‘DAYES OF GALL AND WORMWOOD’: PUBLIC RELIGIOUS DISPUTATION IN ENGLAND, 1558-1626

JOSHUA MARK RODDA, BA (Hons), MA

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

JULY 2012

Attestation

I am aware of and understand the university's policy on plagiarism.

I further certify that this thesis represents work undertaken by me during my period of study at the University of Nottingham.

Signed _____ Date _____

Abstract

This study examines a form of religious debate that saw Catholic priests and ministers across the reformed spectrum arguing in direct opposition to one another, and drawing on long-standing academic forms and intellectual ideals in doing so. Public religious disputation is first defined and placed in its religious, cultural and intellectual context, alongside formal disputation in the universities, printed controversy, literary dialogue and other manifestations of discourse and debate. The structures, tropes and tactics of the formal, academic process – as used in public or 'professional' controversial debate – are then detailed, in order to give a more precise definition, and a framework for the analysis of individual events.

The chapters following this move chronologically from the accession of Elizabeth I and the 1559 Westminster conference to the aftermath of the death of James and the 1626 debate at York House. Drawing on the trends discussed in the first chapter and the procedures detailed in the second, these sections place individual disputations in their immediate context; examining the use and restriction of public religious debate by state and church authorities, the impact academic forms could have upon public, controversial disputation, the interplay between faith and human learning on display and the changing perceptions of the practice as political, religious and cultural conditions developed through the period.

The aim of this study is to assert the significance of public religious disputation, and accounts thereof, as something more than a simple 'variety' of religious controversy or polemic. Its formal structures and direct interactions shed light on Reformation and post-Reformation religious arguments; but its structures and ideals also demonstrate a shared, fundamental mode of discourse and competition underlying those arguments. These encounters, and the accounts they produced, are not just examples of partisan polemic – they are potentially invaluable tools for the religious and cultural historian.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been completed without the generous support of the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council, to whom acknowledgement and thanks must be given from the outset. I can only hope this work lives up to their faith in my project and potential.

I am further indebted to my supervisor, Dr. Julia Merritt, for her encouragement, support and guidance through the preparation and writing of this study. Julia's diligent attention to my work and invariably thought-provoking comments and feedback have been invaluable from the beginning. Thanks must also go to those historians and other scholars – professional and postgraduate – who have allowed me to discuss my topic with them, and those who have attended my conference and seminar papers relating to it, whose interest, feedback and choice questions have been a vital source of energy.

I must also thank my family and friends for their unwavering support these past three and half years, for glancing at the occasional draft chapter, and, quite simply, for their existence. Your role might have been less tangible, but this thesis – and its author – would be nothing without you.

Conventions

Original spellings and punctuation have been followed throughout.

Where clarity has forced a change, it is marked with brackets: [ ]

Abbreviations

HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

Contents

Introduction

'*I never knew good come by disputation.*'[1]

This thesis describes an aspect of post-Reformation controversy that has fallen between fields of inquiry. Amid the mass of written polemic generated by controversialists in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, there were more immediate engagements: face-to-face debates, that fuelled and complemented the storm of proselytising and denunciation in print. Spurred on by classical ideals and biblical imperatives, and encouraged by prior historical examples, divines throughout the period issued calls for scholarly, often public, disputation as a means of addressing religious questions, and the resulting events – ranging from smaller encounters to occasions like the Hampton Court conference of 1604 – formed milestones in controversy. The Reformation had, in the words of Thomas McCoog, been 'punctuated' with challenges to dispute; indeed, in some contemporary minds, its changes were 'propelled' by disputation.[2] Direct religious argument was regarded as distinct from written controversy; a view reflected in the manner in which it was reported and described, and in the histories of the practice that appeared through the seventeenth century.[3] In their structures and ideals, these events offer a fascinating window into the period's divisions, and provide an opportunity for those seeking a

[1] John Feckenham, in William Fulke, *A True Reporte of a Conference had betwixt Doctour Fulke, and the Papists, Being at Wisbiche Castle* (London, 1581), sig. B2^{v}.

[2] Thomas M. McCoog, ''Playing the Champion': The Role of Disputation in the Jesuit Mission', in Thomas M. McCoog (ed.), *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits* (Oxford, 1996), p. 119; and the view of Francis Savage, in Joseph Puterbaugh, '"Your selfe be judge and answer your selfe": Formation of Protestant Identity in *A Conference Betwixt a Mother a Devout Recusant and Her Sonne a Zealous Protestant*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 31 (2000), p. 423.

[3] In 1604, the Jesuit Robert Persons compared Augustine's disputations with those fuelling the Reformation, and in 1658, the clergyman John Ley, spurred on by an encounter between fellow ministers, produced a detailed history, moving from a biblical dispute between two angels and the Devil through the continental Reformation to more immediate events: N. D., *A Review of Ten Publike Disputations* (St Omer, 1604), *passim*; John Ley, *A Discourse of Disputations Chiefly Concerning Matters of Religion* (London, 1658), esp. pp. 31-47. For recent emphasis on the role of controversy in shaping ideas about the past, see Thomas Freeman, 'The Power of Polemic: Catholic Responses to the Calendar in Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (2010), pp. 475-6, 495.

combined Catholic and reformed post-Reformation narrative. Their procedures describe a shared intellectual arena, allowing for broad, cross-confessional analysis.[4]

Thus, public religious disputations in this period call for a dedicated study. They have not been neglected entirely, but as events they are often considered in isolation; their printed results treated as but one element of that mass of pamphlet controversy to which, even in the seventeenth century, there appeared to be 'no end'.[5] In order to address this gap, this thesis will concentrate on the mechanics, implications and perception of the practice. As will be discussed below, 'public' is here taken in opposition to 'academic', to denote events taking place beyond the educational sphere: those public in *purpose* as well as performance (or through the distribution of accounts). The period of focus is from the accession of Elizabeth I to the immediate aftermath of James' death, through which time a clear arc – in application and perception – can be traced in public religious disputation.

These encounters united two distinct phenomena: academic disputation, which was a staple of university education and could be applied to any number of subjects, and the more charged realm of religious controversy and polemic. It is this dual identity that has stranded them between two spheres of research: where they have been studied in detail, they are rarely presented as more than examples of one or the other. In works on controversy, a disputant's arguments are often cited, without reference to the fact or structure of the disputation itself: Patrick Collinson's seminal *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* applied a series of 1590 debates in precisely this manner, in exploring the difficulties faced by conforming puritans. Similarly, Michael Questier's

[4] Peter Lake calls for a combined narrative in 'A Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys: The Strange Fates of Edmund Grindal and Cuthbert Mayne Revisited', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 18 (2008), esp. p. 153. Further, see Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. xvi-xvii – it should be noted that shared *intellectual* ideas and forms allow us to combine narratives *without* discounting contemporary self-images. Recently, Ian Campbell suggested a similar *modus* on the Aristotelian roots of Irish political discourse; shared concepts allowing him to cross national and religious boundaries: Ian W. S. Campbell, 'Aristotelian Ancient Constitution and Anti-Aristotelian Sovereignty in Stuart Ireland', *The Historical Journal*, 53 (2010), pp. 573-591.

[5] Daniel Featley, *The Romish Fisher Caught and Held in his Owne Net* (London, 1624), sig. I^{v}; Michael C. Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 13.

work on conversion discusses several public or semi-public disputations, noting their arguments and implications, but this rarely draws *directly* on process.[6]

The practice has occasionally been considered in more detail. Peter Milward's 1977-8 directory of religious controversies, which catalogues pamphlet exchanges in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, outlines the aftermath of several disputations.[7] More recently, Ann Hughes has examined mid-seventeenth-century debates, and accounts thereof, under the heading of religious 'confrontation'; calling for a detailed study of their procedures as a means to greater understanding of religious writing in the period.[8] McCoog's work on the Jesuit mission of the 1580s, meanwhile, follows disputation in Catholic efforts, with a focus on Edmund Campion; his article, published in 1996, is unique in outlining the *form* and *perception* of such events, including their contested worth to the mission and the Protestant authorities.[9] In addition, there have been detailed studies of the most prominent instances of religious debate – notably Hampton Court.[10] As the scattered nature of these examples suggests, however, studies of public religious disputation are invariably tied to particular places, groups or shorter periods of time; their findings limited to individual events. It should also be noted that in 2002, the historian of rhetoric Peter Mack cited a forthcoming work by Judith Deitch on disputation practice in this period; but at the time of writing this does not appear on the integrated British Library catalogue, or feature in the Bibliography of British and Irish History.[11]

---

[6] Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967), p. 336; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, esp. pp. 28, 33-5, 159. Questier does briefly touch on performance and the pressures surrounding these events.

[7] Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1977), esp. pp. 60-1, 97, and *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978), esp. pp. 1-5, 167-8, 171-2, 220-227.

[8] Ann Hughes, 'Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic', *History Today*, 41 (1991), p. 33; *idem*, 'The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England', in Anne Laurence, W. R. Owens and Stuart Sim (eds) *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88* (London, 1990), pp. 31-50.

[9] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', esp. pp. 119-22, 125, 129-30; see chapter 3 below.

[10] See chapter 5 below.

[11] Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 58n.

Historians of educational practice have detailed disputation in the universities. In his own overview of the requirements at Oxford and Cambridge, Mack uses a seventeenth-century handbook (Robert Sanderson's 1615 *Logicae Artis Compendium*) to illustrate disputation at the former, allowing for some variation and providing several examples.[12] S. L. Greenslade's contribution to *The History of the University of Oxford* has outlined in more general terms the required course of disputations in the sixteenth century, and Lawrence Green's work on the theologian John Rainolds goes into tremendous detail on the university's requirements, at the undergraduate level and in the divinity school.[13] Another work of note, though somewhat older, is William Costello's *Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*, whose section on 'the disputation' proves the most detailed and enthusiastic account of such events.[14] Again, however, these discussions are restricted to their field: only rarely has their focus on practice and performance been applied to public or 'professional' religious debate – Green's work on Rainolds and the efforts of Hughes being notable, albeit brief, exceptions.[15] More recently, Debora Shuger has examined those university disputations that dealt with controversial religion, and this will be considered where the relationship between academic and public disputation is discussed below.[16]

Its academic ties notwithstanding, public religious debate demands to be approached with an eye to controversy and polemic, not just in the dual historiography that has come to surround it, but in the events' content, and the nature of their surviving records. One type of source predominates: printed accounts; all claiming to be accurate, and generally compiled by one of the disputants – eager to claim victory,

[12] Ibid., pp. 58-60.
[13] S. L. Greenslade, 'The Faculty of Theology', in James McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1986), pp. 296-7; Lawrence D. Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Newark NJ, 1986), pp. 27-9.
[14] William T. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge Mass., 1958), pp. 14-31.
[15] Hughes, 'Public Disputations', p. 28.
[16] Debora Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin and the Birth of the Public Sphere', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 72 (2009), *passim*; see chapter 2.

cast doubt on their opponents, and pursue their arguments at greater length. The better part of the surviving source material thus falls into the category of religious polemic, and must, to an extent, be dealt with as such. In addition, the disputations themselves were surface ripples on an ocean of printed material, their trends in argument reflecting shifts in controversy as a whole. It is necessary, therefore, to note recent approaches to this wider phenomenon, in order to address the place of disputation within it.

Although several influential works on religious controversy have been published in recent decades, it has oftentimes remained in the background. Its relative importance to contemporary religious thought cannot be denied, but the 'stark and off-putting monotony' Questier finds in its tone and doctrinal content – not to mention the more legitimate question of reliability inherent in its purpose – has generally relegated it to the role of supplementary material, behind state papers, private correspondence and more benign theological works.[17] The form has, however, experienced a resurgence since the mid-1990s, having played a role in the work of – among others – Peter Lake and Anthony Milton. Lake himself has described the marginalisation of 'mere polemic' in favour of other types of material, and champions its use in examining contemporary self-images, but works of controversy can also provide some insight into broader thought patterns – they reflect common ideals, practices and needs, as well as indicating 'contest and anxiety'.[18] Milton's call for a study of 'the actual *mechanics* of religious controversy' draws attention to the significance of this material – and its workings – to our understanding of religious thought, expression and identity in this period.[19]

By the early years of Elizabeth's reign, controversy was a crucial part of the religious landscape, particularly in educated, clerical and government circles.

[17] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 186.
[18] Peter Lake, 'Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 89-90.
[19] Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 4.

Greenslade has observed its 'existential quality' – controversy dealing as it does with matters fundamental to personal, religious (and, in this period, political and *geo*political) identity.[20] Every divine, regardless of the church he defended, was in some way prepared for it to be a part of his career; and, as Milton notes, the years 1605 to 1625 alone saw the production of more than 500 works in the field.[21] James McConica has gone so far as to describe it as 'the chief *intellectual* concern of the day'.[22] The continual struggle for the nation's soul, and the need for competing churches (and groups within them) to justify themselves in the face of complex questions and devoted opposition were the central motivating factors; but at a more basic level, the prevalence of controversy can be attributed to the changing intellectual world in which clergymen moved.

For the reformed churches, controversy was integral to religious identity. They were the result of comparatively recent developments, partly defined in *opposition* to Catholicism. As Lake points out, referencing anti-papal writings, 'every negative characteristic imputed to Rome implied a positive cultural, political or religious value which Protestants claimed as their own exclusive property', and so reformers came to value, if not idealise, confrontation.[23] Most would not, of course, have described their motives so explicitly, and reformed theology provided other forms of self-image; but a comparison of Protestant attitudes with those of Catholic writers shows a subtle difference in outlook influencing perceptions of controversy, whether written or in disputation.[24] For representatives of the English Church in particular, there was a need to clarify and defend their position. Their doctrinal situation, in a 'no man's land' between theological extremes, led them to experience in a real sense what Tertullian,

[20] Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', p. 324.
[21] Ibid., p. 325; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 32.
[22] James McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford: The Collegiate Society', in McConica, *The History of the University of Oxford*, p. 732.
[23] Peter Lake, 'Anti-Popery: 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, 1989), pp. 73-4. Lake's description of this world-view hints at the connection between reformed thought and the development of Renaissance humanism: see chapter 1 below.
[24] Which is not to say that there were no disagreements *within* these churches: an illustrative cross-section on disputation can be found in McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', pp. 125, 129-30.

Martin Luther and John Colet had identified as the 'function' of heresy – a 'test of the faith of believers... a means of keeping the church alert.'[25] For radical reformers, a similar effect was produced by the concept of a godly minority, perhaps the period's most overt example of self-definition in opposition to others. In this climate of confrontation, to which Catholics felt the need to respond, controversialists placed each other under additional pressure, driven by discursive ideals. Beyond the idea of direct conversation (indeed, single combat) that fuelled individual exchanges, there was a perception – more pronounced among Protestants – that no controversial work should go unanswered. Silence invariably equated to defeat; a notion that could be twice as damaging when offers of disputation were turned down.

There was also a scriptural imperative. When the Archiepiscopal chaplain and prolific disputant Daniel Featley detailed his reasons for engaging Catholics in 1624, he cited 1 Peter 3:15 above canon law and the instructions of the king: 'be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you'.[26] Works of controversy were held to perform a spiritual function: though aimed at opposing divines, their role was also one of confirmation. Their production was seen – particularly by Protestant writers – as having a personal, spiritual value: it was not simply a requirement of office – it was an illustration and reflection of one's own faith. The resulting works were believed to have a beneficial effect upon Protestant readers.[27] In this respect, the impact of written controversy can again be compared to that of disputation: any response thought to be triggered by religious argument would be amplified in the mouths of university-trained orators.

---

[25] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 3; R. R. McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue: The Humanist Approaches of Erasmus and More', *Viator*, 24 (1993), p. 364.

[26] 1 Peter 3:15, as cited in Daniel Featley, *An Appendix to the Fishers Net* (London, 1624), p. 53. See Pierre du Moulin, *A Conference Held at Paris* (London, 1615), p. 1, for a similar French citation; Declan Gaffney, 'The Practice of Religious Controversy in Dublin, 1600-1641', in W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood (eds), *The Churches, Ireland and the Irish* (Oxford, 1989), p. 145, for a comparable 1641 expression of the purpose of controversy; and Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 27 for an echo of Featley.

[27] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 37.

Writers and clergymen in post-Reformation England were thus *compelled* to produce such works, and to engage their adversaries in some semblance of debate; a compulsion evident in the training of seminary priests, in Jacobean royal commands and in Calvinist citations of scripture. As the chapters below demonstrate, the needs of individual groups and churches were combined with spiritual and intellectual imperatives, grounded in a certainty that such endeavours *would have an impact*. In short, these actions were not undertaken on a whim. They were a necessity; an immediate, effective form of devotional practice.

The importance of controversy in contemporary eyes cannot, therefore, be denied. At the least, controversialists believed that allowing their opponents' works to go unanswered risked discredit for – or even defection from – their own side; this alone implying faith in their effectiveness.[28] As is frequently observed, it is difficult to determine what the climate of religious uncertainty in this period meant for the population at large; but the state, church and controversialists of every stripe were aware of its dangers, and all reacted accordingly. The question that has arisen in works detailing controversy is how far this perception reflects the reality of personal religious experience; and thus how significant and effective such works can truly be said to have been. The question was raised in 1996 by Questier, who compared polemicists' confidence 'that truth could be grasped in its entirety' through their works with the natural limitations of the material: its inherent bias and the aforesaid 'monotony' of doctrinal argument.[29] Questier argues that polemic was forced, by political considerations and its own objectives, to avoid shared beliefs and provide 'veiled impressions' and 'parodies' of the various churches: anyone who converted on account of controversy, he states, 'did so on the basis of word-games and literary sleight of hand.'[30]

[28] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 17.
[29] Ibid., pp. 12, 186.
[30] Ibid., p. 36.

Although there is some truth in this, and conversion was undoubtedly a more complex process than most controversial efforts would allow, Questier's critique of doctrinal polemic does not account for the volume of such works produced, or fit with all recorded opinions.[31] The disputations and their accounts offer clear examples here. They demonstrate lay interest in doctrinal argument, and were organised and written up in a manner intended to appeal to a wide audience: often in public, always in English, and generally in dialogue form. The time and political effort that went into the debates staged with Campion in 1581, or the conference between Rainolds and the priest John Hart in 1582, not to mention the preparation of their printed accounts, does not suggest irrelevance or detachment from doctrinal argument, and shows little contemporary awareness of those flaws identified by Questier. On the contrary, records of state sanctioned disputation imply a considerable degree of credibility and lay interest, while private conferences – known to have taken place in noble and gentry houses – demonstrate the latter directly. In addition, while faith is certainly more elusive, a church, as a political, social and cultural entity, lives and dies by its outward components: its doctrine. A polemicist's sleights of hand may not have been 'an adequate basis' for conversion, but they were nonetheless important: to show merit in a moralistic culture, confidence in the face of national insecurity, and certainty in a time of contention and doubt.[32] For those in power, there remained an urgent need to defend national doctrine after the twists and turns of the Reformation, and opponents on all sides felt the need to question it. These actions, however crassly presented, must have had an impact on personal assurance in this period.

There can be no doubt, in a society as theologically charged and polemically saturated as the circles in which these controversies thrived, that a particular work might have planted the seed of doubt in one or two minds, as Questier himself points

[31] Declan Gaffney notes that the image of controversy as an unhelpful 'disease' was joined by an acceptance of its place in preaching and 'conversion-seeking', *as well as* disputation and polemic: Gaffney, 'Practice of Religious Controversy', p. 145, citing Joshua Hoyle, *A Rejoynder to Malone's Reply Concerning Reall Presence* (Dublin, 1641), sig. a^{r}.
[32] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 12.

out.[33] But that, it could be argued, was all controversialists were concerned with. Claims of whole and comprehensive truth were rhetorical – even a matter of form – and what was actually on offer was an initial step. Conversion itself was seen as an experience independent of reason, its preparations and aftermath requiring spiritual counsel or self-reflection and study; little of which – as Questier contends – could be obtained from controversy.[34] But that was not the point. The point was to demonstrate that such personal efforts were right, justified and necessary (imperative, even), and to compete in a climate where 'false' churches were invariably trying to do the same.

As a body of source material, the mass of religious controversy and polemic generated in this period ought not to be dismissed. Though challenging, these works remain a vital source; and for more than just the arguments they contain. Their rhetorical tropes and misdirections certainly make them *seem* like self-defeating works of 'spin' to modern eyes; but they cannot be rejected as self-conscious sparring. As the opening chapters of this thesis demonstrate, the practices and arguments followed in controversial disputation – many of which appear as frequently in written tracts – were the products of a wider culture; accepted modes of thought and expression, many of which now seem altogether alien. Their style and manoeuvrability should not, with hindsight, be conflated with a lack of either relevance or conviction.

Printed and manuscript accounts of public religious disputation form the main body of evidence for this thesis, but these will not be examined in isolation. They are polemical works with pretensions to accuracy: Hughes offers an optimistic portrayal of their study, but even this rules out the possibility of fully reconstructing the events

[33] Ibid., pp. 36-7. Tobie Matthew took this further: 'the truth and certainty of Catholic doctrine is such that I hold it at this day the greatest miracle of the whole world that a man who is in any way of a judgment and will which is not mightily depraved, can forbear to subscribe entirely to the truth of Catholic doctrine, and to acknowledge his obedience to the holy Catholic Church, upon that kind of conference and proof, which he may easily hear thereof, within the space of a very few hours, from any Catholic learned man.' Tobie Matthew, *A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew*, ed. A. H. Mathew (London, 1904), p. 26.

[34] See John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 33-5.

themselves.[35] Examples will be noted below of selective editing and factual inconsistency beyond the level of bias inherent in polemic. Moreover, many disputations did not produce full or printed reports. Thus, despite their value in revealing shared practice and perceptions, the scattered, partial nature of printed disputation accounts amplifies the need for supplementary evidence. These encounters were recounted in private letters as well as in pamphlet exchanges, and – in the case of more prominent events – are referenced in state papers. Manuscript archives hold a wealth of minor allusions, as well as additional accounts, some written in opposition to printed reports. Thus, while this thesis primarily explores a long and fascinating catalogue of printed disputation accounts, these will be supported with a range of additional material, to place the disputations in context, add detail and – in some cases – introduce arguments from both sides of a debate.

These events, by virtue of their participants, records and content, must be placed in the context of religious controversy; but their *unique* attributes, and those of their accounts, should be emphasised. To examine it as a practice in its own right, it is necessary to discard the assumption that public religious disputation was but one 'variety' of controversy; interchangeable with pamphlet exchanges. It might be easy to suppose, in this period of upheaval, that forms of expression were secondary to the ideas expressed; but the image of change *propelled* by disputation must be kept in mind. Public, face-to-face debates were a part of controversial activity, and can be examined as such; but in their structure and impact, they were a distinct phenomenon. They reflect a discursive intellectual climate that crossed theological divisions, offering a point of cross-confessional contact; and their accounts frame oft-studied arguments in clear, persuasive forms, combining the benefits of literary dialogue with emergent ideas and uses of the past. The chapters below will examine the unique aspects of public religious disputation: its intellectual foundations, its customs and techniques, and its role as a shared arena in a period of turbulence and change.

[35] Hughes, 'Public Disputations', p. 29; see chapter 2 below.

Chapter One: The Culture of Controversy

'*The Lord hath given us wisdome and reason...*'[1]

The image of a Reformation propelled by disputation can be extended to the early modern period as a whole; a reflection of the importance of discussion and argument to contemporary thought. This chapter will examine the culture of discourse surrounding and encouraging public religious disputation. Ideas and events reminiscent of the practice will be considered, alongside disputation in the universities and its potential beyond the academic sphere. Modes of Renaissance thought, argument and expression will also be discussed, to give a framework for the analysis of disputants' methods in later chapters. Printed controversy will be revisited, to examine the influence of this intellectual climate upon the disputations' natural habitat; and finally, its impact on the practice itself will be addressed.

Public disputations, and related occasions, were not the sole expression of the period's culture of discourse. It was an attitude drawn from classical traditions, informing elements of literature, government and law as well as academic and religious debate.[2] At all levels, it was reflected in the notion of 'counsel', which was applied as much to abstract *concepts* of advice as to the workings of particular groups: Parliament drew on both in asserting their role.[3] John Guy's depiction of contemporaries' application of the word 'counsel', conflating abstract ideas with institutional deliberation, is reminiscent of the blurred contemporary usage of 'disputation': neither necessarily denoted a specific action, and both could be applied

[1] Francis Savage, *A Conference betwixt a Mother a Devout Recusant, and Her Sonne a Zealous Protestant* (Cambridge, 1600), p. 121.
[2] On the adoption of classical terms and traditions in debates surrounding freedom of speech, for example, see David Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2005), esp. pp. 2-3.
[3] Ibid., esp. pp. 7, 120-1. Recently, Jacqueline Rose has explored both abstract and practical ideas of counsel in relation to royal authority and clerical advice: 'Kingship and Counsel in Early Modern England', *The Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 47-71.

to discursive ideals.[4] As will be discussed in the context of particular debates, they in fact describe *polar* concepts, drawn from the same foundation, either of which could be applied to define a disputation's purpose. Comparing these superficially disparate words, in their use and significance, we can thus put language to the period's underlying belief in discussion and debate; a belief that proves simpler to define than some of the more nebulous concepts it produced.[5]

The idea of counsel raises several important points about this concern with discourse. First, it introduces a note of prestige; illustrated in Francis Bacon's marriage between counsel and 'Sovereignty'.[6] This emphasis on the wisdom shown in seeking counsel – revived with the classical ideals of Renaissance humanism – can be seen in several disputation accounts; specifically, in events arranged to reassure an individual of status.[7] Secondly, it calls attention to the *personal* character of much public discourse in this period – as clear in the language and dedications of printed works as in private correspondence.[8] The language of personal counsel was often used to frame public issues and debate, an approach whose benefits in recounting a public disputation will be explored below. Here, however, it should be noted that political and religious discourse were linked by something beyond the religious climate: they shared basic modes of expression. Their conferences and disputations have as much to tell us about cultural and linguistic trends as about the topics discussed.

Academic Disputation

These observations can be detailed through an examination of changing thought patterns; and specifically the development of educational institutions. Before

[4] John Guy, 'The Rhetoric of Counsel in Early Modern England', in Dale Hoak (ed.), *Tudor Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 292-3; Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, p. 3.
[5] See Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, p. 3.
[6] Guy, 'Rhetoric of Counsel', p. 292; Francis Bacon, *Bacon's Essays: with Annotations*, ed. Richard Whately, 3rd edn (London, 1857), pp. 192-3.
[7] Examples can be found in the 1559 Westminster conference and in the 1620s: see chapters 3 and 6 below. On the 'humanist-classical language' of counsel see Guy, 'Rhetoric of Counsel', p. 294.
[8] Linda Levy Peck, 'Kingship, Counsel and Law in Early Stuart Britain', in J. G. A. Pocock (ed.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 99.

approaching the universities directly, however, it should be noted that other establishments were shaping modes of debate along different, but recognisable, lines. The inns of court, where a growing number of young gentlemen were taught legal skills and knowledge, are one such example: Wilfrid Prest notes that legal awareness was seen as important to a gentleman's education; but in addition, the perceived benefits of time at the inns included training in argumentative techniques, from a different perspective to that of the universities.[9] The 'moot', a form of mock trial, was a central exercise, strikingly reminiscent of academic disputation: the questions were carefully framed beforehand and the arguments formally set out, although the format varied between institutions.[10] Again, a comparison with public religious disputation shows that, procedurally, the latter had as much in common with secular modes of discourse as with other forms of controversy – again, it proves more than just a face-to-face version of pamphlet polemic, or an extension of academic forms into a 'public' sphere. Moreover, the inns' role in educating the gentry carried structured debate further than the universities alone might have done.[11]

The universities were, however, the home of 'disputation' in the formal sense, and the training ground of most clerical disputants. Aside from their direct link with disputation, they were simply a dynamic intellectual environment, and an introduction to their development should preface any study of the mechanics of controversy. As McConica notes, Oxford and Cambridge held 'a virtual monopoly of clerical education': new clergymen being appointed almost exclusively from graduate ranks by the sixteenth century.[12] Thus, they represent the shared intellectual background of most educated controversialists. And indeed, the work of Ann Moss might lead us to include divines educated abroad, as changes in approach moved independent of

[9] Wilfrid R. Prest, *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (London, 1972), p. 23.
[10] Ibid., pp. 116-119. Prest refers to the participants as 'disputants'.
[11] The prominent role and relative independence of the inns made them a prime target for Catholic missionaries; a conduit, in the words of William Allen, to 'the gentry of almost all the nation': ibid., pp. 176-7, 178, 188, 203.
[12] McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 730.

religious turmoil, and the pagan origins of many an academic text secured it from the upheavals of the Reformation.[13] Beyond England's universities, there was a shared classical and biblical heritage, from which all sides could draw their examples.[14] In England, the universities' role in clerical education was one of their most important functions, and in disputation the training they offered was particularly significant. Their curriculum, 'erudite, moralistic and public spirited', was a perfect breeding ground for controversialists, combining knowledge with a grounding in ordered, persuasive discourse.[15]

But the universities' significance to public disputation is most apparent where the role of such debate in academic life is considered. Disputation was a cornerstone of any student's progress: its influence can be seen in the structure of textbooks and in student notebooks.[16] Mack has detailed the Cambridge statutes of 1570, which required BA candidates 'to dispute twice in the public schools and to respond twice in college' over their four years of study, and MA students 'to respond three times to a master, to respond twice in disputations in hall, and to declaim once'; and there were similar requirements at Oxford.[17] McConica describes 'the relentless pressure of disputation', arguing that college teaching revolved around preparation for these debates.[18] As Mordechai Feingold describes it, the format regulated '*discourse* and examination' for a student's course of study.[19] It should also be noted that while students were subjected to disputation throughout their studies, the Act at Oxford and the Cambridge Commencement – held annually – brought the practice into a more public environment.

---

[13] Ann Moss, 'Humanist Education', in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 145-6.
[14] Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 279.
[15] Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', p. 295; McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 730.
[16] Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp. 62, 67, 296.
[17] Ibid., p. 58; Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 27-8; Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', pp. 296-8, 308-310. On 'opponent' and 'respondent', see chapter 2 below.
[18] McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 710.
[19] Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1997), p. 300 (emphasis added).

These exercises continued into the seventeenth century, though by its midpoint, critics of the universities were beginning to view them as opportunities for logical wrangling, and a hindrance to truth and learning.[20] Similar views were voiced in public religious disputations in the 1620s, but the continued predominance of formal debate within the academic sphere maintained their structure and vitality.[21] As long as disputation retained its all-consuming academic role, its architecture was ingrained into educated divines, and this goes a long way toward explaining its – at times contradictory – use in the demanding realm of controversy.

Intellectual and Educational Developments

Aside from noting their disputation requirements, it remains to be shown how the universities shaped the culture of discourse and debate in early modern England, and how their influence changed across the period under discussion. Mack's outline of the skill-set taught at Oxford and Cambridge – including 'argumentation and the syllogism' and 'tactics for disputation' – provides an insight into their programmes, but it should be emphasised that the curriculum was not static.[22] Changes in teaching methods – indeed, in the manner in which knowledge and education were perceived – were constantly occurring. In the mid-sixteenth century, there had been a reaction against medieval teaching practices, fuelled by the advance of humanism; but subsequent developments were more complex, often flowing back on themselves.[23] At the most basic level, humanist ideas represented a revolt against medieval scholastic thought and argument, particularly its perception of (and reliance upon) Aristotle. More generally, it was a movement away from the potentially circuitous arts of logic towards those of literature – which in terms of discourse and debate meant an emphasis on persuasion, and the pursuit of truth through discussion, rather than strict

[20] Ibid., p. 300.
[21] See chapter 6 below.
[22] Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 295.
[23] James McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford', *The English Historical Review*, 94 (1979) p. 291.

logical forms.[24] McConica has traced the humanist advance through undergraduate reading lists, in the use of rediscovered classical works (new attitudes drew heavily on Cicero) and writers like Erasmus and Rudolph Agricola.[25] For the humanists, 'discourse' was something of a preoccupation: most explicitly, Feingold notes their consolidation of language, rhetoric *and* logic within a unified 'art of discourse', with persuasion – crucially for religious debate – as their primary collective function.[26]

This phrase, 'the art of discourse', is reminiscent of the work of another key figure in Renaissance thought – the French educational reformer and erstwhile Protestant martyr Pierre de la Ramée. The phrase was Cicero's, adopted by Ramus in an effort to improve educational practice.[27] Much like the humanists, Ramus' concern was to make education, and the subjects taught, clearer and more relevant; but although he was eager to reduce the formal aspects of logic, commentators on Ramism frequently note its similarities to medieval scholasticism.[28] Ramus' approach was more conservative than the humanists' shift in emphasis: an effort to simplify logical structures, rather than emphasise the persuasive arts; and it was this more subtle (but potentially clumsy) approach that detracted from its appeal in England.[29] Ramus' conversion from Catholicism and death in the St Bartholomew's Day massacre, his works' blend of scripture with classical writers, his methods' perceived independence from human invention and his apparent preoccupation with dichotomies all held a fascination for reformed controversialists, but his ideas did not take firm root in academia.[30] Several of the period's more prominent educators and divines (some of

[24] Martin Elsky, 'Reorganizing the Encyclopaedia: Vives and Ramus on Aristotle and the Scholastics', in Norton, *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, pp. 402-4.
[25] McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 702; David Marsh, 'Dialogue and Discussion in the Renaissance', in Norton, *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, p. 266.
[26] Feingold, 'The Humanities', p. 281.
[27] Walter J. Ong, *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge Mass., 1958), pp. 178-9.
[28] Ibid., pp. 4, 53; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 106-7.
[29] Ong, *Ramus*, p. 4.
[30] Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 108, 111. Ramus' work was translated into English in 1574, two years after the massacre. To puritans, the benefit of Ramism was that it reflected the workings of the world, removing human invention from activities like scriptural interpretation: see Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 101; Donald K. McKim, 'The Function of Ramism in William Perkins' Theology', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16 (1985), esp. pp. 513-15.

them disputants noted below) were critical of his approach: John Rainolds, a paragon of Christian humanism, was an adherent of the scholar Juan Luis Vives, and – though he praised Ramus' faith and the benefits of his work in preaching – expressed concern about a number of his ideas.[31] The reaction of John Case was similar.[32] Rainolds' pupil Daniel Featley, a student at Corpus Christi whilst early debates on Ramism were dying away in the 1600s, attacked its advocates with a self-assured metaphor worthy of any of his later disputations: they hid, he stated, in their master's shadow, for 'they could not bear the clear sunlight of science'.[33] Richard Montagu and Francis Bacon criticised Ramus' habitual abridgement, and the reaction against his use of dichotomies has been exhaustively catalogued.[34] But the impact of Ramism is perhaps best expressed by Feingold: its appeal, he argues, was short-lived among the Protestant majority in English academia, and was soon overtaken by humanism; an 'emergent mood of intellectual confidence and respect for true learning'. In this context, the relative conservatism of Ramus' reforms rendered them partially irrelevant, his beneficial ideas – such as his clear concept of systematic 'method' – being 'silently adopted'.[35]

But how, then, does Ramus have a bearing on the period's intellectual climate? And what is his relevance to public religious disputation? Disputation was, after all, a scholastic exercise, cited by Vives (and Ramus himself) as the one remaining use for scholastic forms.[36] As ostensibly a more streamlined form of scholasticism, it might seem inevitable that Ramism had an impact on the practice, at the least for its

[31] McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 307; Feingold, 'The Humanities', p. 291; McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 713; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 109. Vives' approach was to emphasise persuasive argument based on probable truth: Elsky, 'Reorganizing the Encyclopaedia', p. 403.
[32] McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 300.
[33] Bodl. MS Rawl. D. 47, f. 100; Feingold, 'The Humanities', p. 292.
[34] Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (New York, 1961), pp. 200-3; Peter Sharratt, 'Peter Ramus and the Reform of the University: the Divorce of Philosophy and Eloquence?', in Peter Sharratt (ed.), *French Renaissance Studies 1540-70: Humanism and the Encyclopedia* (Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 8-9, 15.
[35] Feingold, 'The Humanities', pp. 289-293. Ong characterised this as a 'gradual loss of identity' (Ong, *Ramus*, ch. xiii), while Morgan notes the integration of Ramism with Aristotelianism: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 235.
[36] Juan Luis Vives, *In Pseudodialecticos* (1519) and the 1543 works of Peter Ramus (*The Structure of Dialectic*, *Training in Dialectic* and *Remarks on Aristotle*), in Elsky, 'Reorganizing the Encyclopaedia', pp. 402, 405.

adherents; but given the range of criticism amongst prominent scholars and disputants, and the humanist position of men like Rainolds, this relationship ought not be overstated. Instead, Ramism should be seen as a *symptom* of the intellectual climate; and not one debilitating enough to have an immediate impact in the universities. It was an effort to improve unwieldy scholastic practices at a time when there was a growing reliance upon open discourse, and to clarify logical forms in direct competition with the notion that truth could be defended – or probable truth obtained – through fluid, rational debate. Disputation was a scholastic form; but Ramism had little effect on it, because the disputants themselves were not bound to scholasticism. Moreover, the most influential aspects of Ramism – those adopted by puritans for the lecture and pulpit – were less applicable where arguments were being directly contested.[37]

Logic and Rhetoric

In terms of the experience of public religious disputation, the period's intellectual climate is best examined not through the trends competing for academic influence, but in the common tools disputants had access to. While the performances of individual divines might show their reliance on humanist persuasion, scholastic wrangling or structured Ramist categories (to resort to contemporary stereotypes), developments in the practice itself can be identified and described more cogently through changes in logic and rhetoric.

Despite the shifting intellectual ideals of the period, formal logic retained its position in academic study and debate.[38] Indeed, it may well have been buoyed by the omnipresence of disputation in teaching and examination. Ong has made this connection: Aristotelianism thrived – and, to an extent, Ramist logic developed – partly *because* of disputation, which 'thrust... abstruse speculation into active

[37] Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 112.
[38] See, for example, Bartholomew Keckermann, *Praecognitorum Logicorum Tractatus III* (Hanau, 1606), in Feingold, 'The Humanities', p. 276.

confrontation with living and present adversaries'.[39] To take the example of the syllogism – a cornerstone of formal logic – Quirinus Breen noted that despite its 'burdensome' nature as a mode of *discourse*, in disputation it provided both adversary and audience with a clear, full description of one's argument.[40] Thus, to reach a logical conclusion, the wrangling for which scholasticism was so often condemned was not the fault of any process, but that of the user; and in addition, problems raised by its *public* application were less significant within academia. The survival of formal logic thus provides evidence of what McConica describes as an 'eclectic' culture in the universities, fuelled by competing public and academic needs.[41] This conflict is writ large in public religious debate, but the point to be emphasised here is that logic form continued to play a significant role in the universities, despite humanist concerns about its efficacy and beauty.

Although the role of logic within disputation will be considered in more detail below, the connection between the two must be explored further. Following the suggestions of Ong and Breen, it is interesting to note that critics of formal logic made exceptions when it came to structured debate. Given the period's increased focus upon clear, open discourse, and the growing public application of disputation, its retention of logic form makes the practice a curiosity, and through the seventeenth century increasingly left it open to criticism. Aesthetic concerns about the effectiveness of forms like the syllogism were joined by doubts as to their validity; and yet, formal debate continued to play a part in the major discussions of the day.[42] Here, the influence of the universities should be emphasised: disputation beyond their walls was often an imperfect reflection of the events still taking place inside, and their retention of structured logic is a prime example. The use of these techniques in so public a phenomenon as 'professional' religious debate – not to mention the printed accounts

[39] Walter J. Ong, in John Milton, *Complete Prose Works*, vol. 8, ed. Maurice Kelly (New Haven and London, 1982), p. 161.
[40] Quirinus Breen, 'John Calvin and the Rhetorical Tradition', *Church History*, 26 (1957), pp. 4, 14.
[41] McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 296.
[42] H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, vol. 1 (Cambridge Mass., 1934), pp. 56-7; Breen, 'John Calvin', pp. 4, 6; Feingold, 'The Humanities', p. 277.

that often followed – can be explained, in part, through their perceived weight and precision; but it was also encouraged by their roots in academic custom. Where 'disputation', in the proper sense, was concerned, they were simply part of the package.

While the use of logical structures thus remained a relative constant, the same cannot be said of rhetoric. Developments in this topic were occurring over and above the humanists' emphasis on persuasion, and doing so in a manner that sheds light on the changing culture of discourse. In 1961, Wilbur Samuel Howell illustrated one such movement with reference to a key figure in Elizabethan controversy: in the 1540s, whilst serving as praelector in humanities and rhetoric at Corpus Christi, Oxford, John Jewel delivered an oration attacking what he saw to be the new meaning of rhetoric: that speech be constructed in a manner 'systematically opposed to ordinary habits of communication.'[43]

> For if in speaking we seek... that we may be understood by others with whom we deal, who can discover a better mode of speech than to speak intelligibly, simply, and clearly? What need of art? What need of childish ornaments? ... Truth, indeed, is clear and simple; it has small need of the armament of the tongue or of eloquence. If it is perspicuous and plain, it has enough support in itself; it does not require flowers of artful speech.[44]

This 'outburst' reflects a minority opinion, and with the advance of humanism it would remain so for some time.[45] But Jewel was not the sole example; and humanism

[43] Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric*, p. 123.
[44] John Jewel, *Oratio contra Rhetoricam*, in Hoyt H. Hudson, 'Jewel's Oration against Rhetoric: a Translation', *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 14 (1928), pp. 381-2; Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric*, p. 123.
[45] Brian Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford, 1988), p. 255.

itself was not concerned exclusively with style. Already, its emphasis on rhetoric above Aristotelian logic showed a desire to be closer to 'the rhythms of speech.'[46]

The humanists' rediscovery of a great many classical texts had placed a new emphasis on stylised rhetorical figures; but with it came an increased focus on practical application – the propriety of rhetoric for specific *forms* of discourse.[47] Brian Vickers argues that this emphasis on practicality was 'the most distinctive feature' of the re-introduction of classical works, noting the importance humanists placed on rhetoric's 'role in society'.[48] In counterpoint to Jewel, Vives claimed – with characteristic moral focus – that '[nothing is] more advantageous to human society than well-formed and well-developed language'.[49] The debate was over what, precisely, 'well-formed' meant.

Lending immediacy to the humanists' practical and moral imperatives, and vital to the purpose of public religious disputation, was a new awareness of the will, and of the emotional power rhetoricians could wield. As Vives put it in the 1530s:

> in man the highest law and government are at the disposal of will. To the will, reason and judgement are assigned as *counsellors*, and the emotions are its torches. Moreover, the emotions of the mind are enflamed by the sparks of speech. So, too, the reason is impelled and moved by speech. Hence it comes to pass that, in the whole kingdom of the activities of man, speech holds in its possession a mighty strength which it continually manifests.[50]

---

[46] Virginia Cox, *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 102.
[47] Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric*, pp. 254-5.
[48] Ibid., pp. 270-1.
[49] Ibid., pp. 274-5.
[50] Juan Luis Vives, *On Education: a Translation of the De Tradendis Disciplinis*, ed. F. Watson (Toronto, 1971), p. 180, in Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric*, p. 277 (emphasis added).

This offers more than a simple justification for the humanists' emphasis on rhetoric: it gives an explanation, from one perspective, of the period's culture of discourse. Vives is describing personal judgement as a microcosm of discourse – 'the whole kingdom of the activities of man' – and doing so in terms as familiar to students of religious and political history as to those examining Renaissance oratory. In this period, rhetoric was adapting through social and political use, and its application in religious debate was changing along similar lines.[51]

The Universities in Religious Discourse

The growth of Renaissance humanism was not the only development occurring in this period. Indeed, the rejection of Aristotle and medieval scholasticism has been joined or replaced by educational historians with an emphasis on their survival, beside, or combined with, humanist approaches.[52] Neither mode of thought was simple enough for the two to have been mutually exclusive, and each informed and influenced the other. McConica has examined the survival of Aristotle in university teaching, his work on Tudor Oxford building up a detailed image of the 'eclectic' environment in which divines were educated – an environment with persistent ties to medieval precedents.[53] This refinement was also apparent in continental schools.[54]

The impact of these institutions on the culture of discourse and climate of controversy in England cannot, however, be expressed in purely theoretical or educational terms. Far from being an isolated environment, the universities were closely tied to political institutions, and naturally engaged with religious disputes. In 1596, Case described Oxford and Cambridge as 'the eyes of the state and church', and although this was prescriptive more than a comment on reality, it does indicate the

[51] Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric*, p. 65.
[52] McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 702; B. G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison, 1969), pp. 127-8. John Morgan also traces the survival of Aristotelianism, citing Rainolds as an example: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 106.
[53] McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', pp. 292-3, 296-8; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 228.
[54] Armstrong, *Calvinism*, pp. 1-2, 127, 136-139.

perceived intensity of the connection.[55] Royal counsellors were often named chancellor to one of the universities (in the reign of Elizabeth, these included the Earl of Leicester and Sir Christopher Hatton at Oxford, and William Cecil at Cambridge), and there are frequent instances of the monarch or Privy Councillors exerting control over one or both institutions.[56] On Oxford, S. L. Greenslade has detailed the methods of control available to the state, up to the statutory changes made with each phase of the Tudor succession.[57] The reason for this need for control is clear: Jennifer Loach notes a complaint from the Council in 1581 that 'most of the seminarie Priests which at this present disturbe this Churche have ben heretofore schollers of [Oxford]', although Penry Williams argues that by this time 'the battle against the Catholics' in the universities 'had been won'.[58]

The influence of these institutions must, therefore, be considered on several fronts. In a real and direct way, they shaped the tones and technicalities of contemporary discourse; but they also formed part of its broader context. As noted above, they were a dynamic intellectual environment, in which all manner of topics – including the most important issues of the day – were confronted. The government's need to keep watch over them was reflective of their dual role in the culture of discourse: as a training ground for officials, educators and clergymen, and as a setting for educated discussion; a semi-public amphitheatre in which arguments, including religious controversies, were played out.[59] Thus, many of the conditions informing public religious disputation, beyond the format's home in academia, can be traced

[55] McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 312; Moss, 'Humanist Education', p. 153.
[56] Penry Williams, 'Elizabethan Oxford: State, Church and University', in McConica, *The History of the University of Oxford*, pp. 404, 440; Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, p. 30. This can be seen in Cecil's action against lectures by Thomas Cartwright, noted in Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 49; in Leicester's measures against Catholicism, in Williams, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 413; and in Elizabeth's refusal to grant Rainolds the presidency of Corpus Christi, in Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 36-37. Rainolds' debate account *The Summe of the Conference betwene John Rainolds and John Hart* (London, 1584) is dedicated to Leicester in his capacity as Chancellor of Oxford (pp. 3, 6). There was a tightening of conformity in the seventeenth century: Nicholas Tyacke, 'Religious Controversy', in Tyacke, *The History of the University of Oxford*, esp. p. 581.
[57] Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', p. 325.
[58] Jennifer Loach, 'Reformation Controversies', in McConica, *The History of the University of Oxford*, p. 378; Williams, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 414.
[59] Shuger describes academic disputations as a 'larval' public sphere: Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', pp. 333-4.

through these institutions; from the advance of humanist persuasion and the survival of formal logic to the political immediacy of post-Reformation theology. The universities provided public religious disputation with theory and technique, but also with energy and life: the buildings in which John Rainolds disputed still harboured memories of the Marian trials.[60]

Literary Discourse

Finally, some mention should be made of the literary manifestations of the period's culture of discourse; specifically, the fictional dialogue. The form will be discussed further in relation to disputation accounts, as there are fascinating parallels to be drawn between the two; but here, its popularity should be noted.[61] As C. J. R. Armstrong argues, following Carolus Sigonius' *De Dialogo* of 1562, its ascendancy must be considered in relation to prevailing intellectual modes.[62] Forms of dialogue had been produced through the medieval period, the most basic religious manifestation being the catechism (as Ian Green observes, an oral exercise written up for greater distribution and effect).[63] But humanists latched on to the classical dialogue – a trend reflected in the increased variety and volume of such works in the sixteenth century.[64] Virginia Cox, in considering the popularity of the Renaissance dialogue, makes an intriguing point in suggesting that 'whenever any age adopts on a wide scale a form which so explicitly 'stages' the act of communication, it is because that act has,

[60] See chapter 3 below.
[61] Recently, Antoinina Bevan Zlatar has considered Elizabethan polemical dialogues from an historical and literary angle, placing them in a similar environment to that noted here, and briefly comparing the 'most serious' to what she calls 'transcriptions of public disputations': Antoinina Bevan Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (Oxford, 2011), esp. pp. 1-8, 15-16, 19.
[62] Sigonio observed: 'Because the disputation is a rational investigation conducted among learned men by means of question and answer... the ancients maintained that dialogues should be composed of questions and answers and thus come under the competence of dialectic'. *De Dialogo* (Venice, 1562), cited in C. J. R. Armstrong, 'The Dialectical Road to Truth: the Dialogue', in Sharratt, *French Renaissance Studies*, p. 37.
[63] Ian Green, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530-1740* (Oxford, 1996), p. 8. Green describes 'catechism' itself as 'a whole range of overlapping and interlocking activities': ibid., pp. 4-5.
[64] McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue', p. 357.

for some reason, come to be perceived as problematic', an argument borne out here by the *types* of material presented in this manner.[65] A large number of religious works were written in this form – demonstrating, when Cox's argument is extended, the *need* for religious discourse in this period of contested, starkly theoretical ideas.[66] This is a simplification. But although R. R. McCutcheon is quick to separate fictional dialogues ('leisurely and amicable') from public disputation ('regulated and antagonistic'), it is the contention of this thesis that, where religion was concerned, the same ideas and needs fuelled both forms.[67] Francis Savage urged the latter mode *within* an instance of the former.[68] Moreover, the popularity of the dialogue, its mechanics and its use for more than religious instruction are of great interest here, as the genre does for disputation accounts what other types of debate have for the disputations themselves: call attention to language, form and techniques, and tie them to something more fundamental than pamphlet polemic.

Thus, both public religious disputation and accounts thereof can be placed in a wider context than their current historiography permits. In either form, these events are more than instances of academic practice or religious polemic: they emerged from a culture of discourse that was being continually adapted and re-thought as institutions and individuals tried to perfect their arguments and address an increasingly engaged public. This last may be the most important point to make: Howell observed the contemporary perception of rhetoric as 'the theory of communication between the

[65] Cox, *Renaissance Dialogue*, p. 7.
[66] Savage's *Conference Betwixt a Mother* is offered as an archetypal example of Protestant enthusiasm for dialogue by Puterbaugh. This enthusiasm can also be seen in the success of Arthur Dent's *Plaine-Mans Pathway to Heaven* (1601), 'set forth Dialogue-wise, for the better understanding of the simple': Arthur Dent, *The P[l]ain-Mans Path-way to Heaven* (London, 1654); ODNB Dent, Arthur. In 1612, the puritan Robert Hill re-wrote *A Golden Chaine*, William Perkins' work on predestination, as a catechism, in the hope of giving 'much light unto it & [causing] it to be read with greater delight': William Perkins, *A Golden Chaine* (London, 1612), sig. ¶2^{v}; J. F. Merritt, 'The Pastoral Tightrope: a Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London', in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 154.
[67] McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue', p. 357.
[68] Francis Savage, *Conference Betwixt a Mother*, pp. 113-121.

learned and the lay world or between expert and layman', in contrast to the learned mode of formal logic, and it is from attitudes like this that one might posit the spread of education as a factor *behind* the period's concern with discourse.[69] Like the humanists' move towards rhetoric, it cannot be seen as an isolated or causal phenomenon: these ideas were *re*actions to changing demands upon the intellectual world. Equally, changes in public religious disputation were not a predictable expression of religious divisions; they were a result of intellectual ideals and a growing popular consciousness *reacting* to religious divisions. The distinction is a subtle one, but vitally important.

Religious Controversy: Written Polemic

These observations can now be applied to religious polemic. Though frequently depicted (and studied) *en masse*, controversy took many forms, from pamphlets and longer works to pulpit sermonising and disputation. In some cases, arguments were pursued in letter exchanges.[70] All of these activities can, of course, be described as manifestations of discourse; and this is particularly true given the personal nature of writing in this period. As can be seen in counsel, the classical and Renaissance description of writing as an *active* endeavour was crucial to the relationship between controversy and discourse.[71] In this period, writing was moving further into a 'public' sphere, but retained its language of direct interaction; and thus *all* polemic should be examined in discursive terms. The question is how new modes of argument and expression made their presence felt in this field. It has been suggested that the prevalence of controversy can be attributed, in part, to the intellectual climate in which it was produced, and this statement can now be expanded upon.

[69] Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric*, pp. 3-4.
[70] A consistory disagreement between Jerome Beale and Samuel Ward in the late 1620s was expanded in letters between the two: Bodl. MS Tanner 71, ff. 10-11, 15; 72, f. 314; 80, f. 143.
[71] Cox, *Renaissance Dialogue*, pp. 34, 40.

First, a good portion of the tone and direction of controversy stemmed from the moral dichotomies of the Renaissance. The humanists' moral emphasis, combined with developing forms of argument (and the divisions inherent in post-Reformation clerical life) encouraged a world in which merit was if not defined, at least *explained* in opposition to one's adversaries. With the rest of Europe, England had developed an epideictic literary culture, habitually employing the language of praise and blame. Renaissance thought was preoccupied with the position of humanity between clear positive and negative characteristics, and with this came a tendency to use absolute labels.[72] When a society united by this mode of thought and expression was divided on a topic as vital as religion, a storm of polemical attack and counter-attack was almost inevitable. Again, there are deeper trends than simply the religious at work – the influence of dichotomy and epideictic language was intimately connected with the oppositional self-image of the reformed churches.

It is also possible to trace specific academic forms in written controversy. Criticism of an opponent's logical errors was a common feature in polemic: Peter Lake, in discussing the clash between Archbishop Whitgift and the puritan Thomas Cartwright in the 1590s (rivals at Cambridge, now risen to be controversial opponents) identifies 'logic and learning' as a point of agreement. Both were defending 'their standing as men of learning and scholarship', and logical inconsistencies were as open to attack as 'incorrect' theology. Again, in Lake's estimation, this resulted from the prevalence of disputation in the universities, combined with a reliance upon biblical truth.[73] Pamphlet polemic also exhibited aspects of disputation itself; replies to opposing works were often presented in an approximation of dialogue form,

[72] Baxter Hathaway, *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy* (Ithica, NY, 1963), p. 337n; Brian Vickers, 'Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance', *New Literary History*, 14 (1983), p. 509. Vickers defends this convincingly through literary works, and the use of such dualities was natural to polemic.

