-c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Foster, Joseph, ed. *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714*. Oxford: Parker and Co, 1891. *Archive.org*.
- Foster, Stephen. *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the shaping of New England Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Fox, Adam. *Oral and literate culture in England, 1500-1700*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Freeman, Jane. "The parish ministry in the diocese of Durham, c. 1570-1640." Ph.D. thesis, Durham University, 1979. *Durham E-Theses Online*. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1867>. Accessed March 31, 2015.
- Freeman, Rosemary. *English Emblem Books*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1948.
- Freeman, Thomas. "Demons, Deviance, and Defiance: John Darrell and the politics of Exorcism in late Elizabethan England." In Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000: 34-63.
- Fudge, John D. *Commerce and Print in the Early Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Gaskill, Malcolm. *Witchfinders*. London: John Murray, 2005.
- Gavin, Joseph B. "Elizabethan bishop of Durham: Tobias Matthew, 1595-1606." Ph. D. Diss., McGill University, 1972.
- George, Timothy. *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2005.
- Gibson, Marion. "Introduction." In *English Witchcraft 1560-1736*, Vol. 2. Edited by Marion Gibson. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Witchcraft and Society*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Understanding Witchcraft: Accusers' Stories in Print in Early Modern England." In Stuart, ed., *Languages of Witchcraft*.
- Gibson, William. *Religion and the Enlightenment, 1600-1800*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Gilmont, Jean Francois. *John Calvin and the Printed Book*. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2005.
- Glaisyer, Natasha and Sara Pennell, eds. *Didactic literature in England 1500-1800: expertise constructed*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Gordis, Lisa M. *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and interpretive Authority in Puritan New England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Grabo, Norman. "The Art of Puritan Devotion" *Seventeenth-Century News* 26, 1 (1968): 7-9.
- Grafton magazine of History and Genealogy*, Vol. I. New York: Grafton Press, 1908-1909. *Archive.org*.
- Green, Ian. "Career prospects and clerical conformity in the early Stuart church." *Past and Present* 90 (1981: 71-115).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530-1740*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "For children in years and children and understanding." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986): 397-425.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Preaching in the Parishes." In *The Oxford handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, eds. Peter McCullough et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Grosart, Alexander B. "Richard Bernard." In *Ruth's Recompence* ed. James Nichol. Edinburgh, 1865.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

- Haigh, Christopher. "Communion and Community: Exclusion from Communion in Post-Reformation England." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51, no. 4 (2000): 721-740.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Matter of Much Contention in the Realm': Parish Controversies over Communion Bread in Post-Reformation England." *History* 88 (2003): 393-404.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Plain Man's Pathways to heaven: Kinds of Christianity in post-Reformation England, 1570-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Halasz, Alexandra. *The marketplace of print: pamphlets and the public sphere in early modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hale, J. R. *Renaissance War Studies*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1983.
- Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. "Practical Divinity and Spirituality" in John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Handbook for Travelers in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, and Somersetshire*. London: John Murray, 1882.
- Harkrider, Melissa Franklin. *Women, Reform and Community in Early Modern England: Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk, and Lincolnshire's Godly Aristocracy, 1519-1580*. Rochester: Boydell & Brewer, Inc., 2008.
- Harris, S. G. "Samuel Hieron: A Devonshire Vicar in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I." In *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association* Vol. 24. Plymouth: William Brendon and Son, 1892. *Google Books*.
- Hayward, Douglas L. "Pitney and its Register Book." In *Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society's Proceedings, 1889*. Vol. 37. Taunton: T. M. Hawkins; London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1849. *Google Books*.
- Heal, Felicity. *Of Prelates and Princes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Hessayon, Ariel. *Gold Tried in the Fire*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. *Google Books*.
- Hill, Christopher A *Turbulent, Seditious and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570-1720*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1974.
- Holland, John. *The History, Antiquities, and Description of the Town and Parish of Worksop, in the County of Nottingham*. Sheffield: J. Blackwell, 1826.
- Holmes, Clive. "Women: Witnesses and Witches" *New Perspectives on Witchcraft, Magic and Demonology* Vol. 4, ed. Brian P. Levack. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Horn, James. *Adapting to a New World*. University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Hudson, J. Clare and E. Mansel Sympson, eds. *Lincolnshire Notes and Queries*. Vol. III. Horncastle: W. K. Morton, 1893. *Google Books*.
- Hughes, Ann. *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meanings of Religious Polemic" in Francis Bremer, ed. *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.
- Humphreys, Arthur L., ed., *Somersetshire Parishes*. London, 1905. *Archive.org*.
- Hunt, Arnold. "The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England." *Past & Present* 161 (1998): 39-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Art of Hearing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Hunt, William. *The Somerset Diocese: Bath and Wells*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1885. *Google Books*.

- Hunter, Joseph. *The History and Topography of the Parish of Sheffield in the County of York*. London: Lackington, et. al., 1819.
- Huntley, Frank Livingstone, ed. *Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study with the texts of The Art of Divine Meditation (1606) and Occasional Meditations (1633)*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1981.
- Hyman, Lawrence W. *Richard Bernard: A study of The Faithful Shepheard, The Isle of Man, and Ruth's Recompence*. Columbia University: MA Thesis, 1947.
- Ingram, Martin. "The reformation of manners in early modern England." In *The experience of authority in early modern England*, eds. Paul Griffiths et al. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ridings, rough music and the 'reform of popular culture in early modern England.'" *Past and Present* 105 (1984): 79-113.
- James, Frances B. "Sir Henry Rosewell: a Devon Worthy." In *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*. Vol. 20. Plymouth: William Brendon and Son, 1888. *Google Books*.
- James I. "Directions concerning preachers." In Edward Cardwell, ed., *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England* Vol. II. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1839. *Archive.org*.
- Jordan, Richard Douglas. "Thomas Traherne and the Art of Meditation." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985): 381-403.
- Kaufmann, U. Milo. *The Pilgrim's Progress and Traditions in Puritan Meditation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Kelly, E. R. Ed., *Somersetshire*. London: Kelly and Co., 1875. *Google books*.
- Kemp, Geoff, et al. *Censorship and the Press, 1580-1720*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2009.
- Kisting, Wesley R. "Authority and Inwardness: The Power of Conscience in Early Modern England." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Iowa, 2007.
- Kneidel, Greg. "Ars Praedicandi: Theories and Practice." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* edited by Peter McCullough et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. With Michael Questier. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Antippery: the Structure of a Prejudice." In Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*. London: Longman, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice." In *Religious politics in post-Reformation England: essays in honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Boxmaker's Revenge*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635." *Past and Present* 114 (1987): 32-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Court', the 'Country', and the Northamptonshire connection: Watching the 'Puritan Opposition' think (historically) about politics on the eve of the English civil war." *Midland History* 35 (2010): 28-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Defining puritanism—again?" in *Puritanism: Transatlantic perspectives on a seventeenth-century Anglo-American faith*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Dilemma of the Establishment Puritan: the Cambridge Heads and the case of Francis Johnson and Cuthbert Bainbrigg." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 29 (1978): 23-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity at the court of James I." In *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, edited by L. L. Peck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The politics of popularity and the public sphere: the 'monarchical republic' of Elizabeth I defends itself." In *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, edited by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Puritanism, (Monarchical) Republicanism, and Monarchy: or John Whitgift, Antipuritanism, and the 'Invention' of Popularity." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40 (2010): 463-495.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Richard Kilby, a study in personal and professional failure." In *The ministry, clerical and lay*, edited by William Sheils and Diana Wood. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Robert Some and the Ambiguities of Moderation." *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte* 71(1980): 254-279.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Saving souls or selling (virtual) godliness? The 'penny godlinesses' of John Andrewes and the problem of 'popular puritanism' in early Stuart England." In *Formal matters: reading the materials of English Renaissance literature*, edited by Allison K. Deutermann and Andras Kisery. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Bradshaw, Antichrist and the Community of the Godly." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 4 (1985) 570-589.
- Lake, Peter and Michael Questier. "Puritans, Papists and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context." *The Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000): 587-627.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prisons, priests, and people." In *England's Long Reformation 1500-1800*, edited by Nicholas Tyacke. London: University College London Press, 1998.
- Lambert, Sheila. "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship." *Past & Present* 124 (1989): 36-68.
- Lamont, William M. *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603-60*. New York: Macmillan St. Martin's Press, 1969.