[73] Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought* (London, 1988), pp. 14-15. The protagonists were 'educated divines who accepted the standards of argument and proof used in the universities for academic disputation.' Morgan places this logical dispute in a more precise point of competition, in which puritan attitudes toward learning were taken to mean ineptitude: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 67-9.

reproducing their opponents' arguments for confutation. Thus, not only was formal, public disputation a unique phenomenon; its techniques actually *informed* controversial writing. In describing the disputes of her own period of interest, Hughes offers a similar point:

> These incidents remind us that the pamphlets and other sources used by modern scholars to discuss the issues that divided English Protestants after 1640 were not themselves the products of detached, study-based academic debate... it is important that many pamphlet-controversies had their origins in direct physical confrontations and debates between adherents of different religious positions.[74]

The relative neglect of public disputation in prior work on religious controversy thus seems inexplicable. Controversy reflected the period's culture of discourse as much as its religious divisions, and in its ties with disputation – direct and, through academic training, incidental –the field is *explicitly* rooted in that former trend.

One aspect of the intellectual climate remains to be considered: the conflict between human learning and faith. Mack notes a 'distrust' of pagan culture among Christian thinkers, further describing a conflict between the social mobility provided by education and the godly emphasis on a predestined 'elite'.[75] These models are somewhat heavy-handed, particularly given the enthusiasm for pre-Christian authorities and forms shown by reformed disputants, but there is some truth in them. John Morgan traced the debate back to the Church Fathers: Augustine stood for the use of learning in defending the church, while Tertullian argued for its rejection, as damaging to faith.[76] Expanding on these positions, Thomas More argued that reason was not alone enough for scriptural interpretation, and Erasmus elevated 'belief and

[74] Hughes, 'Public Disputations', p. 28.
[75] Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 253.
[76] Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 41.

inspiration' in preaching.[77] These positions continued to develop through the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and can be traced in accounts of disputation and controversy more generally. When William Charke and Meredith Hanmer agreed in principle to engage Campion in debate in 1580, all sides insisted that the arguments eschew 'naturall and morall reason... great nourses of Atheisme and heresie'; and William Whitaker – again writing in opposition to Campion – rejected reason as a sole basis for determining religious questions.[78] These attitudes were not always followed, certainly by the disputations' evidence, but any use of logical dexterity in controversy left itself open to such criticism – a weakness frequently exploited in public debate.

Beyond an acceptance of its limitations, positions on the role and efficacy of learning varied with theological standpoint. The humanists elevated classical learning and ideals as the foundation of *most* human endeavour, but as the period progressed this involved a separation of learning from religion. For the godly, any emphasis on human ability was qualified by the Calvinist conception of justification: knowledge and understanding were necessary, but faith came by revelation. Thus, learning and reason were vital *preparatory* and *defensive* tools, but their role in religious debate remained in doubt.[79] Remarkably, this situation is qualified by Morgan with reference to educational influences, disputation again offering the best example. Reason was not wholly rejected by reformers, even for interpreting scripture, partly because of their academic training: they had a clear set of tools for understanding and argument, and were not prepared to abandon them.[80] Thus, as the disputations considered here demonstrate, the question of learning in controversy often became one of nuance and polemic: as Morgan notes, puritans 'hammered at those who (they believed) had

[77] McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue', p. 381, citing Thomas M. C. Lawler et al. (eds), *The Complete Works of Thomas More*, vol. 6, part 1 (New Haven, 1981), p. 175; Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 253.
[78] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 130; Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, pp. 94-5. John Case, however, argued for the necessity of reason in confronting opponents: McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 313.
[79] Morgan, *Godly Learning*, esp. pp. 23, 40, 41-2.
[80] Ibid., p. 49.

attempted to reduce religion to mere intellectual endeavour'.[81] In religious argument, the role of human learning and reason ultimately came down to faith: they were potent defensive tools when appropriated to show the truth of one's own position, but dangerous artifice in the hands of one's adversaries.[82]

Religious Controversy: Public Disputation

It is now possible to look directly at public religious disputation. Although the phrase itself still needs to be clarified, we must first consider attitudes toward all religious debate. Before these events can be placed in context, we must pursue the concerns above, and ask how such face-to-face encounters were possible in post-Reformation England. For the clearest opening discussion of these questions, we must return to Thomas More. McCutcheon describes his *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* as 'a sort of moot disputation', but notes that More – despite his humanist allegiance to discourse – advised moderation when dealing with religious topics.[83] Heresy, from More's position, undermined discourse. The *Dialogue* argues that debate is only necessary where doctrine is 'doutfull and ambyguouse': where self-evident truth is concerned, supporting arguments seem 'mystrustfull and waveryng', and opposing it is by definition a lost cause.[84] This issue plagued many public disputations, often resulting in a contested outcome or stalemate – though historical and doctrinal arguments were possible, the participants were at odds in their most basic assumptions. Thus, as McCutcheon describes it, the purpose of a dispute 'comes to seem psychological... less to establish consensus than to keep identities separate', a view than can be tied to

[81] Ibid., p. 50.
[82] Thus Tobie Matthew could speak of the efficacy of conference, while asserting 'I must not hang my soul upon the cunning or craft of a disputer': Matthew, *True Historical Relation*, pp. 26, 62. Rainolds lays out the distinction in recounting his debate with Hart: 'humane artes, wherin the Philosophers have seene many sparkles of the truth of God by the light of reason, are profitable instruments to set forth the truth, so farre as they have peace, not warre, with Gods worde.' Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 255.
[83] McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue', p. 375; see Cox, *Renaissance Dialogue*, p. 62.
[84] More, *Complete Works*, pp. 345-6; McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue', p. 358 (also note pp. 362, 367).

critiques (with hindsight) of polemic.[85] To an extent, then, it can be argued that controversial religion undermined the humanist belief in discourse: divines were, for the most part, defending absolute (rather than seeking probable) truth. But to dismiss the belief entirely would be to overlook the conflicting needs and nature of faith, and the *purpose* of debate as perceived – and stated – by contemporaries.

More subversive than the practicalities of debate were the dangers of interaction with heretics, which might confer legitimacy or – worse – risk conversion.[86] Separation was urged by Protestant writers, but such advice could not always be adhered to. Indeed, it is somewhat contradictory in the context of constructing a *reformed* identity.[87] On the Catholic side, there were similar warnings against public discussion; but here Questier finds that exceptions were made for priests, who 'might confer because the conference would seem, on account of their learning, to be a *disputation*'.[88] Moreover, Questier's account of the Catholic viewpoint, with McCoog's work on Jesuit training and a comparable Protestant attitude, suggests that all were aware of the imperatives in controversy noted above.[89] Direct confrontation was undoubtedly seen as a danger; but for learned divines it was a *necessary* one. Thus, while a comparison of *outward* caution with the prevalence of cross-confessional disputation paints a contradictory picture, the reality appears to have been one of intelligent moderation: care and learning were required; with an awareness of one's opponents, and – above all else – faith. It should also be remembered that these efforts were seen to have benefits as well as dangers.

It has now become vital to offer a clear definition of the term 'disputation', to place these debates more precisely in context, and consider them in relation to events that might, on the surface, appear similar. Despite the linguistic vagueness of both contemporary accounts and more recent works, a precise delineation of the word will

[85] McCutcheon, 'Heresy and Dialogue', pp. 360-1.
[86] Ibid., pp. 359-1.
[87] Puterbaugh, '"Your selfe be judge and answer your selfe"', p. 423.
[88] Ibid., p. 422; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 155 (emphasis added), 179.
[89] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 122. On Jesuit training, see chapter 3 below.

be necessary to establish the boundaries of this study. 'Disputation' benefits in this regard from its academic connections: though its rules and structures could vary beyond university walls, the academic form offers a clear definition within that context.[90] A degree of caution must, however, be observed when the term is encountered in contemporary works, as there are numerous instances of it being applied to unstructured debate. Even John Ley, whose 1658 *Discourse of Disputations* gives a catalogue of formal encounters (and whose definition will be referenced below), thought fit to include the Devil's temptation of Christ in Matthew 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-13 as an example of the practice – an attitude that, whilst understandable, dramatically broadens the word's contemporary definition.[91] With this in mind, however, 'disputation' will henceforth be used as a comparatively precise term, for encounters that, in their form and language, resembled the disputants' academic experiences. As the next chapter will demonstrate, the academic definition can, for these events, be viewed as an archetype or ideal.

The word 'conference' must also be considered. It maintained something in the region of five definitions in this period, one of which was synonymous with formal disputation. It was substituted for the latter in the prefaces and titles of many debate accounts; conceivably because it was thought to appeal to a wider audience.[92] Beyond this, there were 'conferences' that reflect modern usage of the term (administrative and political meetings, and academic interactions without formal debate), and encounters that comprised little more than private conversations. The word is not specific enough, therefore, to be used as a defining term for these events: even recent historians have been forced, by the vagueness of their material, to offer definitions so

[90] Green describes these events as 'public discussions in which debatable subjects were cast into the form of questions which then could be handled according to Aristotelian dialectical procedures': Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, p. 27. Further detail is given in chapter 2 below.
[91] Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 34; see chapter 2 below.
[92] The Protestant account of the first debate with Campion, written by Alexander Nowell and William Day, is entitled *A True Report of the Disputation or Rather Private Conference had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Jesuite* (London, 1583).

broad as to be meaningless for a detailed study.[93] Its use here is further complicated by the existence of those conferences *including*, but not equal to, disputation: Hampton Court, for example, consisted of formal debate interspersed with other types of encounter.[94] Of course, any use of 'conference' in this period has an additional degree of complication in its puritan associations: beyond the exchanges included in their prophesyings and combination lectures, puritans expanded the term to cover their organisational groupings, as described by Collinson.[95] Thus, any precise use of 'conference' was long ago claimed by historians of the puritan movement, and here the term can never be more than a catch-all for public disputations and a multitude of comparable occurrences.

The prophesyings are themselves an interesting case, and their relationship with the practice of disputation must be examined before lines can be drawn and events considered for inclusion here. Their format could vary considerably, but it is worth noting the observation of John Scory, a Marian exile who experienced them on the continent: 'I thought myself... to have been in the divinity disputations at the Commencement time in Cambridge'.[96] Though some were given to sermons or congregational discussion, prophesyings could take on a form reminiscent of disputation, or include such debate as part of their programme. Collinson, with John Craig and Brett Usher, notes that such events often concluded with 'private conference among the ministers', sometimes – as could happen with disputation – over dinner.[97] This emphasis on *private* conference should also be considered. Before the 1570s, prophesyings and related exercises in England were wholly clerical, in a deliberate

[93] For example, Joseph Puterbaugh: 'I use the term "conference" here... to denote discussions and debates (also known as "prophesyings" or "exercises") about crucial issues of doctrine, discipline, and ecclesiastical order.' Puterbaugh, '"Your selfe be judge and answer your selfe"', p. 421n.
[94] See chapter 5 below.
[95] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, esp. pp. 177-9. See Patrick Collinson, John Craig and Brett Usher (eds), *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St Edmunds 1582-1590* (Bury St Edmunds, 2003), *passim*.
[96] John Scory, in Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 169.
[97] Collinson, Craig and Usher, *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, p. xxvii; Daniel Featley, *The Grand Sacrilege of the Church of Rome* (London, 1630), from p. 233.

avoidance of debate 'before the unlearned'.[98] But as this changed, a key difference emerged between these events and public disputation. Whilst many disputations – particularly in Elizabeth's reign – were sanctioned by the state, the prophesyings were seen as potentially subversive. Collinson argues that 'the popular element was always the Achilles heel' of these events; but in public religious disputation – arranged to persuade and edify, in the face of *certain* error – the public element was, for those in power, the *point*.[99]

The puritans' congregational debates raise a more basic question of definition. It was noted above that some defined 'disputation' as debate between clerical participants; but how, then, do we classify those occasions where a minister was questioned by his congregation? In addition, if the criterion of academic form is too rigidly adhered to, might useful events be overlooked? It could be argued that there is no great difference between spontaneous clerical disputations and debate with or between laymen: at a 1626 encounter between Featley and the Jesuit Thomas Everard, the first question was posed by their host, Viscountess Falkland; and in 1582, Whitgift was ordered to engage lay recusants in conference to publicly answer their concerns (this reflecting an Episcopal duty formalised in the 1570s). Hughes, meanwhile, included clerical *and* lay encounters in her work on seventeenth-century disputation.[100]

Public religious debates can never be wholly separated from comparable events, any more than their accounts can be removed from the category of pamphlet polemic. Methods blurred between different types of engagement, and adapted to suit immediate needs. Here, however, 'disputation' will be defined by two attributes, following contemporary distinctions: the learned or clerical status of the participants, and – to a lesser extent – the format observed. Other types of encounter will be noted,

[98] John Hooper, *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper: Together with His Letters and Other Pieces*, ed. Charles Nevinson (Cambridge, 1852), p. 132, in Collinson, Craig and Usher, *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, p. xxix.
[99] Ibid., p. xxix.
[100] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, pp. 237-240; Puterbaugh, '"Your selfe be judge and answer your selfe"', p. 424; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 151-2; Hughes, 'Pulpit Guarded', pp. 31-50.

but only in relation to this central block. The goal of this thesis is not to reconsider puritan organisations, or to assess attitudes toward *all* religious discourse in England. Instead, the intention is to consider one *type* of encounter, recognised by contemporaries as defined and unique. Despite the problems of definition that need to be taken into account, it is the contention of this study that a clear type of event can be identified with the term 'public religious disputation'.

The aim of this thesis is to consider public or 'professional' religious disputation from a new direction: as an example of combined intellectual and ideological discourse, in a culture of (relatively) open debate. These events were more than just the sum of their parts, academic and controversial; they are indicative of changing perceptions of discourse, and demonstrate new demands upon the intellectual world, occasioned as much by the Renaissance as by the Reformation. With this in mind, the chapters below will examine public religious disputation in detail; concentrating first upon the technical attributes of the academic form.

Chapter Two: The Disputation Process

'For what was the custome of Oxford in this kinde to us... who had by joynt consent set downe an other order to be held in this disputation?'[1]

Before embarking on a fully contextualised study of public religious disputation, it is necessary to introduce the mechanics of the practice; to elucidate further the categorisations above, and to detail the influence of academic convention. For those disputing beyond the universities' purview, the rules of disputation were not written in stone (although reports of public debate often approximate that conception). Rather, it was an intellectual instrument, to be employed as the occasion demanded. Even within academia, as Debora Shuger notes, it was 'a format that university men used in their dorms or at dinner to play and wrestle with ideas', as well as a staple of formal examination.[2] The intention here is not, therefore, to select from the wider world of controversy events that conform to the academic structure; rather, it is to trace the adaptation of that structure in the context of public religious debate. Noting the contemporary propensity for religious conference, James Holleran states that 'the academic way at this time was also the way of the world'; but in fact, the use of *formal* disputation in this field was not without its difficulties and divergences – or, indeed, some surprising continuities.[3]

The academic process has been examined before. In the 1950s, William Costello used accounts and statutes to detail seventeenth-century disputation at Cambridge, emphasising its elements of ritual and technique.[4] More recently, Shuger – in discussing religious controversy *within* academic disputation – has given a clear outline of the form's use at Oxford, drawing on further contemporary accounts,

[1] Daniel Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded* (London, 1638), p. 37.
[2] Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', p. 316.
[3] James V. Holleran, *A Jesuit Challenge: Edmund Campion's Debates at the Tower of London* (New York, 1999), p. 27.
[4] 'To the twentieth century, the disputation is as exotic a performance as a bullfight to a non-Spaniard. The manoeuvres of the disputants were as technical as the veronica and half-veronica; the audience was as critically appreciative...': Costello, *Scholastic Curriculum*, pp. 14-31, at p. 15.

alongside the work of Costello and Mark Curtis.[5] Those engaging with the practice more tangentially, however, content themselves with an outline of the fundamentals, typically describing the roles taken, the order for debate, and the choice of topic or question.[6] As the more detailed studies – and contemporary sources – demonstrate, there is a great deal more to be said about the process, but these elements are a good starting point. Broadly speaking, disputation proceeded along the following lines: a respondent, selecting or being given a question, would make an opening statement, before defending their position against one or more opponents, who urged arguments and authorities to challenge their reasoning. A moderator would then summarise, clarifying where necessary, before offering a conclusion.[7] Although the precise rituals and etiquette varied between levels and institutions, all formal disputation followed this pattern; and through it we can begin to trace its application in 'professional' religious debate.[8] What is remarkable is the extent to which this process can be reconstructed from accounts of public, controversial encounters. Although detailed sources exist for academic disputation, accounts of public religious debate form the central body of evidence for the observations to follow.[9]

[5] Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', esp. pp. 314, 316-320, 337-46; Mark H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642* (Oxford, 1959), esp. pp. 88-9.
[6] Hughes, 'Pulpit Guarded', p. 35; *idem*, 'The Meanings of Religious Polemic', in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston Mass., 1993), p. 209; Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp. 58-9.
[7] Hughes, 'Pulpit Guarded', p. 35, and 'Meanings of Religious Polemic', p. 209; Shuger: 'St. Mary the Virgin', p. 316; Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp. 58-9; Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, p. 88.
[8] On the Cambridge process, see Costello, *Scholastic Curriculum*, pp. 14-31. Curtis outlines differences between levels; citing undergraduate debates (where the moderator could intervene) and the Act and Commencement disputations as the extremes: Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, pp. 88-9.
[9] For an introduction to the sources available, see Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', p. 314. Extracts from several of these (accounts of Elizabeth's 1566 Oxford visit by John Bereblock and Nicholas Robinson, from the Latin in Charles Plummer, *Elizabethan Oxford* (1887), and John Overall's account of a Commencement debate, from Archibald Campbell, *The Doctrines of a Middle State between Death and the Resurrection* (1731)) are printed by Shuger, pp. 337-46. Costello's sources include notes from John Buck, in George Peacock, *Observations upon the Statutes of the University of Cambridge* (1841).

The Fundamentals: Opponent, Respondent, Moderator and Question

In the universities, the central roles (opponent and respondent) were to be strictly adhered to – an insistence mirrored in 'professional' encounters. In the 1620s, the minister George Walker reports offering adversaries their choice of role – as he told the Jesuit John Percy in 1623: 'If you be pleased to oppose any speciall article of our faith, I will defend it, or if you will take upon you to answer, I will prove against you...'; and a similar (though at times less equitable) adherence to them can be seen throughout the period.[10] Daniel Featley emphasised equality in the roles, and showed firm allegiance to their characteristics, although several of his debates were cut short before his turn at responding came.[11] Some accounts are, it must be said, more concerned with highlighting the roles than others. The radical Protestant divine John Field, in reporting the debates staged with Campion in 1581, makes frequent, explicit reference to them; as do Walker, Featley and others in the seventeenth century; but some events – such as John Rainolds' 1582 debate with Hart – are recounted with no clear mention of 'opponent' or 'respondent'.[12] Even where it is not expressly stated, however, an awareness of the academic format remains, and the roles can be identified by their respective attributes. In Rainolds' account of this same debate, the burden of proof shifts back and forth with some regularity. Although the respondents' points are uncharacteristically detailed and the exchanges more fluid, Hart and the rising Oxford luminary Rainolds are clearly described as following an adaptation of the formal process.[13]

More than just an order for proceeding, the roles were markedly different, requiring different skills, and each had benefits and limitations. As the party charged

[10] George Walker, *The Summe of a Disputation* (London, 1624), sig. A3^{v}; *idem*, *Fishers Folly Unfolded: or The Vaunting Jesuites Vanity* (London, 1624), p. 9. Mack cites Peter Martyr's 1549 disputations on the Eucharist as an instance which 'does not illustrate the firm separation of roles... traditional accounts of disputation would lead us to suspect': Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 60. But here, they are still distinct; blurred only in the length and frequency of the disputants' turns: see, for example, Bodl. MS Add. C.197, ff. 1^{r}, 2^{r}, 3^{r}.
[11] Featley, *Appendix*, pp. 55, 86, 92; *idem*, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 271.
[12] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, *passim.*
[13] See chapter 4 below.

with introducing arguments, the opponent could naturally direct the course of a debate, and might thus assume a position of authority; but, as Campion was informed in 1581, 'If your cause were good and your skill great, you might make it harder to reply [oppose], then to answere [respond]. For the answerer may with a worde deny the proposition, and so, soone take from the replyer all his weapons.'[14] The roles were not, however, truly balanced; nor were they adhered to simply for custom's sake. They were used tactically: to demonstrate ability and respect for the form, and to control an adversary's level of involvement. As Featley reminds one opponent, '[the] respondent... is not to proove, but to hold and maintaine his own grounds against contrarie oppositions': a means of escape here, but also a shield against extensive answers.[15] Among Campion's restraints in 1581 was a restriction to the respondent's role, which allowed his adversaries to control topic, content, and methods of proceeding; not to mention the extent of his contribution.[16] Exploitation of the roles was not, however, limited to prison debates; and so pronounced were the differences between them in their potential impact on a disputation that when applied with relative freedom they could result in remarkable shifts in the balance of power. The most significant example is an account of a 1584 debate at Lambeth, in which Archbishop Whitgift responds against two puritans, Thomas Sparke and Walter Travers.[17] Here, Whitgift is placed in an astonishingly restricted position, and his Episcopal authority is directly challenged by the *procedural* authority of his opponents.[18]

The main roles are thus an intriguing point of continuity between academic and public religious disputation; but in other fundamental aspects the differences are more apparent. The moderator was a more dispensable presence, often displaced,

[14] John Field, *The Three Last Dayes Conferences* (London, 1583), sig. Ff.i^{v}. The designations of the roles vary. The author of one 1632 account describes them as to 'dispute' and 'defend' – an indication of the opponent's control and the respondent's task of holding ground: S. E., *The Conference Mentioned By Doctour Featly in the End of His Sacrilege* (Douai, 1632), p. 10.
[15] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 271.
[16] Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 11^{r}. More generally, see Field, *Three Last Dayes*, *passim*.
[17] BL. Add. MS 48064, ff. 49^{r}-63^{r}.
[18] See chapter 4 below. I owe this observation and its emphasis, in part, to Peter Lake.

through context and purpose, by the audience, a doubting or presiding individual, or a more imposing source of authority. Again, the Campion debates provide an excellent example: at one, Field reports that William Fulke – one of the opponents – called for a moderator from the audience; and that when none volunteered the lieutenant of the Tower, Owen Hopton, stepped into the role; having once taken it up by default.[19] Thus, the arbiter of good practice was an individual who at the first debate had given a *first-hand* account of the respondent's time at the rack.[20] When James I took part in controversial debate (at Hampton Court, and before the Countess of Buckingham in 1622), his royal presence, combined with his own enthusiasm for disputation, transformed the part into a restrictive blend of moderator, disputant and ultimate authority – a tragic irony that will be discussed in later chapters.[21]

More often, however, the moderator is omitted entirely (as in the case of Rainolds and Hart), or the role passes to all or part of the assembled company. The latter is particularly true of seventeenth-century debates, occasioned by doubting individuals. Here, departure from the academic practice reflects purpose: a mark of its use in more immediate surroundings. By his own account of his disputation with Percy, Walker told the Jesuit: 'these hearers shall judge of the forme and carriage of our disputation, and to whom the victory doth belong.'[22] The audience at Lambeth in 1584 'acknowledged' arguments, those at the Campion debates are described as demonstrating displeasure, and disputants passing between points on numerous occasions rhetorically pass them to 'the judgement of the learned', or that of the audience.[23] In the aftermath of a disputation between Featley and Percy, again in 1623, the Protestant side were criticised in one Catholic account in that they did not

[19] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs L.ii^{r}, O.i^{v}; see chapter 3 below.
[20] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. C.i^{v}.
[21] One account of Hampton Court has James making 'a [per]emptory conclusio[n]', 'after many oppositions & replyes': BL Add. MS 38492, f. 81^{r}. See chapters 5 and 6 below.
[22] Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 19.
[23] BL Add. MS 48064, esp. ff. 55^{v}, 56^{v}, 60^{v}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs L.i^{v}, L.iii^{v}, N.iiii^{r}, Ff.iii^{r}, Q.i^{v}, S.iiii^{r}, T.iii^{r}, Y.iiii^{r-v}, Aa.iiii^{r}; Featley, *Appendix*, p. 73.

'satisfie the Judicious & unpartiall Auditours'.[24] It is, however, worth noting that disputants without a moderator could hearken back to the academic practice when faced with poor form. James Ussher, disputing in Dublin Castle in 1600, exclaimed: 'I would we had... a moderator, to judge of this dealing.'[25]

The real foundation of formal disputation was the question. Topics in public or 'professional' encounters were subject to circumstance, but the respect held for the process extended to the sanctity of the question. Disputation, it must be remembered, was a long-standing form of reasoning, aside from being an institutional tradition: deviation was seen as a cardinal sin.[26] In Field's account of the Campion debates, *both* sides are called back to the question by Hopton.[27] At the disputation between Featley and Percy, an argument was introduced by Sir Humphrey Lynde, the organiser, that was rejected as being 'not now to the question'; and, at a previous event, Featley himself reports stating, 'I will not now digresse from the question', as a potent, justified defence.[28] Writing in the aftermath of his debate with Featley, Percy accused him of this very fault: he had 'no shift, but to divert the disputation from the substance of the proposed Question'. Thus, deviation was accounted both a fundamental error and a desperate last resort for the failing disputant.[29]

The significance of the question thus remained true to the academic form, but the *choice* of question, in connection with the disputants' religious views, highlights the disparity of purpose between these events and disputation as academic examination. The custom of the universities was for one disputant to select the question, usually consisting of a general thesis; but in public religious debate this

[24] Anon, *A Reply to D. White and D. Featly* (St Omer, 1625), p. 17.
[25] Bodl. MS Barlow 13, f. 80^{v}. Alan Ford posits the absence of a moderator as the reason for public disputation 'exacerbating' divisions; but it could also be the moderator's *presence* that had this effect: Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford, 2007), p. 61.
[26] The sanctity of the question extended to the course of argument: see, for example, Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Aa.ii^{r}.
[27] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. L.ii^{v}.
[28] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 11; Featley, *Appendix*, p. 73.
[29] A. C., *An Answer to a Pamphlet* (St Omer, 1623), p. 67.

decision was entirely contextual.[30] The Lambeth debate was based around puritan objections to the Book of Common Prayer, and Walker admitted offering the same 'questions' to every priest he encountered: that the Pope was Antichrist, Rome the Whore of Babylon, justification by works heretical and Catholic image-worship idolatry.[31] In Percy's debates, the questions were ostensibly raised by doubting individuals; but in fact they reflect his own well-documented preoccupations – the relative history and visibility of the Catholic and reformed churches.[32] The origins and context of their questions thus distinguish these events from controversial disputation in the universities. While Shuger notes that the latter 'are given, and take, exceptional liberties' in their topics and arguments, she attributes this to format *in context*: 'one could never rule out the possibility that the whole business was just play-acting... The format entails a systematic ambiguity because its peculiar mix of scripted and unscripted elements renders the commitments and motives of the speakers... invisible.'[33] That ambiguity is lost, however, in 'professional' religious debate. For a Jesuit attacking Protestant visibility, or a minister critiquing the Prayer Book before an audience of notables, the format allows flexibility only in terms of tactics and presentation in the aftermath: no cloak or deflection of a disputant's true position exists. This is why, as the chapters below demonstrate, public religious debate is all the more extraordinary, and why it was subject to greater control.[34] In 1658, Ley's history of religious disputation distinguished its subject from 'ordinary' university

[30] Shuger states that the respondent usually chose the question in academic disputation; whereas Mack assigns this task to the moderator; or, where a moderator was not present, the opponent: Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', pp. 317-8; Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 58.
[31] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 49^{r}-63^{r}; Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 9.
[32] A. C., *True Relations of Sundry Conferences* (St Omer, 1626), p. 1; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 1-2; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 4; Milward, *Religious Controversies... Jacobean*, pp. 216-27.
[33] Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', esp. pp. 325-335.
[34] Shuger expresses surprise at what academic disputants could get away with, noting that 'no one seems *ever* to have gotten in trouble for words spoken in a disputation'; but John Feckenham objected in 1580 that imprisoned Catholics would need immunity: ibid., pp. 321, 325; Fulke, *True Reporte*, sigs A5^{r-v}. The difference was lost on the puritan Henry Jacob, who in offering a disputation after Hampton Court noted: 'It is ordinary in our Universities to admit of argumentatio[n] against any poynt of Religion and Faith; and that in such a maner, as is more dangerous to the truth, and lesse indifferent, then this forme that is heere offered.' Henry Jacob, *A Christian and Modest Offer of a Most Indifferent Conference* (Middelburg, 1606), p. 26.

debate; 'where the controversie is rather formall then serious, except when the Respondent taketh upon him the defence of some Paradox.'[35] In these public instances, there could be little doubt that both the questions *and* the disputants were serious.

In accounts of public religious debate, the choice of question was often the first target for manipulation, and its formulation and expression could prove a greater bone of contention than the arguments themselves. Offering a disputation to Catholics held at Wisbech Castle in 1580, William Fulke suggested, by his own account, that they should choose the question; 'thereby it shall appeare whether I come premediated.'[36] In the debate between Featley and Percy, the nature of the question remained in dispute throughout, continuing so in the printed aftermath; Percy arguing, 'The Question being mine, it pertaineth to me to tel the meaning'.[37] This was a contributory factor in the debate's collapse; but it allowed both disputants to level accusations of poor *practice* in subsequent exchanges. At an earlier debate, again involving Featley, it was not the question itself that proved contentious, but its lengthy expression by the respondent, the priest Richard Smith. Featley accused Smith of trying to oppose; but a Catholic report notes Smith's reply – that he was outlining the question as both men had been taught at university: 'D. Smith tould him that himselfe was a Doctour of Oxford, and that he (M. Featlie) was a Graduate of the same universitie, wherefore there was reason they should observe their universitie-manner.'[38] Featley's response speaks volumes for the relationship between academic and public disputation: 'Your tiphenie wherewith you cover this skarre in your reputation from the custome of Oxford (for the respondent to confirme his Thesis) is

[35] Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 31; Further to this, Hughes' notes that in religious debate – particularly in the universities – the questions represented 'fundamental truths... which ought to be uncontrovertible'. In public disputation, however, these were genuinely challenged: objections were not offered for the sake of argument. Hughes, 'Meanings of Religious Polemic', p. 209.
[36] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sigs. A4^{r}, A4^{v}-A5^{r}.
[37] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 12; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 17.
[38] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 288; S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 19-20.

too transparent and netlike. For what was the custome of Oxford in this kinde to us... who had by joynt consent set downe an other order to be held in this disputation?'[39]

The format's fundamentals, then, present a remarkable, at times inconsistent, blend of continuity and adaptation. Deviation from the academic format reflected participants, setting and – more importantly – purpose. The roles and question became flexible when released from academic requirements; indeed, they were treated as polemical tools to be manipulated. But crucially, these elements – particularly the question – were also presented as intellectual ideals to be upheld. Whilst reverence for, and interpretation of, disputation varied between divines and occasions, the fundamentals remained a relative constant. Moreover, their impact on the course and import of an event could be substantial, far outstripping that of more detailed intellectual manoeuvres.

Arguments and Authorities: Logic Form, Scripture and the Fathers

It is, however, to the more intricate aspects of logic and authority – which disputation shared with unstructured debate and written controversy – that we must now turn. In formal debate, arguments were framed in set logical structures: the syllogism and enthymeme; induction and example.[40] In describing academic disputation, Costello emphasises its reliance on this mode of reasoning: 'the opponent follows a carefully plotted line of syllogisms designed to trap the answerer into a position where he may be logically forced, step by step, into admitting the exact opposite of his thesis.'[41] While the relationship between *public* religious disputation and logic form was not a simple one, structured arguments were frequently employed in these events. With Campion in 1581, this mode of argument naturally followed the allocation of roles: Fulke informed the Jesuit, 'our purpose is not to deale by discourse, but briefely by

[39] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 37.
[40] See Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric*, pp. 22-3. Ong notes that to Ramus, all forms were 'syllogisms... with one or other part suppressed or understood': Ong, *Ramus*, p. 186.
[41] Costello, *Scholastic Curriculum*, p. 20.

Logical arguments, according to the order of schools'.[42] Offering an 'indifferent conference' after Hampton Court, the puritan minister Henry Jacob asked that 'the Opponents frame their Arguments in strict forme of Syllogisme only: And that the Answerers... answer directly to the premisses, either by denying or distinguishing'.[43] Although these cases reflect a polemical appropriation of the process, their assumption that logic form was to be respected is significant.

This is not, however, to suggest that all divines held the same opinion – or that the use of these structures did not change over time. The Calvinist divine William Perkins followed Ramus in his assertion that syllogistic reasoning was only requisite in dealing with doubtful assertions or 'crypticall' parts of scripture.[44] The separatist Henry Barrow revealed himself to be an outspoken critic of scholasticism in one account, lamenting the potential impact of syllogistic reasoning on truth; and objections can be found in the seventeenth century in relation to audience and purpose.[45] The debate between Featley and Percy spawned a discussion about the propriety of this type of argument in a public setting; Featley arguing that a 'question' – in the formal sense – *necessitated* this mode of debate.[46] Percy, by contrast, called the use of complex forms into question in the face of mixed audiences: a natural concern, given changing attitudes toward learning.[47] In the accounts considered here, logic form is challenged on its incompatibility with fundamental truth, its potential for misuse, *and* its clarity and impact. Looking back on the history of such debate, Ley

[42] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. H^{r}.
[43] Jacob, *Christian and Modest Offer*, pp. 3-4.
[44] McKim, 'The Function of Ramism', esp. pp. 506, 514; ODNB Perkins, William.
[45] Henry Barrow, *A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles* (Dort, 1590), sig. D.iiii^{r}; see chapter 4 below.
[46] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 8-9.
[47] Feingold suggests that Oxford disputations had changed in this regard by the seventeenth century, as humanist ideas became more firmly established. However, this conflict between Featley and Percy indicates that academic disputation was still not universally seen as appropriate for wider audiences, certainly in controversy: Feingold, 'The Humanities', p. 302.

decided: 'for Logickly strict Form of Syllogisme throughout the disputation, it cannot be well observed, much less is it of necessity to be required.'[48]

Featley is the clearest example of a disputant with unwavering loyalty to logic form, and offers an introduction to its use in recounting his 1623 debate: 'There are two meanes only, to prove anything by necessary inference; to wit, a Syllogisme and an Induction: other forms of argument have no force, but as they are reducible to these.'[49] To begin with the syllogism; this is a three-part argument, composed of major (if *x* is true, *y* must be true), minor (but *y* is true), and conclusion (ergo, *x* is true), and was an opponent's central manner of proceeding in disputation.[50] Walker's enthusiasm for syllogistic reasoning is made plain in one account ('let us have... strict Arguments and Syllogismes'), and both he and Featley recall turning the form into a challenge.[51] Earlier examples can be found in accounts of the Campion debates and Ussher's disputation with the Jesuit Fitzsimon in 1600, and scattered instances are present in Rainolds' account of his encounter with Hart, and in Barrow's prison debates in the 1590s.[52] Occasionally, disputants are charged with offering or demanding a syllogism incorrectly, and these critiques reflect the complex relationship between syllogistic reasoning and the disputation format. In addition to its natural link with the role of opponent, there was a correct time and place for the syllogism *within* debate: demanding such an argument from one of his adversaries, Campion was reprimanded, 'It is more then the usuall order of disputatio[n], to require a Syllogism, when I am come to [the] issue of mine argument, namely to authoritie'.[53] Percy, meanwhile,

[48] Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 71. Ley cites the debate between Rainolds and Hart as an example of 'profitable and successful' disputation without recourse to these forms; though Rainolds' account does contain use of syllogistic reasoning: Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 274, 450, 670.
[49] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 11.
[50] On attitudes and alternatives to the syllogism, see Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 69.
[51] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 244; Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, pp. 26-27; *idem*, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs A4^{v}, C^{r-v}, C2^{r}.
[52] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, esp. sigs L.iii^{r}, T.iii^{v}, X.i^{v}, Aa.ii^{v}, Bb.iii^{r-v}; Bodl. MS Barlow 13, ff. 80^{r}-82^{v}; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 274, 450, 670; Henry Barrow, *A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences* (Dort, 1590), pp. 16-30.
[53] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. R.ii^{r}.

argued that a syllogism was 'impertinent to an Induction'.[54] These debates observe a customary fluidity. Costello's 'carefully plotted line' is a starting point, from which authorities – and alternative forms – are expected to take over.

A more common fault was the production of poorly formed syllogisms. In recounting his debate with Thomas Everard in 1626, Featley reports twice objecting to a syllogism that consisted 'all of Negatives' and was thus no demonstrable argument.[55] In a debate between Walker and the Jesuit Sylvester Norris, the former recalls a swathe of four-termed syllogisms, which he openly despaired at before offering 'to make his Syllogisme for him'.[56] Correct formulation of these arguments was vital – a flawless syllogism logically *forced* the granting of the conclusion.[57] But the form was also a polemical device, and one that – in the face of conviction and dubious reliability – could cut both ways. When Ussher criticised an argument from Fitzsimon, he was told, 'Syllogismes are not so exactly to be wayed', and was referred back to the question and context.[58] In the aftermath of his debate with Walker, Norris states: 'Your cause lyeth a bleeding, whe[n] you thus begin to wrangle about Syllogismes'.[59]

Where argument did not proceeded syllogistically, it was usually undertaken through induction and example. Featley defines the former as 'a forme... in which wee proceed from enumeration of particulars, to conclude a generall' – a catalogue of evidence leading to a conclusion.[60] Rainolds in particular favours this mode, its rhetorical potential appealing to his humanism more than did the technicalities of syllogistic reasoning.[61] Again, disputants could disagree about the use of induction, as

[54] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 37.
[55] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, pp. 265-7.
[56] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs E2^{r}-E3^{r}.
[57] Bodl. MS Barlow 13, f. 80^{r}; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 24.
[58] Bodl. MS Barlow 13, f. 82^{v}.
[59] S. N., *A True Report of the Private Colloquy* (St Omer, 1624), p. 43.
[60] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 26. For examples, see Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. E.i^{v}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs X.iii^{r}, Dd.iii^{v}; S. N., *True Report*, p. 24.
[61] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, esp. pp. 42-3, 368-9, 475, 482, 497, 566-8, 590; see chapter 4 below.

illustrated in Featley's disputation with Percy. Having acquiesced to the form, in agreeing to provide a list of visible Protestants in all ages, Featley proceeded only as far as the first age, demanding Percy's response before continuing. In the printed aftermath, Percy scoffed: 'was it ever heard that [the respondent] should be inforced to reply to one proposition alone, before the whole Argument, whether it were Syllogisme or Induction, were fully propounded?' Here, the Jesuit places induction in the same realm as the syllogism, partially echoing Featley's urging of logic form.[62]

Even for those pleading the benefit of the unlearned, then, these methods provided ammunition in polemic: reports of unsound argument rival those of theological divergence. The most common fault, beyond structural missteps, was that of *petitio principii*, begging the point in question. Rainolds tells Hart: 'Whether in opinions of faith and religion... you or we doo hold heresies: that is the point in question.'[63] In 1581, Campion reportedly accused John Walker of *petitio principii* on the question of the apocrypha; and in 1590, Barrow was said to have 'proved the same whith the same'.[64] Featley was accused of *petitio principii* by Percy – though he countered this with approach and context – and Walker was charged with the same by Norris.[65] Beyond this, disputants are accused of changing or confusing focus, or leaving the question entirely. Charges levelled at Fitzsimon in 1600 and Percy in 1623 demonstrate that respondents were as susceptible to structural critiques as their opponents.[66] Use of these strict modes of argument was not, it must be said, an absolute constant in public religious disputation, and in fact it is relatively easy to

[62] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 41, 63; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, esp. pp. 26-9. Percy's contradiction here is a question of audience – that of his account (and this charge and rebuttal in particular) differing from the layman who was the debate's immediate focus.
[63] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 195. This most fundamental of *principii* was to prove a stalling point for several debates, but Rainolds and Hart bypass it by taking a step back to formal arguments and authorities.
[64] Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 3^{r}; Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. E.ii^{v}.
[65] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 16, sigs Ff^{r}, Hh4^{r}, L^{r}-Ll2^{r}; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 23; S. N., *True Report*, pp. 22, 26, 30.
[66] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs H.i^{r}, K.iiii^{v}; L. D., *A Defence of the Appendix* (St Omer, 1624), p. 15; Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs C3^{r}, E^{v}; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 18, 21, 24, sigs T4^{v}-V^{v}; Bodl, MS Barlow 13, f. 80^{r}.

identify those disputants who held them in highest esteem. Logical errors feature prominently in many accounts, but some divines knew where to draw the line; particularly when faced with an immediate purpose or heterogeneous audience.[67] However, the *underlying* influence of these forms cannot be underestimated – they were an intellectual fundament, questioned only in particular circumstances. In this, public religious disputation proves a microcosm of Renaissance intellectualism – a balancing act between formal scholasticism and its practical application.

These structures are nothing without content, and in all disputation they were supported with authorities. Scripture was naturally the most fundamental, particularly for reformed divines.[68] Ley's recommendations for debate in 1658 included an assertion that 'we must make Gods word the authentick rule of tryal', and similar insistences were made in earlier accounts.[69] John Walker cited Augustine's emphasis on scripture against Campion, and Rainolds stressed its importance against Hart.[70] George Walker named it 'the chiefe judge of all' in 1624, and Featley reports informing Everard, 'I will never dispute of point of Faith without Scripture, the Ground of Faith', whilst calling for a Bible.[71] These assertions are matched by the prevalence of scripture within disputation, but their reformed slant and deceptive simplicity can also be observed, in arguments regarding its use and interpretation.

A point that could forestall or change the course of a debate was the use of differing translations of scripture. Rainolds repeatedly turns to the Greek and Hebrew texts, and the Syriac translation, to counter Hart's use of the Latin, although he urges

[67] John Sweet reportedly admonished Featley in 1623 with the words, 'leave these Logick disputes': Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 25. Expanding on a debate with Percy, Francis White apologised to readers for his occasional 'Schollasticke tearmes', blaming his adversaries' sophistry: Francis White, *A Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere to Certain Questions* (London, 1624), sig. b5^{r}.
[68] On *sola scriptura*, in theory and anti-Catholic practice, see Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 2009), esp. pp. 31-4, 41-2; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 68.
[69] Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 69.
[70] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Aa.i^{r}; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 231, 257, 326.
[71] Walker, *Fisher's Folly Unfolded*, p. 19; Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 248.

that version where it supports his point. Once, he notes that a particular phrasing 'is not... in your Latin, which man hath translated. But it is... in the Hebrew, written by the Spirite of God.' [72] At Lambeth, the mistranslation of scripture was put forward as a question by the puritans Sparke and Travers, and Walker challenged Percy in 1623 with the claim that he could affirm Protestant doctrine solely through the Latin; though 'there is none so full of errors and mistakings'.[73] The 1620s return us, however, to the question of purpose and audience. In the debate between Walker and Norris, where markings in the Hebrew text were disputed, several of the gathered company, including Sir Edward Harwood, reportedly complained: 'These Disputations... are above our capacity, and fitter for the Schooles.'[74]

Disputes over the interpretation of scripture naturally followed confessional lines. In Field's account of the Campion debates, one opponent cites the Jesuit's previous insistence 'that the circumstances of the place be considered, the wordes that goe before, that followe after, the scope, the clauses, and whole context'; but as originally written these were not rules for interpretation so much as a full demonstration of Protestant error.[75] Hart presents a more typical Catholic view against Rainolds, following Vincent of Lérins: interpreters 'must take the scriptures in the sense of the Church: and therein they must follow, universalitie, antiquitie, consent.'[76] Whilst Rainolds, Barrow and George Walker stress the interpretation of scripture by scripture, their adversaries follow tradition, and are quick to point out flaws in the alternative.[77] Citing the Catholic theologian and controversialist Thomas Stapleton,

[72] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 55-7, 141, 244.
[73] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 52^{r}-53^{v}, 57^{r-v}; Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, pp. 22-3.
[74] S. N., *True Report*, pp. 36-8.
[75] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. I.iiii^{r}; Anon, *Campian Englished* (1632), pp. 56-63; see chapter 3 below
[76] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 190-191; on Catholic use of Vincentius Lirinensis, see Quantin, *The Church of England*, pp. 53-4.
[77] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 80-2; Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 25; Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. D.ii^{r}. Walker cites Augustine's guidelines; similar to those attributed to Campion: 'in words which have many significations, to observe the scope and circumstances of the place, and thereby to expound them; and to expound obscure places by comparing them with other plaine places of the Scriptures, which speake of the same matter and subject.' Barrow, asked 'who... shal judge of the word?', answered: 'The word'.

Hart informs Rainolds that citation of scripture is 'common... with all Heretikes', offering a list of potential pitfalls in comparing places.[78] The latter point is answered with the need for diligence and learning, but the former proves more problematic: divines defending an established church might easily dismiss their adversaries' interpretations as heretical, and the principle of *sola scriptura* left debate open to potentially insoluble disagreements. In this regard (the church proved by scripture; scripture interpreted by the church), cross-confessional debate could prove an exercise in polemic over 'profitable' debate. Its immediacy highlights incompatibilities in all controversy – not just in the divines' theological positions, but in the arguments used to support them.[79]

It was the need for more focused authority that drew controversialists to the writings of the Church Fathers. Roger Goad describes this sequence in Field's account of the Campion debates, and one manuscript report has Campion stating: 'I doe principally relye and cl[eave] unto the scriptures... and next unto them, to the churche and doctours'.[80] Of course, for Protestant divines in particular, patristic works were no substitute; they were at best a guide to scriptural interpretation.[81] While Hart, in Rainolds' account of their debate, describes their consent as 'the rule whereby controversies should be ended', Rainolds expresses doubt that he 'would beleeve the Fathers in those things, in which they are convicted of errour by the scriptures',

[78] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 83, 94-95, 185. Hart echoes Vincentius in this opinion: Quantin, *The Church of England*, p. 53. Percy cited Tertullian's caution against 'private' interpretation: A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 69.

[79] Called before Bancroft in the 1590s, the convert William Alabaster was confronted with a scornful reference to such arguments, through an 'ould tale' of a collier and the Devil: 'what doth the Church beleeve quoth the Devell, that which Christ taught saide the Collyer; and what taught Christ saide the Devell? That which the Church holdeth aunswered the Collier'. Alabaster concluded that the argument was good; for 'he overcame the Devell': *Unpublished Works by William Alabaster (1568-1640)*, ed. Dana F. Sutton (Salzburg, 1997), p. 134.

[80] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. K.i^{r}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 2^{r}. Further, see Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 73.

[81] Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', p. 322; Loach, 'Reformation Controversies', p. 370. For comparisons of Catholic and Protestant use of the Fathers, see Quantin, *The Church of England*, esp. pp. 32, 54-5, 72-3.

further describing a reliance on human authority as a measure of weakness.[82] As described by Rainolds, this encounter included a lengthy discussion of the merits of patristic authority, in which Rainolds asserted that some of the Fathers' works were 'corrupted: and counterfeits do beare their names.'[83] But the Fathers were cited on all sides in controversy, throughout the period, and the disputations are no exception: Rainolds himself engages Hart with patristic citations, and there are few accounts in which they do not appear.[84] Featley – whose reformed credentials are beyond doubt – recalls telling the priest Christopher Bagshaw that 'in regard of the antiquity of the Author, whosoever he was, you should vouchsafe him some answer' – an expectation that infused contemporary reference to the Fathers.[85]

Reporting a 1621 debate with the Jesuit George Fisher, *alias* Musket, Featley offers a list of 'rules' for interpreting patristic writings: first, that some 'after the manner of Orators... utter many things by Hyperbolies', which should be taken into account; second, that works and writers should be compared for clarification; third, that 'bastard and Apocryphall Treatises' should be rejected; and finally that an author's period of writing should be noted, as the most ancient generally gave the 'purest' testimony.[86] John Sweet, in the aftermath of Featley's debate with Percy, emphasised the second of these, in connection with the authority of the church.[87] Again, methods follow confessional lines, and questions of interpretation are complicated by a plethora of editions and translations; but these guidelines stem from

[82] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 36, 490, 584. William Whitaker avoided human authorities, including the Fathers, in favour of objective Ramist method: Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, p. 101.
[83] Ibid., pp. 184-230. Rainolds describes the claim that texts are corrupted as a trick used by 'young Logicians in Oxford... when they could not unloose a knotte', but applies it himself several times: pp. 76, 216-7, 412-13. There is some discussion of counterfeits, pp. 505, 509-10, 516-7. See Quantin, *The Church of England*, p. 18.
[84] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, esp. pp. 615-7; Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', p. 321; Quantin, *The Church of England*, pp. 23-4.
[85] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 251. The Elizabethan college head Laurence Humphrey similarly urged reverence for ancient writers: Quantin, *The Church of England*, p. 61.
[86] Featley, *Appendix*, pp. 100-104; see Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 157, 470, 472-3.
[87] L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, p. 29.

shared hermeneutic principles.[88] According to Featley, James I gave rules for patristic interpretation in 1625, which included distinguishing private opinions from that of the church, dogma from rhetoric and positive doctrinal profession from controversy.[89]

Much like formal logic, the citation of authorities provided disputants, and the authors of accounts, with ammunition: they were quick to respond when the Fathers were cited – as they saw it – incorrectly. By Field's account, Campion was told 'You doe open violence to the place', whilst interpreting a passage in Tertullian, and responded: 'Every argument used by the Fathers, must not be pressed farther than their purpose'.[90] Rainolds, for all his urging of their flaws, was sharp in challenging misuse of the Fathers: where Hart cites Chrysostom in support of Papal supremacy, he both criticises his interpretation *and* accuses all Catholics of using it to 'perswade the simple, and chiefly young scholers who trust your common-place bookes'.[91] In addition, Rainolds notes words passed over and points missed ('I am the soryer that your sight serveth you no better'); and responds to a citation of *all* the Fathers with the words: 'Hath any man living read them all? Nay, can they shewe them? Can they get them? I had almost said, can they name them?'[92] In the Catholic account of Featley's disputation with Smith, the former is accused of ignoring evidence in Augustine and Cyprian, confusing an argument by urging works together, and imperfectly citing Augustine to the benefit of his own position.[93] Again, such criticisms are extant in all controversy, but are here presented in a ritualised setting, contributing to theological *and procedural* claims and approaches.

---

[88] Quantin, *The Church of England*, pp. 64-5. On differing editions, see Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 206-8, 598.
[89] Daniel Featley, *Cygnea Cantio* (London, 1629), pp. 30-32. In the first, James cites Vincent of Lérins.
[90] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Y.i^{v}.
[91] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 280-1.
[92] Ibid., pp. 71, 312, 467. This does not, however, prevent him from claiming 'all the Fathers' later. At this, Hart challenges him: 'You have not read them all: have you?' Rainolds' astutely – but incongruously – responds: 'I have read him, that hath read them all'; a reference to Cardinal Bellarmine: ibid., p. 107; see below.
[93] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 104, 113-4, 114-6.

Despite the shared – and highly polemicised – emphasis on antiquity, later authorities are not ignored in disputation accounts. As in all controversy, their use was as much tactical as evidentiary; but again, disputation proves more direct. Rainolds cites Robert Bellarmine, to counter Hart's use of Stapleton with a more imposing Catholic authority; and disputing with Sparke and Travers, Whitgift cited Peter Martyr and Nicholas Ridley to set his arguments in a reformed tradition.[94] Disputants could, however, be criticised for flying to recent authorities too readily. Just as Rainolds criticised Hart's reliance on Stapleton, Featley reports telling Bagshaw, 'We come not hither to heare Bellarmines but D. Bagshaws answers'.[95] Where John Walker cited Sadoleto against Campion, one Catholic account has the Jesuit describing his use of 'a lat[e] wryter within this XL yeres' as a waste of time; although the citation not – it must be said – refused.[96] Unlike that of scripture and the Fathers, then, the use of recent works trod a fine line between evidence and evasion.[97]

Neither were the authorities used exclusively theological. Rainolds and his intellectual disciple Featley cite Aristotle in several places, as does Hart in the former's account of their debate. Both Rainolds and Hart invoke the philosopher in applying reason to religious topics: the sufficiency of scripture, and the need for consensus in scriptural interpretation.[98] Featley, meanwhile, cited Aristotle in pressing structural points against Smith and Bagshaw – though in the latter case, when challenged, he states: 'I urge not Aristotle for any matter of faith, but for a question of Logick'.[99] Even so, this, with the use of historical examples, denotes a pool of authority stretching beyond scripture and the Fathers. Educated divines had a great

[94] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 106-8, 114, 451, 457, 527. On Protestant adoption of Bellarmine, see Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 239. BL Add. MS 40864, ff. 54^{r}, 62^{r}.
[95] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 249. On Stapleton, see Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 347-8, 443-4, 641, 645, and chapter 4 below.
[96] Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 11^{v}-12^{r}.
[97] James I opposed the use of 'later writers, especially those beyond the Seas' in discussing the English Church: Featley, *Cygnea Cantio*, p. 25.
[98] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 89, 307, 540, 609.
[99] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 298; Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 254-5.

deal to draw on in confirming their arguments; but some cast their net wider than others.[100]

Tactics: Attack, Defence and Use of the Audience

The use of authorities was not the only area where a disputant's approach might vary. Beyond the architecture of disputation, another level of tactical adroitness can be seen: a blend of skill and personality. Aggression in debate could take many forms, some more considered than others: Campion is described as making a pre-emptive strike against his opponents' use of the Fathers ('You may spare your labour...'), and Rainolds similarly pre-empts a distinction between pope and bishop in his account of the Hart debate ('least I lose my labour through an [except the Pope:]').[101] At the other extreme are the 'insulting' statements Field notes from Campion, and those Rainolds ascribes to himself – his observation, for instance, that 'a man must enterprise somewhat... For, you were all undone, if this game should be lost'.[102] These confrontational aspects fall into two categories: attacks drawn from an opponent's arguments, and showmanship for the audience. The first could be as simple as repeating an adversary's point, or as complex as laying out logical traps, in a more fluid version of Costello's chain of syllogisms.[103] Rainolds asks Hart self-evident questions as a prelude to important points; a technique later identified by William

[100] McConica describes Rainolds' teaching outlook as that of 'the Christian humanist whose one desire is to fill the minds of the young... with a rich spectrum of pagan wisdom, ready to be turned by those who understand it properly into harmonious instruction for a good life... pagan wisdom conveyed through Christian filters.' McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 306.
[101] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. K.i^{r}; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 358.
[102] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. K.iir; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 127. The last refers to Stapleton.
[103] Rainolds reviews one argument from Hart with the words 'if you will give me leave to strip it' (*Summe of the Conference*, p. 308), and turns several arguments against him, once remarking: 'Yet take I not advantage...'; pp. 326, 344, 540.

Laud following a 1622 debate with Percy: 'it seemes by that which followes, you did by this Question... but seeke to win ground for your other'.[104]

Attacks were not always so technical, however – often, they took the form of direct negations, or cast doubt on an adversary's knowledge and ability. At Campion's second 1581 debate, as described by Field, Fulke told him, 'you shewe your selfe altogether ignorant of the matter'; and at the third Goad accused him of conjecture, from 'ignorance or forgetfulnes' of a place in St Paul.[105] Contradictions and absurdities were pounced upon: Rainolds is quick to point out Hart's inconsistencies, though Hart makes similar accusations in Rainolds' account: 'you speak as though you were bereft of sense and reason'.[106] More reprehensible was the urging of an absurdity for cynical reasons; an accusation Rainolds levels at the priest more than once.[107] Disputants also made accusations of evasion or trifling; Hart's reaction to one such indictment again demonstrating incompatibility: 'It is folly (I see) for me to reason with you, if you be resolved to cast of[f] so weightie reasons, as trifles.'[108]

Another common occurrence was the issuing of challenges *within* disputation; a tactic used to change the subject or conditions, to speed victory, or to generate ammunition for accounts. Such challenges were a common feature of the Campion debates, arising from the Jesuit's desire to oppose and the grandstanding of his opponents. By Field's account, William Charke issued a challenge whilst opposing on the fourth day, and John Walker repeatedly used the phrase 'what say you to...?' in advancing arguments.[109] Reporting Hampton Court, William Barlow notes a challenge from the Bishop of Winchester to an older Rainolds: the bishop 'willing him, of his

---

[104] Ibid., p. 180; R. B., *An Answere to Mr Fishers Relation of a Third Conference* (London, 1624), p. 47.
[105] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs M.i^{v}, Q.iii^{r}.
[106] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 120, 175, 330, 336, 534.
[107] Ibid., pp. 132, 479.
[108] See Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs D.iiii^{v}-E.i^{r}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Bb.ii^{r}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 2^{r}; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 144-5, 172, 447. Featley describes such incompatibility in striking terms in recounting his debate with Bagshaw: 'I perceive it will be to little purpose to reason with you by arguments drawne from reason, for you will make good any absurdity in reason by your faith'; Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 257.
[109] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, from sig. Aa.ii^{r}.

learning, to shew where ever he had read, that Confirmation was at all used in Auncient times by any other but Bishoppes'.[110] These challenges occurred where disputants sought to undermine an adversary's reputation, but they were also seen as powerful rhetorical tools in debate, and a potent resource in the aftermath: George Walker points out that when Percy rejected his challenge on the Latin translation of scripture, 'he was much condemned, censured and reproved by the hearers.'[111]

More polemically pertinent were those attacks meant to divide a disputant from their own side. Rainolds often makes this effort with Hart, stating that the priest placed 'al[l] the Popes' in danger with one argument; and Charke reportedly told Campion 'you have gyven a greater wounde to your owne syde, then you or a hundred suche as you, can cure', following an argument on the sufficiency of scripture.[112] Featley can also be observed using this tactic: 'None of yours doth acknowledge any figure in these words of our Saviour, this is my body', he informed Smith, by the Catholic account of their disputation; the priest having admitted 'a figure joyned with truth and propriety' in the Sacrament.[113] Thus, while direct attacks might seem like simple grandstanding, they could in fact stem from a debate's surroundings and the participants' individual circumstances.

Disputants also sought to overpower their adversaries through use of the audience – invoked as supporters of a particular approach or victims of 'misleading' arguments. Confronted with 'bitter and reproachfull' attacks in his debate with Norris, Walker reports asking the audience for permission to respond in kind, 'though it be very unseemly'.[114] Disputants could equally plead the company's benefit in refusing arguments: by Field's account, Campion thus dodged a place he saw as unnecessary,

[110] William Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference* (London, 1605), pp. 34-5.
[111] Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 23.
[112] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 335, 344, 423; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 5^{r}.
[113] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 67-70. See Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, pp. 292-3; *idem*, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 261.
[114] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. C^{v}.

and Goad stated that he 'should weary... the company' by reciting Catholic errors.[115] In disputing with Bagshaw, Featley remarks: 'I must be briefe, that I may not defraud the Auditorie of your arguments.'[116] Such points had a negative equivalent in accusations of 'abuse' of those assembled. Campion was subjected to several such claims – first in response to a scriptural interpretation, and again when he asked to explain an answer: 'Belike you have an yll opinion of the auditorie, that they can understand nothing, except you tel it them twenty times over.'[117] By one Catholic report, the Jesuit himself cited the needs of the audience in bringing his opponent to a question: 'that our coming hether and trowblinge this worshippfull audience, might not be altogether in vayne'.[118]

Divines could also highlight points by turning to the audience in triumph. Campion's opponents do this often: 'Marke here his absurdities', Fulke instructs; and an argument from Goad is prefaced with the phrase, 'Let me make it plaine unto this auditorie...'[119] Disputing against Percy, by his own account, Featley reacted to one answer with a triumphant 'Mark, I beseech you...', and in Walker's debate with Norris, both disputants made similar referrals: 'I pray you Gentlemen to marke and take notice,' Walker's account has Norris urging after a perceived admission, and again following one of his own arguments.[120]

But how were disputants to hold their ground against these triumphs, traps and challenges? At a time when disputation without bitter speech was being urged as an ideal, and disputants could soon be accused of pride and vainglory, humility was a powerful tool, used early in debate, and often in accounts. A disputant's preparation time is frequently stated, to magnify victory and counter defeat. Percy criticised

[115] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. I.iiii^{r}; L.ii^{v}.
[116] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 261-2.
[117] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs K.ii^{r}, L.iiii^{v} (further, see Aa.iii^{v}, Ff.i^{r}); Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 11^{v}.
[118] Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 2^{v}-3^{r}.
[119] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs L.iiii^{r}, U.iii^{v}.
[120] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 24; Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs A4^{v}, C^{v}, C4^{r}, D2^{v}. Norris reports a similar 'Behold Gentlemen...' from Walker: S. N., *True Report*, p. 53.

Featley's first account of their disputation in this regard, observing: 'Any man reading this parcel, would be induced to thinke, that D. White and D. Featly had never had notice before... for what end they were to meet with the Jesuites: but that they were on the suddaine summoned to this Conference, without any preparation, or knowledge of the Question'.[121] To this, Featley responded: 'What doth this adva[n]tage our cause, or prejudice yours? It matters not much, how wee came to this encounter, but how we came off.'[122] In 1581, it was not just the imprisoned Campion who claimed unpreparedness by the Protestant accounts – Alexander Nowell and William Day paint the debate (as opposed to a controlled examination) as unexpected: 'we came purposed to examine [the] untruthes of Campion's booke, rather then to dispute'.[123] Humility could also be voiced in the arguments themselves: Fulke and Goad make remarkable admissions in Field's account, that would have counted against them in an academic disputation: 'The very words I do not remember,' Goad admits, citing an error of the Council of Trent; and Fulke, unaware of written decrees from Nice, tells Campion, 'If I do not shew it, then let me beare the blame.'[124] By contrast, Rainolds' humility relates to style: 'if you thinke I cast colours, and use wordes too smooth: I can amend that fault with speaking more roughly'.[125]

The most frequently challenged mode of defence was evasion. Whitgift is said to have made efforts to change the subject at Lambeth in 1584; whereas Sweet, in the aftermath of Featley's debate with Percy, describes every aspect of the former's conduct as evasion – from the initial clash over the question to his departure.[126] Often, of course, evasion is in the eye of the beholder, and most disputants offer some justification for avoiding or refusing points. Rainolds describes one response from Hart as an admission of defeat, but one qualified with reference to other scholars: 'Our

[121] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 13; Daniel Featley, *The Fisher Catched in His Owne Net* (London, 1623), pp. 5-6.
[122] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. Cc2^{r}.
[123] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. E.i^{v}.
[124] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs L.iii^{r}, N.ii^{r}.
[125] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 158, 271.
[126] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 52^{r}, 58^{v}, 61^{v}; L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, pp. 14-16.

Rhemists will render good account (I dout not) of this... I must referre to them. For I my selfe know not indeede how to accord it.'[127] In 1581, Campion rejected an argument because it would lead into 'all questions' – an evasion grounded in the procedural sanctity of the question.[128] Similarly, Hart tells Rainolds: 'We shall never make an end if we stand on everie particular that may be cavilled at'; and Rainolds observes, 'if I should flit thus from point to point on every occasion that your speech doth offer, we should confound our conference, and never make an end of the point in question.'[129]

In addition, disputants could reverse arguments to challenge their opponents: Nowell and Day report that Campion urged one point in the form of a counter-question, and another argument is turned back in Field's account of the second day.[130] Disputants could also launch into long orations in order to control the debate; and of course, where necessary, they could invoke the name and authority of fundamental truth.[131] Rainolds peppers his argument with such reminders, referring to 'The truth, which I deale for' and 'the truth: wherein I wish your companie.'[132] Thus, in theory, educated divines had the resources to defend against most – if not all – points in religious debate. The trick lay in being free, able and willing to apply them, and to apply them appropriately. In this, at least, public disputation reflects academic debate: a test of the disputants themselves.

Practical Considerations

The choice of location for these events often came down to circumstance. Those arranged for doubting individuals were generally held in private residences, and prisoners were confronted within prison walls. In the latter case, questions of exposure

[127] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 491.
[128] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs M.ii^{v}, M.iii^{v}.
[129] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 521, 562.
[130] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs C.ii^{v}-C.iii^{r}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. H.iiii^{v}.
[131] Campion is accused of making long speeches: Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs C.iii^{v}, F.iii^{r-v}.
[132] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 59, 360.

and control played a significant role, in relation to the effect the authorities – or, for that matter, conscientious prisoners – felt the debate might have on those present.[133] The layout of the room is less frequently described: most accounts pass swiftly from the occasion to the arguments themselves. However, both Featley and Walker provide details of the seating arrangement at debates in the 1620s, and in this paint a picture of an intellectual joust, with the audience in close attendance. Countering a claim that Percy took his arm to persuade him to continue their debate, Featley recalls that they were 'placed distant one from the other, at the opposite ends and corners of the Table'; and that the audience 'sate, or stood, close crowding about the Table, and betwixt those two.'[134] Walker describes his debate with Norris thus: 'the one sitting downe at the one end of a Table, the other at the other end, and the auditors sitting along on both sides, and some standing about in a large upper Parlor.'[135] These were, of course, instances of 'public' debate in its most private form – events for doubting individuals – and more prestigious or sensitive disputations required a more formal layout. One Catholic account of the debates with Campion has the Jesuit sat on a stool, opposite his opponents, who were behind a table full of books.[136] For occasions like Hampton Court, accounts of disputation during royal visitations to the universities might give a better indication of the arrangements than Walker or Featley.[137]

In the disputations themselves, there was an awareness of correct proceeding going beyond the rules of formal debate. Where a side comprised more than one disputant, this was factored into the order, and at larger exchanges a single representative speaker would often be chosen. Proposing a disputation to the Wisbech

[133] Barrow reports an agreement to move from a parlour in the Fleet Prison, as a crowd had gathered: Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, p. 5.
[134] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 43-4.
[135] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A3^{r}.
[136] BL Harl. MS 422, f. 148^{r}.
[137] Anthony Wood describes an elaborate arrangement during Elizabeth's 1566 visit to Oxford: 'a fair large scaffold set up for the performance of the Disputations, reaching from the nether end of the Church to the door of the Choir. Towards the upper end was a void place left, wherein a Travys was set up, and underneath a Cloth of State for the Queen, and by it a partition made for the Ladies and Maids of Honour.' Anthony à Wood, *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1796), p. 159. See Shuger, 'St. Mary the Virgin', p. 337.

Catholics, Fulke asked them to select one 'to speak for all the rest... for I cannot speake to eight men at once.'[138] The emphasis in arranging these occasions was on balance (or the appearance thereof): George Walker notes that Percy, confronted with an interjection from another minister during their debate, complained: 'it was unequall for two to set against one both at once.'[139] This, it should be noted, was precisely the situation Campion had infamously been subjected to, four decades before.

It is Featley who provides the most detailed 'rules' for public religious disputation, and whose accounts contain the most examples of the same from other disputants; indeed, it is undoubtedly Featley's method that Ley's 1658 *Discourse* follows in its recommendations for debate.[140] Featley's rules, produced in the aftermath of his disputation with Percy, are as follows: first, he urges sincerity, following St Paul ('Let nothing bee done through strife or vaine-glory'); second, he insists that the disputants begin and end with a prayer; third, that notaries be appointed and the notes subscribed by both sides. The fourth and fifth conditions require a well-defined question and adherence to logic form.[141] Negotiating the terms of his debate with Musket several years before, Featley had expressed a shorter version of these, requiring that 'bitternesse of speech be avoyded', as well as logic form and equality in the roles.[142] The first was echoed, by his account, in the Percy debate; the Jesuit's companion Sweet asking: 'That all bitter speeches be forborne'.[143] This condition can also be seen in one of George Walker's accounts, with Norris asking 'that the disputation might be performed... with all mildenesse, and without bitter wordes or byting speeches.'[144]

---

[138] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. A4^{r}.
[139] Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 6. The minister was Henry Burton, rector of St Matthew's, Friday Street: p. 4; ODNB Burton, Henry.
[140] Ley references Featley throughout, and his guidelines follow a similar pattern (with the notable exception of logic form).
[141] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs R3^{v}-S^{r}.
[142] Featley, *Appendix*, p. 51.
[143] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 8; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 15.
[144] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs A2^{v}-A3^{r}.

From the content and presentation of most accounts, this particular rule was an ideal, rather than a requirement, but one more closely adhered to – certainly by Protestant divines – was that disputation should begin and end with a prayer. Campion's opponents were particularly observant in this regard, although Campion did not participate, crossing himself instead.[145] Bagshaw refused Featley's offer of prayer in the early 1610s.[146] Most remarkably, at Lambeth, Whitgift can be seen refusing the suggestion from Sparke with a clear and telling distinction: 'he shold make noe prayeres there, nor that place a conventicle.'[147] In 1590, at a prison debate with the separatist John Greenwood, one conformist opponent is said to have been rebuked in similar (but wholly contrary) terms – Greenwood objecting: 'Whie do you here take uppon you to offer up the prayers of us all without our consent, we not being met togeather to that purpose'.[148] Here, then, was a rule in disputation that some, in the late sixteenth century, had seen as entirely out of place, and more appropriate to puritan gatherings. Featley's rule, however, is derived from patristic authority, namely Gregory of Nazianzus.[149]

Notes, Written Answers and the Production of Accounts

The practices outlined thus far are drawn from printed or manuscript accounts of disputation, intended for the expansion of disputants' points and the justification of their methods. While shared assumptions, structures and ideals *can* be gathered from such works, their purpose and authorship raises a procedural question as important as the conduct of the debates themselves: how were these events being recorded and set forth? And how great, as a result, was the distance between disputation performed and disputation reported? The first thing to consider is the presence of notaries. Ley, in his

[145] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs H^{r}, O.i^{r-v}, T.i^{r}, T.i^{v}, Z.ii^{r-v}, Z.iii^{r-v}, Cc.iiii^{v}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 1^{r-v}, 7^{v}, 13^{r}.
[146] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 231.
[147] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 50^{v}.
[148] Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, p. 48.
[149] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. R4^{r}.

Discourse, describes their role as being 'faithfully, and without partiality, to write what passeth betwixt the adverse parties', drawing on Jacobean examples to illustrate this ideal. He notes that the moderate Francis White, in the aftermath of an encounter with Percy, could be painted as 'silly' because 'there was not a word written... when he and his Adversaries disputed together'; and recounts accusations levelled at Percy 'when he thrust himself into a Notaries office' at Featley's disputation with Musket.[150] A notary is mentioned in some – but not all – contemporary debate accounts. Remarkably, Field reports this objection from Campion: 'I see that you have some appoynted to note, as if it were made a solemne matter. I should have the like... I have bene yll dealt withall already, & things heretofore spoken by me, have bene mistaken, and published in print otherwise then I ever meant.'[151] When Featley disputed against Percy, two years after the Musket debate, he reports an agreement 'that the Arguments and Answers should be taken by one common Writer; and that the Opponent, D^{r}. Featly, should set his hand to each severall Syllogism; and the Respondent M^{r}. Fisher, to his severall Answers.'[152]

Offered debate at Wisbech in 1580, the former college head (and erstwhile opponent of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer) John Young required, amongst other things, 'foure Notaries, two for us, & twoo for you, and at the ende of every argument let them reade it, and if they agree, let them say, *Concordat*, & let the foure bookes be kept in two Chests, wherof you to have one key, & wee an other, &c.'[153] Such demands reflect a keen awareness of the potential for misrepresentation in accounts: Walker reports asking Norris 'that the Arguments & the answers might be writ downe, for preventing all false relation'; and Percy, recounting his disputation with Featley, states: 'the wryting of such things as had passed in the Conference... was wrapped up in a paper, and sealed up with three seales... & left in Syr Humfrey Lynds hands, or

[150] Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, pp. 67-8; White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{r}.
[151] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs H^{v}, H.i^{v}, I.iii^{v}.
[152] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 17.
[153] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. B^{r-v}.

some other Protestant, with promise that it should be kept unopened till the next meeting'. In both cases, the precaution failed to minimise conflicting reports.[154]

Despite the respect held for notes taken in disputation, the use of writing was by no means consistent, nor always so formal as to require a notary. Oftentimes, points were written down because of a disputant's personal approach, or because the occasion demanded it. Some arguments were written and subscribed by request, when an adversary saw in them something to triumph at. This tactic was favoured by Featley, but it can also be observed in accounts of debate with Campion and the separatists Barrow and Greenwood.[155] On the other hand, notes or written answers could be so extensive as to virtually supplant oral debate: Fulke asked the Catholics at Wisbech 'whether you will conferre by speach or writing' – the latter dismissed as time-consuming – and Percy's process is described by Featley as a combination of the two:

> the principall Respondent, M. Fisher, meditates by himself an Answer; which hee first writeth in a private paper, then sheweth it to his Assistant, M. Sweet, and two other that stood by: according to whose advice he addeth, blotteth out, and altereth what they thought fit. After this, he dictateth it out of his private paper to the common Writer of the conference... and, having compar'd it with his private paper, subscribes it as a Record, and then reads it openly.[156]

[154] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A3^{v}; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 38.
[155] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. F.i^{r}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. L.iiii^{v}; Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, pp. 7, 10, 17, 21; *idem*, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. E.iii^{r}; Featley, *Appendix*, pp. 58, 66, 67, 72; *idem*, *Grand Sacrilege*, pp. 247, 249; *idem*, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 240, 242, 243, 258, 263.
[156] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. A4^{r-v}; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 20, 29-30.

Rainolds describes his debate with Hart as conducted 'not with extemporall speaking, but writing with advise', although this is not always reflected in their dialogue, and may, in part, refer to the production of his account.[157]

Full notes and written answers were not, therefore, a constant result of public disputation, and accounts were contingent on the information available, filtered through an author's memory, perspective and purpose. Nowell and Day state that following their debate with Campion, they 'set downe in writing certaine notes of the same, out of our fresh memorie to all events', with the proviso that 'our memorie could not alwayes retaine the order, or the very wordes wherein every sentence was uttered.'[158] One Catholic report concludes: 'Mutch more spoken, w^{ch} I coulde not remember.'[159] Featley's account of his disputation with Percy is described as written 'partly, out of the fresh memory of such passages as we then observed; but especially, by help of such Notes as were taken in the Conference it self'; and his account of his debate with Bagshaw is 'drawne out of the notes' of two observers, but printed almost three decades after the fact.[160] Most remarkably, Rainolds' account of his debate with Hart is described – in a preface attributed to Hart himself – as drawn from notes on which both men collaborated: written up by Rainolds, given to Hart for review, and then expanded on before printing.[161]

Adding to the measure of deviation one might expect in accounts drawn partially from memory, there is evidence (and admission) of editing in many accounts. Barlow describes his report after Hampton Court as 'an Extract, wherein is the Substance of the whole', and Percy held his account of one debate with White to

[157] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 15.
[158] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs A.ii^{r-v}.
[159] BL. Add. MS 11055, f. 191^{v}.
[160] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs *3^{r-v}; *idem*, *Transubstantiation exploded*, p. 231.
[161] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 10-11; see chapter 4 below. Ley presents this as an ideal: 'The Disputants are to have liberty to revise their own Reasons, Objections, and Solutions, and to correct them by altering, adding, or expunging... This liberty Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Hart allowed one another'; Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 72.

contain 'the chiefe Passages' of the exchange: 'for substance I have not omitted any thing that may much import, considering what the occasion, and subject of the Conference was'.[162] Recounting the separatists' prison debates, Barrow admits to forgetting one point and re-inserting another, 'not perfectly remembring the due place where yt should come in.'[163] Moreover, in all accounts, arguments are perfected with the benefit of hindsight: Rainolds' work blurs the line between account and treatise; and Percy lists questions he *might* have asked in one report.[164]

What is remarkable, in light of these considerations, is the propensity of such works to describe themselves as 'true' relations.[165] Some claim essential truth despite imperfections in memory; and omissions are oftentimes justified by way of pertinence. Field advises that: 'If Campions answeres be thought shorter th[an] they were, thou must knowe that he had much wast speach, which being impertinent, is nowe omitted: although I protest, nothing is cut off from the weight and substance of the matter'.[166] In recounting his debate with Percy, Featley justifies omissions through the absence of the Earl of Warwick (present in the event), as well as 'moderation' in depicting the Jesuit's process: his account is thus 'fair' and 'passable', as well as including 'nothing but the truth'.[167] Another of Featley's methods is to support claims of accuracy with the subscription of those present: his full account of this disputation includes the names of two earls, two knights, his colleague White, two esquires, the clerk of the Court of Wards, two bachelors in divinity and the notary, Thomas Aylesbury, to this effect.[168] The Protestant account of his debate with Smith was written by John Pory and subscribed by the playwright Ben Jonson, both of whom were in the audience.[169] Nor was it just the listeners who might offer such guarantees: Rainolds makes much of

[162] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, sig. A3^{v}; A. C., *True Relations*, p. 35.
[163] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. C.ii^{v}; *idem*, *Letters and Conferences*, pp. 2, 57.
[164] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 19-21.
[165] Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, sig. A.iir; Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 26; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 37; R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, sig. A^{v}.
[166] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs A.ii^{v}, G.iii^{r}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. G.iiii^{v}.
[167] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. *3^{r-v}, p. 38.
[168] Ibid., p. 46; Featley, *Appendix*, p. 6.
[169] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 306; Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 35.

Hart's preface to his report, and in one account White used his *own* status as an 'eare-witnesse' to deflect 'Censure from men judicious, and lovers of Truth'.[170]

Of course, such claims rarely pass unchallenged. As White observes, 'our Adversaries will perpetually tumultuate, and accuse of falsitie, all things which passe not under their owne hands', a remark that holds true regardless of standpoint.[171] Countering Percy's account of their 1622 debate, Laud exclaims 'Not one Answere perfectly related?'; and in a subsequent work finds a point 'I doe not at all remember was so much as named in the Conference, much lesse was it stood upon'.[172] Sweet accuses the first account of Featley's debate with Percy of 'daubing and amplifying the speeches of D. Featly'; and both he and Percy present a list of falsehoods in the work.[173] Walker's account of his debate with Norris is wholly deconstructed in the latter's self-consciously titled *True Report*:

> in relating the arguments and answers... some he changeth, some he corrupteth: heere he leaveth out, there he foisteth in: one while he disjoynteth the wordes, otherwhile he dismembreth, & perverteth the sense... he maketh such a misshapen and confused Chaos of malicious slaunders, of foolish & impertinent additions, as may well become one of his own deformed and bastardly brood.[174]

Norris describes such falsification as common to past heretics and contemporary Protestants; including, unsurprisingly, Featley.[175]

These assertions are but the most obtuse element of a more detailed polemical stance, encompassing questions of authority and presentation, and using literary

[170] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 5, 11; White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b6^{r}; see Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, p. 72.
[171] White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{r}.
[172] William Laud, *A Relation of the Conference* (London, 1639), pp. 26-7.
[173] L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, pp. 17-19; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 37-8.
[174] S. N., *True Report*, pp. 6-7
[175] Ibid., pp. 3-6.

methods to persuade the reader. Most accounts are written in dialogue form, though some mingle this with direct narrative or drop it altogether. The printed, Protestant accounts of the Campion debates make for a representative sample: Nowell and Day present the first in a simple narrative, whereas Field employs annotated dialogue for later encounters. The benefits of dialogue form in these works were twofold. First, it played a direct role in claims to balance, truth and modesty – as Virginia Cox notes on literary dialogues: 'the writer is renouncing an authorial role, and becoming, like the reader, an admiring eavesdropper on the conversation of others.'[176] Secondly, it engages the reader: through it, they become 'participants'; indeed, moderators.[177] This effect was enhanced where an account was wholly or partially intended for a specific readership, as in Rainolds' account of his debate with Hart. Cox makes a distinction between treatise and dialogue: the former 'casts its writer and reader in the role of master and pupil'; whereas in the latter they are 'hunting-companions, sharing equally in the... chase.'[178] But Rainolds directs his work to the students of the English seminaries at Rome and Rheims, with the words 'learne of your felow and friend M. Hart' on the question of the Pope's deposing power.[179] Thus, to expand on Cox's analogies, Rainolds presents his adversary – and through him, Catholic readers – as a companion needing to be guided, or a pupil on his first hunting trip. Hart serves as emblem, warning and target for Rainolds' heterogeneous readership.[180] The relationship between the disputants could prove as significant and complex a device as that between author and reader: as well as triumphing over an adversary, an account might also raise him up, to accentuate victory, and associate a cause with its champion. Thus White is 'accounted a prime Protestant Controversist' in a report by Percy.[181]

[176] Cox, *The Renaissance Dialogue*, pp. 43-4.
[177] Ibid., pp. 2-3, 106.
[178] Ibid., p. 44.
[179] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, esp. p. 28.
[180] See chapter 4 below.
[181] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 22.

A final point to be considered is the rhetoric used to present disputation accounts: the justifications given for their production and distribution. In this, authors observe customary humility: the setting forth of printed accounts is often depicted as a necessary task, compelled by false reports already circulating.[182] More tangibly, disputants involved in 'private' debate could be criticised for making it public, particularly where a doubting person was involved: one Catholic account states that Featley's debate with Percy, 'though privatly inte[n]ded, was afterwards victoriously printed'.[183] Individual accounts will be discussed below, but here it is important to note that polemical purpose infused the way they were drawn up and presented; and that this drew on pervasive cultural trends.

Adopt, Adapt and Invoke: the Departure from Academic Disputation

Detailed study of these accounts ultimately reinforces that note of caution offered by Hughes: we cannot accurately or truthfully reconstruct what occurred in a disputation.[184] But this does not, I believe, preclude us from moving from the accounts to the events themselves. Just as Hughes highlights the strategies used to present truth in such works, so the procedural foundations of debate – and expectations in this regard – can be observed; indeed, they form an integral part of the authors' approach. Accounts of public religious disputation need to be examined not as flawed 'true reports' of debate, but as extensions and *representations* of it.[185] In this, despite their purpose and partiality, they have a great deal to tell us – about the events to which they pertain, and the broader culture surrounding them.

To return to John Ley, a degree of written aftermath was integral to public religious disputation: though maligned, such representations and extensions were vital to these events' impact. Ley describes his preferred form as 'the personall debates of

[182] See Cox, *Renaissance Dialogue*, pp. 41-3.
[183] L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, p. 3.
[184] Hughes, 'Meanings of Religious Polemic', p. 212.
[185] Cox, *Renaissance Dialogue*, pp. 4-5.

such as are far from the perfect Union of the Apostle, whose minds are contrary, and their tongues contradictory, and their pens also; when they take them up like pikes to prosecute the war by writing, which by verbal disputation they began.' Full, profitable debate could not occur in a vacuum: written additions are included in Ley's ideal, and so they should be treated by historians – as a *part* of the process, as much as a challenging source for it.[186] The question of accuracy is secondary to that of image and purpose.

In terms of public religious disputation itself, Ley arrives at his definition through two distinctions, clarifying that indistinct usage of 'disputation' noted above. He distinguishes his category first from discourse 'without the strife [of] tongues'; encounters between those in agreement, and written works termed 'disputations' by their authors. For the latter, he cites Bellarmine, who 'calleth his Volumes of controversies, Disputations, though there appeared none opposite to dispute against him.'[187] As noted, Ley's second, subtle distinction refers to academic debate, shrouded in Shuger's 'mask' of purpose, and those 'where the controversie is rather formall then serious'.[188] Ley is not, of course, to be followed without question: his work is infused with his own standpoint and informed by its immediate context. Moreover, adopting strict categories, rather than tracing the adaptation of the process, is in many ways counter-productive. But drawing on Ley and – more importantly – on the examples detailed here, it is now possible to describe the reach of formal, academic disputation into public controversial encounters, and to elucidate those categories identified in the previous chapter.

Formal disputation remained a commonplace in post-Reformation religious discourse, but it was a remarkably malleable one. The influence of the form is impossible to deny – it is present in the structure of accounts, in the assumptions underlying procedural critiques, and even in those debates that deviated from it; in

[186] Ley, *Discourse of Disputations*, pp. 33, 72.
[187] Ibid., p. 31.
[188] Ibid., p. 31.

elements unconsciously retained. But divines still argued about its technicalities and etiquette, and the format could be adapted in a variety of ways, subject to preference and circumstance. What we are confronted with, then, is not a defined category, but a constellation of events, radiating outward from a formal core. At the close of the previous chapter, ‘disputation’ was defined by two criteria: the learned or clerical status of those involved, and its adherence to the academic process. Here, where the details of that process are taken into account, neither criterion is lessened; but both describe a spectrum, rather than an homogenous block. It is with this in mind that instances of public religious disputation will now be placed in context.

Chapter Three: Disputation Exploited, 1558-1581

'I would you would dispute to have the truth knowen, rather then to have victorie...'[1]

Disputation permeated religious discourse in post-Reformation England, but was not uniform in its circumstances and tone. In the later sixteenth century, the emphasis was on authority and power: disputation of controversial religion was prohibited by royal injunction in 1559, and those events sanctioned afterwards were, for the most part, neither fair nor balanced.[2] Though the practice was not used exclusively in anti-Catholic efforts, or for the maintenance of state and church authority, much public religious disputation under Elizabeth involved the examination of imprisoned priests. From the accounts produced, and the arrangements they describe, it is clear that the authorities saw the potential – and therefore also the dangers – of the practice as a weapon in the country's charged religious climate.

This is not to argue that all public religious disputation was cynically motivated. The form had an image of impartial enquiry, the scope for comprehensive (or selective) evidence, and, in more controlled situations, the relative safety that came with being able to dictate an encounter's course and terms; but there are examples in this period of those in high office taking *genuine* interest in the outcome of a debate, and in the questions tackled. It should also be noted that Elizabethan religious disputation was not limited to one-sided engagements – accounts of prison debate are most prevalent in the 1580s, and the later period produced a number of more balanced events. Conference to reclaim recusants was required of clergymen from the 1570s.[3] Thus, a genuine belief in the efficacy of such debate cannot be dismissed. Accounts of prison disputation should be seen, in academic *and* religious terms, as but the most driven, controlled aspect of a wider, respected process. The assertion of McCoog that

[1] Edmund Campion, BL Harl. MS 422, f. 148^{v}.
[2] Henry Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion* (Oxford, 1898), p. 60.
[3] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 151; see chapter 4 below.

Reformation disputations were trials, 'to demonstrate the wicked errors of a convicted heretic or... destroy religious opposition', lacks nuance; particularly when extended to this period.[4]

The Examination of Catholics

Most accounts of public religious disputation in Elizabethan England detail encounters with imprisoned Catholics, but a systematic exploitation of the form must be proved, rather than assumed. It could be argued that in the period's climate of controversy and formal discourse disputation would naturally occur; and that the dominance of prison debate in the surviving records reflects circumstance, rather than design. Lake and Questier present the early modern prison as but 'the place where Catholics and Protestants were most often brought together' – a natural arena for disputation, that facilitated interaction through the laxity of the system, the legitimate, at times public, platform it offered and the sheer number of priests incarcerated.[5] Christopher Bagshaw's account of the Catholic community at Wisbech notes conference *and* disputation between the priests as they descended into factionalism at the end of the sixteenth century, a measure of freedom that was not unusual.[6] This said, the role of the authorities in arranging and, crucially, *reporting* prison debate should not be understated.[7] The freedoms enjoyed could vary: when Fulke offered disputation to Catholics held at Wisbech in 1580, John Feckenham reportedly commented, 'these men are as strange to mee as you are'; this offered little evidence of the community Bagshaw would later describe.[8] The prisoners were free to turn down Fulke's offer,

[4] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 120.
[5] Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 'Prisons, Priests and People', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (London, 1997), pp. 195-233.
[6] Christopher Bagshaw, *A True Relation of the Faction Begun at Wisbech* (London, 1601), esp. pp. 1, 12-3, 22-3, 71; Lake and Questier, 'Prisons, Priests and People', p. 202.
[7] The authorities played a role in the Wisbech disputes: Milward, *Religious Controversies... Elizabethan*, pp. 117-119; Lake and Questier, 'Prisons Priests and People', p. 206.
[8] Lake and Questier, 'Prisons, Priests and People', pp. 197-8; Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. A5^{r}.

but could not set terms for the debate.[9] Similarly, Campion, imprisoned in the Tower, was never allowed to set conditions, and few of his challenges were directly answered.[10] Moreover, where *accounts* of prison debate are concerned, clear patterns of application and restriction can be traced.

The prison disputations for which accounts survive are never directly instigated by a Catholic challenge. Invariably, the Protestants propose or demand a debate, under instruction from someone in authority. Fulke was dispatched to Wisbech by Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, though he had no written commission.[11] Campion's opponents were sent by a reluctant John Aylmer (directed by 'a higher authority'), and the disputation between Rainolds and Hart was arranged by Francis Walsingham.[12] The authoritative tone of the Campion debates is further heightened by the presence of men like Thomas Norton and Robert Beale. These events, as Lake and Questier argue, represent an official appropriation of (and collusion with) the prison environment: a turn to public display in lieu of effective physical control.[13] But they were still *cautiously* undertaken, pursued and contained in response to the *authorities*' concerns.

The more important question is how these occasions were squared with the image of disputation. The form's use in examination or power-play was not an Elizabethan innovation: at the Marian debates held prior to the executions of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, a similarly fragile balance was maintained between political purpose and intellectual process. David Loades describes these events as a 'show trial', whose 'paper thin academic properties deceived no one'; but their use of formal disputation is remarkable: it was chosen *instead* of a trial, 'to discredit [the reformers']

[9] Fulke, *True Reporte*, *passim.*
[10] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. H^{r-v}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs K.i^{r}, N.iii^{r}, R.iiii^{r}, S.ii^{r}, U.iii^{r}, U.iii^{v}, U.iiii^{v}, X.iiii^{v}, Ff.i^{v}.
[11] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. A2^{r-v}.
[12] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 135; see Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. C.i^{r}, and Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. H^{v}; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 33.
[13] Lake and Questier, 'Prisons, Priests and People', pp. 204-5. Towards the end of the reign, Henry Fitzsimon was 'allowed' to conduct prison disputations in Ireland: Gaffney, 'Practice of Religious Controversy', p. 150.

intellectual pretensions'.[14] Manipulation of the process was not seen as anathema to its status; at least, those in authority express little doubt on that score. In fact, its use as a polemical device shows its contemporary standing: Greenslade invokes these events as a sign of the continued prominence of disputation, despite their imbalance, and the same can be said for Elizabethan prison encounters.[15]

These 1554 debates had many of the restrictive features that would characterise prison disputation under Elizabeth. Cranmer and the others were permitted to dispute at one of the universities, but at Oxford, the more conservative institution. They were separated when the disputations began, and lacked the time and books necessary to prepare – at least, so Ridley complained when summoned.[16] Moreover, their adversaries were 'advocates and judges,' as Loades has it, 'with the power to condemn their opponents of heresy if they were so to find.'[17] Religious disputation with those imprisoned for their beliefs was naturally riddled with difficulties. The prisoners themselves were aware of the balance of power, and their objections are often cited in their opponents' accounts, to demonstrate fairness in the works themselves. At Wisbech, Fulke was told: 'disputation is void, for although wee overcome our adversaries, wee shoulde not prevail, the lawe is already... against us, & wee come rather to suffer, than to dispute.'[18] John Young was of the opinion that disputation with prisoners 'cannot be a free disputation' – a view echoed in Feckenham's need for immunity.[19] In 1581, Campion can be seen refusing to dispute on the true church, as it would be 'daungerous, unles leave might be obtained of her

[14] D. M. Loades, *The Oxford Martyrs* (London, 1970), pp. 127-8. Cranmer, Peter Martyr and others had agreed to defend Edward's church in a public disputation, but this suggestion died with Cranmer's imprisonment: W. J. Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Boston Mass., 2007), p. 17; Anthony Marten, *Another Collection of Certeine Divine Matters and Doctrines of the Same M. D. Peter Martyr* (London, 1583), sig. Qq.iii^{r}.
[15] Greenslade, 'Faculty of Theology', p. 324. The arguments were remarkably detailed: Loades, *Oxford Martyrs*, pp. 131-6. Persons described the Marian debates as an oasis of fairness amid Protestant-controlled encounters; 'havinge both judges, notaryes, and arbitrators to the likinge of both parts appointed': N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, pp. 17-19, 74.
[16] Loades, *Oxford Martyrs*, pp. 129, 131.
[17] Ibid., p. 129.
[18] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. A5^{v}.
[19] Ibid., sigs B^{v}, A5^{r}-A5^{v}; see chapter 2 above.

Majesties most honourable Counsail'.[20] Fear of recrimination hindered debate, but there is a also more general principle at work here: the value of free and fair disputation. Campion's objections are buttressed with the observation that his opponent would be granted 'free disputation' in any Catholic city.[21]

Imprisonment also created a direct, psychological imbalance, to say nothing of torture and impending execution. Hart reportedly told Rainolds: 'The condition of conference with you is somewhat un-even. For I lie in prison, and am adjudged to dye: the closeness of the one, & terror of the other, doth dull a mans spirits, and make him very unfitte for study.'[22] Campion's 1581 debates began with a discussion of his racking, in which Owen Hopton told him that he protested too much, having 'rather seene then felt the racke': 'you could, and did presently go thence to your lodging without helpe, and use your handes in writing, and all other partes of your body: which you could not have done, if you had bene put to that punishment, with any such extremitie as you speake of.'[23]

The withholding of books was perhaps the most common complaint. This, it should be noted, was not just a natural consequence of incarceration: here, the authorities could have a direct impact on the balance of a debate. 'They bid us fight,' one priest complained at Fulke's Wisbech conference, 'and take our weapons from us.'[24] The objection was repeated, despite Fulke's argument that scripture and the Fathers were 'sufficient'.[25] What is remarkable here, aside from that confessional difference noted in chapter two, is the source of the refusal: 'I have no authoritie to deliver you those bookes', Fulke tells them; 'I cannot deliver those that are taken away by order of the Counsell'.[26] More intriguing than imbalance between the sides in prison disputation is the relationship between the Protestant disputants and their

[20] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. K.iii^{v}.
[21] Ibid., sig. Y^{v}.
[22] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 33.
[23] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. C.i^{v}.
[24] Fulke, *True Reporte* sig. A3^{v}.
[25] Ibid., sigs A3^{v}-A4^{v}, B3^{r}-B4^{v}.
[26] Ibid., sig. A4^{r-v}.

superiors: such instances highlight the tension between open discourse and political reserve.

At first glance, this question was handled in a similar manner by Rainolds and Hart, the priest stating: 'I am destitute of bookes: we are not permitted to have any at all, saving the Bible onely. You of the other side may have bookes at will: and you come fresh from the universitie: whereby you are the readier to use them and alleage them.'[27] Rainolds' response echoes that of Fulke: 'If a man do surfet of varietie of dishes, the Phisicion doth well to dyet him with one wholsome kinde of meat'; but here, the requirements of disputant and patron are reversed, as Walsingham's order was that Hart be provided with any book he needed.[28] In the context of previous events, he might simply have been trying to ensure the *appearance* of equity; but his own well-documented Protestant confidence, and the interest he displays at the 1584 Lambeth debate, suggests something more.[29] Of course, use of disputation in religious polemic and a genuine belief in its efficacy are not incompatible when one has faith.

Elizabethan prison debates thus amplify the tensions afflicting public religious disputation in this period: discursive and intellectual ideals are revered on their own merits *and* carefully manipulated – a situation complicated by the inequalities of power involved. It would be easy to dismiss such occasions as 'show trials', but despite the authorities' involvement, intentions were not always obvious, and the outcome was not always a foregone conclusion. For all the control they were subject to, prison disputations could – as Lake and Questier indicate – be real, public manifestations of discourse, and their conditions varied as the reign progressed. An examination of individual events is thus required to untangle the web of perceptions and intent surrounding them.

[27] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 33.
[28] Ibid., p. 35
[29] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 56^{v}; see (for example) Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 166-7.

The Westminster Conference

The 1559 Westminster conference, called to ease the passage of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, began – on the surface – as a more balanced affair. The official account, set forth in black letter by Jugg and Cawood ('prynters to the Quenes Majestie'), describes its purpose in positive, academic terms: 'for the satisfaction of persons doubtful, as also for the knowledge of the very trueth in certayne mater of difference'; and where the Catholic side, composed of Marian bishops and clergymen, are asked to 'render accompte of their fayth', it is made clear that these are the Archbishop of York's own words.[30] This opening cannot, however, disguise the event's purpose. William Haugaard suggested that it was initially intended to prepare the ground for reform before a clerical audience, but that political developments had broadened its role.[31] Even in the printed account, there is an immediacy to its timing ('assone as possible might be agreed upon'), and there was an overwhelming political presence in the event, including the Privy Council and members of the nobility and Parliament.[32] The account states that representatives and nobles asked that answers be written and read in English, against Catholic wishes, 'for the better satisfaction & inhabling of their owne Judgments to treate and conclude of suche lawes as myght depende hereupon.'[33] The debate's political drive thus shines through the academic imagery of this report.

Moreover, while enough was granted the Catholics for the *rhetoric* of balance to be maintained, the outcome of the conference was pre-arranged as far as possible.

---

[30] Anon, *The Declaracyon of the Procedynge of a Conference* (London, 1560), sigs 1^{v}-2^{v}. Nicholas Heath had been granted the see of York by papal provision: ODNB Heath, Nicholas. The other bishops (as listed by Gary Jenkins, following John Jewel and John Foxe) were Bayne of Coventry and Lichfield, White of Winchester, Watson of Lincoln, Scot of Chester and Oglethorpe of Carlisle, with Henry Cole, Dean of St Paul's, and John Harpsfield, Alban Langdale and William Chedsey: Gary W. Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves and Illustrious Subjects at the 1559 Westminster Disputation', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 75 (2006), p. 321. Feckenham was also present. On the use of black letter in works for wide circulation, see Green, *Christian's ABC*, p. 7.

[31] William P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 97-100.

[32] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sigs 2^{r}, 3^{v}; Haugaard, *Elizabeth*, p. 101.

[33] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 3^{v}; Haugaard, *Elizabeth*, p. 97; Norman L. Jones, *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion 1559* (London, 1982), p. 124.

In a letter to Peter Martyr, Jewel – soon to be a Westminster delegate – outlined the occasion's purpose in terms far removed from those of the official account: it had been arranged so that the Catholics 'may have no ground of complaint that they are put down by power and authority of law'.[34] The questions were chosen to pave the way for reform, and were framed around scripture and the ancient church, undermining recourse to continuity, and the final format required answers in English.[35] Of the Catholic requirements, it was granted that answers be provided in writing, but even this was qualified with the proviso that they be read aloud.[36] These conditions reflect purpose and audience, as Haugaard notes. But they also speak to the *primacy* of purpose over intellectual ideals and Catholic demands. In an echo of Jewel, Robert Persons' history of disputation asserted that 'the Queene and those that were nearest about her, havinge determined to make a change of Religion, thought they should do yt best, and most justifiable, yf they promised some name of disputation, wherin the Catholiks had byn satisfied or vanquished'.[37] Westminster, then, had much in common with prison debates: it was politically driven, weighted against the Catholic side and then conducted in a partisan manner. Though neither side were prisoners when the debate began, by its end the bishops of Lincoln and Winchester were *en route* to the Tower.[38]

Historical consensus describes the event as 'staged'; or, at the least, 'manipulated to discredit the Catholic cause'.[39] Norman Jones suggested that it was only intended 'to provide propaganda', and was then seized upon as an opportunity to weaken the Catholic position.[40] Remarkably, however, the printed account

[34] Jewel to Martyr, in *The Works of John Jewel*, vol. 4, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge, 1850), p. 1200; Haugaard, *Elizabeth*, p. 97; Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', pp. 318-19.
[35] Jones, *Faith by Statute*, p. 123; Haugaard, *Elizabeth*, pp. 96, 100; Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', p. 321.
[36] Jones, *Faith by Statute*, p. 124. Further, see Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', pp. 330-1.
[37] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 78.
[38] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 7^{v}.
[39] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 121; Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 32.
[40] He further argues that the intention was to 'expose' the bishops; suggesting both exploitation of *and* respect for disputation: Jones, *Faith by Statute*, pp. 115, 127.

manipulates little beyond *process*: the Catholics' discredit is attempted through a description of practice and attitude.[41] The religious points – of which there were several before the conference collapsed – are glossed over, and the questions are appended almost as an afterthought.[42] To give a typical example, referring to the Catholics' spokesman, Henry Cole: '[He] made a declaracyon of their meaninges and their reasons to their first [pro]position, which being ended, they were asked by the privy counsel if any of them had any more to be saied: and they said no.'[43] The purpose of this work, then, is not religious instruction. Unlike later accounts, it is *entirely* polemical – an epideictic tale. Here, the character of the new settlement is being defined, in opposition to that of its detractors.[44]

The debate itself was not held to the university form; indeed, its conditions remained confused throughout.[45] The authorities' initial agreement to have written declarations rather than open debate again speaks to the event's purpose – clear statements and judgement being preferred over convoluted scholastic disputation. There was, however, a moderator of sorts: Sir Nicholas Bacon, who took the duty to mean keeping the Catholics in check.[46] From the outset, by the printed account, the bishops deviated from the predetermined form, claiming to have 'mistaken' the initial agreement. Their 'book' was not ready, but they were prepared 'to argue and

[41] Jenkins makes the point that victory was achieved through rhetoric rather than argument, although he does not emphasise procedural ideals: Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', pp. 318, 337.
[42] The questions appointed concerned the use of Latin in common prayer and the sacraments, the authority of individual churches to appoint ceremonies, and the lack of scriptural evidence to suggest that the Mass was for the living and the dead: Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 8^{r}.
[43] Ibid., sig. 5^{r}. Jewel offers a remarkable account of Cole's demeanour: he 'turned himself towards all quarters, and into every possible attitude, stamping with his feet, throwing about his arms, bending his sides, snapping his fingers, alternately elevating and depressing his eyebrows...'; 'I never heard any one rave after a more solemn and dictatorial manner': Jewel, *Works*, vol. 4, p. 1203.
[44] Persons' account is similarly focused on conduct and process; blaming the authorities for the outcome: N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, pp. 77-86.
[45] Collinson, however, describes it as 'the Westminster Disputation' (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 32), and Jones terms it a disputation throughout; but the printed account alternates between 'conference' and 'meeting'. Jewel suggests that there were *plans* to use formal disputation; his report to Martyr stating that 'on the first day nothing should be proposed by either party beyond bare affirmations; and... at the next meeting we were to answer them, and they, in their turn, to reply to us': Jewel, *Works*, vol. 4, p. 1203.
[46] See Jones, *Faith by Statute*, pp. 125-6. To Persons, this moderator was 'one of the greatest adversaryes to Catholike Religion, that was in England, violent in condition, and utterly ignorant in matters of divinity'; N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 79.

dispute'.[47] As the debate continues, the account turns into a litany of awkwardness: having declared that they had no more to say on the first proposition, several of the bishops then ask to add to their answer – a deviation which, like their first 'mistake', is allowed, though 'they myghte have ben well reprehended for suche maner of cavillacyons'. The granting of both requests is here described as having two motives: to ensure the Catholics' a full hearing, and – crucially – for the better ordering of the debate.[48]

Further argument on the first question was appointed for the second day, but was then disallowed by Bacon, who insisted that the Catholics go to the second topic.[49] After a dispute as to who should begin, they then refused to proceed.[50] Rather than provide a reason for their stand, the printed account glosses over both the initial arrangement *and* this second dispute, satisfying itself with denunciation: the Catholics persist in their refusal with no regard to the arguments, their own reputations, or their cause, 'upon what sinister or dysordered meaninge is not yet fullye knowen (though in some part it be understa[n]ded)'.[51] The implication, that they had no confidence in their position, would survive in polemicists' citations of the event: Featley invoked it in 1638: 'after the Protestants had given the charge, the Popish party... sounded a retreat, and upon frivolous pretences brake up the conference'.[52] Haugaard finds the reason for their reluctance in the second question, on the authority of individual churches, which required either compliance or a damaging appeal to papal authority.[53] But in addition, direct exertion of authority and clumsy manipulation of procedure, in an already imbalanced, politicised exchange, had turned them against further

[47] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 4^{r-v}; Jones, *Faith by Statute*, pp.124-5.
[48] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 5^{v}.
[49] Jones, *Faith by Statute*, p. 126; see Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', pp. 333-7, 338, for an interpretation of the Protestant approach. Again, neither takes account of the *procedural* weight of the moderator; a position whose importance *is* emphasised by Persons.
[50] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, pp. 81-5: 'the Bishops affirminge... [as] the Protestant party was plaintife or accusant, they should begin, and the Bishopps would answere.'
[51] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 6^{v}.
[52] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 20.
[53] Haugaard, *Elizabeth*, pp. 103-4.

participation – by the printed account, some refused 'more ernestly'.[54] At the close, the bishops of Lincoln and Winchester were imprisoned, and the rest were essentially told not to leave town.[55]

The official account of Westminster provides a model for the use of a public debate – and specifically an adversary's conduct – in polemic. The Catholics' perceived evasions and eventual refusal are described as signs of weakness and manifest error, and as disrespectful to 'such an honorable assembly.'[56] Thus, as Persons notes, victory is given to the Protestants, 'and overthrow to the Cath. Bishopps, who yet, as yow see, were never permitted to propose any one argument, or reason in due place and tyme.'[57] Persons invokes practice and purpose, but the *Declaracyon of the Procedynge* had already laid claim to discursive ideals. In calling the conference, Elizabeth sought counsel, demonstrating sovereign wisdom, but the Catholics had then confused and ruined the event.[58] Persons, on the impact of the conference, lamented: '[many] rested themselves upon this point, that the Protestants were learned men, and had gotten the victory in disputations against the Catholiks, for that so yt was told them. And this they thought sufficient for their assurance.'[59]

William Fulke at Wisbech

After Westminster, public disputation of controversial religion was prohibited for more than two decades. National doctrine had been decided, and the government maintained that further debate would not be conducive to uniformity. By 1580, however, this restriction had become problematic. Disputation at the universities

[54] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 7^{r}.
[55] Ibid., sig. 7^{v}: 'the rest (savynng y[e] abbot of Westminster) stand bounde to make daylye their personall apparaunce before the counsell, and not to departe the Cytye of London and Westminster, untill further order be taken with theim for their disobedience and contempte'; see Jewel, *Works*, vol. 4, p. 1204. On the political aftermath, see Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', p. 325.
[56] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 7^{r-v}.
[57] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 86.
[58] Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 1^{v}.
[59] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 87.

continued, the queen herself attending several on visitations, and reports of public, controversial debate on the continent had found their way into English print.[60] Awareness of the practice had not diminished. There had also been developments in the church hierarchy and the higher levels of government: a more engaged, reformist group – typified by Walsingham and Leicester – had risen, and maintained a secure position even after the fall of Edmund Grindal; and both they and the conservatives on whom Elizabeth increasingly relied were faced with growing puritan dissent and the immediate danger of the Catholic missions, both of which demanded confrontation.[61] The former trends are tied to what Lake, following Collinson, has described as the 'protestantization of English culture and society' from the early 1570s.[62]

Thus, when Campion distributed his 'Brag' to the Privy Council in 1580, challenging defenders of the English Church to a public disputation, reactions were mixed.[63] At first, the official line was maintained: the radical controversialist William Charke stated that Christians were 'assured of the manifest trueth', and had no need of a debate after so long without them; and Meredith Hanmer agreed that the time for discussion had passed. Both, however, were willing to debate if it became necessary.[64] Campion himself, in November 1580, reported that many refused his challenge *solely*

[60] Elizabeth's visitations are summarised in Williams, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 397. Further, see Wood, *History and Antiquities*, vol. 2, pp. 154-162. In 1566, one of the disputants was a young Edmund Campion: Williams, 'Elizabethan Oxford', p. 411; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 18. Geoffrey Fenton's *Actes of Conference in Religion* (London, 1571) translated a cross-confessional debate at the Duke of Montpensier's house in Paris.

[61] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 166-7. See Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', esp. pp. 136-7, 155-8; Peter Lake 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), esp. pp. 593, 596, 615-16.

[62] Peter Lake, 'Defining Puritanism – Again?', in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston Mass., 1993), p. 8.

[63] The work requests three hearings: 'the first before your Honours, wherein I will discourse of religion, so far as it touches the commonweal and your nobilities; the second, *whereof I make more account*, before the Doctors and Masters and chosen men of both Universities... the third before the lawyers, spiritual and temporal': cited in Arthur F. Marotti, *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame, 2005), p. 12 (emphasis added); Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 180.