- Lander, Jesse M. *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print and Literary Culture in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Larner, Christina. "Two Late Scottish Witchcraft Tracts." In *The Damned Art: Essays in the Literature of Witchcraft*, edited by Sydney Anglo. *Google Books*.
- Lee, Jason K. *The Theology of John Smyth: Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Mennonite*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2003.
- Letters of Eminent Men, addressed to Ralph Thoresby*. Vol. 2. London: Colburn and Bentley, 1832. *Google Books*.
- Levack, Brian. "Demonic Possession in Early Modern Scotland." In *Witchcraft and Belief in Early Modern Scotland*, edited by Julian Goodare, et al. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Devil Within*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Levy, David H. *The Sky in Early Modern English Literature*. New York: Springer, 2011.
- Lewalski, Barbara. *Donne's "Anniversaries" and the Poetry of Praise, the Creation of a Symbolic Mode*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Lim, Paul Chang-Ha. *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in its Seventeenth-Century Context*. Boston: Brill, 2004.

- Macdonald, Michael. *Mystical Bedlam*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Macfarlane, A.D.J., *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Madan, Falconer. *Oxford Books: The early Oxford Press, 1468-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895. *Google Books*.
- Maggi, Armando. *Satan's Rhetoric*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Maltby, Judith. *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Marchant, Ronald. *The Church Under the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. *Google Books*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642*. London: Longmans, 1960.
- Marotti, Arthur F. "Patronage, Poetry, and Print." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 1-26.
- Marshall, George W., ed., *The Registers of Worksop, co. Nottingham, 1558-1771*. Guildford: Billing and Sons, 1894.
- Marshall, Peter. "The Reformation of Hell? Protestant and Catholic Infernalisms in England, c. 1560-1640." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2010): 279-298.
- Mather, Increase. *Cases of Conscience Concerning Evil Spirits*. Boston: rpt. London, for John Dunton, 1693. In *The Wonders of the Invisible World*. London: John Russell Smith, 1862. *Google Books*.
- Matthews, A. G. *Walker Revised: Being a revision of John Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion 1642-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.
- McGiffert, Michael. "Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism." *The Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982): 463-502.
- McGinnis, Timothy Scott. *George Gifford and the Reformation of the common sort*. Kirksville, MO, Truman State University Press, 2004.
- McIntosh, Marjorie. *Controlling misbehaviour in England, 1370-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- McKenzie, D. F. "The London Book Trade in 1644." In *Bibliographia*, ed. John Horden. Oxford: Leopard's Head, 1995.
- McKim, Donald. *Ramism in William Perkins' Theology*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and reformed: Roman and Protestant churches in English Protestant thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England." *Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 625-651.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A qualified intolerance: The limits and ambiguities of early Stuart anti-Catholicism." In *Catholicism and anti-Catholicism in early modern English texts*, edited by Arthur Marotti. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999.
- Mitchell, Peter. *The Purple Island and Anatomy in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature, Philosophy, and Theology*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2007.
- Moore, Susan Hardman. *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call of Home*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Moriarty, G. A. "Bernard of Epworth, co. Lincoln." *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 113 (July 1959), 189-92.
- Morrill, John. "The attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament, 1640-42." In *History, Society, and the Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

- Morrill, John. "The Church in England, 1643-9." In *Reactions to the English civil war 1642-1649*, edited by John Morrill. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.
- Mosher, J. A. *The exemplum in the early religious and didactic literature of England*. New York, 1911.
- Muller, Max. *Richard Bernard: The Isle of Man (1626); eine literargeschichtliche untersuchung*. Markneukirchen: J. Schmidt, 1933.
- Muller, Richard A. "Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo salutis?" *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 68-81.
- Murray, John. *Handbook for travellers in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, and Somersetshire*. New edition. London: John Murray, 1869. *Google books*.
- Narramore, Kathryn Coad. "Du Vergers Humble Reflections and Dedicatory Epistles as Public Sphere." *Prose Studies* 35 (2013): 139-153.
- Narveson, K. and G. Kneidel, "Bernard, Richard." In *British rhetoricians and logicians, 1500-1660*, ed. E. A. Malone. Detroit: Gale, 2003.
- Narveson, K. R. and Gregory Kneidel, "Richard Bernard." In *The Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Detroit: Gale, 1978.