[64] William Charke, *An Answere to a Seditious Pamphlet* (London, 1580), sigs A.ii^{v}-A.iiii^{r}; Meredith Hanmer, *The Great Bragge and Challenge of M. Champion a Jesuit* (London, 1581), *passim*; McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', pp. 129-30; Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 12.

because of royal commandment.[65] The Jesuit painted this as an excuse; but given later events, there were undoubtedly divines who felt constrained by the policy. Moreover, as Lake and Questier discuss, the challenge – and the mission itself – presented the authorities with a crisis of legitimacy. The 'Brag' was a precaution against politicisation of the Jesuits' presence, but the approach of this and related works was to level that same accusation: the government and English preachers, they argued, were unable to defend their position in debate, and so made the exchange a political one, following their own worldly inclinations and abilities.[66] Thus, the authorities were faced with – and had helped to create – a climate in which public religious disputation could no longer be avoided. Forms of discourse had already been urged from within their own ranks and resisted (the best example being Grindal's stand and removal); but these challenges *publicly* placed their prohibition on the wrong side of religious *and intellectual* principle.[67]

Where the acceptability of public disputation is concerned, however, striking parallels can be drawn between the attitude of English authorities and that of Catholic leaders on the continent: McCoog charts disagreement between Everard Mercurian, Jesuit Superior General, and William Allen on precisely this question. Mercurian, long wary of any English mission, forbade disputation unless the priests saw no other option: 'it is a characteristic of heretics, when they are clearly beaten in argument, to be unwilling to give in to anybody'.[68] But Allen looked for academic ability in his

[65] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 129.
[66] Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', pp. 606-7, 624. See Thomas M. McCoog, '"The Flower of Oxford": The Role of Edmund Campion in Early Recusant Polemics', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24 (1993), esp. p. 899.
[67] On the prophesyings, see Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', esp. p. 132: 'Their dialogic form put different expositions of the same scriptural text before promiscuously mixed, clerical and lay, elite but also popular, audiences... [they] could thus be taken to be constructing an intellectually active and critical audience, an audience called upon, in effect, to judge between different positions... attempts to start discussion, provoke opinion, raise questions and thus to create division'.
[68] McCoog, '"Playing the Champion"', p. 125. For later Jesuit recommendations, see Michael Questier, ''Like Locusts Over all the World': Conversion, Indoctrination and the Society of Jesus in Late Elizabethan and Jacobean England', in McCoog, *The Reckoned Expense*, esp. pp. 272, 280.

missionaries, describing Campion as 'a most brilliant orator and of most ready wit'.[69] Allen's preferences are apparent in the programme of his Douai seminary: its students were trained in disputation, taught to examine scripture in the original languages, and pitted against each other in practice debates. Each week, some would take the Protestant side to hone their skills; and material for study was chosen specifically to counter Protestant divines.[70] Just as English clergymen faced conflicting orders and instincts, then, the missionaries had a range of instructions, but the English authorities did not leave the question open to debate. Thus, it was inevitable that the challenge would be a Catholic one; and that the resulting debate would play out behind prison walls. A *need* for disputation can be found on both sides, long before 1580; but until the mission began, it was held in check by cautious authorities, perpetuating old warnings about engagement with heretics.

The work of Campion and Persons (who soon added his voice to the challenge) marks an end to the English authorities' aversion to public religious disputation. In October 1580, just months after the 'Brag', Fulke was dispatched to Wisbech, his offer bearing the authority of Bishop Cox.[71] A former Chancellor of Oxford, Cox maintained a keen interest in learning and close relations with Elizabeth and Lord Burghley.[72] By Fulke's account, the prisoners were unprepared for this Episcopal mandate: they refused to accept Cox's involvement until they received letter and testimony to that effect.[73] They had been required to have regular *private* conference with Protestant divines, and Fulke states that this was not the first such offer to be

[69] McCoog, '"Playing the Champion"', pp. 123-4; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, pp. 17-18.
[70] McCoog, '"Playing the Champion"', p. 122.
[71] On Persons' challenge, see Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 11n. McCoog does not mention Wisbech, instead describing the Campion debates as an initial attempt 'to demonstrate that the government was not afraid of a discussion'. The change in attitude, he argues, was a direct result of Campion's work – particularly the *Rationes Decem* of June 1581. McCoog, '"Playing the Champion"', pp. 130-1, 135. On the Wisbech Catholics, several of whom had been involved in the 1554 disputations, see Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', p. 137n; N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 74.
[72] ODNB Cox, Richard; Kirby, *Zurich Connection*, pp. 2, 15; Jenkins, 'Whoresome Knaves', p. 323. Cox had presided over Peter Martyr's Oxford disputations on the Eucharist and had been present at Westminster: N.D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, pp. 34, 78. Lake notes that '*even* Cox had reservations about the prophesyings': Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', p. 134 (emphasis added).
[73] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. A2^{v}.

made to them; but this reaction, and the fact that some were strangers to one another, suggests a new approach. This was, moreover, the first such meeting to be written up and printed.[74]

The comparisons to be drawn between Fulke's account and the printed report after Westminster are striking. The exchange was not, in itself, a disputation; rather, it was an impromptu conference grown from an attempt to initiate one. The Catholics' lengthy refusal again allows the work's force to derive from attitudes, rather than theological points, but its tone is less driven. It is written in dialogue form – claiming, at least, to recount everything said – and eschews the judgemental language of later portions of the Westminster account. Fulke concludes: 'Seeing yee refuse all thinges I offer you, I have no more to say: but to pray to God, if it be his will, to open your eyes, that you may see the trueth, or els to hasten his judgementes uppon you for your obstinacie.'[75] This is a measured approach to the reporting of religious discourse, engendered by the climate in which it was produced. The message of the work – that Catholics refuse to take part in reasoned debate – is the same, but it is left to the reader to come to this conclusion and draw inferences from it.

This is not, however, to suggest that the Catholics were shown leniency; indeed, their refusal of Fulke's offer was prompted by the conditions he proposed. Although it is suggested that they would be allowed to select the topics (an element not left to chance at Westminster) and to decide whether the debate would proceed by writing or speech, prison limitations are still in evidence: they were not to be allowed books beyond scripture and the Fathers, and their notes would not be returned to them.[76] Fulke's discussion of these restrictions raises an interesting question: throughout, he is remarkably eager to know whether the Catholics would dispute;

[74] Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 28; Fulke, *True Reporte*, sigs A2^{r}-A3^{r}.
[75] Fulke, *True Reporte*, sig. B5^{v}.
[76] Ibid., sigs A3^{v}-A5^{v}; Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 2^{r}; N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 79.

enough to suggest that this was his (or his patrons') only concern.[77] He had not, one might argue, been sent to arrange a disputation, so much as to ascertain whether, and under what circumstances, the prisoners would take part. This, in the context of the Jesuit challenge, is a crucial distinction. Either Fulke and Cox were genuinely trying to engage the prisoners, or they were working to improve the credibility of the church after the 'Brag'. A combination of the two is most likely: those involved cannot have been oblivious to the Jesuit challenges, but here they do put another question to the prisoners. After their initial refusal, Fulke asks if they will hear him preach – an offer they again refuse. This, however, is not pursued as vigorously, and cannot be described as the account's primary focus.[78]

Fulke's efforts at Wisbech produced some brief discussion of religion, but this was not held to any form. His account records sporadic debate on the question of the true church, a sermon given by one of his companions ('Flud' by name) and the practice of disputation itself, before he returns to his offer and asks, *hypothetically*, whether the prisoners would dispute at Cambridge. Again they refuse, and the meeting ends.[79] Fulke's account was printed the following year.

Disputations with Campion

This meeting is valuable as a first showing of the authorities' hand, and as a disputation *about* disputation; but in all other respects it is overshadowed by the

[77] He repeats the question in response to several queries and demands: Fulke, *True Reporte*, sigs A4^{r}, A5^{r}, A5^{v}.
[78] Ibid., sigs A6^{r}-A8^{r}.
[79] Ibid., sigs A6^{v}-B5^{v}. On 'Fludd (or Floyde)', see Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 325. The opinions of disputation here are remarkable; Feckenham stating: 'I like no disputation: I never knew good come by disputation. In the beginning of Queene Maries time there was a disputatio[n] in the Convocation house: What good came of it? There was an other disputation in the beginning of the Queenes raigne at Westminster, there came no good of it. And since there have beene disputations, but no good as I see, come of them: therefore I like not these disputations'; sig. B2^{v} (the statement may be Fulke's, to show that Catholics did not, indeed, profit by debate). The reference to later disputations does not – as far as the evidence shows – refer to recorded, public events.

events of 1581. That July, Campion was captured and taken to the Tower.[80] In questioning him, the authorities had two objectives: counteracting his writings and activities, and establishing his role – if any – in the Catholic plots being concocted on the continent. The Jesuit maintained that his purpose in England was purely religious, having affirmed as much at a gathering of priests that month, but he was nonetheless questioned on his contacts and the circumstances of his being in the country.[81] The approach taken with Campion was twofold: persuasion and discredit, the two blurring together as false reports of his confession and conversion were distributed at home and abroad.[82] Through late July and August, he was tortured, moved in and out of close imprisonment and examined in a variety of settings on his activities and intent.[83] Meanwhile, John Aylmer was directed to answer his *Rationes Decem* – which had been distributed at St Mary's, Oxford in June – and to arrange disputations with the Jesuit.[84] This measure was designed to undermine Campion's challenges; to discredit him with Catholics and Protestants alike, particularly those over whom he might have exerted some influence.[85] In the late 19th century, Richard Simpson suggested that the impact of the *Rationes Decem* stemmed from its roots in 'the new learning'; and

[80] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 134; Richard Simpson, *Edmund Campion: a Biography* (London, 1896), p. 338. Campion had previously engaged in private conferences: Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, pp. 24, 31, 33.
[81] Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 330, 341-2; Elizabeth Hanson, 'Torture and Truth in Renaissance England', *Representations* 34 (1991), p. 72. On the mission's purpose, see Persons in G. T., *An Epistle of the Persecution of Catholikes in Englande* (Douai, 1582), esp. p. 82; McCoog, '"The Flower of Oxford"', *passim*; Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere", pp. 600-1, 605-612.
[82] Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 335, 339-40.
[83] Ibid., pp. 337-345; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, pp. 35-7. Once, several historians claim, Campion was brought before the queen; although this has been called into question: Marion Colthorpe, 'Edmund Campion's Alleged Interview with Queen Elizabeth I in 1581', *Recusant History*, 17 (1985), pp. 197-9.
[84] Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 13; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, pp. 31-3. The *Rationes Decem* laid out Campion's proposed line of argument and attacked reformed answers to the 'Brag': see Edmund Campion, *Ten Reasons*, ed. J. H. Pollen (London, 1914), p. 90. Aylmer's reluctance to respond is outlined in Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 357-9, and letters expressing the same can be found at BL Lansd. MS 33, nos 17 and 18. In John Strype's biography of Aylmer, the bishop is not described as having a hand in the Campion debates, Strype focusing on his objections after the fact: *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Aylmer* (London, 1701), pp. 53-4.
[85] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 135; Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 335-6, 360-1. Simpson provides a letter from Rainolds to a pupil as evidence of Campion's impact: 'you seem to me, to study more industriously than decently a most virulent enemy of religion, and to admire more vehemently than justly a barbered and dandified rhetorician'; from the Latin in John Keble (ed.), *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1888), p. 106.

indeed, the work imagines its readers as 'philosophers, keen-sighted, lovers of the truth, of simplicity, of modesty, enemies of temerity, of trifles and sophisms'.[86] Simpson argues that the debates resulted partly from the demands of interested courtiers, though they were certainly a polemical strategy by the queen and Council.

These 'public' disputations – acceptable now that Campion languished in the Tower – were arranged entirely to the Jesuit's disadvantage, and would prove the most imbalanced of the reign.[87] But the printed, Protestant accounts they produced describe – for the first time in the period – the formal structures of disputation, in claiming even-handedness. They are also the first such works to fully address controversial topics.[88] Of course, their rhetoric of balance and purpose is hampered by Campion's situation, not to mention the Protestants' approach, and they do not endeavour to hide their allegiances; but given the circumstances in which the debates were arranged, and the climate in which the *Rationes Decem* had been received, their descriptions of full, formal disputation – which Catholic reports confirm to have been used in the event – speak to the continued acceptance of scholastic debate, and its *re*acceptance by the state and church. There had been a progression, of sorts, from Westminster.

The disputations took place over four days. On the last of August, the opponents were Nowell and Day, deans of St Paul's and Windsor. On September 18th, Fulke took over, with Roger Goad; both returning on the 23rd. Four days later, the opponents were John Walker and William Charke, the latter having served as notary at

[86] Campion, *Ten Reasons*, p. 145; Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 362-3. Lake and Questier describe its notoriety as a result of 'tone and... medium': Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', p. 608.
[87] See Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 41; Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 262, 335-6.
[88] The Protestant accounts are *A True Report* by Nowell and Day, and Field's *Three Last Days*, printed together in 1583. Catholic reports include an account of the first debate in the Tresham papers, printed in HMC, *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections*, vol. 3 (London, 1904), pp. 8-16, and items at the British Library (Harl. MS 422, ff. 136^{r}-172^{v}, containing the third and fourth debates, and Add. MS 11055, ff. 188^{r}-192^{v}, containing the main arguments of the second and fourth; Add. MS 39828, f. 38) and Bodleian (Rawl. D.353, ff. 1-35). Extracts and summaries were produced by Catholics on the continent, including Paolo Bombino and Daniello Bartoli. For an overview, accompanying edited transcriptions, see Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, esp. pp. 220-9 (I have consulted and cite the originals as far as possible).

previous debates.[89] These clergymen are an interesting mix. Nowell was a Marian exile, who upon his preferment demonstrated leanings toward puritanism.[90] Day had been a young convert, his radicalism tempered enough for him to enjoy state patronage throughout his career.[91] Fulke and Goad were Cambridge men: one was head of Pembroke, the other provost of King's.[92] Fulke, an associate of Thomas Cartwright and a man of dwindling puritan conviction, was the most active in anti-Catholicism: Wisbech and the Campion debates represent an engagement that would come to dominate his career.[93] Goad, a lifelong moderate, had also visited Wisbech in 1580, on Cox's panel investigating the Family of Love.[94] The final opponents present the most unusual duo: Walker was a committed reformer, adapting to Elizabethan moderation; but Charke was more radical.[95] A 'puritan ringleader', active in the conferences, his deployment here was a result of his own anti-Catholic efforts and dealings with Aylmer.[96] The inclusion of men like Charke is remarkable, offering an insight into the authorities' objectives. Field, a notary for the latter disputations and author of the corresponding account, was to become a leading figure in the presbyterian dissent of the later 1580s, although Collinson notes his 'respectability' at the time of the 1581 debates, Field having secured favour with Leicester.[97] Aylmer had encountered Field, Charke and others in 1577, sending William Cecil a report that

---

[89] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs A.i^{r}, C.i^{r}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs H^{r}, O.i^{r}, Z.iii^{r}; BL Harl. MS 422, f. 148^{r}.

[90] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 63, 65-6, 70, 74. Holleran notes his 'reputation for winning converts': Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 44.

[91] Though described as an 'extreme Puritan' by S. L. Ollard, Day was named Bishop of Winchester in January 1595, with the support of William and Robert Cecil: S. L. Ollard, *Fasti Wyndesorienses: the Deans and Canons of Windsor* (Windsor, 1950), p. 44; ODNB Day, William.

[92] H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958), *passim*; see Richard Bauckham, 'Science and Religion in the Writings of Dr. William Fulke', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 8 (1975), p. 18.

[93] Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse* (Oxford, 1978), p. 321; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, pp. 58-9.

[94] Christopher W. Marsh, *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 37-9, 203n; Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, esp. pp. 230-1.

[95] ODNB Walker, John.

[96] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 202

[97] Oxford granted him a preaching license in 1579, and in 1581 he took up a lectureship at St. Mary Aldermary, though he was barred from preaching before compiling *The Three Last Days*: Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983), p. 351; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 220n.

deemed such men only marginally less dangerous to uniformity than Catholics; but they still proved useful in confuting Catholicism.[98] Lake and Questier note the opportunities such efforts offered divines like Field, Charke and Walter Travers to show loyalty.[99]

The setting and conditions of the disputations varied – a result of Campion's showing, Catholic reports and the attitude of the authorities.[100] The first took place in a chapel at the Tower, with seating arranged for a large auditory, but the second was held in Hopton's private hall, and was attended by around thirteen people.[101] Each pair of Protestant divines had their own approach, but there were instructions to which they all had to adhere. As noted, the disputation form was used to bind Campion's hands, as he was confined to the role of respondent. Again, this order came from the organisers, Fulke having to inform an adversary that it was beyond his power to grant their demands, although the rule lapsed once on the second day, once on the third, and again under Charke and Walker.[102] Remarkably, in seeking to justify the debates' imbalance, the Protestants – and their printed accounts – still work to appropriate the procedural authority of disputation. Where Campion is granted an opportunity to oppose, it is described as a deviation from the appointed course: 'you shalbe answered,' one opponent states, 'though it be not your *part* to oppose'.[103]

---

[98] Strype, *Aylmer*, p. 55. Aylmer had not opposed Charke's appointment as lecturer at Gray's Inn, his response suggesting a similar anti-Catholic policy: Prest, *Inns of Court*, pp. 191-2.

[99] Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', p. 624; see Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', pp. 150, 151; Peter Marshall, 'John Calvin and the English Catholics, c. 1565-1640', *The Historical Journal*, 53 (2010), p. 860.

[100] See Strype, *Aylmer*, p. 53.

[101] Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 363-4, 372. McCoog has only the fourth debate held at Hopton's house: McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 135. He does not, however, cite his source, and Field says nothing of the location. One Catholic report states that the second debate took place 'in Sir Owin Hopton his parlor': BL Add. MS 11055, f. 188^{r}. Holleran notes doubt as to *which* chapel was used for the first, but settles on that of St Peter ad Vincula, because of the size of the audience: Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 41n; HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 8.

[102] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs K.i^{r}, T.iii^{v}-U^{v}, X^{v}, Ff.i^{v}.

[103] Ibid., sig. K.i^{r} (emphasis added). Also, see BL Harl. MS 422, f. 152^{r}: 'Although it be contrary to the order of disputation, and to our appointed conference, yet I will admitt it'. Holleran states that the rules 'are never explained or justified', but in this overlooks the assertion of the Protestant disputants (and accounts) that *formal disputation*, combined with the state origins of the debate and the accusations of treason levelled at the Jesuits, offered justification enough: Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 72.

As described by Nowell and Day, the first debate began with a blend of suspicion and proselytising goodwill. Campion was told that they were there 'to do him good', and was assured that the questions would be taken from the *Rationes Decem*, so 'he could not thinke himselfe to be suddenly taken as unprovided.' By this account, Campion said only that he did not understand their coming; but the only complete Catholic report of the day has the Jesuit objecting that it was not fair dealing, for he was 'destitute of all the helpes wherewith hee made his booke'.[104] The disputation was soon hijacked by state concerns. Accusations of cruelty in the *Rationes Decem* prompted a discussion of Campion's own experiences, during which Hopton described his time on the rack.[105] The Jesuit was told to consider the cause, at which Beale asked if he had been questioned on religion. By the Protestant account, Campion answered: 'That he was not in deede directly examined of Religion, but moved to confesse in what places he had bene conversant, since his repaire into the Realme'; and when Beale then explained the concern, he replied that 'he might not betray his Catholike brethren'. The examination of the *Rationes Decem* resumed, and that distinctly Elizabethan line between disputation and interrogation was avoided.[106] Catholic accounts are less mannered: Paolo Bombino, an early biographer of the Jesuit, has the intimation of treason causing him to rise to his feet, asserting: 'If anyone, setting my religion aside, dare charge me with any crime whatsoever... discharge on me all the cruelties you can.'[107] The full Catholic account has: 'Let any man... within this realme charge me with woorde or fact but concerninge conscience and religion, and I yelde toe determinacion', at which Nowell calls for silence.[108]

---

[104] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. C.i^{r}; HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 8. The Catholic account notes that 'at the entree everie Protestant had one of Mr. Campion's bookes [the *Decem Rationes*] in his hande.' Campion's wariness reflects this in the work itself: 'it is tortures, not academic disputations, that the high-priests are making ready': Campion, *Ten Reasons*, p. 90; Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', p. 604.

[105] For an alternate version, see HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 9

[106] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs C.i^{v}-C.ii^{r}; HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 9.

[107] Bombino in Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 187; Simpson, *Campion*, p. 366.

[108] HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 9.

The questions, taken from the *Rationes Decem*, were not for Campion's benefit – they were a tactical move. The topics amounted to a defence of positions charged by the work as heretical: the removal of parts of scripture by Luther and subsequent reformers. This allowed Nowell and Day to take the role of the injured party, while their respondent was forced to argue from prior assertions. By the end of the morning, Campion – and those few Catholics allowed to sit by him – were asking that they might dispute on some other point, rather than continue with the work.[109] Campion's difficulty is emphasised in the Protestant account: several times, he falls silent, and once rises up, 'with so great contention of voice, and with such gesture, casting up his armes, & beating upon his booke, that one of us challenged him therefore, demaunding why he used such outragious speach and behaviour'.[110] The Protestants, meanwhile, played to the crowd: they surprised Campion with an edition of Luther chosen to cast doubt on his argument, appealed directly to the judgement of those present, and concluded the morning with a summation which – by their own account – was attacked by the priest Ralph Sherwin as being selective.[111] In the afternoon, they made a show of departing from the *Rationes Decem*, but soon returned to the morning's topics. When they finally turned to another question, it was justification, itself 'first of all other mentioned in [the] booke', and here they protested they had only brief notes, having come to examine the work, 'rather then to dispute'.[112]

Two further points are worth noting in this debate. The first, as reported in the printed account, came when Campion almost subscribed to the doctrine of *sola fidei*, on the condition that his opponents agree that, being justified, one should 'walke forward more and more in the workes of righteousnesse.' Nowell and Day agreed, and

[109] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. D.iii^{v}.
[110] Ibid., sigs C.iii^{r}, C.iii^{v}, D^{v},
[111] Ibid., sigs C.ii^{r}-C.ii^{v}, C.iiii^{r}, D.iii^{v}; HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 11; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 54; Simpson, *Campion*, pp. 366-8. Sherwin plays a substantial role, despite Nowell and Day being 'sent onely to Master Campion' (Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. F.iii^{v}): HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, pp. 11, 13-14. On Sherwin's background, see Scott Pilarz, '"Campion Dead Bites With his Friends' Teeth": Representations of an Early Modern Catholic Martyr', in Christopher Highley and John N. King (eds), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), p. 216n.
[112] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sigs E.i^{r-v}.

the subscription was only stayed by Sherwin.[113] Another point involved Campion's knowledge of Greek. The Jesuit was given several books in the language, which – by the Protestant account – he flatly refused to read; but Catholic reports claim that he refused only the first, and that this prompted scorn from the Protestant side. Later, they assert, the Jesuit read and gave the true meaning of a place in St Basil, confounding any suggestion of deficiency, 'whereat there was some admiration made among the Protestantes.'[114] The printed accounts, produced later, maintain that this is false; and here later opponents take every opportunity to test Campion's knowledge of the tongue. On the second day, Fulke hands him a New Testament, saying: 'see it and reade it'; at which Campion exclaims, 'what childish dealing is this... [I] have as much Greke as wil serve my turne'.[115] On the third, Fulke reads a place in Epiphanius aloud, Campion responding, 'I understand Latine better then Greeke. Yet I trust I have Greeke ynough to answere you withall. Reade it in Latine.'[116] Charke, on the fourth day, makes show of translating a place in Basil, because the Jesuit, he says, did not 'deale... with the Greeke'.[117] It should be noted that alongside Catholic denials, Simpson cited several of Campion's letters, containing 'apposite Greek quotations, written in scholarlike hand'. In his estimation, following the full Catholic report, accounts of Campion's inability are a fiction, based on one refusal (the print was too small), and created purely to discredit him.[118]

Campion was more active when the second day began, questioning the disputations' validity: 'these conferences are unequall, both in respect of the suddainnesse of them, as also for want of such necessary helpes as were fitte and convenient.' It is here that he calls for his own notary.[119] By Field's account, he

[113] Ibid., sig. F.i^{r}.
[114] Ibid., sigs F.iii^{r}-G.i^{r}; HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 14; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 54.
[115] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. M.iii^{r}.
[116] Ibid., sig. Q.i^{v}.
[117] Ibid., sigs Ff.ii^{r}-Ff.ii^{v}.
[118] Simpson, *Campion*, p. 368; HMC, *Various Collections*, vol. 3, p. 14.
[119] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs H^{r-v}; BL Harl. MS 422, f. 148^{r-v}. He concludes: 'I would you would dispute to have the truth knowen, rather then to have victorie'.

summarised his objections by describing the debate as a 'conference' – a rare explicit distinction between this and 'disputation'. His ideal encounter, he states, would be 'in the Universities'.[120]

If the reported conduct of Nowell and Day was grandstanding and opportunistic, that of Fulke and Goad was wholly businesslike.[121] By all reports, their arguments and reactions suggest that they were keen to avoid their predecessors' outbursts, and to proceed efficiently with the examination of Campion's work.[122] Fulke's opening statement, as printed by Field, placed Campion's prior conduct in opposition to the ideals of disputation: 'this I woulde have knowen unto you, that our purpose is not to deale by discourse, but... according to the order of Schooles, &c.'[123] So perfunctory was the Protestants' tone that Campion made a point of asking each divine his name before responding to their questions.[124] As the disputation progressed, following the *Rationes Decem* to church visibility and error, he was rebuked several times for evasion: 'You... abuse the presence with multitude of wordes', Fulke told him; and again, 'You do but talke.'[125] In Field's account, where both sides are called back to the question by Hopton, Goad accuses the Jesuit of trying 'to avoid the matter in controversie'.[126] Throughout, the opponents focused on religious topics, eschewing matters of state authority. Field has Campion answering an instance of St Peter's dissimulation with the declaration: 'Why, in some case the Catholikes thinke they may communicate with you, come to your Churches, & you againe co[m]municate w[ith]us, & go to our churches, *dispute & conferre* w[ith] us, &c'; to which Fulke responds, 'You drawe to a thing you ought to be silent in. It is a matter of state, it were best for you to leave such things.' Here, Campion asks if he is being threatened: a

[120] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. H^{r}.
[121] Holleran describes them as 'magisterial' and 'combative' respectively: Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 64.
[122] See ibid., p. 57.
[123] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. H^{r}.
[124] Ibid., sigs H^{r}, H.iii^{v}; BL Harl. MS 422, f. 148^{r}.
[125] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs H.iii^{r}, I.iii^{v}.
[126] BL Harl. MS 422, f. 154^{r}; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. L.ii^{r}.

sharp reminder of the balance of power, which at once damages the rhetoric of formal, equitable disputation.[127]

This change in tone came to full fruition on the third day, and here sheds light on the purpose of these debates. Throughout, the Protestants had maintained that they were working for Campion's benefit; the assertions of Nowell and Day being repeated by Hopton on the 23rd. Field has him telling the Jesuit 'to consider what great favour her Majestie shewed him, that hee might have conference with the learned to reforme his errours'; to which Campion replies that he is not in doubt, and aims to instruct his opponents.[128] When none present then volunteered to serve as moderator, Fulke reportedly turned to the lieutenant to ask:

> that it might please [him] when one argument was done, to commaunde us to go to another. And also when we have accepted an answere, not to suffer the adversarie to carie the matter with multitude of wordes: so that we be neither forced to leave our argument, as though we could followe it no longer, nor the adversarie permitted with large discourses to spende the time unprofitably, contrary to the right meaning of this conference.[129]

As the debate heats up, he explains:

> The other day when wee had some hope of your conversion, we forbare you much, and suffered you to discourse, contrary to the order of any good conference... nowe that we see you are an obstinate heretike, and seeke to cover the light of the trueth with multitude of wordes, we meane not to allow you such large discourses, nor to forbeare you, as we did.

[127] Ibid., sigs N^{v}-N.i^{r} (emphasis added).
[128] Ibid., sig. O.i^{r}.
[129] Ibid., sig. O.i^{v}; see chapter 2 above.

Catholic manuscript reports had already interpreted Campion's verbosity as dominance; and these assertions, combined with his professed certainty, drove his opponents to exert greater control.[130] From the first day, disputation had been manipulated to contain Campion, but in risking it in the first place, the authorities had failed to cover the polemical exits.

Two things need exploring in this statement from Fulke. The first is the Protestants' prior concern for their respondent's soul. While it seems doubtful that they truly believed he might be convinced, the expression of hope was vital – reports of his conversion had already been circulated to discredit him; and, more importantly, the debates needed an objective *beyond* discredit and self-evident proof. A genuine hope for Campion's conversion should not, however, be dismissed: as implied in many contemporary analogies, a disputation was a battle, at the end of which something ought to be claimed. Moreover, it was considered a Christian duty to win dissenters to the faith. In a move that recalls Fulke's offer at Wisbech, Catholics in the Tower were brought to hear sermons, indicating an effort beyond disputation to foist reformed doctrine upon them.[131] In considering purpose, perhaps, we must distinguish between the intended effects of a disputation and those of subsequent accounts – McCoog's depiction of Reformation debates as 'trials' intended to demonstrate and destroy is flawed in a post-Reformation context because it glosses over this distinction. With the exception, one might argue, of Westminster, religious opposition was not 'destroyed' in disputation; rather, it had to be weakened through the distribution of unfavourable reports. More importantly, the errors of heretics were not to be demonstrated, but met and justifiably confuted. Disputation was a challenge and duty, as shown in every facet of its surrounding imagery.[132]

---

[130] Ibid., sig. O.ii[r].
[131] Milward, *Religious Controversies... Elizabethan*, p. 59. From February to March 1581, they were brought to hear Calvinist preachers, but despite issuing challenges were not permitted to engage directly: Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. 2 (London, 1875), pp. 163-4.
[132] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 120.

The second point to be noted is Fulke's renewed distinction between 'discourse' and 'good conference'. A portion of this is rhetorical; intended to place Campion in opposition to recognised ideals. But in the climate of the period this alone speaks to the persistent role and weight of formal disputation. If Campion's written efforts had succeeded because of their form and tone, Fulke's championing of scholastic debate might appear something of a risk, but it does not seem to have been regarded as one by the authorities or the disputants. In fact, the methods employed by Fulke and Goad demonstrate those trends posited in chapter one: the continued influence of academic tradition, and a persistent faith in the value of certain scholastic forms.[133] Moreover, Fulke's distinction between 'discourse' and disputation hints at his frustration at Wisbech. The tone of his 1581 account cast him as the dutiful polemicist, but here he seems more like a schoolmaster, working to contain a troublesome pupil. Indeed, this image itself forms a part of the account's approach: once Fulke questions Campion's education, expressing doubt that he had read a particular volume by Augustine. 'I do not beleeve that ever you read it,' Fulke states. 'But sure I am, that xx. yeres agoe you had not read it. You would seeme to be an older student in Divinitie then you are by a great deale.' This is a response to the protest, 'Twentie yeres agoe I have read this booke', but is phrased to undermine the Jesuit – again, to discredit his 'intellectual pretensions'.[134] These formal debates – and the accounts that followed – were not intended simply to confute Campion's religious points, but to *separate* them from the clear foundation of learning elucidated in the

[133] Campion, by contrast, gives a nod to practicality: 'I answere... two wayes. First, for the understanding of the people, and after in respect of the learned.' For the people, he states that a passage cited is falsified and written by a heretic, while for the learned he suggests that all citations from the author be studied with care: Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. X.ii^{r-v}.
[134] Ibid., sig. X.iii^{v}; Loades, *Oxford Martyrs*, pp. 127-8.

Rationes Decem and the 'Brag'.[135] Disputation *had* to be used, because an adversary had associated their beliefs with a certain degree – and type – of scholarship.[136]

Much of this day consisted of a return to earlier points, as Campion was shown works previously unavailable. The Protestants' tone remained brusque; their respondent's answers being read back to him as each place was cited and given the last word. Campion's answers were taken as definitive, and he was given little space to expand on them – in this, these exchanges resemble the first day's examination of the *Rationes Decem*. As Fulke reportedly told him, 'We have heard your answere before: we are not now to dispute the matter againe, but to deliver our credite for the allegations.'[137] This process did not, however, consume the entire disputation; and in fact, a good portion of the day consisted of syllogistic reasoning, hindered more by confessional intractability than artificial restriction. Here, by the Protestant account, Campion confined *himself* to prior answers: often, he gave a definitive statement and would then accept no further debate; even when Goad allowed him (briefly) to oppose.[138] There are, however, signs that the Protestants were simply noting his answers and moving on, suggesting demonstrative, rather than persuasive, intent.[139] Once, Goad expanded the morning's acceptance of prior answers to cover *all* Catholic works: 'Whatsoever you can shewe... hath bene shewed by others of your side, and is sufficiently answered.'[140] This, though tactical and – with hindsight – detrimental to the debate's intellectual credentials, is nonetheless confined to a few incidents. By any

[135] In the *Rationes Decem*, Campion had cited Cicero to show that 'truth does sometimes stand out in so clear a light that no artifice of word or deed can hide it': Campion, *Ten Reasons*, p. 91.
[136] Nowell and Day assert: 'wee thought... wee should have bene sore incumbred by his learning, and overmatched by his knowledge in the tongues: so farre off was it, that... upon experience and triall with him, we found him not to be that man that we looked for': Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. G.i^{v}. This discredit began in print: Anthony Munday's *A Discoverie of Edmund Campion* (London, 1581), described him as a vainglorious sophister, pitied by the learned (sigs G.i^{r}-G.ii^{r}). Munday developed this with reference to the disputations in *A Breefe Aunswer Made unto two Seditious Pamphlets* (London, 1582), targeting attitude and use of logic: sigs C.i^{r}-C.ii^{v}. See McCoog, '"The Flower of Oxford"', pp. 901-5.
[137] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. O.ii^{v}.
[138] Ibid., sigs Q.i^{r}, Q.iiii^{r}, T.iii^{r}, T.iii^{v}-U^{v}, U.iiii^{r}, X.iii^{v}, Y.ii^{v}, Z.ii^{r}.
[139] Ibid., sig. Q.iiii^{r}.
[140] Ibid., sig. U.iiii^{r}. Similar sentiments are expressed by Fulke, sigs R.iiii^{r}, X^{v}.

account, it is neither endemic nor obvious enough to disqualify the event as a disputation.

Indeed, the efficient scholasticism of Fulke and Goad was something of a high point. Simpson noted that on the fourth day, Walker and Charke – with the government's 'man of business' Norton, now one of the notaries – 'treated Campion more brutally than any of the former disputants.'[141] Simpson highlights the accusations of impudence and sedition with which Walker opened proceedings; but both he *and* the Catholic reports fail to mention the beginning of that oration, as related by Field: 'Gentlemen, ye shall understande that we be sent hither by authoritie, to talke & conferre with one called Campion, an English man borne, and brought up in this realme in schooles & places where good learning hath bene taught, so that he might have bene a good instrument in this common wealth and Church'.[142] Here is a divergence from previous days: Walker is not trying to undermine Campion's abilities, but to paint them as a loss to the realm – taken by Rome, and thus tragically gone to waste. Whatever their prior intentions, it would seem that by the 27th of September Campion's opponents held out little hope for his conversion.[143] Moreover, the reference to his schooling bolsters the illusion that the disputations were balanced: Campion is an educated man, and thus a worthy adversary, despite his imprisonment. More generally, Walker retained the practical wariness of Fulke; his scolding of Campion ending with a determination to proceed: 'notwithstanding we will doe our best that we can, God give it good effect.'[144] Charke was less ambivalent, and Field has Campion himself pointing out his hostility: 'This man would be angry with me, if

[141] Simpson, *Campion*, p. 375. Norton is termed Campion's 'Rackmaister' in Persons' *A Defence of the Censure* (Rouen, 1582), p. 8. Though a puritan critic of the regime, he frequently engaged in anti-Catholicism, which M. A. R. Graves describes as being 'in collaboration with and in deference to the privy council': M. A. R. Graves, 'Thomas Norton the Parliament Man: An Elizabethan M.P., 1559-1581', *The Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), pp. 31, 35; Patrick Collinson, 'Puritans, Men of Business and Elizabethan Parliaments', *Parliamentary History*, 7 (1988), p. 192; Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', p. 592.
[142] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Z.iii^{v}-Z.iiii^{r}; see Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 1^{r}.
[143] One Catholic report casts doubt on this. The queen, Walker tells the Jesuit, 'had rayther wyne you by [fair] meanes; then to show Justice agaynst you': Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 1^{r}.
[144] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Z.iii^{v}-Z.iiii^{r}.

he knew why.' Here, Charke responds, 'If I woulde, knowe I not why to be angrie with you, a notable and vowed enemie of the trueth of God, and a seditious man against the state? But I come not to deale with your person, but against your errors: Answer the argument.'[145]

Walker's first question was a return to the *Rationes Decem*, and the first point covered by Nowell and Day.[146] Here, however, Field indicates that Campion was permitted to give considered answers. The debate was no more balanced than earlier portions had been, but direct arguments were at least being made, similar to those against Fulke and Goad.[147] In the afternoon, Campion was allowed to state his position on justification – a statement presented in Field's account in reasonable language.[148] In the attitude of the opponents, however, the divergence between Field's account and Catholic reports is remarkable. Persons describes a return to the posturing of the first day, Charke in particular playing to the audience.[149] Their reactions, meanwhile, are presented as unfavourable: Persons claims that they once tried to leave, but that Charke closed the doors. Field makes little mention of this, other than to note 'an open misliking of the answeres, and some speach of making an ende', at which Charke requests an additional argument.[150] The one Catholic assertion supported here is that of Charke's appeals to the auditory. His arguments are dressed with such phrases as, 'This I would have all the companie marke and understand, whom you labor with indirect speaches to abuse and draw from the truth', as well as praise for the purpose *and disputation format*, and condemnations of evasion.[151] One rebuke is for the

[145] Ibid., sig. Aa.ii^{r}; on Charke's hostility, see Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 3^{v}-4^{v}.
[146] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Z.iiii^{r}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 1^{r}, 1^{v}.
[147] Holleran suggests that the disputants (or the authorities) 'felt that that Protestant positions... had not been adequately presented by Nowell and Day', hence the repetition; although the space given Campion to expand on his answers actually suggests a *procedural* fault: Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 74.
[148] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Dd.i^{r}. Charke cautions that 'you are not to use your old sleight in running from the matter, and loading one thing upon an other'; but this stems from a disagreement over the nature of the topic.
[149] Simpson, *Campion*, p. 376; Persons, *Defence of the Censure*, pp. 5, 8.
[150] Simpson, *Campion*, p. 376; Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Ff.iii^{v}.
[151] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs Aa.iii^{v}-Aa.iiii^{r}, Bb^{v}, Cc.ii^{v}-Cc.iii^{r}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 3^{v}, 4^{r-v}, 5^{r}, 5^{v}, 10^{v}, 11^{r}, 11^{v}, 12^{v}.

benefit of any Catholics in attendance: Charke repeats an answer 'to lay open your contradictions for some that I thinke are present, and looke for no such weaknesse in their Champion.'[152]

Field notes a procedural discussion at this debate, which raises questions of reliability. In the morning, Norton suggested that the disputants 'stay a while and speake leasurely', so that their answers could be put in writing. This was not to deviate from spoken debate, but to formalise the notaries' role and give the disputants a greater hand in the notes' preparation; allowing them to perfect their arguments.[153] The questions here are why this was needed; and how, if it was, had the notaries been recording previous debates? In Field's account there is no difference between the arguments following Norton's suggestion and those preceding it; but the idea does provide new opportunities for Campion's discredit. Having agreed to it, the Jesuit is said to have demonstrated impatience, describing the writing – initially suggested as 'profitable for the hearers' – as a 'loss of time'. A marginal note from Field further states that he 'did often adde & alter his answeres, while they were in writing.'[154]

The afternoon of the fourth day provides for a comparison of the opponents. Of all the pairs taking on the role, Walker and Charke had the most disparate styles. They alternated on the afternoon's topic (justification), Walker urging the first line of argument before handing over to his partner.[155] Walker, by his own admission, was 'an olde man... long from the universitie', and his fastidiousness surpassed that of other disputants.[156] He began with basic etymology, asking Campion the derivation of 'faith', and tying this to 'foundation'. He then asked the subject and object of faith, identifying one as man's understanding, and the other as the truth or word of God. Finally, he asked the same of hope and charity, bringing Campion's answers round to

[152] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Ee.i^{v}.
[153] Ibid., sig. Aa.ii^{v}. The suggestion is not mentioned in Catholic accounts, but at the close of one, Charke tells Campion, 'All your Aunswers are sett downe': Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 13^{r}.
[154] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Aa.iii^{r}.
[155] Ibid., sig. Dd.iii^{r}.
[156] Ibid., sig. Dd.i^{r}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 7^{v}: 'it is longe synce I lefte the unyversytie, but yet I will trye you in Logike, and Philosophie.'

a Protestant image of justification.[157] Each step appears to have been achieved with little animosity, and it is possible that Campion was surprised by the questions' simplicity. It is worth noting, however, that Catholic reports depict Walker as a staggeringly weak opponent: indecisive and unlearned, and frequently chastised by Campion himself. 'We come to dispute,' the Jesuit tells him, 'you muste not therfore stande uppon yf, and, and...'[158] Once, he is challenged for *petitio principii*.[159] Walker's approach, then, was a tightrope act: disarming, but susceptible to scorn from sharper minds. By contrast, when Charke urged his first point of the afternoon, no quarter was given. His first statement warned Campion against deviation, and was followed by a polemicist's rant about 'the olde popery and the newe'.[160] It is near impossible to tell whether this combination of opponents was a deliberate move by the organisers, or whether it was unintentional.[161] Given the depiction of him in all accounts of the encounter, it is easy to imagine Charke's impatience as Walker ran through basic definitions. Here was religious and intellectual change in action.

These debates represent the authorities' most aggressive use of disputation, but despite their careful manipulation, they can also be interpreted as a *loss* of control over the practice. State and church caution does not reflect mastery so much as wariness; a mistake, made evident as Catholic reports spread and the disputations were scaled down and contained. The printed accounts were delayed for two years; a fact that has been interpreted as Protestant hesitancy. Simpson observed that Nowell and Day 'rested quite contentedly', despite the perception that they had been bested.[162] Further, he posited a 'common opinion' (actually that of Persons) that their successors would have produced accounts immediately if they imagined themselves the victors (in this,

[157] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. Dd.iii^{r}; BL Add. MS 11055, ff. 190^{r-v}; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 8^{r}-9^{r}.
[158] Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, ff. 2^{r-v}.
[159] Ibid, f. 3^{r}.
[160] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sigs Dd.iii^{r-v}.
[161] Holleran suggests that the combination was concomitant with royal frustration, and a desire to discredit both Campion *and* his radical opponents: Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, p. 73.
[162] Simpson, *Campion*, p. 371.

he contrasts Field's report with Fulke's work after Wisbech, overlooking their difference in purpose).[163] The authors themselves naturally offered explanations for the delay: Nowell and Day claimed they saw no reason to produce their account (though it had circulated in manuscript), as the *Rationes Decem* had been confuted elsewhere; but following Catholic reports, they were 'partly of ourselves enclined, and by the often and earnest exhortations of others importuned, and by some of great authoritie almost inforced to set downe the true report of the saide conference'.[164] This goes beyond the customary trope of being *pushed* into writing, mentioning as it does higher authorities: 'almost enforced' is an extraordinary phrase in this context. Field's accounts are prefaced with the following: 'being private conferences, it was thought not much requisite to make the[m] publikely knowen, neither had they bin now set forth, if the importunitie of the adversaries, by their sundry untrue and contrary reportes made and scattered amongst their favourites, had not even perforce drawen the[m] forth.'[165] Thus, the works were not, indeed, pro-active, but a reaction to Catholic appropriation and condemnation: damage control, following events the authorities had themselves commissioned.[166]

The Campion debates were not disastrous – they certainly don't appear to have been an effective Catholic conversion tool, although the extent of their influence is impossible to determine.[167] Nonetheless, they were halted after the fourth day. A fifth debate, scheduled for October with Laurence Humphrey (Regius Professor of Divinity

[163] Ibid., pp. 376-7. This can be found, almost verbatim, in Persons' *Defence of the Censure*, p. 9.
[164] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. A.ii[r]; Holleran, *Jesuit Challenge*, pp. 95, 220.
[165] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. G.iiii[v].
[166] Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. A.ii[r]; Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere", p. 621. Campion's performance was folded into martyrdom accounts: McCoog, '"The Flower of Oxford"', *passim*; Anne Dillon, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535-1603* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 92-4 and Freeman, 'The Power of Polemic', pp. 481, 482-6. On the Protestant side, meanwhile, Zlatar notes the 'fictionalization' of the debates in George Gifford's *A Dialogue Between a Papist and a Protestant* (1582): Zlatar, *Reformation fictions*, pp. 114-123.
[167] One onlooker was upbraided for praising Campion's performance: Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', p. 621, but the best example Simpson can find of a conversion after the debates is the Earl of Arundel: 'though... till a year or two after, he neither did, nor intended to, embrace and follow it; and after he did intend it, a good while passed before he did execute it.' Simpson, *Campion*, p. 369.

at Oxford) opposing, was cancelled by Aylmer, apparently on his own authority.[168] Crucially, however, those involved did not question their use of disputation, instead blaming carelessness *within* it. Norton's report of September 30th stated that the disputations had been damaging because they lacked order, moderation and a beneficial audience.[169] Lake and Questier focus on the third of these – echoed by Aylmer – as a call for restriction.[170] But procedurally, the first two suggest a departure from the authorities' prior approach. Public disputation was not dismissed: there was no re-assertion of the 1559 injunctions. Instead, prison debate was brought closer to the academic ideal. The only way to conduct such an event without incurring condemnation was to present it in a scholarly manner and ensure victory more subtly; and this is precisely what can be seen in the 1582 conference between Rainolds and Hart. The Campion debates had been contained, but public religious disputation had, to an extent, been set free. After Campion's execution, in a work directed to William Charke, Persons renewed the challenge for an 'equall disputation'.[171]

[168] Strype, *Aylmer*, pp. 53-4; Simpson, *Campion*, p. 360. Humphrey supposed that 'a different course was to be taken with the Jesuits, and that they would... be accused not of heresy, but of treason.'
[169] BL Lansd. MS 33, no. 61, f. 150r.
[170] Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', p. 621; Strype, *Aylmer*, pp. 53-4.
[171] Persons, *Defence of the Censure*, pp. 9-11.

Chapter Four: New Opponents, 1582-1603

'They who deale with [the] taming of lyons (I have read) are wont... to beate dogges before them: that in a dogge the lyon may see his owne desert.'[1]

The conditions that gave rise to the 1581 debates did not disappear with Campion's death, or with the production of the printed accounts. As Elizabeth's reign progressed, reports of public religious disputation on all fronts indicate that the practice expanded and diversified. In part, this was a reaction to new challenges, but it also reflects a *conscious* response to prior events. The English church and government were not, of course, a monolithic entity – both housed a range of opinions as to how adversaries should be dealt with.[2] But where public disputation is concerned, particularly with imprisoned priests, a development in policy can be seen in 1582. Changes in Campion's aftermath were occasioned by Catholic challenges and denunciation; but these matched the *intellectual* preferences of officials and divines. Rainolds' deployment against Hart suggests a new direction in prison debate; but that same year, clear evidence can be found in a directive from the Privy Council to Whitgift and the bishops.[3]

This directive, entitled 'Our Opinion concerning the Proceedings with the Jesuits and Seminary Priests, and other Papists, by such as shall be appointed to have Conference with them', contains instructions for disputation. John Strype describes it as a response to the growing number of priests held in England, and to challenges like that of Campion; but its rules match the problems encountered in 1581, and – more directly – Rainolds' debate with Hart. They emphasise reliance on scripture, discount written authorities after the accession of Pope Gregory I, and lay out a progression of

[1] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 495.
[2] See Kenneth Fincham, 'Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 126-30.
[3] This is printed in John Strype, *The Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Whitgift* (London, 1718), pp. 98-9; Strype cites collections including the Petyt manuscripts at the Inner Temple: Petyt MS 538, vol. 47, ff. 18-19.

evidence to be followed; before requesting abstention 'from angry and opprobrious Words', and arguments 'with Weight and Force of Matter'.[4] The topics to be dealt in are listed as follows:

> The Authority and Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures. Of the true Church, and what be the Right Notes and Definition thereof. In this Matter be contained, Whether the Church be Visible, or not? Whether the Catholick Church must of Necessity have one Visible Head in Earth? And of his Succession in Persons, and Sees, and in Doctrine.[5]

This paper, then, confirms the position implied in Norton's reaction to the Campion debates, explaining the direction public (or publicised) anti-Catholic disputation would take from 1582. It concludes with a list of recommended disputants, including Nowell and Day, Fulke, Goad, Walker, Laurence Humphrey and Rainolds, as well as Charke and Walter Travers. The refinement of anti-Catholic disputation did not, it would appear, mean the abandonment of radical disputants; but this directive provides an incomplete picture. It is only a statement of intent; and indeed, the divines listed (twenty-five in all) suggest an explosion of anti-Catholic debate not reflected in the surviving evidence. In part, this can be explained through the fortunes of individual clergymen, the increasingly visible danger of Catholicism through the later 1580s, the ability of disputants to hold to the suggested topics and the use of religious disputation in efforts separate from polemic (of which there is evidence later in the reign). But in addition, a refinement can be seen in the gap between the debates expected here and those ultimately written up and printed.

[4] Strype, *Whitgift*. p. 98.
[5] Ibid., pp. 98-9.

John Rainolds and John Hart

To add detail to this directive, then, we must first turn to the model for the new approach. Rainolds' debate with Hart was arranged by Sir Francis Walsingham; a patron of reformed learning, and of Rainolds in particular.[6] Walsingham's intentions were varied. Green goes so far as to argue that he 'was less interested in Hart's soul than in the political value of a recantation', adding that the Pope's temporal authority was the 'one major point' of the discussion that interested him; but this is not reflected in reports of the debate.[7] Though in 1609 Walsingham's Catholic namesake described it as a Protestant contrivance, 'assigned' in lieu of a public trial, Featley, in Thomas Fuller's *Abel Redivivus* of 1651, stated that Rainolds was sent to engage Hart in response to a direct challenge.[8] Rainolds' account asserts that he was sent 'for the better informing of [Hart's] conscience and judgement'; and the priest's own preface to the work – which will be discussed below – describes the occasion in similar, though resistant, terms.[9] Of course, those defending a disputation had as much interest in presenting it as a genuine, persuasive effort as critics had in highlighting its political aspects, but these assertions are matched in Rainolds' account by the scope of the arguments.[10] One issue stands out amongst Walsingham's concerns: Feingold suggests that in arranging this debate, he hoped to counter 'the infelicitous outcome' of the disputations with Campion.[11] It is also worth noting that Hart's fellow prisoner Luke Kirbie, in a letter printed by Allen, reported that Rainolds, like Fulke at Wisbech, had

[6] Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 30-33.
[7] Ibid., p. 31.
[8] Francis Walsingham, *A Search Made into Matters of Religion* (St Omer, 1609), p. 3; Daniel Featley, 'The Life and Death of John Reinolds', in Thomas Fuller, *Abel Redivivus: or the Dead Yet Speaking* (London, 1651), pp. 481-2.
[9] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 9-10, 33. Two versions of Rainolds' account survive: *The Summe of the Conference*, and an incomplete manuscript held at Lambeth Palace Library (MS 402), which is signed by Hart on the last page, and – in a different hand – refers its readers to the printed edition. It is possible that this is a draft produced during negotiations over the printed account: its edits all reflect the printed work. This version halts abruptly at a point corresponding to p. 603 of *The Summe of the Conference*.
[10] See Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere"', esp. p. 587.
[11] ODNB Rainolds, John.

occasionally 'come hither to preach and conferre', suggesting that it was the account that formed part of a new strategy.[12]

A seminary priest, Hart had been caught on his arrival in England in June 1580, tried and condemned to death. For a time, he was imprisoned in Nonsuch, where he was examined by Walsingham and sent – before their conference proper – to Rainolds at Oxford, for three months' 'religious instruction'. When this had no effect, he was taken to the Marshalsea, then to the Tower. Scheduled to be executed beside Campion, he recanted *en route* to Tyburn and was granted a reprieve, apparently offering his services to Walsingham as an informant on Allen. Green asserts that it was Hart's subsequent wavering that prompted Walsingham to arrange the disputation.[13] The priest's preface to Rainolds' account describes the Secretary's 'favour' in allowing the debate, but denies doubt on his own part: he accepts the disputation 'grounding my selfe upon the most certayne foundation of the Church,' and does so 'with all dutie'.[14] His true feelings have been lost in the competing depictions of subsequent reports, but there is a note of reluctance here, compatible with the Catholic Walsingham's claims, and echoed in his objections to the conference's imbalance.[15] Overall, he appears more conflicted than Campion had been, and Rainolds paints him as a measured but inexperienced disputant. By no account was he the bold challenger Featley would later describe.

The choice of Rainolds for this recorded event is a clear indication of a change in tone after Campion. Peter Heylyn's *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1668) states that it was Rainolds' puritan leanings that commended him to Walsingham's attention, but he

---

[12] William Allen, *A Briefe Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of XII Reverend Priests* (1582), sig. B.v^{v}.

[13] Milward, *Religious Controversies... Elizabethan*, p. 60; Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, p. 31; E. E. Reynolds, *Campion and Parsons: The Jesuit Mission of 1580-1* (London, 1980), p. 152; B. A. Harrison, *A Tudor Journal: The Diary of a Priest in the Tower, 1580-1585* (London, 2000), pp. 31-2, 38n, 50n-51n, 193. Harrison prints Hart's letter to Walsingham in full, pp. 163-5. It doesn't mince words: 'It were not remiss, in my simple judgement, speedily to think upon some means how to know the very secrets of [Allen's] whole heart, if it were possible. Which thing may be done in this wise...'.

[14] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 9. The reference to Walsingham's 'favour' echoes Hart's letter: Harrison, *Tudor Journal*, p. 163.

[15] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 33; see chapter 3 above.

was also widely respected for his learning.[16] Rainolds was an academic figure, more active in university disputes than in anti-Catholicism. Though he was ordained and began preaching in the 1570s, and had taken an active role in religious clashes at Oxford, he is at this time generally described as a *student* in divinity; a more positive force in reformed theology than someone like William Charke.[17] His critiques of Ramus included an objection against his bitter invectives and 'moral example as a controversialist'.[18] Moreover, like his father and two of his brothers, Rainolds had been brought up a Catholic; and his studies at Oxford were interrupted by a visit to one of the English seminaries on the continent.[19] It is interesting that Featley, in describing Rainolds' background, finds his origins in college and county, passing over his childhood in favour of comparisons to Jewel and Richard Hooker.[20] The most dramatic account of Rainolds' turn from Catholicism tells of a disputation with his brother William ('earnest for Reformation'), which resulted in a mutual conversion:

> As heart would wish, each one his brother takes;
> As fate would have, each one his faith forsakes.[21]

Disputation was thus woven into the myth of John Rainolds, but Green – prompted, in part, by Anthony Wood's work on William – casts doubt on this tale. The mutual conversion does not fit with the chronology of either brother's beliefs, and the story might have been inspired by a 1584 debate between John and another sibling, Edmund. Green concludes that Rainolds may well have been a Protestant by 1566,

---

[16] Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1668), p. 51. Kirbie described him as 'the best learned of that sort': Allen, *A Briefe Historie*, sig. B.v[v].
[17] Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 29-31; Fuller, *Abel Redivivus*, pp. 480-1; ODNB Rainolds, John.
[18] McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle', p. 307.
[19] Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 51; Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, p. 25.
[20] Fuller, *Abel Redivivus*, pp. 477-8
[21] From a Latin poem by William Alabaster; translated by Featley in Fuller, *Abel Redivivus*, pp. 479-80. See Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, pp. 12-13, 84-5. Manuscript versions can be found at the Bodleian (MS Rawl. D.399, f. 199) and Cambridge University Library (Add. MS 8460).

when he was made a probationary fellow at Corpus Christi, and certainly by 1567. Feingold describes the process itself as 'gradual'.[22] From his activities and background, then, Walsingham's match for Hart was no anti-papal firebrand, although his theology would become more radical through the 1580s. For those arranging and allowing the exchange, each disputant was a departure from prior occasions. But while Hart presented an opportunity, Rainolds was a *deliberate* change of pace.[23]

To this point, the singular 'debate' or 'disputation' has been used, but in fact the exchange was spread over several occasions and written up by Rainolds as one, uninterrupted whole.[24] The account includes written exchanges after and between the divines' face-to-face meetings, *within* its continuous dialogue, and thus, while it conforms well to Ley's ideal of disputation pursued through writing, it cannot be taken as reported speech; although the work contains as many direct exchanges as longer, heavily referenced orations. The account's creation is described in Hart's preface: it began, the writer states, with 'breefe notes', which Rainolds expanded upon; Hart 'being troubled then with more necessary cogitations of death'. Later, the preface reports that Hart was allowed to examine the draft and suggest amendments, but when he found out it was to be printed, he tried to delay, eventually being permitted to review it with greater access to books.[25] This version of events cannot, of course, be taken as truth, or even as written in Hart's own words: the vague reason for his hesitancy ('for... considerations which seemed to me very great and important') is telling, as is a formulaic acknowledgement that the account is 'a true report'. Interestingly, however, it describes the printing of the work as 'his Honours pleasure' – Walsingham's idea.[26]

---

[22] Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 26-7, 32; Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, p. 84; ODNB Rainolds, John.
[23] See Harrison, *Tudor Journal*, p. 31.
[24] Godfrey Anstruther put the span of the exchange at three months: Godfrey Anstruther, *The Seminary Priests*, vol. 1 (Ware, 1969), p. 154.
[25] LPL MS 402 might reflect a stage in this process. Although it is signed by Hart, the body text and edits share a distinct hand, and the tone and content of the insertions suggest Rainolds editing himself.
[26] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 10-11.

Rainolds' preface, directed 'to the students of the English seminaries at Rome and Rhemes', praises the work's preparation as a mode of debate unto itself: following an earlier authority, he describes a conference 'not by extemporall speaking, but writing with advise; the question agreed of; the arguments, the answeres, the replies set downe, and sifted of both sides, till ech had fully sayd' – a method 'most fit for triall of the truth'.[27] The exchange, then, contained elements of written as well as spoken debate. Perhaps as a result, it was not, as described, strictly held to the academic form; but does show familiarity with that process. At first glance, Rainolds seems to have opposed for much of the debate, offering the greater contribution and exerting more control, but in fact Hart takes this role several times, and that impression is a result of Rainolds' authorship of the account and Hart's imprisonment.[28] The use of logic form is also evident, but not so explicitly described as in 1581. On the one occasion where he does offer detailed criticism of another's logical practice, Rainolds refers not to Hart but retrospectively to Campion.[29] Throughout, these formal aspects of disputation are a given, rather than a novelty – another change in tone.[30] Rainolds' decision not to highlight scholastic forms is undoubtedly a reflection of his humanism: his preference within the debate is toward listing, and other more rhetorical methods.[31]

The questions went beyond the issue Green posits as Walsingham's sole interest. The temporal power of the Pope was, it must be said, a central focus, disputed at length by the citation of authorities; and indeed, this gives a more directly political

[27] Ibid., p. 15.
[28] Hart begins by framing arguments and proving them through syllogistic reasoning, offering similar proofs further into the debate; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, esp. pp. 37, 457.
[29] 'It was a common practise amongst the young students of our Universities in the time of the Dunses... that if in disputation they were brought to an inconvenience, were it never so absurd: they would have a distinction, though voyde of braine and sense, yet a distinction to mainteyne it... And I wish, if it had beene the good will of God, master *Campian* had had the grace in the Tower-conference to have aimed... rather in sinceritie to have sought the truth, then with shiftes and cavilles the mayntenance of his cause and credit.' Ibid., pp. 46-7. This is placed in opposition to Campion's 'I would you would dispute to have the truth knowen...' (see chapter 3).
[30] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 37, 274, 328, 450.
[31] Ibid., pp. 42-3, 335, 368-9, 475, 482, 497, 590. There is a striking group of three, p. 160, and use of rhetorical questions, pp. 466, 513.

impression than the questions of transubstantiation, justification and visibility tackled with Campion. But the discussion extended to the interpretation and *force* of the authorities cited. A part of the debate was dedicated to the use of scripture, and another was given over to the Fathers. The role of the church was also considered, alongside the judgement of successive councils.[32] Thus, while logic form is taken for granted, Rainolds' account serves as a commentary on the authorities relied upon in cross-confessional disputation. This is, perhaps, unsurprising; the one being an enduring formula, while the other was an intractable point of contention.

Rainolds' approach, as reported, was a blend of academic methods with controversy. Unlike Campion's later opponents, he seems to have held out some hope that Hart might be convinced – contrary to Green's depiction of the event's purpose, he does not allow answers to stand, or simply note them for later exploitation. The event – for all its limitations – is here presented as a disputation, not a 'show trial': Rainolds works to persuade Hart throughout. His method in this is one of comprehensive evidence and exhaustive disproof: several times, he shows an argument of Hart's to be false, only to demonstrate that it was also unnecessary. On Peter's presidency of two Apostolic gatherings, he prefaces a secondary argument with: 'But, to yeeld unto you (for your most advantage) as much or more then any likely-hood may afford you... yet are you no neerer unto [the] supremacy which you shoote at.'[33] Once, he argues that the Catholic 'schoolmen' – including Thomas Aquinas – have little authority in scriptural interpretation, *before* proving that they support his point.[34] Where Hart asks why he cited lesser writers before the more respected Fathers, he offers an explanation reflecting not only his own approach, but – inadvertently – the perceived ethos behind prison debate: 'They who deale with [the]

[32] Ibid., pp. 29-32, has an outline of the account's content. The parallels to be drawn with the Privy Council's recommendations are remarkable.
[33] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 153.
[34] Ibid., pp. 110-113. Further, see pp. 63, 78, 224, 560, 563, 589, 595-6, 597, 615-6, 624.

taming of lyons (I have read) are wont, when they finde them somewhat out of order, to beate dogges before them: that in a dogge the lyon may see his own desert.'[35]

A more aggressive element of this comprehensive approach was that Rainolds was, as Hart describes it, 'disposed to toy'.[36] Several times, he lays traps for the priest, forcing him into a corner.[37] Hart is aware of these tactics, however. Once, he asserts, 'I see what you goe about'; Rainolds having embarked on an induction to prove that when the Pope erred, he did so as Pope. Rainolds replies, 'You are too suspicious', before making precisely the argument predicted.[38] Some time later, he again reassures him, 'I seeke not to entangle you'.[39] For one so opposed to the theatre in later life, Rainolds makes little effort to avoid linguistic or intellectual theatrics.[40] His use of colourful language and argument is remarkable, and a further indication that he hoped to have a positive effect. Later in his career, he is reported to have used striking imagery and humour in teaching: Featley states that anyone hearing or reading his criticism of Aristotle's scholastic champions would laugh so hard as to endanger both spleen and health.[41]

Rainolds' approach in this regard can be broken down into three categories: metaphor, sarcasm, and *reductio ad absurdum*. The best instance of his logical extensions appears early in the account, where Hart cites St Paul ('The head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you') in support of the Pope's single primacy. Here, Rainolds asks who the feet are:

> The Emperour I trow, must be the right foote. The left, who? The king of Spaine? What shall the French king do then? It is well that the king of

[35] Ibid., pp. 495-6.
[36] Ibid., p. 161.
[37] Ibid., pp. 180, 446, 634.
[38] Ibid., pp. 355-8.
[39] Ibid., p. 360.
[40] Rainolds' views on the stage emerge here: 'If one of us should make but a semblance of such an answere: you would sport your selves with it, and... whoope at it like stage players.' Ibid., p. 80. See Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 79-82.
[41] Fuller, *Abel Redivivus*, p. 478; Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 55-6.

> Scots is no member of it: nor the king of Denmarke. Marry we had newes of the king of Swethland, that Jesuits had converted him. Shall he be the left foote? Or shall the king of Poleland set in a foote for it... how many feete may this body have?[42]

A similar absurdity occurs further into the debate, Rainolds concluding from his opponent's arguments that Peter was built upon himself, and – bizarrely – was his own head.[43] Later, an imprecision in Hart's description of the Mass prompts Rainolds to comment, 'Their teeth be good and strong, if they eate of a stone altar.'[44]

The use of elaborate similitudes serves as the cornerstone of this dramatic approach; an offshoot, in some respects, of Rainolds' citation of authorities. He compares the work of Thomas Stapleton to the army of Antiochus: impressive only in the eyes of its originator.[45] He compares the Pope's usurpation of power to that of Richard III, and casts Hart as a writer defending that monarch. In the course of the account, Rainolds constructs analogies involving all manner of professions and historical anecdotes, classical tales, Lacedemonian's plucked nightingale ('a voice, nought else') and shadow boxing. Candlelight at noon denotes unnecessary proofs, and the Jesuits are said to mingle counterfeit coin with genuine, on discovering they have been given both. Once, by way of a dispute between Diogenes and Plato, the false church becomes a plucked chicken.[46] What is important here, in the context of sanctioned cross-confessional disputation, is that each of these dramatic or humorous features has some connection to the world of learning, beyond controversial religion.

---

[42] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 39-40. In the Lambeth manuscript this exchange is an insert, on separate paper, intended to replace a shorter version of Rainolds' argument (that by 'head', Paul meant all of the Apostles, or those with the best gifts): LPL MS 402, ff. 6^{v}-7^{v}.
[43] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 63.
[44] Ibid., p. 448.
[45] Ibid., p. 84.
[46] Ibid., pp. 62, 95, 106, 123, 124-5, 144, 147, 152, 174, 192-3, 199, 237, 295, 361, 366, 404, 424-5, 428, 487, 555, 629.

In appearance, they are weightier and more justified than the grandstanding of Nowell, Day and Charke.

This is not to say that Rainolds was above such grandstanding, simply that his account does a remarkable job of underplaying it. His adversary, as described by Rainolds himself, is quick to point out when he crosses the line: 'You triumph over me at every small occasion, as though you had a conquest'.[47] Several times, Rainolds is criticised for his tone, but this is always framed in terms of his reputation.[48] In addition, his rhetorical and comedic flourishes are countered by the mass of evidence accompanying them. Rainolds' points, however made, are never made to look trivial. The question of grandstanding also raises that of audience – some officials would certainly have been present, but there is no mention of an audience in either version of the account.[49] If they were indeed absent or restricted, any triumph in the event was meant for Hart's benefit, and so the lack of an audience here might be revealing – or, for that matter, a deliberate omission. More generally, it is a testament to the account that such an earnest impression is given, despite Hart's imprisonment and Rainolds' flamboyant debating style. Charke's aggression is offset with knowledge and measured humour, and the simplicity of Campion's *Rationes Decem* is countered with humanist poise.[50] As a reaction to the 1581 debates, Walsingham's choice of disputant was remarkably astute.

But what of Hart in all this? The priest is described as relatively inexperienced, but is nonetheless an active participant: as written, the conference is more than just a platform for Rainolds to orate against Catholicism. Hart is given space, to a greater degree than Campion, to offer arguments, although the account's production must urge caution in asserting balance in the event. In addition, two things should be borne

[47] Ibid., pp. 169.
[48] Ibid., pp. 91, 367, 599.
[49] Historians have not been able to describe an audience; Milward likening the event to Fulke's Wisbech visit: Milward, *Religious Controversies... Elizabethan*, p. 60.
[50] The juxtaposition of Rainolds and Campion demonstrates the outpacing of new formal clarity by humanist 'confidence'. It was this, as much as his religious standpoint, that made Rainolds a natural choice for the debate.

in mind: Hart's reported submission to Walsingham, and his own intellectual ability.[51] Despite the apparently full, detailed nature of the debate, both cast doubt on the priest's value as an opponent.

Wood indicated that Hart was educated at Oxford, but later historians find no mention of him in the college registers.[52] He took orders at Rome in the 1570s and proceeded to the University of Douai, graduating just two years before being sent on the English mission.[53] Rainolds invokes his training on the continent early in the account, in reaction to Hart's pleas of unpreparedness: the priest's course of study, he states, was short but intense, and at its end he was granted a degree, 'Wherefore... you may not alleage unripeness of yeares, or reading, or judgement: especially against me, before whome, in time so long, in place so incomparable, you tooke degree in divinitie'.[54] This is offered as a statement of equality, but when combined with Rainolds' preface to the seminarians, it takes on a greater significance. The preface emphasises the length of time spent by English university students – 'sixe yeares in the studie of Philosophie, for that you spend three; seven in Divinitie, for that you spe[n]d foure' – asking, rhetorically, if that at Rome or Rheims was really enough.[55] Transposing this back into the point about Hart's education, it is clear that Rainolds' claim to balance is not genuine; that in fact it contains a measure of the 'scorn' Hart would later identify. Rainolds is conscious that Hart is not on his own intellectual level, but still needs to *prove* his superiority. The account, then, is a work of *educational*, as well as religious, polemic: beneath the central motive of disproving the Papal supremacy, it is an effort to compare the worth of English and Catholic

[51] In the aftermath, there were doubts among Catholics as to Hart's 'steadfastness under torture': Anstruther, *Seminary Priests*, vol. 1, p. 154.
[52] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. 1 (London, 1721), p. 277; Foley, *Records*, vol. 2, p. 327n.
[53] ODNB Hart, John.
[54] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 34-5.
[55] Ibid., pp. 20-1.

training in logic and divinity.[56] This, it must be said, was a contest Walsingham and others would have had a keen interest in, particularly in Campion's aftermath.

The clearest indication of Hart's inexperience is his reliance on the work of Stapleton: at several points, Rainolds responds to an argument with, 'D. Stapleton told you so, and you beleeved it.'[57] Where Hart offers his preferred places from the Fathers, praising and elevating the Pope, they are dismissed as 'the chiefest of... [Stapleton's] treasurie'.[58] Prior to this, there is a detailed criticism of Stapleton's handling of the Fathers, which Rainolds defines by three 'feats': first, that he changed their words; second, that he found meanings not intended; and third, that he drew conclusions from contradictory points, as if forgetful of his own previous assertions. Stapleton, Rainolds states, was guilty of vanity, and by adherence to his writings Hart damaged the supremacy he hoped to defend.[59]

This criticism, intended to divide Hart from his authorities, returns us to the question of the priest's loyalties. Rainolds does not miss an opportunity to drive a wedge between his adversary and the Catholic Church: where Hart cites Gilbert Genebrard, in arguing that Popes not lawfully succeeding ought not be judged as Popes, Rainolds notes that Genebrard there conceded two points: that Popes had erred, and that the succession had been broken for long periods of time. He adds: 'Wherein if you say the same with him, M. Hart; I am glad of it. But your felowes (I feare me) will not allow that you say, if you allow that he saith.'[60] Additional evidence of this intention – indeed, of a desire to convince Hart – can be found in their debate on the Mass, where Rainolds implores: 'I would to God, M. Hart, you would... consider more deepely both the wicked abuses wherewith the holy sacrament of the Lords supper is profaned in your unholy sacrifice of the Masse; and the treacherous meanes whereby

[56] There is criticism of the seminaries within the account: ibid., pp. 349, 351-2, 486.
[57] Ibid, p. 443; see chapter 2 above.
[58] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 645.
[59] Ibid., pp. 347-9.
[60] Ibid., pp. 330-335.

your Maister and Felowes of the College of Rhemes doo seeke to maintaine it.'[61] As noted, the attributes of both Hart and Rainolds give the account an *active* polemical drive: the priest is a link to those Catholic readers addressed in Rainolds' preface.[62] In context, from the Protestant perspective, Hart is a *positive* model; a counterbalance to the martyr that emerged from Campion's mishandled examination.

In describing the outcome of the debate, Green concentrates on its political aspects – Hart's apparent capitulation, and the production of Rainolds' account.[63] His depiction of the event accords, in part, with the work itself, in that Hart's admission comes toward the end of the discussion: 'Truly,' the priest is reported to have said, 'I see more probabilitie on your side then I did'. This is followed, after further debate, by the statement:

> I had thought... that you meant to give as much to [the] Prince by [the] title of [the] supremacie, as we do to the Pope. Where you give no more me thinkes... the[n] S. Austin doth, who saith that Kings do serve God in this, as Kings, if in their own realme they com[m]aund good things, & forbid evil; not only co[n]cerni[n]g the civil state of me[n], but the religion of God also. And thus much I subscribe to.'[64]

What is interesting here, however, is that by Rainolds' account this was not intended to be the end: far from being dismissed as soon as this had left his mouth, Hart himself calls a halt. The account has Rainolds asking for more time, to discuss the true church; but Hart, displaying similar wariness to that of Campion, or simply hoping for a stay of execution, declines: 'I will co[n]fer no farder herof, unles I have greter assura[n]ce

[61] Ibid., p. 553.
[62] See chapter 2 above; Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 28.
[63] Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, pp. 31-2.
[64] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, pp. 666, 674.

of my life.'[65] The suggestion that Rainolds was prepared and authorised to proceed, with a more challenging question, further speaks to the debate's purpose being more than political – if, that is, the account is accurate.

Once Rainolds' *Summe of the Conference* was printed in 1584, Hart appears to have received the assurance he desired, being deported to France with a number of other priests the following year.[66] Rainolds' offer did not, however, result in additional debate; and thus some doubt must remain over the event's purpose. Indeed, even its outcome was questionable: Hart remained a committed Catholic, despite any concession drawn; and the facts soon fell victim to polemical posturing. Hart's admission had been limited, even by the printed account; and whilst Rainolds feels able to tell the seminarians to 'learn' from the priest, it was recorded – possibly by Hart himself – that during the exchange he 'was punished with twenty days in irons because he refused to agree with the minister Reynolds.'[67] On his expulsion, Hart travelled to Rome and was received into the Society of Jesus on the 14th of November; having applied in prison, during or soon after the disputation.[68]

Though Hart himself was not convinced, the debate – or, more accurately, Rainolds' account – had achieved distance from those with Campion, and would become a shining example for reformed writers. Rainolds himself gained favour in the aftermath; his name *and approach* having featured in the Council's directive to Whitgift.[69] As the 1580s progressed, and the threat posed by Catholicism became increasingly visible, anti-Catholic disputation continued, but accounts dwindled. At

[65] Ibid., p. 674.
[66] Foley, *Records*, vol. 2, p. 106n; Harrison, *Tudor Journal*, p. 194.
[67] Harrison, *Tudor Journal*, p. 57. This appears in Hart's prison diary, on December 1st, 1582. E. E. Reynolds and others believe that Edward Rishton was the diary's author, citing a version of this statement in his name: Reynolds, *Campion and Parsons*, p. 152. But Harrison offers a convincing argument for Hart being the author, from a reference from Persons: *Tudor Journal*, p. 19. A similar description of Hart's refusal is given by Kirby: Allen, *A Briefe Historie*, sig. B.v^{v}. Fascinatingly, as Harrison points out, the date of this punishment – and thus of Hart's resistance – was the first anniversary of Campion's execution; an occasion Hart had narrowly avoided: *A Tudor Journal*, p. 57. The refusal is not mentioned in Rainolds' *Summe of the Conference*.
[68] Hart added 'SJ' to his name in the diary's final entry, penned the day of his deportation: Harrison, *Tudor Journal*, p. 194. Further, see Anstruther, *Seminary Priests*, vol. 1, p. 154.
[69] Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, p. 32; Strype, *Whitgift*, p. 99.

Oxford in 1584, in a mingling of public and academic disputation, Rainolds disputed against his brother Edmund, a moderate Catholic. Both were said to have performed well, but neither was convinced.[70] In the intervening year, disputation with imprisoned priests continued: in March 1583, the Yorkshire clergyman William Palmer disputed against the priest William Hart on behalf of the local authorities.[71]

The Lambeth Conference

Two contrasting images of disputation have thus far been described. On the one hand, it was a respected test of learning and a route to truth through structured, equitable combat. On the other, it was a tool of the polemicist, whose every nuance – indeed, whose very existence – could be cited for additional respectability. In examining disputation with imprisoned priests, this second aspect has been referenced to an overwhelming degree, but in 1584 an event took place that was more akin to the first: a conference at Lambeth, between two puritan divines and several of Elizabeth's bishops.

By the lone manuscript account, written by Walter Travers, this event was occasioned by the Earl of Leicester.[72] Conscious of puritan calls for debate and objections to the Book of Common Prayer, Leicester had requested that Whitgift summon Travers and Thomas Sparke, 'for his satisfaction in such pointes... as were called into question that he might heare what the ministers did reproove and how such thinges were to be aunswered'.[73] Whether Leicester had particular expectations is not made clear, and this description of the meeting's purpose –ostensibly written by an opponent of the authorities – is similar to that of Westminster in its guarded phrasing

[70] Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures*, p. 32.
[71] ODNB Palmer, William; Anstruther, *Seminary Priests*, vol. 1, p. 155.
[72] Two versions of this account survive: BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 49^{r}-63^{r}, and a version held in the Morrice manuscripts at Dr Williams' Library, London. The latter is transcribed, with brief omissions, in A. Peel, *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 275-283. The two are remarkably similar, indicating that one is a direct copy of the other.
[73] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 50^{r}. On puritan calls for disputation, see Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions*, pp. 155, 172.

of the occasion. In fact, the immediate backdrop was the archbishop's drive for conformity, which involved direct claims to unity and articles challenging radical dissent; the latter rousing protest from councillors including Leicester and Burghley.[74] Thus, the debate was not called on Leicester's whim, further evidence of which can be found in the individuals summoned. Travers, once exiled to Geneva, was too radical for preferment in the Church of England, but had gained favour with Burghley. He had been made chaplain to the Lord Treasurer's household and tutor to Robert Cecil in 1580, before securing a position at the Temple Church in London.[75] Sparke, meanwhile, had become chaplain to Bishop Cooper of Lincoln in the 1570s, and counted Lord Grey of Wilton among his patrons.[76] The puritans, then, were *critics* of the church, not separatists, and the two-day debate was an exploratory but cautious exercise, endorsed by forward members of the Privy Council. The final audience included Grey and Walsingham, and Burghley was present for the second day.[77]

In this company, it is the man tasked with defending the Prayer Book who becomes a curiosity. Whitgift took the lead throughout, aided on the second day by Edwin Sandys, and on the first by Cooper, who had been translated to Winchester that year.[78] Whitgift's opening statement appears reassuring: as Travers has it, he told the puritans, 'you appeare not nowe judiciallie before me, nor come not as called to question by authoritie for these thinges, but by waye of conference to object, what you

[74] Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions*, p. 155; S. J. Knox, *Walter Travers: Paragon of Elizabethan Puritanism* (London, 1962), pp. 63-4. Knox calls the debate 'a great concession on Whitgift's part', which 'gave great hope to the puritans', and this is echoed in Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 269. On Whitgift's drive for conformity, see Fincham, 'Clerical Conformity', pp. 130-3.

[75] Knox, *Walter Travers*, pp. 54-5; Prest, *Inns of Court*, p. 192. When, in 1584, Burghley suggested Travers' appointment as Master of the Temple, the idea was successfully opposed by Whitgift: Knox, *Walter Travers*, pp. 65-9; Strype, *Whitgift*, pp. 173-5; Prest, *Inns of Court*, p. 195.

[76] ODNB Sparke, Thomas.

[77] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 49^{r}, 50^{r}, 56^{r}. Though the account refers only to 'Lord Grey', Collinson describes him as Lord Grey of *Pirgo*, rather than Sparke's patron, Wilton. John, Lord Grey of Pirgo, had died in 1564, and his surviving son, Henry, was not raised to the peerage until 1603. Both men demonstrated support for puritanism, but Wilton's life fits with the conference: ODNB Grey, Henry; ODNB Grey, Arthur.

[78] Ibid., ff. 49^{r}, 50^{r}, 56^{r}. The Morrice manuscript provides the dates (December 10th and 12th) without the year, and the version at the British Library omits both. However, Knox and Collinson place the event in 1584, after Cooper's translation (ODNB Cooper, Thomas). For an explanation of the dating, see Knox, *Walter Travers*, p. 64n. The placing of Cooper and his former chaplain on opposing sides is, therefore, remarkable: see Fincham, 'Clerical Conformity', pp. 134-5, 7.

have to saye against the booke that it may be aunswered.'[79] Few direct comparisons can be made between this event and the examination of imprisoned Catholics, but the contrast between this assurance and the restraints evident in other accounts – particularly in the early 1580s – does throw the latter into sharp relief. Here, disputation is allowed to play a broader role in the maintenance of national doctrine.[80] The significance of this, however, depends on the relationship between the sides: how far Whitgift would submit to the process, and whether the puritans' connections would restrict them in a more subtle manner. This said, Sparke's tone at the beginning of the first day appears wholly independent and positive; as, by Travers' account, he 'gave most humble and hartie thanks to god, and to that honorable [pre]sence, that after soe manie yeares, wherin or cause colde never be admitted to any indifferent heareing, it had pleased god of his gracious goodnes soe to dispose that we had nowe that equitie'.[81]

In terms of structure, Travers' does not, on the surface, seem to be reporting a formal disputation. But while the roles are never expressly stated, the participants do fall into them, directed as much by topic as by custom.[82] Objecting to the Prayer Book, the puritans are naturally presented as opponents, while the archbishop responds. This *de facto* structure can be seen in the puritans' objections and the use of 'to which the Archbishop aunswered' at the beginning of Whitgift's replies.[83] The result, as noted, is that the archbishop's authority is, procedurally, lessened: he keeps *nominal* command of the event's practical aspects, but is forced to follow the puritans'

[79] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 50^{r}.
[80] Whitgift told the puritans, 'it shalbe free for you (speaking in dutie) to charge the booke w[ith] such matters as you suppose to be blameworthie in it'; ibid., f. 50^{r}.
[81] Ibid., f. 50^{r}.
[82] Elsewhere, it should be noted, Travers would show wariness of formal logic, stating that its arguments 'are as common to good and badde, as are the rules of grammar': Walter Travers, *A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Discipline Ordayned of God to be Used in His Church* (Middelburg, 1588), p. 180, in Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 110.
[83] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 51^{r} onwards.

lead.[84] Sparke and Travers, meanwhile, direct the arguments with an astonishing degree of freedom, and are naturally permitted to select the questions.

At the commencement, Sparke outlines two broad points that he and Travers intend to deal with: first, 'such matters as concerne the bookes appointed to be reade in the Churche for holy scripture', and second, the sacraments.[85] The first is then divided into two sections; one relating to the canonical scriptures, and one to the apocrypha.[86] Sparke's first objection is that parts of the former were passed over in the Prayer Book as 'least ediefieing', in favour of passages from the latter.[87] This prompts a discussion of the nature of both, in which Travers describes Whitgift's position – and that of the church – as 'not... farre from blasphemie.'[88] Sparke then argues that the best translation of scripture should be read in church, whereas the Prayer Book appointed that which was 'the worste & to be charged w[ith]... grosse and palpable errors.'[89] One example – a description of Mary being 'married' to Joseph, rather than 'betrothed' – is given, before unnamed members of the audience call for the disputants to deal with a matter requiring 'skill in the tongues'. Whitgift then seizes this opportunity to press the puritans on the main topic of the day: the errors they saw in the apocrypha.[90]

The archbishop is not presented in a favourable light here; a depiction that must, of course, be taken with a pinch of salt. It was certainly in the interest of Sparke and Travers to align themselves with the reformist figures in the audience, while describing Whitgift as an impediment to the assembly. The archbishop is offered as a symbol of the errors they hoped, with their listeners' support, to overturn; and

[84] See chapter 2 above
[85] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 50^{v}.
[86] Here, the Morrice manuscript, in Peel's transcription, has Sparke saying 'we are to speake of the Canonicall and of the Apocrypha' (Peel, *The Seconde Parte*, p. 277), whereas BL Add. MS 48064 has 'we are to speake of the Canonicall, and *not* of the Apocrypha' (f. 50^{v}).
[87] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 50^{v}-51^{r}.
[88] Ibid., f. 52^{r}. His position was that the writing of the canonical scriptures (informed by the Holy Ghost), and that of the apocrypha (achieved, in Travers' eyes, by man alone), were equal; as the Fathers had, on occasion, doubted them both.
[89] Ibid., f. 52^{r-v}.
[90] Ibid., ff. 52^{v}-53^{v}.

Whitgift, as written, certainly plays his part. His opening reassurance has to be affirmed by Leicester, and rings false when compared to his denial of Sparke's prayer.[91] In the debate itself, he is evasive: dismissing arguments quickly, and urging new matters rather than proceeding with those at hand.[92] In addition, Travers notes occasions where he read from his notebook, something neither puritan – indeed, no other participant – is reported to have done. The first of these, in which the archbishop reads an argument from Peter Martyr on Ecclesiasticus, is followed by Cooper's call for a bible, 'for further and *deeper* considera[tion] of the place'.[93] At the second debate, Whitgift answers a mistranslation in Romans by suggesting that there is 'some ambiguitie' in the original Hebrew, before admitting that he himself has no knowledge of the language.[94]

At the end of the first day, there was some discussion of private baptism and baptism by women, both of which the archbishop was defending when night fell and the debate was cut short.[95] Travers' describes a frustrating transition to the second day: forced 'to put into the land before we had runne half [our] course', the puritans are required to repeat arguments for the benefit of Burghley ('as by a contrarie winde, alreadie a good waye uppon the voyage, we were cast back againe').[96] It is interesting that the debate is here depicted as a *journey*, rather than the more customary battle or duel.[97] This revision of the first day, prompting new points from Burghley and the audience, appears to have taken up a good portion of the second, for only two further topics were discussed – the use of interrogatories and the cross in baptism, which the puritans roundly condemned, and provision for an educated preaching ministry.[98]

[91] Ibid., f. 50^{r-v}; Knox, *Walter Travers*, p. 64; see chapter 2 above.
[92] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 52^{r}, 58^{v}, 61^{v}.
[93] Ibid., f. 54^{r} (emphasis added). For another example, see f. 54^{v}.
[94] Ibid., f. 57^{v}.
[95] Ibid., ff. 55^{v}-56^{r}.
[96] Ibid., f. 56^{r}.
[97] See the conclusion below.
[98] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 60^{r}-63^{r}.

What is striking about this second day – although it can be seen, to a lesser extent, on the first – is the involvement of the audience. In Travers' report, their interjections form part of the dialogue, indistinguishable from the back-and-forth of the puritans and Whitgift. Burghley takes an active role, once criticising Travers' use of logic on the apocrypha: 'you can never make a syllogisme of that, because Christ had not alleadged them; therefore they were not holie scripture; for... there are alsoe sundry partes of the Canonicall which are not cited at all.' When Travers expands his point to include the Apostles' citations, thus forming a syllogism, it is Burghley who tells him: 'prove your minor'.[99] Throughout, Burghley is the voice of reasoned pragmatism, agreeing with Whitgift's points, but in practical terms.[100] Walsingham, though mostly content to listen, also shows interest, asking whether the places cited by Sparke in response to Burghley's challenge are correct. The book is turned towards him, and he finds and affirms the first of them himself.[101]

The most intriguing contributions come from Leicester: he questions the archbishop on those parts of the apocrypha appointed to be read in churches, and is the first to agree with Travers' interpretation of a place in Judith (that sins appointed by God are sins and the fault of the sinner).[102] On the second day, he *reminds* Sparke of objections on baptism, stating: 'it was a pitifull thing that soe manie of ye best ministers, & painefull in their preacheing, stoode to be deprived for these thinges.'[103] Throughout, he is the individual most sympathetic to the puritan side, and this adds further implications to Travers' depiction of the occasion. He also directs the event's practical elements as often as Whitgift: at the end of the second day, he asks the puritans if they have further points, and closes the debate.[104] Of course, Leicester's interest and inclination are not surprising: he was to attack Whitgift's policies in the

[99] Ibid., f. 56^{v}. The Lord Treasurer's response is reported as 'Yea... if they alleadged all'; but this is to the same effect, and Travers immediately cites two places by way of proof.
[100] See, for example, ibid., ff. 61^{v}, 62^{v}-63^{r}.
[101] Ibid., f. 56^{v}.
[102] Ibid., ff. 54^{v}, 55^{v}.
[103] Ibid., ff. 60^{r}, 62^{r}.
[104] Ibid., ff. 62^{v}-63^{r}.

Lords three months later.[105] But his contributions are worth considering, to gauge the credentials of this event as an open hearing for the puritans, rather than a way of simply *dealing* with them. For all the favourable comparisons to be made with anti-Catholic disputation, it must be remembered that this conference was occasioned by those in authority, and attended, however optimistically, by the man who had commissioned Hart's examination.

The outcome is perhaps the best argument for this note of caution, as several elements conspired to prevent Sparke and Travers achieving anything. The first was the attitude of the puritans themselves. Knox argues that their objections were subject to self-censorship, in that they avoided presbyterianism, although the best argument he can make for Sparke's views in this regard is that he would (quietly) fight that corner two decades later at Hampton Court.[106] If Sparke shared Travers' presbyterian opinions, and if, as Travers suggests, they were free to propose the questions, this is certainly a glaring omission. Where Leicester asks for 'other pointes materiall of doctrine' at the end of the debate, Travers notes this response from Whitgift: 'yea we wold call the B. authoritie into question & other thinges'. But here the puritans refuse to take the bait, moving to the issue of an effective ministry.[107] This is reminiscent of nothing so much as Campion's refusal to deal with the true church: an indication that some topics were so deeply entrenched as to prevent discussion. The closest Sparke comes to criticising the Episcopal system is an argument against non-residency and pluralities; a matter disliked by all, and thus requiring no debate.[108] Collinson compares the event's apparent compromise to Hampton Court, which in its aftermath faced accusations of state orchestration.[109] It is a comparison that cannot easily be dismissed.

---

[105] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 270.
[106] Knox, *Walter Travers*, p. 64.
[107] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 62^{v}; Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 269.
[108] BL Add. MS 48064, f. 63^{r}.
[109] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 462-3; see Jacob, *Christian and Modest Offer*, pp. 28-30.

And yet the procedural restraints imposed on Whitgift remain a curiosity. In Travers' account, the archbishop plays a predictable role in the debate's outcome, but he is partially *forced* into evasion through his role as respondent. If the debate *was* orchestrated, the account suggests that it was structured to Whitgift's disadvantage.[110] A middle way is perhaps closest to the truth: the puritans were not about to launch into an attack on the bishops; but equally, Leicester and others would not let Whitgift turn the conference into an examination. This would explain the allocation of roles – a further reflection of post-Campion sensitivities. Of course, a less abstract factor in the outcome, expressed in Travers' nautical images, was the lack of time; and this Collinson posits as one of two causes of the end result, the other being *collective* avoidance of 'the larger issues'.[111] This was an event hindered by practical and circumstantial factors, and by the disputants themselves, but not – as far as the evidence can show – fully weighted in one side's favour.

The conference's aftermath was mixed: it did not produce a flurry of written accounts, and Travers' report is curiously restrained. Only Whitgift claimed outright victory, insisting that the audience was satisfied by his arguments. His first biographer, George Paule, repeated this, noting surprise at the puritans' 'weak and trivial' objections.[112] Strype goes further: the 'Honourable Personages' present, 'observing the Strength of the Archbishop's Reasons, and the Weakness of [the puritans'], persuaded them to Conform themselves; and withal told the Archbishop they would acquaint her Majesty thereof.'[113] Collinson refutes Whitgift's claim to have persuaded anyone present, noting the actions of various councillors after the debate, while Knox feels the need to state that Strype's version – which appears wholly unaware of the surrounding circumstances – is 'incorrect'.[114] Sparke and

[110] See Knox, *Walter Travers*, p. 64.
[111] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 269.
[112] Ibid., p. 270; George Paule, *The Life of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury in the Times of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I* (London, 1699), pp. 40-1.
[113] Strype, *Whitgift*, p. 170.
[114] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 270; Knox, *Walter Travers*, p. 64n.

Travers were not persuaded to conform, and Sparke went on to stand silently for puritan objections at Hampton Court.

The Examination of Separatists and Nonconformists

Like disputation with imprisoned Catholics, encounters with radical puritans after Whitgift's translation to Canterbury walked a narrow line between debate and interrogation.[115] Indeed, the nature of puritan objections, and the manner in which the authorities chose to confront them, meant the two could often fuse together entirely. The use of academic forms in official proceedings can be seen in Aylmer's examination of a man named Merbury in 1578.[116] This encounter, which took place in the consistory at St Paul's before a large crowd and Aylmer's Ecclesiastical Commission, began as an inquiry into Merbury's activities, but turned into an examination on rudimentary logic.[117] Merbury, by his own account, was asked what he had to say, whereupon he accused all bishops of murdering souls: 'as manye... as have [per]ished by the Ignorance of ye ministers of ther makinge whom they knew to be Troble.' When pressed on those appointed by Aylmer, he responded: 'I accuse yow nott [par]ticulerlye because I knowe nott your estate'; but if Aylmer had made such ministers, he deserved 'condemnation'. At this, the bishop stated: 'Thy proposition is false if it were in Cambridge it would be hissed out of ye schooles.'[118] He then took Merbury to task on the definitions of 'distinction' and 'difference', and asked how many predicables and predicaments there were in scholastic logic.[119] Merbury protested 'I am no logician', and the examination descended into a shouting match.[120] Just as interrogation might creep into debate, then, academic tropes could appear in

[115] On Whitgift's translation, see Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, p. 113. The change in policy in 1583 would partly account for the falling away of anti-Catholic debate – many on the Council's list no longer enjoyed favour.
[116] Merbury's account is held at the British Library: Add. MS 39828, ff. 23^{r}-24^{v}.
[117] Ibid., f. 23^{r}.
[118] Ibid., f. 23^{r}.
[119] Ibid., ff. 23^{r-v}; see Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric*, pp. 17-21.
[120] BL Add. MS 39828, ff. 23^{v}-24^{r}.

outright examination – a reflection of their role as a commonplace in religious discourse.

The most detailed accounts of disputation on this front concern the separatists Henry Barrow and John Greenwood. Greenwood had been granted several church posts in the early 1580s; turning to separatism around 1585, most likely under the influence of Robert Browne. Barrow, meanwhile, was a 'gentleman commoner', educated at Cambridge and Gray's Inn, who had been drawn to separatism through Browne's writings, in consultation with another figure, Thomas Wolsey.[121] The pair were arrested in 1587, Greenwood with a group of 20 separatists in October, and Barrow a month later, on visiting them in the Clink.[122] Both were taken to the Fleet, and over a period of more than five years were subjected to examination by Whitgift, who was aided in the task by senior bishops and – amongst others – members of the Privy Council. These proceedings naturally concerned religious questions, but (more so even than Aylmer's examination of Merbury) were investigations, rather than disputations. They had no academic form, and their questions appear as 'interrogatories' in the accounts that followed.[123] Barrow viewed these events with contempt, contrasting them with 'conference': 'I was brought out of my close pryson & co[m]pelled there to answere... unto such articles as the Bishops in theire secret Councell had contrived against us.'[124]

[121] Barrow proceeded BA in the 1570s, entering Gray's Inn in 1576: Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 388; Prest, *Inns of Court*, p. 196. When examined, he was asked about his training by Whitgift: Leland H. Carlson (ed.), *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590* (London, 1962), pp. 93-6. See ODNB Greenwood, John; Patrick Collinson, 'Separation In and Out of the Church: The Consistency of Barrow and Greenwood', *The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society*, 5 (1994), pp. 244-6.

[122] *Writings of Henry Barrow*, p. 91; Collinson, 'Separation', pp. 252-3.

[123] *Writings of Henry Barrow*, esp. pp. 86-8, 89, 101, 102, 170, 171, 173-7, 190-2, 193; Leland H. Carlson (ed.), *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590* (London, 1962), esp. pp. 20-1, 22; Leland H. Carlson (ed.), *The Writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593* (London, 1970), pp. 85-9, 223-9.

[124] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. D.ii^{v}. Once, he termed Whitgift 'a monster, a miserable compound... he is neither ecclesiastical nor civil, even that second beast spoken of in Revelation'. Lord Burghley, also present and entirely unfazed, asked him to cite his reference for the first: *Writings of Henry Barrow*, p. 188; Collinson, 'Separation', p. 253.

In addition to these investigations, however, the separatists were called upon to take part in religious conferences – another indication that they were used for more than evidence-gathering.[125] Collinson notes that conferences were held between Barrow and a total of 42 divines whilst he and Greenwood were in the Fleet, but only seven such events were written up and printed.[126] Barrow's reports, produced covertly within the year, are written in a blend of dialogue and narrative form, with the former structuring the latter. The recorded conferences took place over two months in 1590. At the first, on the 9th of March, Greenwood disputed against William Hutchinson, Archdeacon of St Albans and chaplain to Aylmer, and on the 14th, Barrow took on the London divine Thomas Sperin.[127] Greenwood and Hutchinson resumed on the 17th, the latter joined by one Dr Bright, and the following day Barrow faced Hutchinson and Lancelot Andrewes, recently elected Master of Pembroke, Cambridge.[128] On the 20th, Greenwood joined Barrow to dispute against Sperin and another clergyman, Stephen Egerton, and on the 3rd of April they faced Sperin and one Cooper.[129] On the 13th, Andrewes and Hutchinson returned. Of these divines, the views of Sperin and Egerton are most remarkable – both were known radicals, suggesting that a similar policy was being pursued as had been with Campion.[130] But whereas in anti-Catholic debate this suggested caution, here it demonstrates subtlety, and greater confidence in disputation.

As described by Barrow, Greenwood's first solitary debates established the tone and conditions of these events. Hutchinson, echoing Fulke and other sanctioned disputants, told the separatist that 'he came by virtue of Commission', upon which

---

[125] A chronology of the recorded debates is provided in *Writings of John Greenwood*, p. 337.
[126] ODNB Barrow, Henry. Barrow's Accounts are contained in *Sclaunderous Articles*, sigs C^{r}-C.iii^{r}, C.iii^{v}-D.i^{v}, D.ii^{r}-E.iiii^{r}, E.iiii^{v}-F.iii^{v}, and *Letters and Conferences*, pp. 1-15, 16-30, 48-66.
[127] On Hutchinson, see *Writings of Henry Barrow*, p. 191.
[128] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. C.iii^{v}; Henry Isaacson, *An Exact Narration of the Life and Death of the Late Reverend and Learned Prelate, and Painfull Divine, Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1651), f. 5^{v}.
[129] Carlson identifies Cooper as 'Martin or Robert': *Writings of Henry Barrow*, p. 506n.
[130] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. See Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, sig. Aii^{r}; Collinson, 'Separation', pp. 241-2.

Greenwood demanded a witness (naming one Calthrop, a fellow prisoner), and access to writing materials. Hutchinson expressed his purpose as follows: 'not to examine him, or anie way to hurt him, but to confer with him about his separating of himself from the Church of England'; at which Greenwood said that he had not asked Hutchinson to come, but was 'willing of anie Christian conference, *where it shall be free aswell to oppose as answere*, & on both sides the matter to be recorded in writing.'[131] By this account, then, Greenwood *assumed* that formal disputation would be applied, and saw any restriction in the roles as being tantamount to another examination. His description of the more balanced form as 'Christian conference' is also remarkable, given the importance of debate within the puritan movement.[132]

The questions tackled here would similarly set a trend for the events that followed. As Barrow has it, Hutchinson's focus was on the motives behind Greenwood's separation. When Hutchinson declined to set down a proposition of his own, the separatist objected against the governance and composition of parish assemblies: they contained, he stated, 'all sorts of profane people', under an 'antichristian ministerie, lawes, Courts, worship, &c.'[133] Here, he attempts to prove his first assertion by way of the 1559 settlement – that all were received 'by the blowing of her Majesties trumpet'; an image of the church that formed a cornerstone of separatist objections (and Barrow's writings).[134] At the second debate between Greenwood and Hutchinson, the question is said to have been pursued further, but the arguments revolved around a scriptural analogy – the baptism of the Pharisees and Sadducees – urged by Hutchinson during their first exchange. Barrow notes occasional interjections from Bright, but these always express agreement with his partner. Both conferences, as described, were inconclusive. On departing, Hutchinson

[131] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles,* sig. C^{r} (emphasis added).
[132] The phrase is repeated by Barrow: ibid., sig. D.ii^{r}.
[133] Ibid., sig. C^{r}.
[134] Ibid., sigs C^{r}-C.i^{v}; Collinson, 'Separation', pp. 254-6.

is twice said to have promised another point (proof that Rome could be called a true church), but this is not raised in any subsequent account.[135]

At the first of his own conferences, Barrow reports making his opinion of such events clear, and – like Greenwood, though in less practical terms – stating his preferred conditions. Sperin told him that he had been sent by Aylmer to discuss one of Barrow's assertions ('that there was no Church in England'), to which Barrow responded that he 'had nothing to do with' the Bishop of London, and that 'what I hold concerning their Church of England the Bishhopps knew long agoe, & never as yet would grant either publicke or private conference, where the Booke of God might quietly decide the co[n]troversies betwixt us'. Recounting the injuries dealt him since his imprisonment, the separatist asserts, 'I had just cause to suspect anie conference that [Aylmer] could send unto me'; a suspicion that would inform his attitude throughout.[136] As an indication of Sperin's radicalism, Barrow expresses surprise that he is there in the bishop's name, 'because I had heard he had sometymes bene otherwise minded', and advises him to use his own name in requesting a debate, rather than that of Aylmer.[137]

The structure of these initial exchanges has more in common with the fluid discourse of Rainolds' debate with Hart than the approach taken with Campion. As Barrow describes his first encounter, the arguments proceeded naturally from the discussion of Aylmer, and it was not until ink and paper were produced that propositions were set down in response to the question.[138] At each conference, these were generally argued *without* logic form, and debated freely by both sides – as Greenwood had asked, neither was limited to a specific role. There were, however, confused elements of disputation on display, particularly in Barrow's first debate. Once, he set down a syllogism whilst asking Sperin to 'prove' that his parish was 'a

[135] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sigs C.ii^{v}, D.i^{v}.
[136] Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, p. 1.
[137] Ibid., pp. 1-2.
[138] Ibid., p. 3.

true established Church of Christ'.[139] Later, Sperin cited passages in scripture to prove an argument about church governors, but these do not appear to have been considered in any detail.[140] Reacting to a distinction on the substance of a ministry, Barrow states: 'Thus whilest you professe science you make shipwrack of faith, & with your logick put away the Testame[n]t of Christ.'[141] This is expanded upon in subsequent events, and in Barrow's preface to *A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences*: 'these Preachers were loth to have the sore touched, but by evasions sought alwaies to darke[n] & torne away the truth with indirect answeres & con[n]ing distinctions.'[142]

Two things can thus be noted in these initial debates. First, they were not intellectual contests: the prisoners' views and situation preclude niceties of form, and *nominally* rule out scholastic wrangling. Secondly, they are possessed of a heightened immediacy, covering the separatists' direct situation, and the state of the church as it existed – points that drew them closer to examinatory proceedings. The clearest physical manifestation of this was the private nature of the conferences. As noted, Barrow and Sperin had to relocate because a crowd had gathered.[143] The account does not relate which of them suggested the change of venue, but the decision itself is indicative of a movement away from spectacle towards more earnest, delicate discourse. Greenwood's second encounter with Hutchinson further suggests the authorities' hand in this: it was held in the porter's lodge, where the disputants were locked in, 'that no ma[n] might heare our conference'.[144]

It is in his second individual debate that Barrow sets out his view of logical reasoning in relation to religious argument. At the commencement, he repeated the assertion that he had not yet obtained a conference 'where the Booke of God might peaceablie decide all owr controversies.' Before the debate itself, there was some

[139] Ibid., p. 5.
[140] Ibid., p. 14.
[141] Ibid., p. 9.
[142] Ibid., sig. Aii[r].
[143] Ibid., p. 5; see chapter 2 above.
[144] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. C.iii[v].

discussion of his separation, focusing on the etymological links between 'sectories' and 'schismatics'.[145] But eventually, there was talk of making a start, on the topic of the church and its communicants, and here Barrow reports a dispute about process – 'whither it should be after *their* schole maner, by Logicke or no'.[146] Barrow makes his position clear:

> I desired to reason after a Christia[n] maner, according unto truth, though not in logicall formes... I would not bynde the majestie of the Script. to logicall formes, whereabout we should have more vaine cavilles, and spe[n]d more tyme, the[n] about the discussing of the question; and that my co[n]science could neither be convinced or instructed with anie syllogismes so much as with the weight of reason & force of truth.[147]

This explains the format of the conferences, as presented here.[148] But for all that he would not be convinced by logic form, Barrow had no qualms about using it: several of his arguments are set out as syllogisms.[149]

At the beginning of the separatists' first dual conference, in the chamber 'where they were kept close prisoners', Egerton was the last to arrive, and both sides reportedly decided to start without him. Sperin's opening question echoed earlier debates: 'I would know the causes of your forsaking our Church'. Barrow referred him to their previous encounter, and the discussion proceeded from there.[150] As Barrow relates it, the topics again concerned the nature and authority of the church, beginning at the settlement before moving to its dealings with Catholicism, and the power of the bishops and civil authorities. Egerton arrived some way into the second

[145] Ibid., sigs D.ii^{r}-D.iii^{v}.
[146] Ibid., sig. D.iiii^{r} (emphasis added).
[147] Ibid., sig. D.iiii^{r}.
[148] It further reflects Browne's opinion of structured logic, which opposed even Ramist systems: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 110.
[149] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sigs E^{r}, E.i^{v}-E.ii^{r}.
[150] Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, p. 16.

point, and from here his interactions with Sperin are remarkable; both having puritan sympathies.[151] Egerton holds Sperin back from subscribing to the view that bishops held only civil offices; but where Barrow proclaims them Antichristian additions to Christ's 'perfect ministrie', Egerton again halts his partner's denial: 'Mr. Sperin here would have denyed the Bishop[s] to be Antichrist: But Mr. Egerton willed him never to denye that, which they had agreed uppon.'[152]

Procedurally, the conference with Sperin and Cooper provides the most interesting examples. Again, the debate is preceded by a discussion of the distinction between sectories and schismatics, in which Greenwood tells Sperin: 'By your Logicke & prophane Artes you pervert the trueth of the Scriptures... You make [logic] a cloke for your wickednes'.[153] Barrow also reports a dispute over written points and answers: whereas in previous accounts calls for pen and paper had met with a favourable response, here the request is questioned.[154] 'To what purpose?' Cooper asks; 'You seeke writing [but] to catch.' When Barrow states that it is 'to avoide sclander', Cooper dismisses it as a waste of time. Finally, Greenwood decides, 'we will write though you will not.'[155] Again, in permission and intent, this is a departure from anti-Catholic debate. There is little interest on Cooper's side in disseminating accounts, only in confronting the separatists themselves. This reflects the more complex front on which the debates were taking place: there was little desire to publicise separatist views.

The close of this conference is extraordinary. Barrow's account has Cooper breaking off, claiming to be needed elsewhere, but the participants were locked inside a chamber at the Fleet, with no porter at hand to let the free men out. On realising this, Cooper reportedly turned to two 'standers by' (the only ones permitted to observe the

[151] Ibid., p. 18.
[152] Ibid., pp. 21, 29.
[153] Ibid., p. 50.
[154] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. C.iii^{v}.
[155] Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, p. 52.

debate), expanding on his arguments unilaterally.[156] This led to some further, unstructured discourse, which – as Barrow has it – prompted one of the observers, a gentleman named Bartlet, to comment: 'yt was not well we had not some more orderlie Conference about theis weightie causes *that the truth might appeare*.' The separatists agree, blaming the authorities, but Cooper, paradoxically, states: 'They denie our Church and ministrie & therfor *are not to be disputed with*', suggesting that he viewed these events as but another form of examination. More remarkably, at some urging from Greenwood and the observer, he adds: 'We graunt the things they seeke are good, and manie of us have written and taught fullie the same, but they seeke them not by due order.' Thus, despite his attitude, Barrow places Cooper in the same category as Sperin and Egerton: a radical, disputing on the authorities' behalf.[157]

The final debate, in which the separatists conferred with Andrewes and Hutchinson, is described by Barrow in a summary, rather than his usual blend of narrative and dialogue. In form and content, it appears similar to previous events: the account's style a result, as Barrow has it, of its 'disorderly' handling by the opposing divines, 'who sought nothing so much as to obscure & turne away the truth by *theire schole learning*, manifold cavills & shifts, shameless denyall of manifest truthes, & most unchristian contumelies, scoffes, & reproches against owre persons.'[158] Here, 'disorderly' can partly be translated as 'academic': Barrow's objections throughout were as much a reaction to scholastic forms as to the arguments being made. He rejects examination; but also outwardly rejects *procedural* ideals of balance, in favour of 'Christian conference' based on scripture.

Conference with radicals like Barrow and Greenwood is thus interesting in the ideals on display. Despite some blurring of disputation with interrogatory approaches,

[156] These observers are not described in detail in Barrow's account, and are not mentioned before this point.
[157] Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, pp. 58, 62-4 (emphasis added). On the process of integration and distinction underpinning the gap between these men and the separatists, see Lake, 'Defining Puritanism', p. 9.
[158] Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. E.iiii^{v} (emphasis added).

a distinction is being observed, on both sides, between the two actions; and 'conference', as the separatists term it, is held up – explicitly by Barrow; implicitly by the authorities' representatives – as the more valid exercise. This is not to imply that there was a consensus on what 'conference' entailed, but it speaks to the persistence and spread of those ideals exploited in anti-Catholic debate. These events also suggest development; as Barrow's 'Christian conference' – typical of puritan rhetoric – revolves around authority and proof, rather than scholastic forms. But despite his aversion to the (literal) trappings of academia, the Gray's Inn alumnus and former Cambridge man is still tied to syllogistic reasoning, through opponent, training and custom.

Conversion and Reclamation

What these reformed encounters demonstrate is that a *spectrum* of conference and disputation was being employed by the authorities by the end of the reign. Aside from its application in polemic, conference was seen as an effective means of combating dissent and examining – or even reclaiming – recusants and converts. In 1577, the bishops and Privy Council had laid out a regimen of conferences to be applied with notable recusants, and several accounts of such efforts survive.[159] These were, it should be emphasised, *private* encounters, held in the home of a minister or bishop, or before Ecclesiastical Commissioners. They rarely produced printed accounts: those reports that survive are generally written by the subjects themselves, relating failed attempts to persuade them, and remained in manuscript.[160] The lack of printed

[159] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 151-2; see Anthony Milton and Alexandra Walsham, 'Richard Montagu: 'Concerning Recusancie of Communion with the Church of England'', in Stephen Taylor (ed.), *From Cranmer to Davidson: a Church of England Miscellany* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 72 on the pressure for such conferences. On Elizabeth's 1578 progress, suspected Catholic gentry were forced to confer with Protestant divines: Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', p. 149. R. C. Bald suggests that John Donne had been subject to conferences on his conversion, noting the involvement of Anthony Rudd, Dean of Gloucester: R. C. Bald, *John Donne: a Life* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 69-70.