- The New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, Vols. 25, 53, 63. Boston. *Google Books*.
- Newman, Christine M. "'An Honourable and Elect Lady': The Faith of Isabel, Lady Bowes." In *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c. 1100-c. 1700*, edited by Diana Wood. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999: 407-419.
- Notestein, Wallace. *A history of witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718*. Washington: The American Historical Association, 1911. *Archive.org*.
- Nottinghamshire Archive. "Abstracts of names of clergymen, taken from Induction Mandates (AN/IM 201-208/1), 1557-1696." <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/manuscriptsand-specialcollections/documents/collectionsindepth/archdeaconry/appendix%203-2.pdf>. Accessed 12/14/2012.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey. "A Transcript of Richard Baxter's Library Catalogue (Concluded)." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 3 (1952): 74-100.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1946.
- O'Day, Rosemary. "The reformation of the ministry." In *Continuity and change: personnel and administration of the Church of England 1500-1642*, edited by Felicity Heal and Rosemary O'Day. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The English clergy: the emergence and consolidation of a profession, 1558-1642*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edn, Oct 2009.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. [www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com).
- Parker, Kenneth L. and Eric J. Carlson. *"Practical Divinity": The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.
- Parker, Kenneth L. *The English Sabbath*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Patterson, W. B. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Peacey, Jason. "The Paranoid Prelate: Archbishop Laud and the Puritan Plot." In *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Barry Coward and Julian Swann. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004: 113-129.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Peile, John. *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905*. Vol. I. Cambridge: 1910. *Google Books*.
- Penuel, Suzanne. "Male Mothering and *The Tempest*." In *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*, edited by Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *The Book in the Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Pettigrew, Todd. "Profitable Unto the Vulgar: The Case and Cases of John Cotta's *Short Discoverie*." In *Textual Healing*, edited by Elizabeth Lane Furdell. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Pevsner, Sir Nikolaus Bernhard Leon. *The Buildings of England, North Somerset and Bristol*. Hammonds Worth, 1958. *Google Books*.
- Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society*. Vol. 8. *Google Books*.
- Questier, Michael. *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics, 1621-1625*. Camden fifth series 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset*. 2 Vols. Edited by E. H. Bates Harbin. 1907-1908. *Archive.org*.
- Racaut, Luc. *Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity during the French Wars of Religion*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Radcliffe, David Hill. *Forms of Reflection: Genre and Culture in Meditation Writing*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Rahter, Charles A. "Puck's Headless Bear—Revisited." In Ronald L. Dotterer, ed., *Shakespeare: Text, Subtext, and Context*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1989: 157-162.
- Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- The Registers of Bruton, co. Somerset*. Ed. Douglas L. Hayward. Vol. I. *The Parish Register Society*, n.d. *Archive.org*.
- Reis, Elizabeth. *Damned Women: Sinners and Witches in Puritan New England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999 rpt. *Google Books*.
- Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*. Vol. 24. Plymouth: William Brendon and Son, 1892. *Google Books*.
- Rigney, James. "Sermons into Print." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Rosa, Susan. "Seventeenth-Century Catholic Polemic and the Rise of Cultural Rationalism: An Example from the Empire." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57 (1996): 87-107.
- Rose-Troup, Frances. *John White: The patriarch of Dorchester (Dorset) and the founder of Massachusetts, 1575-1648*. New York: 1930.
- Rushford, Thomas. "Burnings and Blessings: The Cultural Reality of the Supernatural across Early Modern Spaces." Ph.D. Diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2007.
- Rushton, Peter. "Texts of Authority: Witchcraft Accusations and the Demonstration of Truth in Early Modern England." In Stuart Clark, ed., *Languages of Witchcraft*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2001.
- Ruys, Juanita Feros, Ed. *What nature does not teach: didactic literature in the medieval and early modern periods*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Ryrie, Alec. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Salzman, Paul. *Literary Culture in Jacobean England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

- Sauer, Elizabeth. *Paper-contestations' and textual communities in England, 1640-1675*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Scarlsbrick, J. J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Scheck, Thomas. "The Polemics of John Heigham and Richard Montagu and the Rise of English Arminianism." *Recusant History* 29 (2008): 12-27.
- Schneider, Carol Geary. "Godly Order in a Church Half-Reformed: The Disciplinary Legacy, 1570-1641," Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University, 1986.
- Seaver, Paul. *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Wallington's World: A Puritan artisan in seventeenth-century London*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.
- Secord, James A. *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman. *Generating Texts: The Progeny of Seventeenth-Century Prose*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996.
- Selement, George. "The Covenant Theology of English Separatism and the Separation of Church and State." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 41 (1973): 66-74.
- Sell, Alan P. F. "Varieties of English Separatist and Dissenting Writings." In Roger D. Sell and Anthony W. Johnson, eds., *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009: 25-46.
- Sharpe, Kevin and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Sharpe, Kevin. "Transplanting Revelation, Transferring Meaning: Reading the Apocalypse in Early Modern England, Scotland and New England." In *Shaping the Stuart World, 1603-1714: the Atlantic Connection*, edited by Allan I. Macinnes and Arthur H. Williamson. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 117-146.
- Sharpe, James. *Witchcraft in Early Modern England*. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 2001.
- Sharrock, Roger. "Bunyan and the English Emblem Writers" *Review of English Studies* 21, no. 82 (1945): 105-116;
- Sheils, William. "An Archbishop in the Pulpit: Tobie Matthew's Preaching Diary." In Diana Wood, ed., *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c. 1100-1700*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999.
- Shepard, Alexandra and Phil Withington, eds. *Communities in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Sherman, William H. *Used Books*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Shoulson, Jeffrey S. *Fictions of Conversion: Jews, Christians, and Cultures of Change in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. *Google Books*.
- Siegel, Jules Paul. "Puritan Light Reading" *The New England Quarterly* 37 (1964): 185-199.
- Simpson, Percy. *Studies in Elizabethan Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Sleights, William W. E. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Smith, Nigel. *Literature and revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Smyth, John. "Paralleles, Censvres, Observations." In W. T. Whitley, ed. *The Works of John Smyth* Vol. II. Cambridge: the University Press, 1915. *Archive.org*.
- Smyth, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Rev. Thomas Smyth*. Vol. 2. Edited by J. Wm. Flinn. Columbia, SC: Reprinted by the R. L. Bryan Company, 1908. *Archive.org*.

- Somerset Record Office, SRO item summaries, Archive catalog, Online  
 <<http://www1.somerset.gov.uk/archives/>> Accessed 3/24/2015.
- Spufford, Margaret. "The Importance of the Lord's Supper to Seventeenth Century Dissenters." *Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 5, no. 2 (1993): 62-80.
- Stieg, Margaret. *Laud's Laboratory*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1982.
- Stranaham, Brainerd P. "Bunyan and the Epistle to the Hebrews: His Source for the Idea of Pilgrimage in *The Pilgrim's Progress*." *Studies in Philology* 79 (1982), 279-296.
- Swaim, Kathleen M. *Pilgrim's Progress, Puritan Progress: Discourses and Contexts*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Syme, Holger Schott. *Theatre and Testimony in Shakespeare's England: A Culture of Mediation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Symonds, Richard. *Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army during the Great Civil War*. Edited by Charles Edward Long. Camden Society, 1859. *Archive.org*.
- Taffel, Mildred Gottlieb. "Richard Bernard: Puritan Divine." MA thesis, Columbia University, 1939.
- Thomas, Denise. "Religious Polemic, Print Culture and Pastoral Ministry: Thomas Hall B.D. (1610-1665) and the Promotion of Presbyterian Orthodoxy in the English Revolution." Ph.D. Diss., Birmingham, 2011.
- Thomas, Jean L. "Drama and Doctrine." *American Literature* 36 (1965): 452-462.
- Thoresby, Ralph. *Diary of Ralph Thoresby* Vol. 1. London: Colburn and Bentley, 1830. *Google Books*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Vicaria Leodiensis*. London: Printed for Joseph Smith, 1724.
- Towers, S. Mutchow. *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003.
- A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.* 4 vols. Rpt. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.
- A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1640-1708 A.D.* 3 vols. Rpt. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Popular Puritan Mentality in Late Elizabethan England." In P. Clark, A.G.R. Smith and N. Tyacke, eds., *The English Commonwealth 1547-1640: Essays in Politics and Society Presented to Joel Hurstfield*. Leicester, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered." *Past & Present* 115 (1987): 201-216;
- Underdown, David. *Fire From Heaven*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1973.