[160] Alexandra Walsham notes the 'audacity' of the double convert Thomas Bell in smuggling an account of his examinations out of York Castle in the 1570s: Alexandra Walsham, ''Yielding to the

accounts indicates either that such efforts were highly unsuccessful, or that the authorities had little interest in calling attention to them – converts and lay recusants presented a more delicate situation than imprisoned priests. If, as later events and the rhetoric of disputation suggest, religious conference was seen as an effective method of persuasion, the latter explanation is more likely. These events were aimed at those under examination; they were not intended for polemic. In the 1590s, at the urging of the Earl of Huntingdon, Thomas Morton engaged in conference with several recusants. His biographer John Barwick stated that Elizabeth had commanded the Earl 'to convince them by arguments rather then suppress them by force'.[161]

The most detailed accounts of conference to reclaim a Catholic convert in this period were written by William Alabaster, whose fascination with the Rainolds brothers was tied to his own religious experience. As he describes in his conversion narrative, Alabaster had been drawn to Catholicism through reading *and* conference.[162] In 1597, he came into contact with the captured priest Thomas Wright, through Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster.[163] The introduction was undoubtedly an attempt to convert Wright through debate, but as such was wholly unsuccessful: Alabaster, writing as a Catholic, describes their discourse as 'never to any great purpose for matters of controversie... but certayn skirmishes'; emphasising his own pride and Wright's credentials.[164] It was in the priest's room that Alabaster encountered William Rainolds' *Refutation of Sundry Reprehensions, Cavils and False Sleights*, a defence of the Catholic translation of the New Testament; and in reading this work he converted to Catholicism – a moment he describes as revelation grounded

---

Extremity of the Time': Conformity, Orthodoxy and the Post-Reformation Catholic Community', in Lake and Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy*, p. 218.

[161] John Barwick, *A Summarie Account of the Holy Life and Happy Death of the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Late Lord Bishop of Dureseme* (London, 1660), p. 67. Lancelot Andrewes had similarly been asked to accompany Huntingdon in helping to convert recusants in the north, by preaching and conference: Isaacson, *An Exact Relation*, f. 4[r].

[162] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, esp. p. 109.

[163] On Goodman, see Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007), p. 82.

[164] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, p. 114; ODNB Alabaster, William.

in prior study.[165] The interplay of learning and religious experience here is remarkable: turning swiftly from knowledge of the truth to its demonstration, Alabaster emphasises judgement as well as 'affection'.[166] Faith and reason are described as lady and handmaid, and in the latter Alabaster states a preference for scholastic divinity over the man-made 'Rethoricall assertions and paradoxes' he found in Protestantism.[167]

In addition, Alabaster expresses enthusiasm and hope for disputation, partly through the imagery of martyrdom:

> I imagined my self to speake with the protestantes and dispute for the Catholique faith; which I was resolved to defend, even unto death itself; and to suffer most gladly any kinde of torture or persecution that man colde laye upon me for the same, acounted my self happie that I was fallen into the opposition of tymes wher I shold have aboundant occasion to shewe my love unto Christ and his Church by confession of my faith.[168]

He reports praying for six months' freedom to prepare, spending more than twenty pounds on Catholic books and engaging in private discourse with as many as would listen.[169] Eventually (as he describes it, after the required six months), Alabaster, who held a Cambridge post, was called before the master of his college and the vice-chancellor, who asked that he return to the English Church, but neither, by his

[165] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, pp. 114-15, 118; Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, pp. 99-100. Alabaster does not name the work, but his description matches Rainolds' 1583 treatise exactly.
[166] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, p. 124.
[167] Ibid., pp. 126-7. This accords with his opinion of John Rainolds (p. 117). His emphasis on religious argument separate from human invention is reminiscent of that of puritan Ramists: see Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, p. 101; chapter 1 above.
[168] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, pp. 120, 133. Marotti finds an imitation of Campion in Alabaster's eagerness: Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 106.
[169] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, p. 121.

reckoning, offered disputation.[170] He was then imprisoned, but again, his desire for debate was frustrated: he was visited by several divines, including John Overall, but 'to no bickering of disputation we ever came'.[171]

Finally, he was brought before the Bishop of London (now Richard Bancroft) whose intention was to win him back to the church: 'he beganne presently to reason with me alone, saying that he hoped I was not yeat so farr gonn, but that I might be reclaimed'. Bancroft asked the extent of his Catholicism, which drew some debate on relative church authority, but Alabaster describes the exchange as a process of question and answer, which only took on a disputatious tone when he proved steadfast.[172] As an extraordinary postscript, he notes that after dinner, Bancroft locked him in a room with the apostate priest Ralph Ithall ('of kyne to the Bishopp'), in the hope of persuading him, but that 'we had scarce begane to talke, but the B. repenting himselfe and thinkinge belike that I might rather move the preest to repentance... than he me to retorne to protestantes Religion he came running backe in great hast, and saide that now he had thought of it, he would not have us talke together'. By this, conversion through discourse was not just a possibility: it was a positive danger.[173] Another meeting with Bancroft occurred several days later, which Alabaster states was pursued through temptation, rather than disputation – this only confirming his position.[174]

Conference had not, however, been abandoned. Within days of his second encounter with Bancroft, Alabaster was sent to Bishop John Still of Bath and Wells, with whom he had personal connections.[175] In the company of several others, Still is said to have launched into a dramatic lament, causing the convert to laugh out loud; but this evolved into a conference similar in tone to his first encounter with Bancroft.

[170] Ibid., pp. 131-2.
[171] Ibid., pp. 133-4.
[172] Ibid., pp. 134-6.
[173] Ibid., p. 136; Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 107.
[174] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, pp. 137-8.
[175] John Still had married a kinswoman of the convert, and had made him a fellow of Trinity, Cambridge: ibid., p. 138; ODNB Still, John.

By his account, Still ignored answers, expressed the view that Rome had been a true church, and at one point could not find a place he cited, but ended on a confident note, telling Alabaster to 'weighe well his reasons which he had given'. Again, the convert departed unconvinced.[176] Following this, he was sent to confer with Andrewes, because (as he puts it) 'the tow Bushoppes... had fownd by experience that ther was little hope of change in me, except they could convince my judgement by force of argument'.[177] Here, both Alabaster *and* Andrewes emphasise the importance of conference, one asking that his adversary 'imploye all his endevours to shewe my error if he could', while the other cites the example of St Paul in urging the role of conference in conversion. Alabaster maintained that he had spoken with learned ministers, and remained unsatisfied.[178] The discussion then turned to the authority of the Catholic Church, and what Alabaster perceived as the lack of a reformed equivalent. Here, Andrewes stresses faith, comparing it to the light of understanding; an argument Alabaster dismisses as 'nothing sownd nor doctorlike'.[179] Once again, by Alabaster's account, the debate did not resemble disputation, although he objected and Andrewes replied.

Following this, conference gave way to official proceedings. At his next meeting with Bancroft and Still, they 'satt in solemnity at the high commission Table', and the discussion revolved around Alabaster's position, with occasional invectives against Rome and 'light questions' that were never followed up.[180] In the meantime, the convert was denied books in prison, and his challenges went unanswered.[181] He was deprived of his ministry, and after more unproductive debates concluded 'that no

[176] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, pp. 138-41.
[177] On Andrewes, Alabaster offers an early critique of avant-garde conformity: ibid., p. 142.
[178] Ibid., p. 143.
[179] Ibid., pp. 143-7. Marotti notes a discrepancy in that Alabaster criticises faith by divine inspiration but applies the same to his conversion. In fact, this is a matter of faith: Alabaster distinguishes divine *assistance* from human *imagination*. Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 108; see chapter 1 above.
[180] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, pp. 148-9.
[181] Ibid., pp. 150, 152.

further disputation or lawfull trial would be geven unto me'.[182] Frustrated, he escaped to the continent and, finally, to Rome.[183]

The gap described in Alabaster's narrative between the disputation he desired and the conferences he received reflects the official attitude towards debate with converts. As G. M. Story and Helen Gardner note, his encounters were all private, and his calls for public debate refused.[184] Alabaster himself notes anxieties surrounding his case: following his meeting with Andrewes, he was not returned to Cambridge, 'least my example and conversion might drawe others to followe me'; and Bancroft would not have him in his house because he was 'afraid to be suspected for a Papist'.[185] These concerns – plausible enough for Alabaster to suggest them – suggest why such debate rarely fuelled polemic. Recusants and converts by definition blurred the binary oppositions on which polemic relied (in contrast to imprisoned priests); but also, in the context of *effectual* debate, they raised greater concerns of exposure.

James Ussher and Henry Fitzsimon

Amid these private conferences and proceedings, formal disputation with imprisoned priests continued, though it was not so widely reported or utilised in polemic as in the early 1580s. In the 1590s, Robert Abbot disputed against the Marian priest Paul Spence at Worcester, but did not print their exchange, 'least I should seem partial either for my self or against him.'[186] Meanwhile, the returned convert Thomas Bell was deployed against Catholics at York Castle and the Jesuit Henry Walpole.[187] Earlier that decade, William Fitch, an imprisoned English Capuchin, had been opposed by several divines, one debate reportedly taking place before a large, lay

[182] Ibid., pp. 153-8.
[183] Ibid., pp. 158-9, 163-4.
[184] G. M. Story and Helen Gardner (eds), *The Sonnets of William Alabaster* (Oxford, 1959), p. xv.
[185] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, p. 148.
[186] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 178n; Robert Abbot, *A Mirrour of Popish Subtilties* (London, 1594), sigs $A4^{v}$-$*^{r}$.
[187] BL Add. MS 34250, f. 67^{r}; Walsham, ''Yielding to the Extremity of the Time'', pp. 225, 227.

audience.[188] In the early 1600s, Thomas Morton disputed against a priest named Young and one Stillington, a gentleman, before a mixed crowd; his biographers noting that the account was never printed, 'because he and his Adversaries engaged themselves by mutuall promise, not to Print it but by common consent'.[189] These events, then, present further evidence of diversity in public religious disputation, in terms of audience, attitude and purpose, but this time *within* anti-Catholic debate. Echoes of Campion inform the modesty of Abbot and Morton. Their concerns sit at some remove from McCoog's demonstration and destruction.

This trend can be explored further by turning, briefly, to Ireland. On June 27th, 1600, a student from Trinity College, Dublin, disputed against the Jesuit Henry Fitzsimon – fifteen years his senior, and a prisoner in Dublin Castle. Fitzsimon had returned as a missionary in 1594, and – as Alan Ford notes – had allowed himself to be captured in the hope of finding Protestant opponents; a strategy that proved spectacularly unsuccessful.[190] His adversary was James Ussher, later Archbishop of Armagh, a dedicated student of Travers (provost at Trinity from 1594) and an adherent of Ramism, less than two years from ordination.[191] Few details of the arrangements surrounding their debate survive, but Ford offers it as a first example of the radical divines of Trinity being focused, *sans* distraction, against Catholicism. Here was a more liberated, Irish version of the 1580s' harnessing of men like Travers, Field and Charke; long since marginalised in England by Whitgift.[192] In the *format* of his debate with Fitzsimon, however, it is Ussher's status as a student – rather than his religious alignment – that is most apparent. By his own account, his allegiance to the

[188] BL Harl. MS 3888, ff. 29v-32v.
[189] Barwick, *A Summarie Account*, pp. 67-8; R. B., *The Life of Dr. Thomas Morton, Late Bishop of Duresme* (York, 1669), pp. 17-19.
[190] Ford, *James Ussher*, p. 12: in prison, Fitzsimon was refused disputation by Meredith Hanmer and Luke Challoner; and was finally 'reduced to shouting challenges at passers-by from his window.'
[191] Ibid., esp. pp. 26, 36-44.
[192] Ibid., p. 59. The use of radical divines to counter Catholicism in England had dwindled after 1583; a change Prest notes in relation to preachers at the inns of court: Prest, *Inns of Court*, p. 181.

full, formal process surpasses that of older divines; indeed, the account is in many ways a template for the practice.[193]

The disputants have equal opportunity to oppose, Ussher taking the role for the first half, and Fitzsimon for the second. At the midpoint, the Jesuit asks to take over, and Ussher responds, 'You shall verie willinglie.' Soon, however, Fitzsimon has to be reminded of the roles, having requested an argument.[194] Logic form is used throughout, and its direction and force – in the 'course of disputation' – are directly urged by the younger man in pursuing one point.[195] The arguments move from syllogistic assertion through authorities to confirmation; the respondent's part is concise and the question, the identification of the Pope as Antichrist, is termed Ussher's 'thesis' – in other words, the encounter is presented as a 'disputation' in every respect.[196] As Ford notes, this was partly a result of Ussher's youth and 'precocious' intellectualism; but more generally, it represents a departure from recorded anti-Catholic debate in England. Ussher's youth, his adversary's fervour and the drive of Trinity College provide a reflection of those trends only glimpsed elsewhere: anti-Catholic disputation loosed from its Elizabethan restraints.[197]

The Spread of Elizabethan Religious Debate

The most detailed accounts of public religious disputation in Elizabeth's England concern the examination of imprisoned priests, but by the end of the reign, these encounters had adapted to new circumstances and old concerns. They were, moreover,

[193] Ussher's account is held at the Bodleian: MS Barlow 13, ff. 80^{r}-82^{v}, with a follow-up letter to Fitzsimon, f. 83^{r-v}. For this reference, I am indebted to Professor Alan Ford. The account reports the back-and-forth of debate with little detail of occasion or arrangements. A marginal deviation from its dialogue (f. 81^{v}) suggests some abbreviation or omission, and – as Ford notes – Ussher's letter to Fitzsimon indicates more than one meeting between the two men: Ford, *James Ussher*, p. 13n.
[194] Bodl. MS Barlow 13, f. 82^{r}.
[195] Ibid., f. 80^{r}.
[196] Ibid., f. 80^{r}. On the question, Ussher took a standard apocalyptic line, responding to points from Bellarmine: see Ford, *James Ussher*, pp. 77-8.
[197] Fitzsimon would later challenge John Rider to a disputation before the Viceroy, Council and members of Trinity College; but this, in terms of face-to-face debate, went unanswered: Gaffney, 'Practice of Religious Controversy', p. 145

one aspect of a wider practice. Surviving accounts of disputation cannot be taken as a definitive measure of its use, but their diversity and spread in the latter portion of the reign, combined with supplementary evidence, indicates a proliferation of such events, on a spectrum ranging from the public examination of priests to the attempted reclamation of converts and reformed discussion of church doctrine. Early restriction was giving way to balance and variety; fuelled by a belief in the efficacy of discourse, and framed in the forms *and ideals* of academic debate. By the reign's close, Jesuits were given opportunities to oppose, and archbishops were required to respond.

Two things, however, must qualify this Utopian outline. The most fundamental is the omnipresence of formal debate in the minds of educated officials and divines. The academic role of disputation, coupled with the period's divisions, suggests that it was the *restriction* of its public, controversial use that was unusual. Those in authority cannot be said to have single-handedly rekindled the practice in the 1580s as a means to their own ends – it was a reaction to religious challenges simply *waiting* to happen. Secondly, religious debate was still subject to the concerns of the time. The absence of anti-Catholic accounts in the later 1580s reflects the ascendancy of Whitgift and the more fearful political and international climate.[198] Moreover, as Lake argues, reactions to Catholic and reformed dissent were not independent of one another, and what prompted disputation in one direction could restrict it elsewhere.[199] Even when these caveats are taken into account, however, the range of debate recorded in the latter portion of the reign is striking. Disputation *as polemic* was one aspect of a broader, more significant, and increasingly visible phenomenon.

Another aspect, sidelined by the examples detailed above, was the role of conference or disputation in the puritan movement. Lines have been drawn here between debates within puritan gatherings and those crossing confessional or controversial lines. In part, this reflects Ley's boundaries: puritan exchanges had

[198] Michael Questier, 'Conformity, Catholicism and the Law', in Lake and Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy*, p. 251.
[199] Lake, 'Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', *passim.*

different intentions – education and clarification, between divines in fundamental agreement. But there is also, of course, the question of prior work on the movement. To expand this study into all puritan 'conferences' is to re-tread areas detailed by Collinson and others. In the context of disputation, the growth of puritan debate in the later sixteenth century can be described as a parallel discursive trend.

What emerges clearly from these Elizabethan accounts is the continual adaptation of formal disputation to suit individual divines and circumstances. The ideological aspect can be seen in Barrow's urging of conference from scripture, and the practical is demonstrated in those debates arranged by the authorities. But individual adaptations are also in evidence; in Rainolds' humanist assurance, Aylmer's academic condescension at the consistory, Ussher's precocity, and the differences between Campion's opponents. What unifies these diverse styles is a loyalty to the disputation format – a structure that would survive in controversy for decades to come. The trends prompting public religious debate were not about to disappear; and on her death, Elizabeth would be succeeded by a king possessed of real enthusiasm for the process.

Chapter Five: Disputation Distinguished, 1604-1620

'there is no order, nor can bee any effectuall issue of disputation, if each partie might not bee suffered, without chopping, to speake at large what hee would.'[1]

Where the new king was concerned, two forces shaped religious disputation in the opening decades of the seventeenth century. The first was James' enthusiasm for such debate. At his accession, those subjugated and examined under Elizabeth voiced renewed hope for tolerance and change, in tracts and appeals to the monarch, and in doing so, they invoked his reputation for learning, citing his printed works and engagement in disputation.[2] The reputation was not unfounded: James established a connection with the universities greater than that exercised by Elizabeth, and in 1605 asserted that if not a king, he would have been 'a university man'.[3] He had disputed with Scottish ministers before acceding to the English throne, and continued to engage in religious debate after 1603, albeit hindered by his royal authority and the import of each event.[4] The second force, however, was more restrictive. James maintained a belief in Christian unity, evident in his treatment of puritan dissenters and his

[1] James I, in Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 32.

[2] Patrick Collinson, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference', in Howard Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War: Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government* (London, 1983), p. 28; Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *The Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), p. 184. Questier notes demonstrations of loyalty from Catholics: Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 265-7; *idem*, 'Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England', *English Historical Review*, 123 (2008), p. 1133. The convert Francis Walsingham describes a climate of receptiveness to religious debate: 'I conceived his Majestie to be very studious of the truth, by that I had often heard, he would dispute and reason himselfe, concerning Religion, being also... of sound judgment and learning, as appeared by his books, which I had seene and greatly liked': Walsingham, *A Search*, pp. 27-8.

[3] Kenneth Fincham, 'Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1997), pp. 182-3; David Harris Willson, *King James VI and I* (London, 1956), p. 290. On James' own opinion of his intellectual ability, see W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 51.

[4] An encounter between James and the minister James Gibson in 1585 survives at the British Library: BL Add. MS 32092, ff. 86^{v}-88^{r}. Although this was a disciplinary measure (Gibson held puritan opinions and had charged the king and others in Scotland with persecution), it contained elements of disputation: James questioned the minister on his sermons and the scriptural 'proof' underlying his accusations, despite informing him, 'I sent not for you to dispute' (f. 87^{v}). It is interesting that Gibson here describes the event as 'conference and reasoninge' rather than examination: an interesting – markedly puritan – choice of words, given Gibson's statement towards the end of the exchange: 'you,' he tells James, 'are no judge of my doctryne' (f. 88^{r}).

approach to the Church of Rome.[5] His stance has been described as a *via media*, a desire to bring moderates to the church whilst excluding radical or subversive views, an expression of unity intended to avert threats to his authority and person. In theory, this would protect the stability and doctrinal equilibrium of the church, and – as Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake point out – could also adapt to changing political requirements.[6] In distinguishing between degrees of dissent, and thus incorporating a broad spectrum in the bounds of conformity and tolerance, it contributed to a climate in which religious discussion could become more widespread; but it might, at the same time, have hindered instances and reports of religious *disputation* – typically the realm of priests and aggressive Protestant polemicists.[7] Whilst opportunities for religious discourse increased in these opening decades, accounts of disputation do not survive in great numbers. The form's influence can still be detected, but the formal, demonstrative events of Elizabeth's reign were not long repeated, certainly in terms of full accounts. Instead, the evidence to 1620 describes scattered, unstructured debates, on the boundaries of the English Church.

The Hampton Court Conference

James began his reign with a conference intended to address national doctrine and religious policy.[8] Held in January 1604, Hampton Court was – in contrast to

[5] Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 30-1; Patterson, *King James VI and I, passim.*

[6] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', pp. 170-1.

[7] Patterson captures this in arguing that the relish with which James approached religious discussion formed part of his desire for Christian unity: Patterson, *King James VI and I*, p. 342.

[8] The principal account is Barlow's *Summe and Substance*. Shorter relations are printed in Roland G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, vol. 2 (New York and London, 1910), pp. 331-354, including 'An Anonymous Account in Favour of the Bishops' (BL Harl. MS 3795, f. 7^{r-v} and BL Add. MS 38492, f. 81^{r-v}) and a transcription of BL Harl. MS 828, ff. 32-8. Several are taken from Barlow's work, where they are printed as 'unsavory, and untrue'; sigs A, P^{r}-$P3^{r}$. Reports can also be found in letters from James Montagu (Edmund Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I*, vol. 2 (London, 1725), pp. 13-15), Tobie Matthew (Edward Cardwell, *A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings* (Oxford, 1849), pp. 161-6), James' agent Patrick Galloway (Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, pp. 212-7) and Dudley Carleton (Maurice Lee, Jr. (ed.), *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters* (Rahway NJ, 1972), p. 57). The

Westminster – intended to respond to puritan appeals, most notably the Millenary Petition of 1603, and to examine the reformed boundary of the Church of England – a line that was increasingly contested towards the end of the sixteenth century.[9] There were, however, remarkable similarities between this event and its Elizabethan forerunner. Like many state-sanctioned religious exchanges, it was carefully controlled, and contemporary reports include suggestions (and outright accusations) of state orchestration and unfair dealing. Given James' reputation and involvement in formal debate, before and after Hampton Court, these images are particularly revealing. Whatever academic regard (or polemical respect) was held for disputation at his accession, when the stakes were high enough those in authority still recoiled from leaving doctrinal questions to chance – or, more precisely, to the vicissitudes of formal, public debate.

It is interesting, therefore, to note Collinson's placement of Hampton Court in the context of similar events and practices. In 1983, he described the relationship between these occasions and university disputation as a 'loose' one, citing the immediate purpose, powerful observers and laxity of form that characterised such politically charged disputes. Nonetheless, he invokes James' observation that, 'if [the puritan representatives] had been in a college disputing with thair scholars, if any of thair disciples had answered them in that sort, they would have fetched him up in a place of a reply; and so should the rod have plyed upon the poor boyes buttocks.'[10] In seeking to contextualise Hampton Court, however, Collinson soon moves away from academic disputation, making little mention of process. Instead, he draws comparisons with the 1518 Leipzig debates and the Westminster conference – 'disputations' upon

---

conference has been extensively studied by historians; early cornerstones being Usher's *Reconstruction* and a chapter in Samuel R. Gardiner's *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*, vol. 1 (London, 1883), pp. 146-59. Subsequent revision has been done by Curtis, Frederick Shriver, Collinson, Nicholas Tyacke and Alan Cromartie.

[9] Nicholas Tyacke, *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603-1640* (London, 1990), p. 3. Patrick Collinson notes the Petition's suggestion that questions be addressed 'by conference among the learned'; an idea intended 'to whet the king's appetite for religious argument': Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 36.

[10] Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 161; Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp. 34-5.

whose outcome 'the religious destiny of whole nations depended'. He qualifies this with their now familiar duality of purpose: such occasions were to determine in principle, but present a government determination in practice.[11] To explore this duality and build on Collinson's placement, it is necessary to examine Hampton Court in a broader context of debate, and note those elements of academic custom on display. The question is, to what extent can the event be said to reflect common – or, indeed, royal – attitudes toward disputation, and how far was it an engineered, traditional echo of earlier 'establishing' debates?

After some delay, the conference took place over three days: the 14th, 16th and 18th of January.[12] The most detailed account is William Barlow's *Summe and Substance*, which Collinson describes as the 'semi-official' version.[13] Barlow himself, then Dean of Chester, was intimately connected with the church hierarchy, having been one of its representatives in the event, and his account naturally inclines toward their side, influenced as much by his own position as by the conference's outcome.[14] The work was originally to be dedicated to Robert Cecil, and was commissioned by Whitgift.[15] But for all its limitations, Frederick Shriver, in examining the surviving accounts, concludes that Barlow's 'must remain the basic source for the conference.'[16] Alan Cromartie posits a lack of immediate criticism as a reason for trusting the work, in part, as both an account of the event and a 'clue' to James' religious position.[17]

[11] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 35.
[12] Mark H. Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', *History* 46 (1961), p. 8; Stuart Barton Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London, 1962), p. 59. A meeting with church representatives was held on January 12th, but James postponed their discussion until the 14th: Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 2; Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 162.
[13] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 37; see Alan Cromartie, 'King James and the Hampton Court Conference', in Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 69-71.
[14] Cromartie, 'King James', p. 68.
[15] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 37; Cromartie, 'King James', pp. 69-70.
[16] Frederick Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), pp. 64-5.
[17] Cromartie, 'King James', pp. 69, 80.

Ultimately, as Collinson notes, the account is three times as long as its closest competitor.[18]

In numerical terms, the conference appears rather one-sided. The established church, essentially the question for debate, was represented by a large gathering of bishops, deans and doctors, while the puritans, overwhelmingly moderate, were John Rainolds, Thomas Sparke, Laurence Chaderton and John Knewstub.[19] Members of the Privy Council were also present, along with several individuals whom Collinson describes as 'hard to categorise', blurring the line between the two sides.[20] One of these, the theologian and chaplain-in-ordinary Richard Field, is listed in Barlow's account among the clergymen summoned by James, but appears in other reports as a puritan representative: the 'Anonymous Account in Favour of the Bishops', as printed by R. G. Usher, states that he 'went in with the Puritans, [but] he never spake but once, and that altogether ageinst them.'[21] This blurring – which occurred between the sides *and* between the disputants and their nominal observers – already sets Hampton Court apart from the more structured public disputations of the period. That between the sides would have a direct impact on the outcome of the conference (and its reception); and, as Collinson notes, the best comparison in the latter regard is with the Lambeth debate, whose hindrances have already been discussed.[22]

On the 14th, both sides were initially present, but James dismissed all but 'the Lords of the Privie Councell, and the Bishoppes, with five Deanes, viz. of the Chappell, Westminster, Paules, Westchester, [and] Salisburie', at which point, as

[18] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 37.
[19] Barlow names those summoned as 'the Archbishop of Canterburie, the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, Worcester, S. Davids, Chichester, Carlell, and Peterborow: the Deanes of the Chappell, Christs Church, Worcester, Westminster, Paules, Chester, Windsor, with Doctor Field, and Doctor King, Archdeacon of Nottingham': Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 1-2. On the second day, only the bishops of London and Winchester were present, accompanied by the deans and doctors, including Barlow, George Abbot and Lancelot Andrewes: Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 337.
[20] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 39.
[21] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 1-2; Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp. 39, 190n; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 338; BL Harl. MS 3795, f. 7^{v}.
[22] See chapter 4 above; Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 35.

Barlow describes it, the door was closed.[23] Accounts of this meeting vary; not just in perspective, but in the degree of *argument* said to have taken place. By all accounts, the king questioned the bishops on several points – the Prayer Book, services in the Church of England, excommunication in the church courts, and the provision of ministers for Ireland.[24] In Barlow's narrative, however, these points are handled in a manner more conversational than was typical even of public disputation. While the bishops cited scripture, the Fathers and Calvin in support of their arguments, there is no trace of formal debate, and the lack of clearly defined sides makes for a conference devoid of structural pretension.[25] This might, of course, reflect the natural abbreviation of a purposeful account; but there are few instances here where the discussion resembles *any* form of debate. James excepts against the Prayer Book's handling of private baptism, and this leads to some unstructured argument on the necessity of baptism by ministers; but as a whole, the encounter retains the tone of a ruler being informed and – to an extent – reassured about the doctrine of his church.[26] Tonally *and* structurally, the impression is given that while he had summoned the puritans to deal with their objections, the bishops were there to clarify and offer advice.

Puritan accounts take a different view. One, written on the 15th and printed by Barlow for condemnation, highlights James' objections, noting that the bishops 'brought foorth many popish arguments, which the King very earnestly answered, and learnedly... and said by those reasons, they might proove Popery.'[27] Another asserts that the bishops 'tooke upon them to *manteyne*' baptism by women – in disputation accounts, 'maintain' is often shorthand for one of the academic roles, and at the least

[23] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 2-3.
[24] Ibid., pp. 6-7, sigs P^{r}-$P2^{r}$; Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft*, p. 65.
[25] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 6-20.
[26] Ibid., pp. 14-19. The meeting is similarly described in a letter of the 15th from Dudley Carleton – as close as historians have come to a 'neutral' source on the event: *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, p. 57; Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited', p. 59; Cromartie, 'King James', p. 65.
[27] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, sig. P^{v}. Another has a similar focus: sig. $P2^{r}$.

denotes structured argument.[28] Curtis, collating this account with intimations in a draft royal proclamation the preceding year, has gone further, suggesting that this opening day resembled a trial. James, he observes, 'charged the bishops to tell him what in the Church needed reform', a demand glossed over in Barlow's account.[29] Finding a middle way upon revisiting the conference, Shriver states that the king 'expressed his opinions forthrightly, debating with the bishops and winning one point'.[30] If the battleground of Hampton Court was church doctrine, that of written accounts – and historical interpretation – has been the attitude of the king. Crucially, however, competing depictions of this first day do not rest upon real or pretended victory, but hinge on the event's proximity to disputation; or, conversely, to counsel.[31]

More revealing than the conduct of this encounter is James' opening oration, although this too is contested. Barlow recalls it as a statement of qualified contentment: the king notes 'the example of all Christian Princes, who in the commencement of their reigne, usually take the first course for the establishing of the Church, both for doctrine and policie... particularly, in this land', invoking the entire Tudor line – regardless of denomination – as instances of the same.[32] This is followed by the declaration that he is more satisfied than his predecessors, and that he thanked

[28] Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 342 (emphasis added).
[29] And one that was issued to the puritans when their turn came: Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference', p. 8; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 341. The proclamation cited by Curtis is an early draft of that given on October 24th, 1603, postponing the conference. Further to this, Carleton has the king addressing the bishops in an echo of Whitgift at Lambeth: 'he sent not for them as persons accused but as men of choice, by whom he sought to receive instruction'; *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, p. 57.
[30] Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited', p. 58. The victory referred to is an alteration to the Rubric of Private Baptism, which Barlow notes was 'not so much stucke at by the Bishops': Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 18-19. Shriver's depiction resembles that of the Dean of the Chapel Royal, James Montagu: 'the King alone disputing with the Bishops, so wisely, wittily and learnedly, with that pretty Patience, as I think never Man living ever heard the like' (Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State*, vol. 2, p. 14), and that of Matthew, again in private correspondence: Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 163. Galloway, meanwhile, describes 'dispute had by his Majesty *against* them': ibid., p. 213 (emphasis added).
[31] Not to be omitted here is Collinson's reminder that the bishops were not an homogenous group. The presence of Gervase Babington of Worcester, Rudd of St David's, Matthew of Durham and Henry Robinson of Carlisle, who may have been 'in closer sympathy with Reynolds and Sparke' might certainly have prompted debate; although the principal speakers were Whitgift, Bancroft and Thomas Bilson: Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 459; see Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 15-19.
[32] On James' chronology, see Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 162.

God 'for bringing him into the promised land'.[33] As Barlow describes it, then, James' purpose was clear: he had not called the conference 'for any Innovation', and his reason for consulting with the bishops first was that 'if any thing should be found meete to be redressed, it might be done... without any visible alteration.'[34] But again, puritan accounts shift the focus onto James' doubts: that of the 15th, along with the report held at Harleian 828 (markedly similar in its depiction of the first day), has Whitgift, Bancroft and Thomas Bilson falling to their knees to ask that nothing be changed, and this is echoed in shorter accounts.[35] By way of answer, they recount the king's acknowledgment that 'the best state would gather corruptions', omitting any longer or more equivocal speech. A similar remark is reported by Barlow, but here appears near the end of James' oration, soon after 'innovation' is dismissed as the encounter's object.[36]

The king's intentions at Hampton Court have been debated by successive generations of historians, and the enduring difficulty of the question needs to be borne in mind here.[37] If, however, he approached the conference with considered satisfaction, as Barlow suggests, it goes some way toward explaining the discursive nature of this opening exchange.[38] More importantly, the existence of this meeting must inform our perception of the conference as a whole. With the puritans' contribution prefaced – indeed, bookended – by consultation with the bishops, the occasion appears closer to an *examination* of their views than a disputation. In other

[33] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 3-4.
[34] Ibid., pp. 4-6.
[35] Ibid., sigs P^{r}, P2^{r}; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 341.
[36] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 5; sigs P^{r}, P2^{r}.
[37] Collinson has attempted to untangle competing explanations: Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp. 39-44. Fincham and Lake note that 'the purpose of the conference remains unclear', although they describe it as a characteristic effort to incorporate moderates and isolate radicals: 'Ecclesiastical Policy', pp. 171-2, 173-6, and 'Ecclesiastical Policies', esp. pp. 25-6. Alan Cromartie identifies a conservative streak in the king's conduct and the lack of concessions: Cromartie, 'King James', esp. pp. 62-4, 80. However, while James' policy preferences might explain the event's form and progress, the conference itself can, partly, be laid at the door of conferences past, and the king's academic turn of mind.
[38] The 'Anonymous Account' states that the conference began on the 16th of January: Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 335.

words, structurally, Hampton Court was a distinctly Elizabethan event. Thus, even before James' conduct and the efforts of the puritans are taken into account, the conference is far from the equitable hearing many had requested. The overarching structure, reliant upon the bishops, shows that James did not value disputation over order and continuity, regardless of its intellectual appeal. Collinson arrives at a parallel conclusion regarding his approach: his experiences in Scotland, he suggests, had cautioned the king against reform, and his attitude here achieved nothing so much as the expression and defence of the royal supremacy.[39] In its origins and execution, Hampton Court reflects an ultimately one-sided battle between James' political – and, by some accounts, theological – reserve and his intellectual enthusiasm; a battle perpetuated in contemporary accounts.

On the 16th, the bishops of London and Winchester – described as 'supervisors' by the 'Anonymous Account' – arrived before the meeting began; the puritans being called in before twelve, followed by the deans and doctors.[40] Barlow reports that the king – arriving last, with his son in tow – opened proceedings with 'a short, but a pithie and sweete speach', to the same end as that of the previous day. James reiterated that the intention was 'not to innovate', instead laying out three goals: 'to settle an uniforme order through the whole Church... to plant unitie, for the suppressing of Papists and enemies to Religion... [and] to amend abuses, as naturall to bodies politike, and corrupt man, as the shadow to the bodie'.[41] Remarkably, the 'Anonymous Account in Favour of the Bishops' reports his stated purpose as 'to establishe truthe of Religion'; whereas one puritan report seizes upon Barlow's second objective, noting that 'the King spake much to unitie, that they might joyne against the Papists.'[42] Again, James' perceived receptiveness – a result of his reputation and the

[39] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp. 43-44.
[40] Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 337; Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 21. Bancroft and Bilson were the most conservative of the bishops: Cromartie, 'King James', p. 65.
[41] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 21-2; this is echoed by Montagu: Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State*, vol. 2, p. 14.
[42] Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 335; Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, sig. P2r.

calling of the conference – offers a polemical battleground, preventing the event from being definitive in its aftermath.[43]

After the king's introduction came that of Rainolds, the 'foreman' of the puritan side. Kneeling, he offered four objections, touching the purity of doctrine, the provision of pastors, church government, and improvements needed to the Book of Common Prayer.[44] In Barlow's account, it is from Rainolds' expansion on the first of these – excepting against several of the 39 Articles, including article XVI on justification – that the debate evolves, without structure. Rainolds' objections, to be precise, are interrupted by Bancroft.[45] From here, Barlow provides shades of the formal process, without ever demonstrating its features directly. As Sparke and Travers had at Lambeth, Rainolds opposes by default, although Barlow's language shows little of Travers' formulaic repetition and awareness of the roles.[46] Again, there is little trace of logic form. At times, authorities are called for and cited, including the Fathers ('Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen and others'), Calvin and William Fulke; although a Bible is not produced until well into the debate.[47] Most remarkable of all, in light of this laxity, is James' reaction to that first interruption from Bancroft: 'there is no order, nor can bee any effectuall issue of *disputation*, if each partie might not bee suffered... to speake at large what hee would.'[48] Thus, if Barlow's account is to be followed, the second day at Hampton Court is concurrently the best and worst example of the period's blurring of 'disputation', both in practice and as an abstract

[43] Usher suggested that Hampton Court sprung 'from James's personal whim,' and garnered 'an interest and significance which [he] never intended it should have': Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 1, pp. 310-1. This image has since been qualified; Curtis questioning the conference's failure, while Shriver and Collinson highlight James' political restraint: see Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 40.
[44] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 23; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 336.
[45] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 25-6. On the significance of this article in the context of late Elizabethan controversies, and James' handling of it here, see Cromartie, 'King James', pp. 74-8; Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', pp. 174n, 179.
[46] On several occasions, Bancroft is said to have 'answered' Rainolds, but any structural continuity is disrupted by interruption, unstructured discourse and James' complex role as moderator: Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 32-80; see below.
[47] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 32-4, 35-6, 61, 69.
[48] Ibid., p. 32 (emphasis added). Fincham and Lake present this as an example of James distancing himself from Bancroft's 'rigid' position, and in this describe the conference as a 'formal disputation': Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 173.

ideal.[49] Questions of format seem to exist only at the back of the participants' minds (and are certainly restricted to the back of Barlow's), while the topics and their context are entirely at the forefront.

It would be tempting to dismiss this lack of structural concern as a result of the drive and abbreviation in Barlow's account, were it not for the markedly *un*structured nature of the arguments reported, the identical focus in alternative sources, and – most significantly – the restrictive presence of the king. James' role in the debate is a complex one: ostensibly that of moderator, but with far greater influence than the title would traditionally impart.[50] More than any similar occasion, Hampton Court throws the difference between academic and public disputation into sharp relief: the moderator is considering *policy*, not judging performance. In the universities, the disputants naturally occupied the spotlight, but here the situation and import of the monarchy – combined with James' intellectual forwardness – placed the king centre stage. His forthright opinions made *him* a disputant (and, as Barlow would have it, a *de facto* respondent) on numerous occasions.[51] This, if it can be termed a disputation, was a disputation subjugated by the moderator – his conclusions were often his own, and always definitive. As well as directing the course of debate, James gave lengthy speeches, dismissed arguments wholesale, and at one point showed *and* interpreted a place in Ecclesiasticus to address the question of the apocrypha.[52] As the second day progressed, Barlow notes that the king answered the puritans' final points himself.[53] Ironically, this image of his involvement only adds to that of Hampton Court as an

[49] A similar depiction appears in Harleian 828: Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, pp. 341-354.
[50] Collinson describes James as 'the presiding moderator'; briefly noting the unusual qualities – of authority and engagement – that he brought to the role: ibid., p. 35.
[51] Tobie Matthew depicts the king as a principal disputant: 'his Majesty had... disputed and debated with them, and confuted their objections; being therein assisted now and then, for variety sake rather than for necessity, by the two bishops'. Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 164.
[52] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 30, 31, 35-6, 38-40, 42-3, 43-4, 46-8, 51-3, 54-6, 57-8, 61-3; on the king's 'learned' argument on the apocrypha, see Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 347.
[53] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 64-83. Harleian 828 has the king interjecting at several points, occasionally 'in answer'; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, pp. 344-5, 346, 349, 350. Montagu reports that James 'undertook [the question of ceremonies] himself, and examined them by the Word, and by the Fathers'; Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State*, vol. 2, p. 14. On James' 'dominance', see Cromartie, 'King James', p. 65.

examination, rather than a full debate.[54] Particularly suggestive in this regard is James' dismissal of three topics – private baptism, lay censure of the clergy and the provision of an educated ministry – because he 'had taken order for [them] with the Bishops already'.[55]

The close of the second day has been much pored over, and says less about the event itself than about the king's opinions – of church government, the supremacy, and the dangers of further reformation.[56] His final speech, prompted by Rainolds' call for broader ministerial administration (including the reinstatement of prophesyings), concluded – as Barlow has it – with the reiteration of 'No Bishop, no King'; a statement made earlier that day.[57] James then asked if the puritans had any more to object. They answered in the negative, and he appointed the following Wednesday for a final meeting.[58] This last day was intended 'for the exhibiting of [the bishops'] determinations' in points discussed on the 14th, and was, by all accounts, a time for administrative conclusions, rather than debate.[59] Harleian 828 notes that the bishops spent two hours with the king before the puritans were called in, and that the day

[54] Jenny Wormald finds a foreshadowing of Hampton Court in a debate between James and the presbyterian Andrew Melville in 1596: James 'had a profound belief in the importance of personal contact', though he could always 'retreat back onto the throne... and command where he could not persuade.' Though Wormald finds that he favoured the former, tensions between the two are evident: Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I: Two Kings or One?', *History*, 68 (1983), esp. pp. 188, 197, 203; Robert Pitcairn (ed.), *The Autobiography and Diary of James Melville* (Edinburgh, 1842), pp. 369-71.

[55] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 31, 51-2, 77-8; in Harleian 828, the last is presented in a positive light: 'the Kings Majesty answered. that the former day he had dealt with the Bishops concerninge the same, and that he meant that these that were unable for the ministerye and had long lived therein, shoold be charitably provided for, and other appoynted to preache in theyr roome: but the scandalous forthwith to be removed from the ministery'; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 346. This is glossed over by Barlow, while private baptism receives the same treatment here: p. 347.

[56] Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp. 40-44; Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference', p. 10; Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 174.

[57] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 35-6, 78-83; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, pp. 351-2.

[58] Ibid., p. 83. On James' attitude on departing, see Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 327; Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference', p. 11; Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited', pp. 60-1.

[59] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, esp. pp. 19, 85-86; Cromartie, 'King James', p. 66. The one exception, a puritan account, has Dove of Peterborough urging an argument about baptism, which is rejected as 'Popish' by the king: sig. P2v. This report may be confused in its timing, as that written on the 15th notes that the bishops urged 'Popish' arguments the day before, specifically naming Peterborough as having 'brought foorth a foolish Argument, with much disgrace to himselfe': Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, sig. Pv.

began with a statement in favour of Episcopal government.[60] On the puritans' arrival, there was 'a little disputing' – Barlow's words – on the language of the marriage service, but this was ended by James with a 'pithie exhortation to both sides for unity'.[61] Chaderton and Knewstub urged points on the use of the surplice and cross in baptism – one asking forbearance for ministers in Lancashire, the other for Suffolk – but these were not disputed so much as dealt with.[62] The conference was then closed by Bancroft, with a prayer thanking God for the king.[63]

The most immediate censure of Hampton Court, Henry Jacob's *Christian and Modest Offer* of 1606, seized upon the puritans' shortcomings – their official selection and moderate views – and this is echoed in historical accounts. Collinson argues that they 'were not in any proper sense delegates', building biographically on Jacob's statement that they: 'were not of [the puritan ministers'] chosing, nor nomination, nor of their judgment in the matters then and now in question'.[64] Less, however, has been said about their performance. In some cases, this is because there is little to say: the 'Anonymous Account', as Collinson observes, states that Sparke 'spake verie sparingly', while Chaderton was 'mute as any Fyshe'; and this is echoed elsewhere.[65] But in comparing Hampton Court to other instances of religious disputation, its most striking feature is the unprepossessing performance of Rainolds, whose encounter with Hart was held up as an example well into the seventeenth century.[66] Certainly, it is

[60] Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, pp. 352-3; Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 93.
[61] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, pp. 93-94.
[62] Ibid., pp. 95-98; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 353.
[63] Barlow, *Summe and Substance*, p. 99. Harleian 828 suggests that Bancroft's prayer and conclusion was intended 'to cut of[f] any further matters'; Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 353.
[64] Jacob, *Christian and Modest Offer*, esp. pp. 29-30; Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 38-9. Shriver provides similar descriptions, noting Rainolds' relationship with Richard Hooker and Whitgift: Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited', pp. 57-8. Further, see Cromartie, 'King James', p. 65, and Arnold Hunt, 'Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference', in Susan Wabuda and Caroline J. Litzenberger (eds), *Belief and Practice in Reformation England* (Ashgate, 1998), esp. pp. 212-13.
[65] Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 337; Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 458.
[66] Featley named both the Rainolds / Hart encounter *and* Hampton Court as debates 'the fruit whereof we gather even at this day': Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. I^{r}. Rainolds himself compared the two, in his handling of the cross by scriptural example, in a letter to the Earl of Pembroke: Peter Lake, 'Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church', in

hard to reconcile the Hart account with James' depiction of the puritans, or the final sentence of the 'Anonymous Account'.[67] Their startling contrast is an indication of how far the authorship of written accounts – not to mention the circumstances surrounding a debate – could affect a disputant's reported showing. In no report of Hampton Court is there any indication of those attributes Rainolds had displayed with Hart. His objections are functional, and devoid of humour, form, and comprehensive evidence. There are, of course, several potential reasons for this – Rainolds was no longer a young man, and was disputing, for the most part, with his king – but the most immediate, relating to source and circumstance, are at the heart of this event's placement in the wider history of public religious disputation.

Firstly, all surviving reports are subject to cause and consequence. They are neither educational displays nor tools for conversion, as Rainolds' *Summe of the Conference* had been, but rather instruments of political persuasion, written to uphold church doctrine, or to claim the king for puritan positions. Their lack of procedural concern is a reflection of this, and the performances of individual divines naturally suffer as a result. This leads, secondly, to the purpose of the conference itself. In religious debate in this period, a broad spectrum can be observed between the maintenance of national doctrine and the expression of theological controversies, and Hampton Court sits closer to the former. In addition to James' immediate requirements, the history of rulers establishing doctrine placed an emphasis on this aspect of the debate which, combined with James' perceived receptiveness, produced a guarded event and a highly politicised aftermath. By Barlow's account, James himself prevented the debate from straying into full, controversial disputation, or – worse – an intellectual free-for-all. The conference was not intended to 'establish the truth of religion' – the king knew disputation well enough to be aware of its pitfalls,

---

Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 200, citing LPL, MS 929, item 121.

[67] 'Dr. Reynolds and his brethren are utterly condempned for silly men': Usher, *Reconstruction*, vol. 2, p. 338; BL Harl. MS 3795, f. 7^{v}. Shriver describes 'the hapless Reynolds' on the question of church government: Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited', p. 65.

and held the discussion to 'profitable' questions and approaches. Thus, Collinson's placement of Hampton Court within a political, rather than academic, tradition is understated by comparison to similar occasions, and it is unsurprising that the one academic reference he picks up on – James' depiction of the puritans' *restricted* abilities – appears in private correspondence, rather than a printed account. Hampton Court, particularly in the figure of the king, shows growing enthusiasm for religious disputation, but this is tempered by a lingering mistrust of its scope and potential.

Protestant Demands and Godly Debate

Hampton Court was a product of its surroundings, and did not set the tone for all Jacobean public religious disputation. It does, however, mark a falling off of full, printed accounts. In terms of debate with puritan dissenters, this can partly be explained through the event itself: Hampton Court and its aftermath engaged some moderates – though Rainolds was never fully convinced – and, to an extent, deflected radical intentions. Moreover, it was intended to be a definitive settlement. Following James' determinations, outright dissent was treated as an act of defiance.[68] Accounts on the bishops' side paint the puritans' arguments as underwhelming, this undermining further challenges to dispute.[69] This goes some way toward explaining their depiction of the puritan representatives, and demonstrates that the authorities, centred on the king, felt little need to engage calls for reform in such a way again (indeed, with radical elements, they had seen no such need in the first place). Disputes at all levels naturally continued, but no further engagement on the scale of Hampton

[68] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 176; Lake, 'Moving the Goal Posts?', p. 180; see James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (eds), *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1973), p. 70. On Rainolds, see Fincham, 'Early Stuart Polity', p. 185. On the outcome of Hampton Court, see Collinson, 'Jacobean Religious Settlement', pp. 44-48; Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft*, pp. 68-73; Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited', pp. 66-71.

[69] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 461; Curtis, 'Hampton Court Conference', pp. 13-14.

Court took place, and few accounts of disputation on this front survive for the remainder of the reign.[70]

This is not, however, to suggest that disputation with puritans ceased. Within the year, James' intellectual appetite manifested again, on a hunting trip through the east of the country – a region B. W. Quintrell describes as having 'as good a claim as any to be regarded as the heart of puritan England.'[71] After Hampton Court, the attention of reformers was directed more than ever to the king, but Quintrell has characterised James' activity on the hunt, which began in November 1604, as constructing a mode of conformity sharper than that pursued by the Council and Bancroft, Whitgift's successor at Canterbury.[72] Whilst in the country, he was nonetheless presented with petitions urging reform and protesting the deadline for conformity laid out after the conference, and one such encounter resulted in a debate. On December 1st, James was visited by a large group of ministers (including Arthur Hildersham, who had been involved in the Millenary Petition and notably passed over for Hampton Court), bearing a petition and 'book of reasons' outlining their complaints.[73] Overcome, as Quintrell puts it, by 'the fascination of theological disputation', James spent the morning in conference with them, finally asking them to write down their demands and referring them to the Dean of the Chapel Royal, James Montagu, and Bishop Chaderton of Lincoln for further discussion. The debate they required of Chaderton, however, never took place – the ministers claimed that the

[70] For an outline of written controversies in this period, see Milward, *Religious Controversies... Jacobean*, pp. 5-33. Fincham and Lake note a hope that wavering ministers 'could be won over by discussion and deliberation', but this does not imply public disputation: 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 176. Nicholas Tyacke notes that 'darkness seems to descend over the history of Puritanism' after James' accession: while the drive for reform continued, its focus and tactics shifted. Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700* (Manchester, 2001), p. 111, and *The Fortunes of English Puritanism*, pp. 3-4.

[71] B. W. Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt and the Puritans, 1604-1605', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1980), p. 43.

[72] Ibid., pp. 43-4. See Fincham and Lake 'Ecclesiastical Policies', pp. 26-7.

[73] On Hildersham, see Samuel Clarke, *The Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines* (London, 1677), p. 116.

bishop refused a public, *formal* disputation recorded by notaries.[74] The king's attitude, meanwhile, hardened as his trip continued.[75]

The most revealing work after Hampton Court is Henry Jacob's *Christian and Modest Offer*; which directly appealed to James' intellectualism. Its dedicatory epistle repeats the call of the Millenary Petition for controversies to be settled by a conference, with the reminder: 'Your Majestie professed before you came to the Crowne, that you did equally love and honor the learned and grave men of either... opinions'.[76] Most remarkably, Jacob calls for a full, formal disputation, echoing the ministers' complaint against Chaderton (itself a reaction to Hampton Court). His *Offer* requires free choice of representatives, equal time in the roles, logic-form, and protection in the aftermath.[77] The fact that Jacob's proposal was not taken up underlines the authorities' reluctance to engage in a formal, public disputation with puritan representatives, but appetites for such debate had clearly not been dulled. Despite its failure, the *Christian and Modest Offer* further suggests that disputation retained – and might even have *gained* – some polemical force in the aftermath of Hampton Court.[78]

Once again, university debates maintained the presence of disputation in the minds of educated divines. James attended several on visitations, including an Oxford debate of 1605, for which Richard Field was called.[79] The king was reportedly

---

[74] BL Add. MS 8978, f. 116^{r-v}; Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', pp. 47-8. Both Chaderton and Quintrell describe this as a puritan 'rejection' of discussion: ibid., pp. 48, 49.
[75] Ibid., esp. pp. 48-50.
[76] Jacob, *Christian and Modest Offer*, sigs *^{v}, *2^{r}.
[77] Ibid., pp. 3-7.
[78] Further evidence can be found in Peterborough, where Thomas Dove claimed to have grappled with 'factious ministers' through 1604, once resorting to public disputation: '[for] two whole days in the cathedral church, in the hearing of 200 people, I took on me the place of respondent and answered all objections propounded... from morning till night': HMC, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury*, vol. 17 (London, 1938), pp. 46, 58-9; Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt', p. 51. On the enthusiasm of Chaderton and Dove, see Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 179; Lake, 'Moving the Goal Posts?', esp. pp. 189-90; HMC Salisbury, vol. 17, pp. 15-16. Morton, while Bishop of Chester, conferred publicly with nonconformists, but failed to convince them: R. B., *Life of Dr. Thomas Morton*, pp. 57-8; Thomas Morton, *A Defence of the Innocencie of the three Ceremonies of the Church of England* (London, 1618), *passim*.
[79] Nathaniel Field, *Some Short Memorials Concerning the Life of that Reverend Divine Doctor Richard Field* (London, 1716-7), p. 10; John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities,*

attentive, often interjecting: 'the longer he tarried the more he would interpose his Speeches... Sometimes he would distinguish or determine of a doubt, and sometimes inforce an argument.'[80] However, John Chamberlain observed that he 'was so continually interrupted with applauding, that he could not express himself so well as he wish'd; yet he found Taste in that Distaste, and was never a whit offended.'[81] Even here, in controversy more formal than serious, James' participation was hindered by his royal authority. His enthusiasm in academic or (as with Hildersham) unexpected encounters can be explained, in part, through political restraints. Jenny Wormald suggests that in England the king had few opportunities to engage in such discourse, citing differences in the style of governance from that James had experienced in Scotland: 'debate', she asserts, 'became the set speech.'[82]

Fully recorded instances of debate between Protestant divines in this period are few and far between, and do not always reflect struggles over subscription. In 1608, authorities at Oxford employed forms of debate to examine the chaplain Humphrey Leech, who had given sermons challenging Calvinist ideas of merit and salvation.[83] After one, he was confronted by the pro-vice-chancellor Leonard Hutton in a nearby 'com[m]on kitchin': the 'culinarian Doctour' – as Leech terms him – accused the chaplain of trying to 'infect' the university with Catholicism, while Leech maintained that his terms were drawn from 'Orthodox Antiquity.'[84] Leech cited the authority of the Fathers – Gregory and Paul – and that of continuity. Hutton queried one distinction, and at the close asked that the place in Gregory be copied out and given to him, but this was as far as any similarity to disputation went. By Leech's account, the

---

of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court, vo. 1 (London, 1828), p. 533. The moderator here was George Abbot, then vice-chancellor of the university.

[80] Nichols, *The Progresses... of King James*, pp. 548-552, 558.

[81] Sawyer, *Memorials of Affairs of State*, vol. 2, p. 140.