- Ussher, James. *The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D.* Edited by Charles Richard Elrington Vol. XVI. Dublin: Hodges and Smith, n.d. *Archive.org*.
- Van Beek, M. *An enquiry into puritan vocabulary*. Groningen, the Netherlands: Woltes-Noordhoff, 1969.
- van Dijkhuizen, Jan Frans. *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Devil Theatre*. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2007.
- Van Dixhoorn, Chad, ed. *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly* Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Venn, John, and Venn, J. A. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922. *Archive.org*.
- Wadkins, Timothy H. "The Percy-'Fisher' Controversies and the ecclesiastical politics of Jacobean anti-Catholicism, 1622-1625." *Church History* 57 (1988): 153-169.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theological polemic and religious culture in early Stuart England: Percy/'Fisher' controversies, 1605-41." Ph.D. diss. Graduate Theological Union, 1988.
- Wallace, D. D. "Puritan and Anglican: The Interpretation of Christ's Descent into Hell in Elizabethan Theology." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* lxix (1978): 248-287.
- Wallace, Dewey. *Shapers of English Calvinism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Walsby, Malcolm, and Graeme Kemp, eds. *The Book Triumphant: Print in transition in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Walsham, Alexandra, and Anthony Milton. "Concerning recusancie." In *From Cranmer to Davidson*.
- Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996 rpt.
- Weaver, F. W., ed. *Somerset Medieval Wills (Third Series) 1531-1558*. 1905. *Google Books*.
- Webster, Tom. *Godly clergy in early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan movement, c. 1620-1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Weiner, Carol Z. "The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism." *Past & Present*, 51 (1971): 27-62.
- White, Helen C. *English Devotional Literature [Prose] 1600-1640*. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 29, 1931.
- White, Peter. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- White, Robert. "Workshop, the Dukery, and Sherwood Forest." 1875. Online at A. P. Nicholson, *Nottinghamshire History*. [http://www.nottshistory.org.uk/white1875/workshop\\_historyp2.htm](http://www.nottshistory.org.uk/white1875/workshop_historyp2.htm) Accessed July 8, 2013.
- Whiteway, William. *William Whiteway of Dorchester, His Diary 1618-1635*. Vol. 12. Dorchester: Dorset Record Society, 1991.
- Willen, Diane. "Thomas Gataker and the Use of Print in the English Godly Community." *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 70 (2007): 343-364.
- "The Will, Inventories, and Funeral Expenses of James Montagu, Bishop of Winchester, anno 1618." In *Archaeologia: Or, Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity* Vol. 44. London: Nichols and Sons, 1873. *Google Books*.
- Willen, Diane. "'Communion of the Saints': Spiritual Reciprocity and the Godly Community in Early Modern England." *Albion* 27 (1995): 19-41.
- Winship, Michael. *Godly Republicanism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Winthrop, John. *Winthrop Papers*. Vol. 3. Massachusetts Historical Society, 1943. *Archive.org*.
- "The wisest king did wonder when hee spy'd." *Early Stuart Libels*.  
<[http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/buckingham\\_at\\_war\\_section/Oiii2.html](http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/buckingham_at_war_section/Oiii2.html)>
- Wolberg, Kristine. *All Possible Art: George Herbert's The Country Parson*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2008.
- Wood, A. C. "A Note on the Synod of Clergy at Southwell." *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire 1949*. Vol. LIII. Nottingham: Printed for the society by Thos. Forman and Sons, 1950.

- Wootton, "Reginald Scot / Abraham Fleming / The Family of Love" in Clark, ed., *Languages of Witchcraft*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2001.
- "Worksop Priory Churchwardens' Book." *Worksop Heritage Trail*. < [http://www.worksopheritagetrail.org.uk/resources/worksop\\_priory\\_churchwardens\\_book.pdf](http://www.worksopheritagetrail.org.uk/resources/worksop_priory_churchwardens_book.pdf)> Accessed July 9, 2013.
- Wright, Stephen. *The Early English Baptists*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006.
- Wright, Thomas. 1851 *Narratives of Sorcery and Magic*. New York: Redfield, 1852.