[82] Wormald, 'James VI and I', pp. 204-5.

[83] Milward, *Religious Controversies... Jacobean*, pp. 167-8; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 62-3; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 89-93. The principal account is Humphrey Leech, *A Triumph of Truth* (Douai, 1609).

[84] Leech, *Triumph of Truth*, pp. 12-13.

discussion was wholly impromptu, and Hutton's threat to send him before Thomas Ravis' Ecclesiastical Commission meant that the spectre of authority hung over the entire proceeding.[85] Leech was later censured by Sebastian Benefield, a Calvinist divine and student of theology, whom he then engaged directly, but his account here reflects common linguistic blurring – its 'private confere[n]ce' denoting simple conversation.[86]

The chaplain's greatest trials followed his final sermon on the 27th of June.[87] Hutton, Benefield and the Hebraist Richard Kilbye confronted him at Hutton's lodging, where Leech repeated much of his former defence. He expressed his obedience to God above any man, and was asked for a copy of his sermon before being, as he puts it, 'dismissed'.[88] Following this, he turned to John King, vice-chancellor and Dean of Christ Church, hoping to pre-empt false accusations, and the ensuing argument was again closer to reprimand than debate. Leech was accused of 'playing' with Catholicism, and hounded from King's room; but again he argued that he only followed 'the sacred Scripture, interpreted by the ancient Church.'[89]

The final action against Leech was a formal examination. He was summoned before a panel of divines, including King, Hutton and Benefield, to answer for his sermons.[90] King opened proceedings by accusing him of Popery and of damaging the university's reputation. Leech expanded upon his former defence, stating that he was supported by others at Oxford, and spoke only what he knew to be true.[91] In this aspect – exemplified by John Aglionby's query as to who those others were – the exchange appears wholly interrogatory, but when Leech produced authorities, it took on a disputatious tone. Aglionby criticised him for citing Greek texts when he had 'but slender skill' in the language – a criticism Leech turned away with the use of

[85] Ibid., pp. 14-19. Ravis had been translated to London in 1607: ODNB Ravis, Thomas.
[86] Leech, *Triumph of Truth*, pp. 22-6.
[87] Tyacke, *Anti Calvinists*, p. 62; Leech, *Triumph of Truth*, pp. 30-51.
[88] Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. 1, pp. 453-4; Leech, *Triumph of Truth*, pp. 55-7.
[89] Leech, *Triumph of Truth*, pp. 58-61.
[90] Ibid., p. 62.
[91] Ibid., pp. 62-3.

translations, his own limited ability, and a number of Latin works.[92] The chaplain's account further claims that he issued a direct challenge to the vice-chancellor: 'I desired him to deale punctually, that is to say, first to admitt a triall by the Fathers, or to deny it... if he admitted this trial, then either to disproove my authorities, or to approove my doctrine.'[93] At this, King and the panel diverted the question to other reformed churches, and then the grounds of faith, where Leech offered a typically Catholic point on the interpretation of scripture.[94] At this, the meeting fell back into examination: one of the panel raised the 'impertine[n]t, & bloudy question' of Leech's opinion of the royal supremacy. Realising that no disputation could take place, Leech made two demands: due process, and the subscription of each side to their positions, both of which were denied.[95] King suspended Leech from his position and forbade him from preaching. After some attempt to pursue his case with higher authorities, the chaplain left England and converted to Catholicism.[96]

Two things are worth noting in the case of Humphrey Leech: first, the willingness of his accusers to stray briefly into religious debate, and second, Leech's urging of due process. Though the disputation form was not adhered to – at least, by Leech's account – its influence can be detected, particularly in his challenge to King. Though he occupied a contrary position on the Protestant spectrum to Hildersham and Jacob, Leech echoes these divines in calling for an equitable, fully subscribed debate. Reports of public disputation might have receded, but these demands again show that religious controversy – connected, as it so often was, with the universities – had not lost touch with the practice. Nor, indeed, had its forms been exorcised from interrogatory proceedings.

---

[92] Ibid., pp. 63-5.
[93] Ibid., p. 67.
[94] Ibid., p. 68. He cited Vincent de Lérins on the role of church tradition in scriptural interpretation.
[95] Ibid., p. 68-70.
[96] Ibid., pp. 70-1, 75-88; Milward, *Religious Controversies... Jacobean*, p. 167. Questier cites this as an example of factional disputes accelerating conversion, identifying Leech as a proto-Arminian: Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 53-4.

Disputes between individual divines also gave rise to direct encounters. In 1611, the London minister George Walker initiated a lengthy exchange with the more experienced clergyman Anthony Wotton, on the subject of justification.[97] Their dispute has been examined in detail by Peter Lake, but its face-to-face elements – and Walker's preferences therein – are worth revisiting.[98] Claiming to have identified a Socinian note in Wotton's writings, Walker appealed for a conference directly and through the godly figurehead Alexander Richardson, but neither approach was accepted.[99] Walker's account includes a letter of 1614, reminding Wotton of their dispute, which describes his desire 'to reason and dispute the question... in a kinde and friendly manner', and the scorn with which Wotton turned him away.[100]

As the controversy progressed, this theme – the avoidance of debate – would become a cornerstone of Walker's position, soon expressed in terms of formal disputation. A meeting between the two divines was eventually arranged by several of Wotton's friends, after Walker preached two sermons on justification 'for the satisfaction of some who were wavering and doubting', which described Wotton's position as 'Socinian heresie'.[101] Walker's account of this meeting accuses his adversary of numerous evasions, but more importantly, it highlights his refusal to deal 'in strict forme of disputation' – a complaint Walker would repeat in anti-Catholic encounters.[102] In urging disputation, Walker – then a recent graduate of St John's, Cambridge – adopted the form's *procedural* weight for his image of a challenge unanswered, but he also presents it as a theological necessity: his letter, as printed,

[97] Printed reports include Anthony Wotton, *Mr Anthony Wotton's Defence against Mr George Walker's Charge* (Cambridge, 1641), George Walker, *A True Relation of the Chiefe Passages betweene Mr. Anthony Wotton, and Mr George Walker* (London, 1642) and Thomas Gataker, *An Answer to Mr George Walkers Vindication* (London, 1642).
[98] Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 221-242.
[99] Ibid., pp. 221-2; Walker, *True Relation*, p. 6.
[100] Walker, *True Relation*, p. 12. Defending Wotton, who died in 1626, Thomas Gataker cited a copy of this letter, with notes in Wotton's own hand. Beside the description of Walker's first offer, he reports, is written: 'I never had any such offer made me from you'; and beside the mention of Spencer: 'this is altogether false.' Gataker, *An Answer*, pp. 19-20.
[101] Walker, *True Relation*, pp. 6, 13; Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, p. 222.
[102] Walker, *True Relation*, pp. 6-7; see chapter 6 below.

reminds Wotton, 'Did not I beseech you with teares to be silent in these points, till you had... thoroughly disputed them with others?'[103] In the aftermath, Walker states that Wotton's 'disciples' spread reports claiming 'that I with teares acknowledged mine errour, and vowed to live and dye in your opinion.'[104] These, with the continuing perceived evasions of his adversary, led him to issue another challenge, this time to a hearing before eight fellow clergymen.[105]

In examining this and other controversies, Lake identifies a curious approach amongst the London godly, that adds texture to their use of face-to-face debate, and might explain the relative absence of recorded, formal disputation. In the handling of these instances, he finds 'godly opinion seeking to maintain unity, order and consensus... by constructing room for disagreement and dispute' – in other words, avoiding harmful rhetoric and controversy by defining clear boundaries of orthodoxy, in which 'disputable' points could be discussed.[106] The hearing arranged to consider Walker's feud with Wotton, he suggests, had the goal of 'silence or, failing that, at least tact... and a tacit agreement to live and let live' – a goal stated in subsequent works.[107] Moreover, Lake notes the role of church authorities in maintaining this approach: King, for instance, passed on direct arbitration of the Walker dispute, and such entanglements were restrained by Episcopal chaplains – including Daniel Featley – through the licensing of accounts.[108] Theoretically, this would allow for more productive debates, a middle way, of sorts, between polarising polemic and the ideal of Christian conference, but it did not require *formal* disputation, or the production of innumerable competing reports. Those advocating moderation had a clear concept of beneficial argument: Lake suggests that Thomas Gataker, one of those presiding over

[103] Walker, *True Relation*, p. 13.
[104] Ibid., p. 14.
[105] Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, pp. 224-5. The hearing was, by Walker's account, abortive: denied the chance to argue 'face to face, in strict syllogisms', he departed, and Wotton was cleared of heresy: Walker, *True Relation*, pp. 19-21.
[106] See Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, pp. 233-4.
[107] Ibid., pp. 229-32.
[108] Ibid., pp. 226-7, 230-1, 233, 242.

the hearing and Wotton's posthumous advocate, preferred 'private conversations or... manuscript discussions between men of learning and good will', this excluding both public disputation and printed accounts thereof.[109]

Walker's attitude illustrates the boundary between this ideal and the wrangling and aggression that could develop in disputation: it is worth noting that with Wotton he never got the format he required.[110] Lake states that Gataker's frustration with the younger minister stemmed from his immodest approach: Walker was factious and difficult; his stark labelling and selective arguments a stumbling-block for real debate.[111] But in addition, he was a close adherent of formal, scholastic disputation, and this could be viewed as equally damaging.[112] Indeed, Lake ties the polemical 'pandora's box' he represented to logic form: 'The point at which amicable disagreement... became open conflict, arrived when that process of assimilation and name calling, *and the systematic syllogistic terrorism that went with it*, was loosed by one side upon the other.'[113] Although Gataker and those like him do not represent a godly consensus on such discourse, their concerns reflect growing objections to disputation; indeed, they demonstrate their direct application in religious controversy.[114]

The question here, of course, is whether these academic forms could be detached from Walker's style. Despite the growing reaction against scholasticism, many still believed that its structures retained *some* useful application. Most illuminating here is Lake's identification of Featley as a facilitator of contained godly

[109] Ibid., pp. 235, 241.
[110] Ibid., p. 239.
[111] Ibid., pp. 236-7.
[112] See chapter 1.
[113] Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, p. 239 (emphasis added). Further, see David Como, 'Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England', in Lake and Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 72.
[114] Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, pp. 238-41. In a funeral sermon for Featley's wife, Joyce, Gataker recalled a conversation between Featley and himself on 'some points of Schoole-learning, somewhat out of her element', at which she 'strooke in with us, and requested us to discourse rather of somewhat, that she might also receive some benefit by, that we might be useful as well to her as to us'; Thomas Gataker, *Saint Stevens Last Will and Testament* (London, 1638), p. 29; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 128.

conference, drawing on his licensing work as chaplain to George Abbot from 1617.[115] Though he maintained the *rhetoric* of distance from aggressive disputation, in anti-Catholic encounters Featley was to become a greater adherent of the practice than Walker himself. For some divines, then, the question was one of how, and under what conditions, disputation should be applied.[116] Thus, perceptions of the form were contingent upon circumstance: Hildersham and Jacob saw it as a means of bringing corrupt authorities to a balanced table (and this, no doubt, was how young Walker saw his adversary), but it could also be regarded as a sharp, unhelpful way of settling disputes.[117]

Conference and Disputation with Catholics

On the Catholic side, the continuing gap in full disputation accounts – a trend evident before James' accession – is harder to explain. Public religious disputation does not, at first glance, seem to have played a substantial role in early Jacobean anti-Catholicism, certainly in terms of its printed aftermath, and neither did disputes between Catholics result in such works. The political conditions do not seem favourable to their production: Fincham and Lake describe an 'ambiguous' attitude and policy of tolerance on James' part, noting the presence of crypto-Catholics at court, but further observe that this had little direct impact on Catholic fortunes. The pursuit of recusancy continued, urged by Parliament and fuelled, periodically, by James' fears.[118] As with puritan dissent, the king distinguished between those who might be drawn to conformity and those who posed a threat, but here the latter group included those most

[115] Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, p. 241.
[116] On conference as 'an extension of the godly preaching ministry', and thus an effective tool with wavering individuals (and against Catholics), see Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 173.
[117] On Wotton's standing, see Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, p. 223. David Como describes a 'world of circulating position papers and quiet, subterranean debate', through which disputes on predestination were conducted: Como, 'Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy', pp. 73, 74, 87. On the king's reported approval of contained debate, see Patterson, *King James VI and I*, esp. pp. 238.
[118] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', pp. 182-6, and 'Ecclesiastical Policies', p. 29. Questier describes instances of 'ruthlessness': Michael C. Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics 1621-1625* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 2.

likely to be involved in fully recorded disputation: priests and converts.[119] The Oath of Allegiance introduced after the Gunpowder Plot might, in its rhetoric, be interpreted as an equivalent to the drive for puritan conformity, but it left far less room for debate; serving to isolate, restrict and, as Questier suggests, divide those most likely to have set their debates in writing.[120]

James' approach to Rome, which included periodic calls for unity, further separated core tenets from points open to dispute; underplaying religious differences in favour of his political concerns.[121] His complex foreign and domestic balancing act often outpaced the vigorous anti-Catholicism espoused by staunch Calvinist divines (who most often favoured – and reported – public disputation), and despite his 'academic' enthusiasm for anti-popery, the focus of such efforts became increasingly contingent on changes in policy and personnel.[122] In the opening decade of the reign, the returned convert and controversialist Thomas Bell responded to Jesuit challenges by imploring the king to allow 'license, and safe conduct for any English Jesuite, or Jesuited Papist in the whole worlde, that shall have courage to appear' for a public disputation; but this was out of step with royal policy.[123] Moreover, polemicists themselves could adopt the king's irenicism, to appeal to recusants and defend the

[119] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 184, and 'Ecclesiastical Policies', p. 29; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 252. Questier describes the distinction more precisely as one 'between those who have an active allegiance, religious as much as political, to Rome and those who do not': Michael Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', *The Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), pp. 318-9; *idem*, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 2. A proclamation of February 22, 1604, gave priests a deadline to leave the kingdom: Larkin and Hughes, *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, pp. 70-3.

[120] Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power', pp. 314-5. Prest notes a decline in priests visiting the inns of court from around 1610, ascribing this to the vigilance of the authorities and the influence of orders other than the Jesuits, more concerned with ministering than high-profile conversions: Prest, *Inns of Court*, p. 183.

[121] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', pp. 182-3, and 'Ecclesiastical Policies', pp. 28-9; Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 17-18. See Patterson, *King James VI and I*, esp. pp. 77-97. His objections to Catholicism were not, however, restricted to the Pope's deposing power: Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 55n.

[122] Patterson, *King James VI and I*, esp. p. 49; see Anthony Milton, 'A Qualified Intolerance: the Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism', in Arthur F. Marotti (ed.), *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999), pp. 96-7, and *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 55-6. The aims of the Oath of Allegiance encouraged moderate writings: ibid., p. 56-7, 58. On James' 'purely intellectual' interest in anti-Catholic controversy, see ibid., pp. 32, 60.

[123] Thomas Bell, *The Popes Funerall* (London, 1605), sig. *^{r}.

unique doctrinal position of the English Church against Catholic advances – an approach that, as with godly debate, did not lend itself to aggressive, formal disputing.[124]

Conference to reclaim wavering individuals and recusants was still required of divines (a requirement formalised in canon 66 of 1604), but this did not encourage the production of debate accounts any more than it had under Elizabeth.[125] In many such cases, 'conference' must be distinguished from 'disputation': the form was not usually applied. But these events do help to contextualise public religious disputation. The example of Francis Walsingham, a deacon who fell into doubt on reading Robert Persons' *Defence of the Censure*, is particularly illuminating. Trying, by his own account, to deliver a copy of the work to James in 1604, he encountered a variety of reactions, from a challenge to *dispute* from a member of the crowd ('who seemed to be a Puritan') to conferences with Bancroft.[126] The attribution of methods here is itself revealing, the puritan urging formal debate, but Bancroft's manner of proceeding is equally remarkable. Though Walsingham, writing as a Jesuit, remained doubtful about the methods used, he describes an intensive process: he was summoned several times, dealt with through direct argument, and referred to a range of Protestant divines.[127] At their final encounter, Bancroft told him: 'It is good you conferred with some that be learned'.[128]

---

[124] Anthony Milton, ''Anglicanism' by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 162-3, 169; Anthony Milton and Alexandra Walsham, 'Richard Montagu: 'Concerning Recusancie of Communion with the Church of England'', in Stephen Taylor (ed.), *From Cranmer to Davidson: a Church of England Miscellany* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 74; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 40; *idem*, 'Qualified Intolerance', pp. 87-9. Not to be omitted here is the re-evaluation of anti-Catholic polemic by avant-garde conformists: Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 48-50; see chapter 6 and the conclusion.

[125] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 151-2, 172-3; see Featley, *Appendix*, p. 53.

[126] Walsingham, *A Search*, pp. 26-52.

[127] Ibid., pp. 32-52.

[128] Ibid., pp. 50-1, 55, 63-72. Questier notes the contrasting styles of Downham, whose major work of the time was *A Treatise Concerning Antichrist* (1603), and the moderate Covell, in discussing the role of the theology of grace in dealings with Catholics: Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 190; Walsingham, *A Search*, p. 69. Similarly, Milton and Alexandra Walsham highlight the range of conference and reading used, as evidence that the authorities saw the benefit of employing differing perspectives: Walsingham was given a work by Bell, but also sent to John Overall. Milton and

A similar range of conferences is related in the conversion account of Tobie Matthew, son of Archbishop Matthew of York. Drawn to Catholicism in Europe in the 1600s, partly through the efforts of Persons (and, in an echo of Alabaster, William Rainolds' *Refutation of Sundry Reprehensions*), Matthew was examined by Bancroft on his return, having attended him unbidden, to offset any 'offence' his conversion might cause.[129] The archbishop urged a conference, directly and through others, but Matthew resisted.[130] Again, the process was comprehensive, but the convert's determination made Bancroft increasingly angry. The Oath of Allegiance was tendered at two final meetings – as Matthew has it, by the order of the king – and on refusing it, as dangerous and beyond his ability, Matthew was sent to the Fleet.[131] There, he was engaged by Morton, later Bishop of Durham, and others; none of whom had any impact.[132] Like Alabaster, Matthew was finally sent to confer with Lancelot Andrewes, now Bishop of Chichester, who offered typically moderate points on Rome and Protestant visibility.[133] Though he entered into debate on the church and the invocation of saints, he remained dubious, maintaining 'that my soul must not rely upon the speech of any man, for being uttered by one who had more learning than myself; for so I should believe one thing to-day, and another thing to-morrow'. Certainty, for Matthew, lay in the Catholic Church.[134]

Though his efforts to involve the king made Walsingham something of a special case, and Matthew's connections had a similar effect, their conversion

---

Walsham, 'Richard Montagu', p. 73. Walsingham hints at the *personal* impetus behind such events: at the end of one meeting, he notes Covell's lament 'that he should receyve, as he sayd, discredit by having talked with me, and not satisfyed me': Walsingham, *A Search*, p. 42.

[129] Matthew, *True Historical Relation*, esp. pp. 24-34, 60-1.

[130] Ibid., pp. 62-70. Matthew told the archbishop, 'for my part, I needed not confer', although his caution did alter with topic. On the papal supremacy, he notes 'this point of controversy were not a very safe one for me to be free in', though he nonetheless made some argument (pp. 65-6).

[131] Ibid., pp. 75-83.

[132] On one, Sir Edwin Sands, Matthew notes 'his resolution to reduce all religion to human reason': ibid., p. 87. On Morton's engagement with recusants whilst Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, see R. B., *Life of Dr. Thomas Morton*, p. 76.

[133] Ibid., pp. 92-102. Here, Andrewes argues that the churches of Rome and England are one and the same, and that a visible Protestant succession could be shown in all ages since Christ (see chapter 6 below). Matthew expresses astonishment at both arguments.

[134] Matthew, *True Historical Relation*, p. 102.

narratives add detail to the period's discursive climate: a reminder that where formal, public disputation occurred, it did so against a continuous backdrop of unstructured, private conference.[135] In many respects, public religious disputation was but the most dramatic aspect – driven by polemic of the type favoured by Walker, and by the unwavering positions of the participants. As Alabaster had, Walsingham describes an eagerness to dispute, but he presents it as a *search* for truth, rather than its active defence.[136] Similarly, Bancroft was prepared to indulge him, to an extent, but he was treated as the discussion's *object*, rather than a disputant.[137] Matthew further reports this argument from the archbishop: 'I did... owe an equal and indifferent consideration of all that which could be said on both sides'.[138] In their own views, and those of their examiners, Walsingham and Matthew again describe a *spectrum* of religious debate, structurally and tonally contingent on those involved. Such disputes were not always conducted in public or with a polemicist's drive; nor did they all resemble formal disputation.[139]

Thus, while the opening decades of the reign seem to present an ideal environment for cross-confessional debate, this did not precipitate an increase in disputation accounts: indeed, measures and approaches on all sides could well have stalled their production. The period's persistent anti-Catholicism and multitude of controversies did not, by the surviving evidence, translate into formal, public debate: Questier states that the laws on conformity, for example, 'created a forum' for discussion; but this was not, as far as the evidence can show, played out through

[135] Bancroft reportedly told Matthew, 'I bear you so much good will that I will satisfy you myself': ibid., p. 63.
[136] Questier cites Walsingham's conversion as an example of the ineffectiveness of polemical tracts, without noting the prior example provided by Alabaster: Questier, ''Like Locusts over all the World'', p. 280.
[137] Walsingham, *A Search*, pp. 39, 41, 49, 50-1.
[138] Matthew, in *A True Historical Relation*, p. 62.
[139] Marotti finds in Walsingham's narrative an effort to persuade James to sanction cross-confessional debate, but describes such debate as 'a practical impossibility', contrasting this time with the 1620s: Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, p. 115.

disputation.[140] Similarly, the founding of Chelsea College in 1610 points toward an increase in anti-Catholic discourse, but it was directed towards written polemic, influenced by ideas of tactical moderation, and ultimately overshadowed by Oxford and Cambridge.[141]

It should be emphasised, however, that direct anti-Catholic debate was but one manifestation of the disputation commonplace; and further, that a lack of full, surviving accounts does not signify a total absence of the practice. As in the later portion of Elizabeth's reign, debate with imprisoned priests continued unreported: after the Gunpowder Plot, John Overall (then Dean of St Paul's) questioned the Jesuit Henry Garnet on his objections to the English Church; and in the 1620s, as printed accounts again began to circulate, Walker and Percy made reference to an earlier encounter that was never written up.[142] Through the 1610s, cross-confessional debate continued on the continent, fuelled and reported by Englishmen travelling abroad.[143] In the spring of 1610, the assassination of Henry IV of France confirmed some of James' fears, but within a month, Featley had arrived in Paris, as chaplain to the English ambassador, Thomas Edmondes.[144] A firm Calvinist and keen disputant, Featley had preached at Rainolds' funeral in 1607, and had been recommended to the

[140] Questier, 'Conformity, Catholicism and the Law', pp. 260-1, and 'Catholic Loyalism', esp. pp. 1135-6, 1144, 1147, 1148-50, 1153.
[141] R. B., *Life of Dr. Thomas Morton*, p. 37; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, p. 106; Milton, ''Anglicanism' by Stealth', p. 162, and *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 32-3, 49.
[142] Milton, ''Anglicanism' by Stealth', p. 162; Anon, *The Black Box of Roome* (London, 1641), pp. 12-13; Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 9.
[143] Catholic disputants in Ireland were influenced by an encounter at Fontainebleau in 1600 between Philippe du Plessis-Mornay and Jacques du Perron, Bishop of Evreux: Gaffney, 'The Practice of Religious Controversy', p. 155n. Accounts included Matthew Sutcliffe, *A Briefe Refutation of a Certaine Calumnious Relation* (London, 1600), N. D., *A Relation of the Triall Made Before the King of France* (St Omer, 1604), Jacques Du Perron, *A Trew Discourse of the Order Observed* (1600) and Anon, *A Discourse of the Conference Holden Before the French King* (London, 1600). It is mentioned in Ley's *Discourse* (p. 45).
[144] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 186; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 57-8; Alan Dures, *English Catholicism 1558-1642: Continuity and Change* (Harlow, 1983), p. 83; David Buisseret, *Henry IV* (London, 1984), p. 175. George Birkhead reported that 'the prisons are filled againe', the Oath 'more exacted than ever': cited in Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power', p. 323; Michael C. Questier (ed.), *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead* (London, 1998), pp. 80-4.

ambassador by King at Oxford. In Paris, he was drawn into formal, public disputation with several Catholic representatives.[145]

Featley's outline of these events, printed in 1638, notes the presence of many English priests in the city, 'who not onely set upon our English Gentlemen that travelled into those parts, and fixed some of them in the wrong, who before were unsettled in the right: but put the Embassadours Chaplaines also oftentimes to some trouble.'[146] For a while, he refused to meet with them, citing his lack of experience and mistrust of Catholic accounts.[147] But he was soon 'drawne into the lists' with the priest Christopher Bagshaw, who had been a Cambridge student and an Oxford fellow, and whose account of the 'Wisbech stirs' is noted above.[148] Few details of their first debate are given, save that it was occasioned by a Scottish Catholic named Alexander – who, by Featley's account, later turned away from Catholicism. Of the disputation itself, held after dinner at Alexander's house, Featley says only this: 'At the last service, M. Alexander blew the coale, and D. Bagshaw presently tooke fire: and immediately after dinner we fell to it with great vehemency for many houres.'[149]

Featley's second Paris disputation was a longer affair, occasioned by a gentlewoman drawn to Catholicism by poverty and Catholic benefactors. Featley indicates that it was this situation that led her to call for a debate, 'that she might not be thought to be drawne to them for temporall respects', and although this is intended to stress Catholic enticements, it proves that disputation was a credible engine of conversion; at least, by custom and perception.[150] The priest appointed was one Dr Stevens, and he and the gentlewoman approached Featley several times for the other part. Featley resisted, questioning the gentlewoman's motives, but he finally agreed in

[145] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 16-25. A shorter account is offered by his nephew, John Featley, in *Featlaei Paligenesia, or, Doctor Daniel Featley Revived* (London, 1660), pp. 9-10. Featley's sermon at the funeral of Rainolds survives at the Bodleian: Bodl. MS Rawl. D.47, f. 129[r].
[146] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 17.
[147] Ibid., pp. 17-21. In reporting his refusal, Featley provides a brief history of disputation, to demonstrate that his cause had nothing to fear from the practice.
[148] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 21; ODNB Bagshaw, Christopher; see chapter 3.
[149] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 21-2.
[150] Ibid., p. 22-3.

response to a direct challenge.[151] The disputation took place in the chamber of one 'M. Porie' – most likely the writer and parliament man John Pory, given his involvement in a subsequent encounter.[152] Again, few details are provided, although here Featley notes his adversary's performance: he recalls an 'eloquent' oration, 'imbroidered with all variety of learning', but states that in the heat of syllogistic argument Stevens 'lost himselfe, being derided by some, and pittied by others in regard of his great age.'[153]

This debate extended into a second encounter, in which Bagshaw was substituted for the faltering Stevens.[154] Featley's *Transubstantiation Exploded* includes a full account of the exchange, further detailing its arrangements and audience.[155] The occasion is described as 'farre more solemne', and was attended by 'the L. Clifford, Sir Edward Summerset, and divers other persons of great quality both English and French'.[156] The topic concerned transubstantiation, as defined by Trent – a doctrine whose answer was increasingly contested among Protestant divines, but on which Featley remained steadfast throughout his career.[157] The disputation is described as following the academic form: though Featley opposes for much of it, Bagshaw is asked to assume this role towards the end, the chaplain once reminding him, 'The burthen of prooving lieth now upon you, M. Doctor'.[158] At one point, Featley is criticised for launching into a lengthy oration, and there are several accusations of faulty logic.[159] Though Featley's account, printed more than three

[151] Ibid., p. 23.
[152] Ibid, p. 23; William S. Powell, *John Pory, 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill, 1977); esp. pp. 36-41. Powell does not mention this first debate, but if Pory was indeed the host, its build-up must have taken place early in 1612.
[153] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 23-4.
[154] Ibid., p. 24.
[155] Ibid., pp. 231-276.
[156] Ibid., pp. 24, 231. Henry Clifford, later fifth Earl of Cumberland, had been educated at Oxford and Gray's Inn: ODNB Clifford, Henry.
[157] Despite the significance of the standard Protestant position – 'for which', Milton notes, 'the Marian martyrs had given their lives' – aggressive language on transubstantiation was falling from favour in James' reign; more equivocal views (including use of the term 'real presence') being stated in response to Catholic accusations of irreverence: Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 196-205. On the persistence of Featley's position, expressed in response to Edward Maie in 1621 and Richard Montagu in 1626, see ibid., pp. 199, 201.
[158] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 266, 271.
[159] Ibid., pp. 233, 240, 271.

decades after the fact, is perhaps a greater testament to his own loyalty to the form than a certain placement of it in Paris in the 1610s, the disputants' shared educational background – along with multiple accounts of a later debate – makes it likely that formal disputation was used.

The audience appear to have exerted some influence on proceedings; at once an echo of Elizabethan examinations and a foreshadowing of developments in public religious debate in England. Occasionally, Featley cites their benefit and worth: his opening speech describes his purpose – and Bagshaw's – as 'to give satisfaction to this Honourable Assembly', and he further responds to a criticism with the words: 'I should easily returne the like speeches upon you, but I feare to abuse the patience of this Honourable Assembly, through our impatience.'[160] More remarkable is the point at which the disputants switch roles; Featley being 'called off from further objecting'.[161] The origin of the command is not specified, but if it came from the auditory – a possibility, given certain individuals' education and status – it shows a suggestive level of involvement. At previous, English disputations, such intervention had only come from those with immediate authority and a vested interest in the exchange.

The outcome, as Featley reports it, was to separate the English gentlewoman from her benefactors. In *Transubstantiation Exploded*, he states that following this encounter, he heard that she had been imprisoned for debt, and upon visiting her found her 'constant' in reformed doctrine. For the purposes of this study, a more significant outcome was that an account of the second debate, drawn up by the notaries Arscot and Ashley, was sent across the Channel. Its intended recipient was George Abbot, recently translated to Canterbury – a strong advocate of anti-Catholic debate, and Featley's subsequent employer.[162]

[160] Ibid., pp. 231, 247, 261-2.
[161] Ibid., p. 265.
[162] Ibid., p. 24; Milton, 'Qualified Intolerance', p. 87.

In September 1612, Featley disputed against the priest Richard Smith, later Bishop of Chalcedon.[163] Again, the occasion centred on a doubting individual, though Featley indicates that the encounter came at Smith's urging: 'for reasons best knowne to your selfe, you dealt with M. John Fourd by M. Knevet his halfe brother to draw us together to a friendly conference'.[164] The Catholic account describes Knevet as 'put in minde, that he was mistaken in the matter of Religion', but Questier, whose work locates Ford and members of the Knevet family within a specific English Catholic community, supports Featley's interpretation.[165] He describes the debate as an 'inaugural display' for Smith's college at Arras: a demonstration that secular priests were as practiced and eager for disputation as the Society of Jesus.[166] In Questier's estimation, therefore, disputation with Protestant divines had remained a Catholic priority, although its central impetus came, as it had for Cardinal Allen, from the efforts of Protestant polemicists.[167]

The disputation – whose subject was the 'real presence' of Christ in the sacrament – took place on the 4th of September, the Catholic report stating that Smith was given only one day's notice.[168] A sizeable audience was present, including Ford and Knevet, the playwright Ben Jonson (recently returned to the English Church), the Catholic polemicist and poet Henry Constable and the priest Thomas Rant. Pory arrived with Featley, and appears to have served as his notary, and with Smith came an acquaintance or relation named Rainer.[169] In addition, several others, English and

[163] The full Protestant account of this debate is contained in Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, pp. 285-306. The priest Edmund Lechmere responded with *The Conference Mentioned by Doctour Featly*, of which an edition is contained in John Lechmere, *The Relection of a Conference Touching the Reall Presence* (Douai, 1635). These sources are further detailed in Questier, *Catholicism and Community*, p. 377n. Featley responded at length in *Transubstantiation Exploded*, where he identifies the Catholic author ('S. E.') as Smith's chaplain, Edward Stratford (p. 25).
[164] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 25.
[165] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, p. 7; Questier, *Catholicism and Community*, pp. 376-7.
[166] Questier, *Catholicism and Community*, p. 376.
[167] Arras was founded in opposition to Chelsea College: ibid., p. 384; ODNB Smith, Richard.
[168] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 287; S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 8-9, 17; see footnote 157 above.
[169] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, p. 9; Questier, *Catholicism and Community*, p. 377. Constable had converted to Catholicism in the 1590s, and following James' accession had drawn up plans for an international disputation or conference on religion, in an effort to further his policy of tolerance: ODNB

French, were present.[170] The Catholic account blames Featley's arrogance for the size of the gathering ('M. Featly presuming the victory, had made the matter knowne'), against which Featley can only state that a condition of privacy was never imposed.[171] In the Protestant account, written by Pory, there is little mention of the audience during the debate itself – the arguments are its primary concern.[172] Only towards the end does Pory note an interjection from an unnamed priest, who observes: 'This was a true fight, not a Sorbonicall flourishing'. The accuracy of this instance must remain in doubt – it has a distinct flavour of educational polemic.[173] But the Catholic account, answering that of Pory and Featley, also forgets the audience, indicating a scholarly contest between the two divines.

Academic disputation is referenced heavily in both accounts. Three conditions were proposed, each a common request in such debate: calm and peaceable argument, adherence to the question, and finally that 'M. Featly at this time should onely oppose, and D. Smith onely answer.'[174] A second meeting was suggested, to give equal time in the roles, but this would never take place.[175] After the opening dispute on Smith's lengthy expression of the question, to which Featley would later respond by distinguishing academic custom from the conditions agreed, the arguments proceeded by syllogism and authority: in many respects a model of formal debate. Given its concern with the *fundamentals* of the process – a concern, moreover, framed in both accounts – this debate provides further evidence of the continuing influence of formal disputation, at the midpoint of the Jacobean drought in English reports.

Constable, Henry. On Pory's connections, including Abbot and Dudley Carleton, see Richard Cust, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), p. 63.

[170] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, p. 9. Powell suggests that Walter Raleigh's son, to whom Jonson was tutor, might have been among them, adding that Featley had been his tutor at Oxford: Powell, *John Pory*, p. 38.

[171] Ibid., pp. 9-10, 11-12; Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 35-6.

[172] See chapter 2 above; Powell, *John Pory*, p. 41, and William Dinsmore Briggs, 'On Certain Incidents in Ben Jonson's Life', *Modern Philology* 11 (October, 1913), esp. pp. 279-282.

[173] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 305; see chapter 4. This is never mentioned in the Catholic account.

[174] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 287.

[175] S. E, *The Conference Mentioned*, pp. 18-9.

The outcome of the debate is heavily contested. Featley notes that at its end his copy of Smith's answers was snatched away by 'a friend' of the priest, to be replaced with edited points in Smith's hand.[176] The Catholic account, meanwhile, reports Knevet's observation that 'M. Featly was to[o] yong for Doctour Smith', a claim Featley dismisses as flattery.[177] The Catholic report further states that Knevet died a Catholic, driven from Protestantism by Featley's conduct: again, an assumption that disputation *could* prompt conversion.[178] Featley, however, describes this as pure falsehood: 'name me the Priest who reconciled him, and on his death bed annealed him, and after his death buried him with your Romish rites, and bring some good proofe and testimonie hereof'. He cites the testimony of Knevet's acquaintances in support of his own assertion that 'he was constant in the truth of his Religion'.[179] There is also disagreement over the fate of the proposed second debate. The Catholic account states that Featley avoided it; refusing to meet Smith on the appointed day, and asking to continue as opponent, because he 'did exceedingly feare to undertake the part of defendant'.[180] Featley does not wholly counter this inference, but cites his other disputations – in Paris, and later in England – as evidence that he was not afraid to respond.[181]

As Questier demonstrates, this event tells us a great deal about counter-Reformation attitudes toward disputation, and details connections between English Catholic communities at home and abroad. But at a more basic level, when Featley, Pory and the other Protestants are included in this picture (and Featley's other debates are considered alongside), an image is built up of a cross-confessional English community, that could engage in debate with a degree of freedom only later evident in

[176] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 39.
[177] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, p. 189; Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 214-8.
[178] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 191-2.
[179] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 218-20.
[180] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 180-88; see chapter 2 above.
[181] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 221-4. Here, Featley names a conference with Bagshaw, 'a few weekes after' this event; suggesting that the second Bagshaw debate occurred after his encounter with Smith: pp. 24, 223, 242.

England.[182] Accounts of these disputations were – for reasons of polemical and personal timing – printed long after the event, but are nonetheless indicative of a less controlled environment for religious debate.[183] In this, they lend credence to the notion that the early seventeenth-century gap in anti-Catholic disputation accounts need not imply the disappearance of the practice in England, though James' policies and the views of individual divines would explain its brief decline. Whether or not unrecorded, private or prison disputation was widespread, all aspects of Featley's Paris sojourn point to a continued concern for direct, structured debate amongst English clergymen, and handwritten reports of his encounters were being carried to England in their *immediate* aftermath.

These encounters also suggest trends that would emerge in English religious debate in the 1620s. Their focus on doubting individuals, and the role of their lay audiences, points to a wider application of the practice, whose ingredients were already developing at home, but could only manifest where all sides were at relative liberty. Milton notes the observation of Thomas More, agent in Rome for the English secular clergy, that there was 'growing interest in religious issues among lay Protestants', particularly in the field of controversy, and this can certainly be observed in Featley's Paris encounters.[184] For this interest to fully reveal itself in disputation accounts in England, priests and Jesuits required the freedom to dispute in public, and this would be granted, in part, through the later 1610s and early 1620s. In relation to this, a note should also be made concerning the renewed production of accounts. The new swathe of reported, cross-confessional disputation in the early 1620s reveals increasing difficulty, as wider audiences became actively involved, and clerical disputants questioned their methods in response. It is interesting here to recall that point made by Cox on the dialogue: 'whenever any age adopts on a wide scale a form

[182] This leap is by no means extraordinary, given Milton's image of cross-confessional intellectual and cultural integration: Milton, 'Qualified Intolerance', pp. 91-5.
[183] See Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, passim; Powell, *John Pory* p. 39; ODNB Smith, Richard.
[184] Milton, 'Qualified Intolerance', p. 105.

which so explicitly 'stages' the act of communication, it is because that act has... come to be perceived as problematic.'[185]

[185] Cox, *Renaissance Dialogue*, p. 7.

Chapter Six: The Fisher Controversies, 1621-1625

'I speak not of publick disputations... but of private occasionall conferences, for the satisfaction especially of persons of quality: [which] cannot sometimes bee avoided'.[1]

By the early 1620s, events across Europe had placed James in a difficult position. His religious balancing act had survived through much of the 1610s, although his wariness of Catholicism and politically active puritan opinion fluctuated in response to immediate events, but after 1618, war in Europe left him at the centre of a confessional and diplomatic crisis.[2] Hoping peacefully to secure the position of his son-in-law, Elector Palatine Frederick V, James entered into negotiations for a Spanish marriage alliance for his son, but at the same time came under pressure in England to intervene, as a champion of European Protestantism. Thus, the tensions of the reign were brought to the fore, as James' policies put him at odds with a long-standing mass of anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish opinion.[3] As the negotiations progressed, moreover, the treatment of English Catholics became a point of contention: Spain and Rome insisted that a guarantee of toleration accompany any treaty.[4] Thus, James was again caught between petitioning religious groups, each invoking the dangers posed by the opposing extreme, and citing some precedent from his own formerly controlled position; but he had to accept a measure of toleration for his diplomatic agenda to succeed.[5]

---

[1] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs $H3^{v}$-$H4^{r}$.

[2] The early 1610s had been characterised by an alignment with Protestant Europe and aggressive pursuit of recusants, but Questier observes a new direction emerging from the failed parliament of 1614 and the growing influence of the Spanish ambassador, Gondomar: Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 2-3. See Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 340-1.

[3] Ibid., pp. 4, 8; see Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', esp. pp. 198-9; P. G. Lake, 'Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match', *The Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), esp. pp. 806, 814.

[4] Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 6, 9, 43; Brennan C. Pursell, 'The End of the Spanish Match', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 702; Timothy H. Wadkins, 'The Percy-"Fisher" Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622-1625', *Church History*, 57 (1988), p. 160.

[5] Lake, notes Thomas Scott's use of James' proclamations and works to 'deduce' the king's motives and align himself with royal authority: Lake, 'Constitutional Consensus', p. 815.

Of course, there was no desire on the authorities' part for comprehensive toleration, and political expediency did not mean a reversal of James' position, but a degree of tolerance, including the partial liberation of priests, was set in motion.[6] From 1621, Catholics lobbied hard for such measures, aligning themselves with the king's foreign efforts in opposition to Protestant and parliamentary resistance, and although such calls formed part of intra-Catholic rivalries, the resulting climate did not discriminate. As Timothy Wadkins notes, by mid-1622 even the notorious, imprisoned Jesuit John Percy was allowed some freedom, under which he could minister to the Countess of Buckingham and others at court.[7]

For Protestant divines – particularly forward Calvinists like Walker and Featley – this situation mandated contact and confutation. Lake and Questier note the scale of the change to those operating within a perceived anti-Catholic consensus; but at another level, the persistent images of polemic and conversion – of challenges unanswered and individuals at risk – meant that Catholics needed to be engaged more than ever.[8] Anthony Milton highlights a sermon given by Richard Sheldon at Paul's Cross in 1622, which urged aggressive anti-Catholicism *because* of the climate of tolerance.[9] Moreover, as will be discussed below, divisions within English Protestantism informed anti-Catholic imperatives. For a brief period, then, a limited, *de facto* indulgence of Catholicism cohabited with redoubled anti-Catholic efforts. Priests and Jesuits were at greater liberty to dispute, while many Protestants were eager to confront them – at times directed by the king and bishops, often reacting to increased proselytising activity, and occasionally spurred on by the apocalyptic

[6] See Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 26-7, 33, 34, 36; Bishop to John Bennett, ibid., p. 175.
[7] Ibid., pp. 30, 32; Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', p. 155; Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 200.
[8] Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 32; Lake, 'Constitutional Consensus', esp. p. 807. In September 1622, John Williams attempted to reassure critics of James' policies by encouraging Catholics to allow 'conferences with learned preachers' as an expression of gratitude: Questier, 'Catholic Loyalism', p. 1157.
[9] Milton, 'Qualified Intolerance', pp. 97-8.

context of the war in Europe.[10] Along with the growth of lay interest, this allowed recorded, formal debate between Catholic and Protestant divines to venture out of prisons and into the halls of the nobility and gentry.

With this relocation, however, disputation could fall into line with other developments in controversy, drawing on ideas of counsel to offer a *personal* experience as well as public display. The presence of doubting individuals as a catalyst and focus, and the developing role of the audience as contributors and moderators, would in turn impact upon the practice itself, exerting pressure on the forms and customs observed.

Prelude: Daniel Featley and George Musket

If surviving accounts of public religious disputation were taken as a definitive measure of its use in this period, the activities of John Percy might be interpreted as a phenomenal catalyst to the form's ascendancy. Even when it is accepted that the practice was more fundamental, and its trends more gradual, than the surviving records suggest, the Jesuit must still be seen as a remarkable presence: a participant in some of the most significant disputations of the reign. Wadkins, examining several of these encounters, has detailed Percy's influence, in terms that offer an insight into his prominence in public debate: he describes the Jesuit's notoriety as 'a personal evangelist', and his role in a number of notable conversions.[11] 'Fisher the Jesuit' is a man of his time – one pursuing 'public' disputation in its most private aspect.[12]

Percy's first appearance at such an encounter was, however, relatively unassuming, as assistant and notary on the second day of a 1621 debate between the priest George Musket (whose *real* name was Fisher) and Daniel Featley – long since

[10] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 198.
[11] Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', pp. 155-6.
[12] In *The Grand Sacrilege*, Featley tells Percy: 'you tender the [f]ickle state of your Catholike cause with your collapsed Ladies'; a reference, perhaps, to the Countess of Buckingham: Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 281. On perceived relations between Jesuits and recusant women, see Marotti, *Religious Ideology*, pp. 53-65.

returned from Paris, and now serving as chaplain to Abbot.[13] Featley was becoming an important – though outwardly reluctant – proponent of public, anti-Catholic disputation. His account of the Musket debate, contained in *An Appendix to the Fishers Net* (1623), asserts that: 'the readier and surer means to be resolved... is by zealous and fervent praier, than by hot and eager disputing'; but this is not a rejection of the practice – rather, it *separates* it from Featley's Calvinist conception of faith.[14] Although this is precisely the distinction Questier describes in his critique of all polemic, it should be taken as a *conditional* underestimation of disputation and controversy, and one that is partially rhetorical. Featley cites the caution of Tertullian – 'thou truely shalt lose nothing, but thy voice in contending; thou shalt gain nothing, but choler through their blaspheming' – but nonetheless retains an allegiance to formal religious debate, fostered at university and in Paris, demonstrated in his unmatched production of disputation accounts, and reflected here in his list of authorities commanding such engagements.[15] He concludes: 'I do... willingly yield to the request of our worthy friends, to meet with you in this field; committing the successe to God: whose blessing be upon this our conference, that his Truth may win the Garland, and He have the glory.'[16]

The occasion of this 1621 debate was typical of the period. A preliminary letter from Featley to Musket describes the involvement of 'a learned Knight', acting as intermediary – at the least connected with one of those ubiquitous, doubting 'persons of quality' whom Featley would later identify as the cause of many a private conference.[17] The questions posed were fourfold, touching transubstantiation, merit of good works, and the identity and authority of the true church, but in the event, only the

[13] This occasion is described in Featley, *Appendix*, pp. 49-51. On Musket, 'dexterous in manageing personal conferences', see Charles Dodd, *The Church History of England, from the Year 1500, to the Year 1688*, vol. 3 (London, 1742), pp. 98-9.
[14] Featley, *Appendix*, p. 52.
[15] Ibid., pp. 52-3; see the introduction above.
[16] Featley, *Appendix*, p. 53.
[17] Ibid., pp 50, 111; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs $H3^{v}$-$H4^{r}$.

first was discussed.[18] Indeed, the proposed range of questions suggests a more significant disputation than would eventually take place – Featley indicates that at least one day was to be assigned to each.[19] Thus, it is unfortunate that so few details of the occasion or patrons survive. The disputants' preliminary letter exchange further suggests that the debate was intended to be equitable, and held to the academic form. The state of the question is outlined by both sides, and this – as a duty traditionally performed by the respondent – suggests a level of balance hitherto unseen in such events in England. More explicitly, Featley here requests avoidance of 'bitternesse of speech', adherence to logic form and equal opportunities to oppose.[20] But despite all these good intentions, what remains of the debate is a two-day tussle over transubstantiation, whose only legacy, as recounted by Featley, was a stain on the reputation of Percy. In order to assess how topics and ambition might have slipped so quietly away, the disputants' conduct, and the event's progression, must be examined.

The first day opened with a reiteration of both sides' tenets on transubstantiation. In Featley's account, this begins after his discourse on disputation, with no information given as to practical arrangements.[21] Featley's speech reflects an occasional custom of agreeing terms: he describes 'a twofold change' in the sacrament, and 'a threefold presence', finally declaring the Protestant belief in 'accidental' (rather than 'substantial') change, and a presence that was only 'real' in a spiritual sense.[22] Musket replies that he 'might have spared these distinctions', simply stating the Catholic belief in a real, substantial presence through transubstantiation.[23] Featley opposed for this first debate, but here opens with a 'velitation' before the disputation proper. He cites an admission from the Jesuit Francis Coster, that if Christ

[18] Featley, *Appendix*, pp. 49-51.
[19] Ibid., p. 53.
[20] Ibid., p. 51.
[21] Milward places the debate in Newgate, where Musket was held for a portion of the 1620s: ODNB Fisher [Alias Musket, Muscote], George; but Questier, citing Anstruther, notes that in February 1621 he had been exiled by the Privy Council, but remained in the country: Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 144n.
[22] Featley, *Appendix*, pp. 53-5.
[23] Ibid., p. 55.

was not really, substantially present in the sacrament, Catholics 'should be guilty of such an idolatrie and error', from which he infers that, for all the Catholic Church knew, Christ was neither really nor substantially present. He supports this with a place in Bellarmine.[24] This whole argument is presented without form; indeed, for all his emphasis on procedure, Featley has to be told by his respondent: 'Conclude something syllogistically, and then I will answer you.'[25]

These initial reactions from Musket, as reported here, suggest antagonism between the disputants, which might go some way toward explaining the debate's outcome. 'Frame your argument', Musket demands later that day, where authorities are cited without logic form; and he further pronounces a similarly antagonistic triumph 'featly spoken'. This garners him the rebuke: 'leave these speeches, and urge somewhat to the purpose. If I knew your name, peradventure I should not be indebted to you for a jest.'[26] The pun is repeated on the second day, and is here met with a volley of plays on the priest's adopted name. Featley states: 'I dare say, that the whole company wil witnesse for me, that I am Musket-proofe', his fellow chaplain Thomas Goad adding: 'Heere hath been no Musket-shot discharged, but onely small hayle-shot.'[27] This kind of sparring was not unheard of in disputation, and was a particular commonplace of Featley's encounters, but in light of the gap between this event's conclusion and its original ambitions, such exchanges take on a greater significance. More telling is Featley's citation, on the first day, of a place in Gratian with the words, '[which] wee shall examine heereafter, *if this conference continue*.'[28]

When the disputation did continue, the following Friday, a second stumbling-block was revealed: *external* influences on the event. Featley states that Musket did not arrive at the appointed time; instead sending the message 'That hee might not

[24] Ibid., pp. 56-7.
[25] Ibid., p. 57.
[26] Ibid., pp. 62, 65. Of course, had Featley known Musket's *real* name, he would certainly have had something to say – as demonstrated in his dealings with the Jesuit 'Fisher'.
[27] Ibid., pp. 99-100.
[28] Ibid., p. 63 (emphasis added).

conferre any more with D. Featly, without an Assistant assigned unto him by those of their Society; which Assistant was M. Fisher.'[29] Although this cannot be taken at face value, the request is intriguing; suggesting either a tactical move from Musket, or interference with the disputation from nameless Jesuit representatives – which, though Musket's biographers do not identify him as a member of the Society, is possible.[30] Featley agreed to their condition, although it 'would be an occasion to draw more Company than were fit or safe', and asked that he might also have an assistant, in the form of Goad.[31] Thomas was the son of Roger Goad, Campion's opponent in 1581.[32]

The concern of outside parties is further indicated by Musket's second request: 'I have been traduced by diverse Catholiques, touching my Answers at our last Disputation: and... I intreat you, M. Doctor Featly, to... cleer me from certain aspersions cast upon me; as namely, that I should confesse Papists to bee idolaters, and to adore they knowe not what.'[33] This, referring to an answer drawn by Featley's urging of Coster, is not allowed, as the answer had been mutually agreed upon and set down in the notes, but the stalemate is broken here with a distinction between 'formal' and 'material' idolatry, to which both disputants subscribe.[34] If accurate, this external Catholic concern again indicates an event of some importance, whilst at the same time offering a reason for its premature conclusion.

As Featley's account continues, there are further instances of antagonism between the two divines, but these are more often connected to the disputation form. Over both days, the arguments were mostly formal and syllogistic, Musket opposing

[29] Ibid., p. 76. The phrasing ('those of their Society') goes unexplained. It is possible that Featley here assumes Musket's membership in the Society of Jesus (see below).
[30] Dodd, *Church History*, vol. 3, p. 98; Richard Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests, as Well Secular as Regular*, vol. 2 (London, 1741), p. 295. Milward notes contemporary confusion as to Musket's affiliation: Milward, *Religious Conferences... Jacobean*, p. 203.
[31] Featley's caution reflects his preference for 'private conference' over 'public disputation': *Appendix*, pp. 76-7. His mention of safety refers to the danger in exposing large groups to Catholic arguments, as opposed to official sanctions: later, he reiterates that 'no Law or Canon forbiddeth, but rather enjoyneth private Conference with Popish Recusants, to... bring them (if it be possible) to the bosome of our Church' (p. 112).
[32] Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (London, 1662), p. 159.
[33] Featley, *Appendix*, p. 77.
[34] Ibid., pp. 58, 77-8.

when the debate resumed.[35] As the second day began, however, Featley reports that the priest's desire to revisit previous answers occasioned some unstructured discourse and delay in the appointed order, at which the chaplain – in a reversal of the first day's opening – asked him to proceed 'according to our appointment'.[36] In the debate itself, as Featley has it, the Protestants repeatedly criticised Musket's form. Featley took against two propositions (the major's consequent and the minor) in one syllogism, and, when Musket tried to prove only the second, told him: 'You should first prove your Major. Yet, because I desire you should proceed in your Argument... I forgive you your consequence.'[37] Later, Musket asks for scriptural proof that the words of the Institution should be taken properly, and Goad reminds him that the production of arguments was not a respondent's duty – a point repeated later by Featley.[38] These deviations reach a head towards the midpoint: after much 'long and confused pressing and answering', Goad exclaims, 'For shame urge you some Argument. All this while you have trifled but the time, and put the Answerer to make Arguments, contrary to the Law of all good Disputation.'[39] Setting the truth of these instances aside, their focus on the academic form is worth noting. In this and similar works, Featley seems unusually exacting when it comes to the architecture of disputation, but he is not an exception to the rule in this respect. Rather, he and George Walker represent the rule taken to an extreme.

Commonalities of form and function aside, only one aspect of this debate would be carried into subsequent occasions. By Featley's account, Percy had not been a commanding presence, the arguments moving between the two central participants with Goad occasionally interjecting. Only late in the day does Percy make a

[35] The order was agreed 'by the major part of the Company' at the end of the first day, though Featley's desire to continue his arguments led to the proposal of a third on transubstantiation: ibid., p. 74.
[36] Ibid., p. 79.
[37] Ibid., p. 81.
[38] Ibid., pp. 82, 86. Further into the debate, Percy has to be reminded of the roles: 'you have a speciall negative gift in denying Arguments... [they] shall bee made good against your denyals, if you will give mee liberty to oppose; if not, proceed, Master Musket' (p. 92).
[39] Ibid., p. 88.

contribution, supporting two of Musket's arguments.[40] Later still, it is reported that Featley observed him searching through his notes – specifically, those 'in which hee had written D. Featly's Answers' – and challenged him: 'M. Fisher, what are you afishing for there among your Notes? I pray reade what you have written: for I suspect, you have not done fairely in setting down my Answers, because I have noted you sometimes to write, before I had fully given them.'[41] He asks the Jesuit to read the place, 'before all this company'; a request here echoed by others. Percy, 'with much adoo', relents; and is found 'to have set down one answer... as if D. Featly had yeelded to the Popish tenet', which the *company* then forces him to amend.[42] At a subsequent debate, the Jesuit was denied custody of the notes on the grounds of this incident, which he denied: 'I call God to witnesse, that if I did set downe any thing otherwise then the truth was, I did it not wittingly nor willingly.' Goad, again present, leaves the truth to his conscience, saying only that the Protestants had 'just cause' to believe the contrary.[43]

As reported by Featley, the close of this encounter signals Catholic reluctance. A third day was appointed, apparently for him to continue his opposition on transubstantiation, at the house of a local merchant, but when the day came, the Catholics did not arrive, because parliament was sitting and 'they knew not what construction might bee made of a meeting of this kind'. This, Featley deems 'a pretext': the other debates had been in parliament time, and priests habitually contravened acts of parliament in saying private Mass. In addition, he notes that conference with recusants was not forbidden by any law. Nonetheless, Musket and Percy could not – apparently – be drawn, for 'the last night they had a meeting with the rest of their Societie, and... it was there concluded, that they should not meet any

[40] Ibid., pp. 85, 87.
[41] Ibid., p. 89.
[42] Ibid., pp. 89-90.
[43] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 37-8; sig. Y2^{v}. Percy relates this exchange in a similar manner in his own account of the later debate: 'nothing was replyed' to his defence, 'and therefore I suppose that the Audience was wel satisfied of M. Fishers sinceritie in his Relation, and writing of the former Disputations'. A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 35-6.

more out of their lodging.'[44] On the surface, this might indicate a shift in Catholic – specifically Jesuit – policy regarding public disputation, but the subsequent predominance of Percy in such events does not support this. Featley lays responsibility for the event's premature end squarely at the door of the Catholic disputants, invoking the 'apparant diffidence and distrust in their owne cause' that would be inferred.[45] The suggestion of Jesuit reserve here is worth noting, however, given the objections made by Percy and John Sweet at subsequent debates.

Arguments before the Countess of Buckingham

This abortive 1621 disputation has, in the history of John Percy's activities, been eclipsed by those of the following year. With the exception of Hampton Court, the debates held on the 24th, 25th and 26th of May, 1622, were the most politically charged of the reign, and in their written aftermath remain an unusual case.[46] The involvement of the king, and the delicacy of the occasion, prevented any full account from being printed, and this – coupled with the changing fortunes of the participants (particularly William Laud) – resulted in a gradual proliferation of reports over two decades.[47] Again, the debates were occasioned by a doubting individual, and herein lies a measure of their significance: as Percy states, 'The Occasion of this Conference, was a certaine writt[en] Paper, given by M Fisher to an Hon[ourable] Lady, who desired somthing to be briefly writt[en], to prove the Catholique Roman Church, & Faith, to

[44] Ibid., pp. 111-2.
[45] Ibid., p. 112.
[46] See Timothy H. Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy, S.J. (25 May, 1622): an Unpublished Manuscript from the Religious Controversies Surrounding the Countess of Buckingham's Conversion', *Recusant History*, 19 (1988), p. 146. Bishop informed Bennett of only two debates: 'in the former [Percy] was by many reported to have had the better, though many also say the contrary, but in the Saterday he was reported to have had the worse.' His descriptions suggest that he is referring to the first two days: Bishop to Bennett, in Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 175.
[47] Printed accounts include A. C., *True Relations*, recounting the first and third day; White's *A Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, which includes detail of the occasion and follow-up arguments; and *An Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, covering the third debate, whose author was named as the chaplain 'R. B.' but later revealed to be Laud. This is expanded in Laud 's *Relation of the Conference*. Printed accounts of the second day appear to have been prohibited by the king: Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy', pp. 146-7; A. C., *True Relations*, sig. *4r. Percy's manuscript account is transcribed in Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy', pp. 147-153.

be the only right.'[48] The lady was the Countess of Buckingham, mother to James' favourite, George Villiers, and her wavering came at a moment of acute religious tension.[49]

It is indicative of the religious climate, and the growing personal trend in disputation, that James and Buckingham responded to the countess' concerns with a series of conferences – at once recognising the dangers accompanying a high-profile conversion, and selecting an outwardly respected form by which to prevent it. Though disputation had at times been a tool of savage anti-Catholicism, its broadening application, and the divines chosen to take part, lends a hint of sincere moderation to these events, as do the wider circumstances.[50] Neither can the king's intellectual leanings be discounted: Milton identifies his role here as evidence of his 'intellectual appetite for anti-papal disputation', painting it as another conflict between his academic enthusiasm and political 'anxieties'.[51] But regardless of his preferences, the ready use and careful containment of disputation on display here, given the occasion, clearly separates such occasions from the greater mass of polemical efforts, or at least argues against Questier's image of the perceived effectiveness of doctrinal controversy. Not only was direct, controversial debate adopted to bolster the countess' faith, but reports in the aftermath were subject to heightened control. Had these events been intended *entirely* to discredit Percy, the restriction placed on written reports – particularly of the second day – would make little sense, even with James'

[48] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 1. Featley notes contemporary awareness that 'A. C.' was Percy himself, and in 1639 Laud gave three reasons (familiarity, style and one direct reference) to believe it: Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 44; Laud, *Relation of the Conference*, sig. §2^{v}.
[49] Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', pp. 153-5; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 58-9. Wadkins notes that the countess' decision was accompanied by that of others. Most remarkably, he cites Laud's opinion that the Marquess of Buckingham himself was 'wavering religiously': *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud*, ed. William Scott, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1849), p. ix. Questier notes Buckingham's interest 'in the arguments which Jesuit debaters [used] in order to make converts': Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 30n.
[50] Disputation here forms part of James' balancing act; having to appease both Spanish demands *and* English anti-Catholicism: Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', pp. 162-3.
[51] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 60.

involvement taken into account. The situation was a delicate one, and the focus was not on the Catholic disputant, but on the prominent individual in doubt.

The clergymen chosen to engage Percy represent a movement in this period towards Arminianism, accompanied by moderate approaches to Rome. As is often noted, this was a development encouraged by the diplomatic situation in which James found himself.[52] At each debate, the Protestant side was nominally taken by a moderate divine: Francis White, royal chaplain and Dean of Carlisle, at the first and second, and Laud, then Bishop of St David's, at the third. Laud's views are well documented, and White has been identified as an Arminian from his connections and writings in the 1620s and 30s, including those against Percy. Both had enjoyed the patronage of Richard Neile, Bishop of Durham and (in the words of Nicholas Tyacke) 'the organizing genius of early English Arminianism.'[53] Wadkins cites their selection in 1622 as evidence of the king's pragmatic, political shift towards moderate ideas, noting that Featley, the Calvinist firebrand and 'leading anti-Catholic spokesman of the day', was left 'waiting in the wings'.[54]

At the first debate, Percy opposed White on the sufficiency of scripture, fundamental points of faith and the succession of the church; the role and topics falling to him as a result of the paper he had given to the countess. By the Jesuit's account – the only detailed narrative of the 24th – the roles switched at the midpoint, becoming confused as the debate wore on.[55] At the second, the Protestant side was

[52] See Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 201; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, *passim*; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, *passim*. These divines were, moreover, reflective of the range of methods used to persuade recusants: Milton and Walsham, 'Richard Montagu', pp. 73, 77; chapter 5 above.
[53] Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', p. 163; Tyacke, *Anti*-Calvinists, esp. pp. 12, 70-1, 108; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, esp. pp. 77, 428-9, 453; ODNB White, Francis.
[54] Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', pp. 157, 158-64; Milton and Walsham, 'Richard Montagu', p. 77; see Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 13. The idea that Featley was held in reserve is evidenced by a work held at the Bodleian, addressed to the countess, challenging Percy's arguments: MS Rawl. D.47, from f. 15.
[55] Throughout the opening stages, White is described as having 'answered', and only the Jesuit offers syllogistic argument: A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 8-11, 13-22. Later on, Percy 'answers' on several occasions, and all trace of formal argument disappears. The lack of a full account from White is also worth noting: in *A Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, he admits an aversion to such works, referencing the later debate between Percy and Featley, adding: 'knowing also, that my selfe could not exactly

taken by the king; an occasional contributor the day before.[56] This debate, according to Percy, opened with a frank discussion of the Gunpowder Plot and the Jesuit position on the deposing of princes, before the questions of idolatry, papal authority, transubstantiation and Catholic errors were addressed.[57] Percy's account eschews dialogue *and* disputation form, giving the impression of an examination, rather than a debate. The language used, especially with reference to James, is reminiscent of Hampton Court – royal authority again overwhelming the process.[58] On the third day, with Percy – to an extent – opposing Laud, and the audience interjecting with questions, the subject of points fundamental was again touched upon, with the legitimacy of the Roman Church.[59] In each debate, the questions centred on a staple of Percy's approach in controversy and conversion, intended to show truth, stability and Protestant divisions: the relative authority and succession of the Catholic and reformed churches.[60] The reason, as Percy has it, was that 'a Continuall, Infallible, Visible Church... was the chief and onely point in which a certaine Lady required satisfaction', although given his enthusiasm for the topic, it is likely that this was phrased, if not planted, by Percy himself.[61]

---

remember all passages of the Jesuits Disputation and mine... I deferred the printing'. White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{r-v}.

[56] Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy', pp. 147-8. In 1626, Percy offered this explanation for the absence of an account: 'in a manner all the speech of that meeting, was between his Majesty, and M. Fisher, who beareth that dutifull respect to his Soveraigne, that he will not permit any thing sayd by him, to be published now after his death, which he had so specially forbidden to be published in the tyme of his life.' A. C., *True Relations*, sig. *4^{r}. On the king's decision to step in, see Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 30n. For his contributions on the first day, see A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 15, 28.

[57] Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy', pp. 148-53.

[58] Note Percy's reverence, and phrases like 'his Majesty beganne'; 'his Majesty gave a signe to doctor Whyte'; 'his Majesty asked what heresies I coulde charge the englishe church withall'; ibid., pp. 147-8, 149, 150.

[59] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 43-69. Questier and Patterson describe the focus as 'the compatibility of the Roman and English Churches': Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 30n; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 343-4.

[60] Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', p. 156; Milward, *Religious Controversies... Jacobean*, pp. 216-227; see Milton and Walsham, 'Richard Montagu', p. 76.

[61] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 41.

On the first day, White and Percy disputed before a select audience: the king and members of the countess' family.[62] The initial exchanges centred on Percy's paper to the countess: White asked the Jesuit if he was the author, and he responded, 'I wrote such a thing, & if it be a true copy, I will defend it.'[63] What followed was an attempt to refute the paper's arguments, but – as Percy tells it – one in which the Jesuit was allowed an active defence. Though the opening stages thus bring to mind the first Campion debate, this suggests that use of the paper was not a tactical decision but a response to the immediate situation. White cited several of the main points: he agreed with two of the Jesuit's statements – that there was 'one, true, divine Faith', and that this was 'grounded upon the word of God' – but asked for clarification of a third, on the degree of divine inspiration granted the Apostles and their successors. Percy describes this as 'a verball Objection', rather than an outright denunciation of his argument, and cites this response from James: 'leave this verbal controversy, and proceed in the matter.'[64]

It is here that the exchange begins to look like a formal disputation. Percy produced a place in St Paul, with two syllogisms, to prove that the word written was not alone sufficient to salvation, and after some limited argument made the analogy that wood, though useful in construction, was not 'sufficient to build and furnish a house'. At this, White appears to have withdrawn: 'D. Whyte... without saying any thing to this instance, seemed to be weary, and giving the paper to M. Fisher, bad him read on.'[65] From the Protestant side, no full account exists, so there is little by which to judge Percy's accuracy – the Jesuit, if his opponents are to be believed, was not

[62] Percy describes the audience thus: 'L.K. L.M.B L.B. & M.B.' (ibid, p. 13). Wadkins identifies 'L.K.' as the Lord Keeper, John Williams, perhaps following White's mention of Williams' presence (White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{v}): Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy', p. 146. Earlier in *True Relations*, however, these initials are printed in unusually large type beside a directive from – and allusion to – the king: A. C., *True Relations*, sig. *3^{v}. A reference to 'L.K.' in his account of the third day supports this: ibid., p. 43.
[63] Ibid., p. 13.
[64] Ibid., pp. 14-15.
[65] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

above a degree of embellishment.[66] But however this initial structured exchange ended, a more remarkable instance occurs further in. Following White's alleged withdrawal, a fourth point was raised and (apparently) accepted, before Percy turned to the second half of his paper. Here, he had set down a full syllogistic progression to prove that the Roman Church held the 'true, divine, infallible Faith', and he now cited the first of these arguments, retaining its form, in *opposition* to White.[67] The use of syllogistic reasoning was not, of course, exclusive to face-to-face debate, but the citation of *pre-formed* syllogistic argument is rare in disputation accounts – or at least, never so expressly described. This is a clear reminder of the importance, in studying these events, of noting the participants' training and underlying awareness of academic forms. Moreover, by setting out written syllogisms in his paper to the countess, Percy had pre-empted the opponent's role in case of disputation.[68]

Percy's depiction of White is remarkable: the chaplain is at once elevated as a learned champion of Protestantism and portrayed as evasive, inconsistent and wholly unable to reply to the Jesuit's arguments.[69] Rather than dismantling his intellectual reputation, Percy ties him to his cause, triumphing over both; but the manner in which this is achieved is almost self-defeating. Firstly, Percy's use of hindsight is plaintive: on the topic of points fundamental, White invoked the Apostles' Creed, and here the Jesuit details the questions he 'might have asked': 'but he at that present only asked, Whether all articles of the Creed, were held by D. Whyte to be fundamentall?'[70] This led to a discussion of Thomas Rogers, whose work *The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion,*

[66] See chapter 2 above.
[67] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 17 (Percy's paper is printed pp. 1-12).
[68] In 1623, a reply to Percy by Henry Rogers included several pre-emptive syllogisms: *An Answer to Mr Fisher the Jesuite* (1623), pp. 5, 6-7, 8-9.
[69] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 16, 25, 28.
[70] Ibid., pp. 19-21. Bishop wrote to Bennett: 'I have seen the former daies conference set out by [Percy] himselfe with many additions, what he thought to have said, and yet, I assure you, in [my] poore judgment... [it] was a slight peece of worke'; Bishop to Bennett in Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 175. Bishop's analysis formed part of his call for an English Catholic bishop, 'who is able to stand in confractione, or at least that is able to call forth some of the best learned among us to defend Gods truth'; a demand opposed by the Jesuits: see Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 13-14, 16-17, 35; ODNB Bishop, William. Bishop reported that he himself had engaged in disputations, in and out of prison: Questier, ''Like Locusts over all the World'', p. 270.

Professed, & Protected in the Realme of England (1607) had cast doubt on an article of the Creed.[71] But on the key question of Rogers' status – whether he wrote as a private individual or a mouthpiece for the Church of England – Percy again claims to have taken a step back.[72] The depiction of White himself is also inconsistent: if the dean made all the errors reported – faults in *practice*, as much as argument – then he was not the learned champion Percy's rhetoric required. The tendency in accounts of disputation is to extrapolate truth from victory, and this work is at once emblematic of this and a showcase for its potential stumbling-blocks.

Percy also claims truth and self-awareness whilst making blatant omissions; assuming tremendous credulity on the part of the reader. This is not to contradict prior assertions about the purpose of such works; but to demonstrate the extent of this account's shortcomings – as polemic, and as a summary of debate. At the close, Percy states that nothing *of import* has been omitted.[73] He further maintains that he consulted with White on the report's production; but this, if it occurred, took place early on, and dealt with the topics, not the disputants' contributions.[74] Indeed, Percy's emphasis on topic and occasion – and his own admittedly imperfect recollection of the debate – renders the consultation moot, allowing him to gloss over several of White's answers. He is further liberated by the fact that nothing was written in the event.[75] Percy's approach, then, blurs the line between account and treatise, but without the adroitness of similar reports. It is, no doubt, accounts such as this that have led historians to dismiss such works as but another vehicle for partisan polemic.

[71] Percy notes that Rogers' work was 'graced with the title of the Catholique doctrine of the church of England'; although according to Rogers' biographers – and contemporary editions – this title was not adopted until 1854: ODNB Rogers, Thomas; Thomas Rogers, *The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion, Professed, & Protected in the Realme of England* (Cambridge, 1607; reprinted London, 1621).
[72] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 21.
[73] Ibid., p. 35; see chapter 2 above.
[74] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 32-5.
[75] White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{r}; see chapter 2 above.

On the second day, Percy faced White and the king before a similar audience.[76] James opened with a sporting variation on a familiar analogy: 'as fencers, before they take them to theire weapons, are wont to salute and embrase one another, soe before hee entered into argument hee would salute [Percy] with a speech'.[77] Percy describes this oration – again reminiscent of Hampton Court – as 'a longe... sharpe invective againste Jesuits': it was here that the king raised the question of the safety of princes, naming those involved in the Gunpowder Plot and citing a work by Juan de Mariana.[78] Percy expressed his hatred for the plot, and emphasised the Society's 'moderate' view on the deposing of kings, which led to a discussion of the authority and methods of the Pope in such an effort. In this, the Jesuit (implausibly) reports that he was allowed the last word.[79]

The disputation proper was initiated by White, albeit at the king's signal. His opening question concerned the worship of images, proceeding from a point made the first day; and its format, as reported by Percy, is remarkable. Continuing the examinatory tone set by James, it had neither form nor point of argument: instead being a statement of the Jesuit's position.[80] From here, however, the disputants settle into the roles – White opposing, Percy answering – although the respondent here takes the greater part, and there is no trace of logic form. Percy explains his position on idolatry through a simple analogy: 'the picture of ones freinde, which picture one respecteth more, and setteth in a more honorable place... which is some kynde of honor to the picture, but not the same which is due to the freinde himselfe'. This is

[76] Percy describes them as 'L.M.B: L:B, J: L:M:B: J:, L: V:', interpreted by Wadkins thus: 'L.M.B. probably stands for Lord Marquess of Buckingham; L.B. Lady Buckingham [the Countess]; L.M.B. Lady Marchioness of Buckingham; J.L.V possibly John Lord Viscount [Buckingham's elder brother]. The sixth initial from the left, a single J., I cannot identify'. Wadkins, 'King James I meets John Percy', p. 147n.
[77] Ibid., p. 148; see the conclusion below.
[78] *De Rege et Regis Institutione* (1559), which allowed for the killing of kings under certain circumstances: Wadkins, 'King James I meets John Percy', p. 148n.
[79] Ibid., pp. 148-9.
[80] Ibid., p. 149.

followed with 'the honor given to his Majestys chaire of estate.'[81] But before he can expand on this second example, he is interrupted by the king, who objects that however 'learned' Catholics avoid the charge, they still lead 'simple people' into idolatry: 'you are like to bawdes, whoe thoughe they doe not sinne in their owne bodie, yet they are guiltie by inducinge others'.[82] By Percy's account, James then raised several objections to image-worship, which resulted in an exchange that again appears closer to examination than debate. Direct questions are at least avoided, however; the king framing his objections around the second commandment and '2 or 3 strange stories' – which, sadly, Percy does not relate.[83]

Around the midpoint of the discussion, Percy took the role of opponent, although this was more akin to the default position adopted on the first day than to the academic role. The change, moreover, was at James' instruction, and in presenting his first point, on the authority of the Pope, the Jesuit was immediately stripped of an opponent's powers. He found himself responding to an argument from the king, who invoked the opinion of Gregory the Great on the title 'Universal Bishop', and then, by his own account, allowed him to conclude and move on.[84] James, it would appear, had a clear idea of how he wanted the debate to proceed; this reflecting the occasion and again recalling Hampton Court. At the next topic, however, the debate was allowed a return to form: indeed, the discussion of transubstantiation and the real presence here is the most traditional portion of the day. Percy opposed, arguing against the king's denial that Christ's body could be in two places at once. The exchange is very similar to other debates in which the topic was covered, and at its close, James asks Percy to set his hand to a point.[85] This, however, was an exception to the day's rule, as the king here makes clear: 'His Majesty said, nowe I will name to thee those points where[in] the Romane church hath erred, and tomorwe I shall sett downe in wrytinge for thee to

[81] Ibid., p. 149.
[82] Ibid., pp. 149-50.
[83] Ibid., p. 150.
[84] Ibid., pp. 150-1.
[85] Ibid., pp. 151-2.

aunswere'.[86] Thus, after their debate on the sacrament, James re-established control, even setting terms for the event's written aftermath.

Following this, James reportedly went on to list several Catholic errors, but only one is named and debated here: communion in one kind – the practice of denying the wine to the laity.[87] In this discussion, Percy states that White 'left of his longe silence' to contradict the king's interpretation of '*hoc facite*' in the Institution. Percy had defended communion in one kind by maintaining that if these words were applied to the laity they would command all to consecrate and distribute the sacrament, as well as receive it, to which James had answered that it only meant 'doe this which I bid you, take, eate, etc.' White corrected the king, stating that the words commanded the priests to consecrate and distribute, while the exact manner of the sacrament was demonstrated elsewhere. But when Percy began to respond, James cut him off; turning to White with the caution: 'goe not that waye, naye if you goe that waie, etc'.[88] This, if true, and not an instance of combined triumph and fawning, is a fascinating moment; White's view of the church revealed and the king's controversial discretion in action.[89] But in examining this account, two things must be borne in mind: Percy's depiction of White on the previous day, and the tactics adopted by accounts after Hampton Court – attempts, in every case, to pit James against their adversaries' cause.[90]

The last of these debates is the only one to have a full account from each disputant. Percy's, revised in *True Relations*, appeared first, while Laud's was written in response, reprinting the original paragraph-by-paragraph, with detailed refutation.

[86] Ibid., p. 152. These questions were later described by White as a tool against the endless back-and-forth of controversy: White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{r}.
[87] Wadkins, 'King James I Meets John Percy', pp. 152-3.
[88] Ibid., p. 153.
[89] Percy's claims of deference are exemplified at the close: 'I kneeled downe before him, and craved pardon of my earnestnes in defendinge my cause; his Majesty answered, I like thee the better, and soe went awaie from mee.' Ibid., p. 153. This is refuted by White: *A Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. c^{v}.
[90] Patterson, following this account and Protestant assertions, finds common ground in this day's debate, though 'further refinement... would be needed if they were to reach agreement': Patterson, *James VI and I*, p. 343.

Laud's work was originally printed as an addendum to White's 1624 *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, and was here credited to Richard Baylie, his chaplain.[91] Laud explains the delay in printing through 'backwardnesse' (reluctance) to deal with men like Percy, and a desire to see the other debates printed first.[92] Apart from the introduction to White's treatise and several of the arguments therein, however the two former encounters had not been recounted under Protestant hands, and when Laud revealed himself to be the author of his account, he cited 'Reasons, and those then approved by Authority' for the subterfuge, suggesting that personal *and official* restraint had caused him to publish under his chaplain's name.[93] By contrast, his expanded account, identifying him as the author, appeared during his tumultuous term at Canterbury, after encouragement from Charles I and colleagues in the church.[94] In the 1620s, each disputant had accused the other of spreading accounts, whilst denying that they had fired the first shot.[95]

Prior to Laud's arrival, the day bore witness to an epitome of 'private' debate. Percy states that 'before the B. came, the La. & a friend of hers came first to the roome where I was, & debated before me' – although his depiction of this, like that of the countess' requirements, seems a convenient method for introducing his customary topics.[96] By Percy's account, the pair stated that they had heard the necessity of a 'Continuall Visible Church... granted by D. White, L. K. &c.' on the previous days, and had *themselves* settled upon the question: 'which was that Church?'[97] Laud

[91] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, sig. A^{r}.
[92] Ibid., sig. A2^{v}.
[93] See ibid., sig. A2^{v}; White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, esp. sigs b3^{r}-b4^{v}, c^{r-v}; Laud, *Relation of the Conference*, sig. A3^{v}.
[94] Ibid, sigs §^{r}-§2^{r}. This version, intended to demonstrate his anti-Catholic credentials, was also subject to delay, resulting from his duties, a 'dangerous fever', and a desire to fully answer Percy's 1626 work: sigs A4^{v}-§^{v}.
[95] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 37-8; R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, sig. A2^{r}.
[96] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 42-3.
[97] Ibid., p. 41.

expresses doubt as to the Jesuit's intentions and the conclusions reached, but otherwise remains silent about this impromptu disputation.[98]

Laud was only present for this final encounter, and for all his emphasis on continuity appears modest in responding to claims about prior events.[99] In Percy's words, he excused himself at the outset 'as one unprovided, and not much studied in Controversies'; and his own account of 1624 confirms that 'the B. had no information, where the other Conferences brake off, no instruction, what should be the ground of this third Conference; nor the full time of foure and twentie houres to bethinke himselfe'.[100] After his declaration of inadequacy, he told Percy that his cause should not be ill-judged, 'having a hundred better Schollers to maintaine it then he.' Percy responded that Catholicism had 'a thousand better schollers'.[101] At this, the disputation began, but even this failed to stop the contest. Laud's 1624 report declares, 'That which hath a hundred, may have as many more, as it pleases God to give, and more than you.'[102] Though formulaic, this burst of competitive humility again raises the question of the motive behind Laud's selection for these events.

At the commencement, Laud describes a breach of etiquette: Percy announcing that he would 'wring and extort' from him anything not spontaneously acknowledged.[103] The Jesuit denies that he used such words 'eve[n] to his meanest Adversaries'.[104] The first topic was the legitimacy of the Greek Church; a subject raised in the countess' exchange with her friend.[105] This led the disputants to the question of points fundamental, where Percy states that he 'was forced to repeate, what [he] had formerly brought against D. Whyte'.[106] Indeed, from here, the debate's early stages are described as a revision of the first day. Laud declared that all articles

[98] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, pp. 2-3.
[99] 'What Dr White and L. K. Granted, neyther the B. nor I heard': ibid., p. 2.
[100] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 43; R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, p. 4.
[101] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 43-4.
[102] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, p. 4.
[103] Ibid., p. 5.
[104] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 44.
[105] Ibid., pp. 43-4.
[106] Ibid., p. 44.

of the Creed were fundamental, and again Percy brought up Rogers. When the bishop echoed White in arguing that Rogers was 'but a private man', Percy asked, 'in what Booke may we find the Protesta[n]ts publique Doctrine?'[107]

It should be noted that Laud's 1624 account often strays into additional argument, but always presents itself as a treatise *based* on the occasion, with ready application of hindsight. Thus, while both accounts blur the line with written controversy, it could be said that Laud actually *separates* disputation and pamphlet polemic rather well. On Rogers, Laud's account – admitting hindsight – turns the question of private authors back on the Catholic Church, before arguing that he had not denied an article of the Creed so firmly as Percy suggested.[108] His answer is thus familiar in its comprehensive progression, and might lead one to ask how much of Rainolds' technique against Hart had been evident in their original exchanges.[109]

Repetition of the first day continued. Laud cited the Book of Articles and scripture as containing the Protestants' 'public' doctrine, and Percy pressed him on scriptural authority – 'how he knew Scripture to be Scripture', thus returning to the progression of his paper for the countess.[110] The bishop's answer, that the books were 'to be supposed, and needed not to be proved, led the Jesuit to cite his printed arguments against White.[111] More interesting than this continued resonance of the earlier exchange is Laud's expansion on this argument in his account: a meditation on authorities, and – further to this – on the use, benefits and dangers of 'natural reason'. Expressing distain for 'That which might put man into a Wheele... proving Scripture by Tradition, and Tradition by Scripture, till the Devill find a meanes to dispute him into Infidelitie,' Laud notes that: 'All that have not imbrutished themselves, and sunke below their Species and order of Nature, give even Naturall Reason leave to come in,

[107] Ibid., pp. 45-7.
[108] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, pp. 13-14.
[109] In 1624, Sylvester Norris commented: 'Guilty was M. Reynolds in publishing his Conference with M. Hart, wherein he forged divers things to the credit of his owne, and disadvantage of his Opponents cause, of which he never so much as dreamed.' S. N., *True Report*, p. 5.
[110] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 47-9.
[111] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

and make some proof'.[112] Although this is placed at the end of a catalogue of authorities – the others being the testimony of the church, the evidence of scripture and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost – Laud clearly describes the role of reason: that, of itself, it could not comprehend God or scripture, but that 'Grace is never placed but in a reasonable creature'. Most significantly, he notes its role in dispute with 'unbeleevers'.[113] Here, the extent of the period's shared ideas and contradictions can be noted. A comparison of Laud's depiction of reason and disputation – as an inherent foundation and a necessity, both separate from Grace – with that of Featley reveals agreement, even a similar use of language, despite their divergent theological views. Featley had a greater appetite for disputation, but in playing it down, he uses similar rhetoric. Thus the necessity and place of disputation can be described as relative constants in the early 1620s. Only later, when all aggressive anti-Catholicism was being discouraged, would Laud himself see public debate with Catholics fall away.

The final questions of the day came, by Percy's account, from the countess, and went to the heart of her concerns. She asked Laud whether he 'would grant the Roman Church to be the right Church', at which Percy reports that he both granted it *and* admitted that the Protestants 'made a Rent or Division' – the bishop's weakness on this topic echoing that of White.[114] Laud presents this as a falsehood: an accusation the Jesuit rebuffs: he 'did in fresh memory take speciall notice of this passage, in regard it concerned a most important point'. Again, Percy returns to his questions against White: 'Why did you make a schisme from us? Why doe you persecute us?'[115] But here, it is Laud's accusation of falsehood, not Percy's defence, that is remarkable.

[112] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, pp. 16-17.
[113] Ibid., pp. 20-3. Laud's list is a partial reversal of the order of evidence Morgan finds in Thomas Cartwright's work against Whitgift in the 1590s: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 74. Whilst Laud's opinion sits at some remove to that voiced by Campion and the radical Charke (see chapter 1 above), disputation remains broadly acceptable.
[114] This question of schism, tied to that of visibility and succession, had become a point of contention amongst English divines – whether Protestant continuity should be sought *within* the ancient Catholic Church: see Milton and Walsham, 'Richard Montagu', pp. 76-7, and Featley's debate with Percy below.
[115] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 55.

So offended was he by the Jesuit's suggestion that in 1624 he took it as a springboard to cite – as Featley had – Tertullian's caution against disputation:

> It was not to denie, that Disputation is an opening of the Understanding, a sifting out of Truth; it was not to affirme, that any such Disquisition is in and of it selfe unprofitable... No sure: it was some abuse in the Disputants, that frustrated the good of the Disputation. And one abuse in the Disputants, is *a Resolution to hold their owne, though it be by unworthie meanes, and disparagement of Truth*.[116]

The question of the 'right' church led to a discussion of general councils, which lasted until the end of the debate. As the company rose, the countess asked 'whether she might be saved in the Roman Fayth', and Laud's answer here varies with the report followed.[117] Percy has a simple 'Shee might', while Laud terms it a response, 'for the ignorant, that could not discerne the Errors of that Church'.[118] When the countess then asked the same question of Protestantism, Laud naturally responded that she could find salvation therein, whereas Percy stated that there was 'but one saving Fayth, and that is the Roman.'[119] This is worth noting, given the developing personal focus of disputation, and the outcome of these debates. The countess ultimately converted to Catholicism – as Percy states: 'Upon this, and the precedent Conference, the Lady rested fully satisfied in her Judgment... of the truth of the Roman Churches Fayth', although for 'frailty, & feare to offend the King' she agreed to attend church.[120] Laud attempts to curb the Jesuit's triumph, arguing that nothing he had said would be sufficient to convince anyone, 'unless... some that were settled, or

[116] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, p. 37.
[117] A. C., *True Relations*, p. 63.
[118] Ibid., pp. 63-4; R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, pp. 66-7.
[119] A. C., *True Relations*, pp. 68-9.
[120] Ibid., p. 72; see Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*, vol. 4 (London, 1896), p. 281; Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 147, 175n, 182n.

setting before.'[121] But the absolute expressed by Percy at the close cannot so easily be dismissed. With a wavering individual at its centre, disputation became a *focused* persuasive effort. Moreover, Percy's denial of salvation through Protestantism is never wholly countered by Laud. On the Greek Church, Laud's account states: 'It ought to be no easie thing, to condemn a man of Heresie, in foundation of faith; much lesse, a Church'.[122] For all the talk of authority and logical ability that dominates accounts of disputation, the role of rhetoric ought not be overlooked. Percy's moderate adversary and his own conviction here gave him the upper hand.[123] When his turn came, Featley – the man sidelined for these events – would not be overcome so easily.

Disputations with Jesuits

The summer of 1623 was a high water mark in reported, cross-confessional disputation.[124] In the spring, Charles had taken part in religious debates in Spain whilst working to conclude his marriage. James had given permission for his son to attend these disputes, and both the prince and Buckingham reportedly engaged with the arguments made.[125] In England, Featley's disputation with Percy would occur on the 27th of June, but preceding it were two smaller, more obscure debates, between Jesuits

[121] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, p. 73. Percy remained close to the countess for ten years, whilst under nominal imprisonment: Foley, *Records*, vol. 2, p. 264. His room at the New Prison was searched in March 1623 by commissioners from Abbot, looking for a printed response to James' questions: Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', p. 158; Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 213, 216. William Farrar reported that Percy was then 'abroad in the countrie by the keepers permission,' and that 'the keeper in default.. was committed prisoner untill the others coming in, which happening a fewe dayes after, F[ather] Fisher, so soone as he was returned to prison was committed to close guard, which argued that the state had some pretence against him, otherwise they would not have made shew of such severitie as the times goe now': Farrar to Bennett, in Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 217. By June, Percy was able to engage Walker and Featley.

[122] R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, p. 6.

[123] The debate did, however, win Laud Buckingham's favour: Milton and Walsham, 'Richard Montagu', p. 78.

[124] On the domestic and international context of June 1623, see Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 48-9.

[125] Following an account by Francisco de Jesús, Brennan Pursell states that Charles and Buckingham 'defended the English Church [against] Spanish divines', noting that once, 'Buckingham became enraged when the prince began to show some understanding or sympathy for the Catholic arguments in favour of papal supremacy. He rose from his seat, threw his hat on the ground, and trampled it': Pursell, 'End of the Spanish Match', pp. 707, 711, citing de Jesús, in S. R. Gardiner (ed.), *Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty* (1869), pp. 58-9.

(including Percy) and the irascible George Walker.[126] The last of May saw Walker disputing against Sylvester Norris, then going by the name of Smith.[127] Norris had been a secular priest, involved in the Wisbech stirs, and had joined the Society in the 1600s, having been seized, imprisoned and banished in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot. He returned to England around 1621, as Jesuit superior to Hampshire.[128] Norris' debate with Walker was again commissioned by a doubting individual; as Walker has it, a kinsman of William Harrington.[129] Walker states that the Jesuit 'challenged' Harrington 'to bring any Minister' to dispute on the authority and faith of the English Church, though Norris admits no challenge, only that he 'yelded' to a debate for the satisfaction of Harrington himself.[130] Walker was recommended by another divine as 'a man ready for such a purpose', and appears to have accepted at short notice.[131] Asked for questions 'opposite to the Romish religion', he presented Harrington with what he would later admit to be his customary topics, pronouncing the Catholic Church the Whore of Babylon, the Pope Antichrist, and Peter's position as Bishop of Rome 'a forged fable contrary to the Scriptures.'[132]

Walker gives an unusual amount of detail about the disputation's practical aspects: the location was 'a private house by the Thames side', and in addition to noting the layout of the room, he reports that two Bibles were called for – the Latin, and an English translation 'for the standers by to look upon.' Not only was this provision a wholly reformed idea; in terms of disputation it was a markedly Jacobean

[126] Norris describes his debate with Walker as 'lesse famous' than that between Featley and Percy: S. N., *True Report*, p. 6.
[127] This is reported in Walker, *The Summe of a Disputation*, answered by Norris in *A True Report*.
[128] ODNB Norris, Sylvester; Foley, *Records*, vol. 2, p. 482n; Dodd, *Church History*, vol. 2 (1739), p. 402.
[129] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A2^{r}.
[130] Ibid., sig. A2^{r}; S. N., *True Report*, p. 9.
[131] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A2^{v}; John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I, vol. 4 (Cambridge, 1927), p. 316.
[132] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A2^{v}. The identification of the Pope as Antichrist was a long-standing constant of anti-Catholicism, on which James himself had written; but one that was increasingly being rejected by moderate divines. Walker's choice of topics is thus a statement of his position within the English Church, as well as an anti-Catholic challenge. See Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 93-127.

one, demonstrating the interest of lay audiences.[133] Norris does not comment on practicalities, but contests Walker's depiction of the Catholic presence: the Protestant maintains that the Jesuit was accompanied by several priests, as well as 'some Romish Catholike Gentlemen', whereas Norris states that he brought only one priest with him, and four others.[134] Norris argues that he was trying to keep the disputation 'secret, and private... for feare of affoarding disgust unto the State, in that our quiet tyme of peace and connivencie.'[135] Despite the climate of the early 1620s, his concern is understandable: there is no record of Norris operating whilst under imprisonment, suggesting that he had not been arrested, and wished to avoid attracting attention. In addition, as will be observed below, 'private' disputation could soon be disrupted by state involvement or concern.

By Walker's account, Norris began with a statement of unpreparedness, and a call for 'loving' and 'sweet' argument. The minister's reply confirms his own view of the boundaries of disputation: 'he desired to byte and gall no adversary but with sound reasons... as for other speeches, he promised for his part to be milde or sharpe, according to the behaviour of his Adversaries.'[136] Given those critiques of disputation already noted in relation to Walker, it is interesting to observe his justification of aggressive practices here. At the start of the debate, Norris was asked whether he would oppose first or respond, and chose to dispute on his own topic, before responding on Walker's. His reaction to Walker's 'questions', however, was less than favourable: he deemed them 'unseemely and unmannerly', 'not fit to be named, much lesse to be disputed or answered', and reminded the assembly that his own question used milder terms (that English Protestants had 'no Church nor Faith').[137] This exchange would have an impact upon the form of the disputation. Walker tells Norris: 'Seeing it is your pleasure thus to speake at large in loose speech, and not in strict

[133] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A3^{r}.
[134] Ibid., sig. A2^{v}; S. N., *True Report*, p. 9.
[135] S. N., *True Report*, pp. 9-10.
[136] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs A2^{v}-A3^{r}.
[137] Ibid., sigs A3^{v}-A4^{r}.

Syllogisme, I will answer you in your kinde.'[138] Use of logic form here was haphazard, consisting of occasional bursts of structured debate amid longer speeches. This is highlighted repeatedly by Walker, whose account again demonstrates great concern with the formal process, but it is not exclusively a feature of his report, as Norris – in replying – notes several instances of the same.

Norris began by asking a direct question, thus instigating a short, unstructured debate on the necessity of visibility. Here, each divine accused the other of trying to avoid disputation, through bad practice, 'wrangling' and 'equivocation' (remarkably, Walker notes the last as a complaint *from* the Jesuit).[139] Throughout, the Protestant urged formal disputation. Once, by Norris' account, he reminded the Jesuit of the roles – Norris' one mention of process in these initial points.[140] The Jesuit's opening questions were intended, by all accounts, to establish terms and set the ground, but this process clearly infuriated his adversary. In the disputation itself, Walker's report makes every effort to portray him as uncomfortable with syllogistic logic: again, he is said to have told the Jesuit, 'if you be able to dispute Scholler-like, let us have one argument framed into a short Syllogism.'[141] Where this is finally given, it is done 'with much adoe'; and several times thereafter, Norris reportedly offered flawed syllogisms. Eventually, Walker declares: 'Now sir I see you have lost the question, and your reason, and your selfe, and all your speech is a Chaos without forme or figure, and proveth nothing at all: If you be unable to make a Syllogisme; I pray you confesse your weaknesse: and let me dispute one of my questions against you', to which Norris replies, 'Stay a little, and I will bring [the point] into a Syllogisme presently.'[142] Walker then has the Jesuit producing a string of faulty arguments, once rising from his seat in distress. When Walker offers to produce a syllogism for him,

[138] Ibid., sig. A4^{r}.
[139] Ibid., sigs A4^{v}-B3^{r}.
[140] Ibid., esp. sigs A4^{v}, B2^{v}, C$^{r\text{-}v}$; S. N., *True Report*, p. 13.
[141] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. C2^{r}.
[142] Ibid., sigs E^{v}-E2^{r}.

Norris protests, 'he confounds me'. After further debate, the Jesuit finally 'hammers out' an argument Walker deigns to answer.[143]

The most striking contrast between the two accounts, however, is in Norris' version of his arguments. Here, syllogistic reasoning is but a feature of the disputation – there is little sign of difficulty.[144] At his alleged point of crisis, Norris accuses Walker of wrangling, and terms his own arguments 'such as no Scholler would reprehend'. He concludes: 'But you who never appeared in any such schooles, never peeped out of Aristotles Parva's, no mervaile though you could not apprehend that kind of arguing. I pardon your ignorance, I beare with your dulnes, & passe to those Syllogismes... which you could not gainsay.'[145] This depiction of Walker's education is curious (he had attended Cambridge), and could reflect a measure of that academic competition found in Rainolds' encounter with Hart – Norris having received much of his education at Catholic institutions on the continent.[146] More significantly, this tussle over logic form and Norris' opening questions highlights a confessional difference in disputation, that would be echoed in later events.

Another prominent feature of this encounter was rage. Indeed, if both accounts were taken as fact, this would be the most aggressive debate of the period. Norris describes Walker as 'in a monstrous rage' towards the close, presenting this as a natural progression from his attitude throughout.[147] The Protestant makes the accusation more often: once, Norris is said to have spoken 'as one full of anger... with vehemency of words', and further into the debate, he is 'enraged'.[148] The conflict here, theology aside, again revolves around *conduct*; and in tonal *and* technical terms, the pair make similar accusations. It is, therefore, possible to build up a picture of the ideal disputant of the early 1620s, crossing confessional and educational lines.

[143] Ibid., sigs $E2^{v}$-$E3^{r}$; see chapter 2 above.
[144] S. N., *True Report*, pp. 23, 41, 42, 44-5.
[145] Ibid., pp. 43-4.
[146] Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, p. 316; Dodd, *Church History*, vol. 2, p. 402.
[147] S. N., *True Report*, p. 55.
[148] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs $B2^{r}$, $B2^{v}$.

Modesty and temperance should be the default position, abandoned only when the topic required, or where an adversary had already crossed the line. Logical proficiency – for both Walker and Norris have standards – was also a requirement, although its role and definition were changing. A measure of ability remained fundamental to intellectual polemic, but also to ensure a productive debate.[149]

The audience, whom both disputants describe as comprising two 'worthy knights' and others 'of both Religions', played an important role.[150] Several times, in the debate itself and at a preliminary meeting, the disputants invoked them as judges of truth and performance.[151] The most remarkable interjection from the audience themselves came during a discussion of the Old Testament in Hebrew, in which the disputants clashed over the precise marks made and words used. Walker was attempting to show that the text had remained unchanged, pursuant to the question of Nebuchadnezzar's salvation, when, as he describes it: 'Some of the Gentlemen desired, that these disputations about the Hebrewe text, which they could not understand might cease, and that Mr. Smith would dispute in plaine English by way of Syllogismes'.[152] This last must be viewed with suspicion, given Walker's preoccupations, but the call for clarity – reported in both accounts – should be emphasised. With the growth of private audiences, questions of learning and ability had come to the fore, becoming a point of contention in debate and a particular concern of the Jesuits. Here, and in Featley's disputation with Percy, audiences question complex structures and topics in religious disputation – things 'fitter for the Schooles', as Norris puts it.[153]

[149] See S. N., *True Report*, pp. 22, 26, 30.
[150] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A^{r}; S. N., *True Report*, p. 1. Walker names the second knight as the godly army officer Edward Harwood: *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A2^{v}; ODNB Harwood, Edward.
[151] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs A2^{r}, A4^{v}, B3^{r}, C^{v}, C4^{r}, D2^{r}, D2^{v}; S. N., *True Report*, pp. 15, 16.
[152] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. E^{r}; see chapter 2 above.
[153] S. N., *True Report*, pp. 37-8.

The debate between Walker and Norris ended quietly, hindered from the outset by its aggressive questions, procedural disputes, and general antagonism. Walker states that it was the Catholic side which called a halt, unwilling or unable to answer an error of the Apostles.[154] As the meeting ended, he asserts, the doubting person was 'well satisfied', and one Catholic observer called him (Walker) aside, saying 'that he was a good Logician, a good Linguist, and well read, and that God had given him a sharpe witte and ready tongue'; to which was appended the warning that he ought not trust his learning 'too much'. Finally, Walker reports, Norris embraced him, asserting, 'I pray God we two may meet in heaven'.[155] The Jesuit gives few details of the debate's end; instead detailing the lies told in Walker's account – as Norris describes it, 'the jugling of [a] vain-glorious Sycophant'.[156] Walker's faults, in and after the event, are listed: 'tergiversations, digressions, forgeryes... grosse absurdityes... begging of the principall question; to grant that after, which before he had denyed; to deny that now, which he formerly granted; yea to a flat contrariety and playne contradiction'.[157] As a comment on good practice, this provides a fitting summary of the exchange.

The following month, Walker engaged Percy, whom he describes as 'a man as famous for his forwardnesse... in challenging, as foolish in performance'.[158] The occasion, as Walker has it, was the bragging of a student of the Jesuit's – unnamed in this lone account – who praised his learning, particularly in the debates with White, and termed him 'a challenger of all Preachers in England'. This student had two brothers, one a Protestant, both of whom are said to have asked Walker to dispute against Percy, to silence this 'railing'. Thus, their debate is presented as a scholarly contest, rather than

[154] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sigs E4^{r}-F2^{r}.
[155] Ibid., sig. F2^{r-v}.
[156] S. N., *True Report*, p. 57; see chapter 2 above.
[157] S. N., *True Report*, pp. 60-1.
[158] Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 2.

an exercise for a doubting individual.[159] This is supported in Walker's depiction of the audience: 'divers friends and neighbours to the Master of the house comming in to heare and see what passed'; and by his opening oration: 'Our desire is... at this time you will make knowne unto us some of your best skill, and shew us some of the chiefe grounds upon which you build your faith and religion.'[160]

Walker offers few details on the practicalities of this encounter. There had been some quibbling on its timing, in which he claims to have accepted Catholic requirements to prevent triumphs from the 'insulting' brother.[161] The questions were not agreed beforehand. Walker seized on Percy's introduction – in which he described his conversion from Protestantism – to raise the topic of good works, and attitudes toward the Protestant faith.[162] From this emerged an exchange on the nature of the true church, but Percy abandoned his customary topic in favour of those of his adversary – the Pope as Antichrist, and Rome as the Whore of Babylon. It is here that the Jesuit describes their previous, unreported encounter: 'I remember that you urged me to dispute upon these above three yeares agoe, when you came to me in the New-prison, belike you spend all your time and studie in these questions.' Walker stated that 'the proving of any one of them doth... overthrow all Poperie', adding that no priest had yet offered a full answer. Percy, as Walker reports it, was 'content' to deal with his topics, but – like Norris – opened with questions 'that we may have some ground to build on'.[163]

As described by Walker, the debate bears little relation to the formal practice: Percy's initial questions prompted duelling propositions, which soon evolved into a disputation *about* disputation, as Fulke (and Walker himself) had experienced in prison encounters.[164] Walker finally called Percy a 'wrangling Sophister... ignorant in

[159] Ibid., p. 2.
[160] Ibid., p. 4.
[161] Ibid., p. 3.
[162] Ibid., pp. 5-6.
[163] Ibid., pp. 9-10.
[164] On Walker's previous meeting with Percy, see ibid., p. 10.

the rules of disputation', challenging him to a real debate.[165] At this, Percy raised the question of authority, prompting additional, unstructured discourse on scripture, and translations thereof. Walker observes that the Jesuit: 'durst not undertake, during the time of the conference, to make one syllogisme, or to propound an argument in forme,' despite requests that he do so.[166] Only at the close did Percy reportedly produce a written syllogism, 'confused... without forme, moode or figure', which Walker relates word-for-word.[167] Two things should be noted here. Firstly, Percy was a more able disputant than Walker describes, even in the eyes of his other foes. More importantly, Walker's critiques are now familiar, suggesting that the fault was rather in himself than in his adversary. Walker's emphasis on logic form and disputation as indicators of learning sets him aside from those, like Percy, responding to audience needs and pursuing practical ideals.

This said, the Jesuit's unease with formal reasoning is matched in this account by a general reluctance to engage. Once, he claims that 'his businesse called him away', and later moves 'as if he stood upon coales, and would gladly be gone'. Later, he again expresses 'a desire to breake off', and it is he who finally calls a halt.[168] Again, these instances match Walker's tone more than Percy's other debates, but the point to be made here concerns the significance of disputation, and the implications of a challenge denied. This depiction of the Jesuit further paints the encounter as an intellectual contest. To his opening remarks on the authority of the Rome, Walker replies: 'wee shall easily answer you, and make it appeare that you are not the man which flying fame reports you to be'.[169] Further into the debate, where Percy seems unable to read a book in Hebrew, Walker notes audience derision: 'some of the standers by laughed... others wondred whether this were Fisher the Jesuit, and made a

[165] Ibid., pp. 10-19.
[166] Ibid., pp. 26-7.
[167] Ibid., p. 27.
[168] Ibid., pp. 21, 26, 37, 43.
[169] Ibid., p. 7.

question of it.'[170] At the close, he reports that one audience member asked Percy 'whether he were indeed that Fisher the Jesuit who disputed with Doctor White before the King', voicing doubt when he answered in the affirmative. These instances show an effort to injure Percy's reputation, but they also suggest that clerical reputations could be built and broken on reports of public disputation.

Walker provides few details of those present, aside from the tale of the three brothers, and mention of the London minister Henry Burton.[171] But the scriptural understanding of lay audience members seems to have been aided by the Protestant: one place is read in Latin for Percy, and in English for the benefit of others.[172] In Walker's account, moreover, the auditory play a central role – *they* inform Percy he's beaten, and express doubt as to his abilities. As a single entity, they ask him direct questions.[173] The account thus demonstrates the importance of the audience as a vehicle for persuasion; in literary terms, they are a direct connection to prospective readers. More importantly, it shows that their role was developing. Following the lead of the king and doubting members of the nobility and gentry, audiences in this period were engaging with the disputations they attended. Much like James, audiences in this period were assuming and adapting the role of moderator; and disputation – and those taking part – would have to adjust accordingly.

Coda: Featley and Fisher

The first and only disputation between Featley and Percy was in many ways a reversal of the 1622 debates. The event was again occasioned by a doubting person, but here the disputants occupied the spotlight.[174] Moreover, it would seem that notoriety had

[170] Ibid., p. 21.
[171] Ibid., pp. 4-6; see chapter 2 above.
[172] Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, pp. 25-6.
[173] Ibid., pp. 26, 28.
[174] The first account was Featley's *Fisher Catched*; which Featley declares was printed without his 'licence or knowledge': Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. *3^{v}. This was answered by Percy in *An Answer to a Pamphlet*, and by John Sweet in L. D., *A Defence of the Appendix*. Featley expanded on his account in *The Romish Fisher* (1624), adding an attestation, a reply to Percy's *Answer*, and a treatise on the

drawn at least one of them into the fray. The individual in doubt was one Edward Buggs, an older gentleman who had fallen ill and had, by Featley's account, been 'sollicited' by Catholic acquaintances to convert.[175] Featley implies that Percy was one of these voices, noting 'Priests and Jesuites' among them, and stating that he had been 'found' at Buggs' house by Humphrey Lynde – the gentleman's first Protestant resort.[176] Percy, however, denies that Buggs had been pressured by any priest, adding: 'for Master Fisher in particular, I know certainly that hee never saw this old Gentleman, much lesse did he speake to him, in any matter of Religion, til that time, when Sir Humfrey Lynd first met Master Fisher.' Percy claims to have been at the house at Buggs' request, to meet with Lynde about the possibility of a debate. He was certainly not 'found'.[177] The posturing here is typical of disputation etiquette. Percy states that Buggs had suggested the debate, to which he responded that he would answer if challenged, but would not issue such an invitation himself. Featley, meanwhile, asserts that he refused to meet any Protestant representative. Again, humility dictated that one should not appear too eager, but honour – and the ideal of truth through discourse – held that challenges ought not be refused.

Two things should be noted in the disputation's prelude. First, Lynde is by no means an incidental character. An Oxford graduate, he would become an important Protestant writer in his own right, and would make a contribution to the final debate.[178] More importantly, the first choice for the Protestant side was not Featley, but Francis White: Percy states that Buggs was 'desirous to heare D. White and him dispute', and it is this – coupled with Percy's denial that he had seen the gentleman before – that implies a debate built on polemical notoriety.[179] Though Buggs was the

---

question. *An Appendix to the Fishers Net* added a censure of Sweet. Percy responded, briefly, in *A Reply to D. White and D. Featly*.

[175] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 1.

[176] Ibid., p. 2.

[177] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 2-3.

[178] Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. 1, pp. 603-4; L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, p. 4; see chapter 2 above.

[179] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 3.

catalyst, the event was planned (unofficially) to be another chance for White to confute Percy. Featley's 'defense', printed in *The Romish Fisher* (1623), asserts: 'D. White prepared and provided to encounter M. Fisher, his former Antagonist; and D. Featly was intreated as an Assistant, to deale in a second place with M. Sweet, if occasion were offered.'[180] Featley blames the reversal on a 'trick' from the Jesuit, 'discovered immediately before the Conference', but there is a suggestion of external influences in his explanation: 'it was then on the place of the meeting, resolved otherwise by some that were principally interessed in the businesse, that D. Featly should beginne with M. Fisher... and D. White (as there should be cause) should take off M. Sweet, if he interposed'.[181] This account, which provides no further detail, is curious, particularly given the firm Protestant standpoint of the principal organiser, Lynde. More generally, it is astonishing that the disputants appear to have had so little control over the order appointed – a deviation from prior events, except where higher authorities had been involved, and an indication of the difficulties faced in 'private' debate. The choice of Featley is also remarkable, given his religious standpoint. There were some – including, it could be said, Lynde – who might have *preferred* to hear him dispute against Percy, despite (indeed, because of) the Jesuit's history with the moderate divine.[182]

Extensive negotiation was involved in arranging the debate, offering further insight into the etiquette and mechanics of private religious disputation. At their first meeting, Lynde invited Percy to set down the questions, which he did in the following form:

> Whether there must not bee in al ages a visible Church, of which, al sorts must learne that one infallible faith which is necessary to salvation?

[180] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. R3^{r}.
[181] Ibid., sig. R3^{r-v}.
[182] ODNB Lynde, Humphrey.

> Whether the Protestants Church was in al ages visible, especially in the ages before Luther: and whether the names of such visible Protestants in al ages, may be shewed out of good Authors?

Percy states that the first was granted by Lynde and others; although Lynde himself denies having admitted any such need for continual visibility.[183] Percy was also allowed to choose his role – first, he replied that it was necessary to perform both, but asked to select one, he decided to respond.[184] His first answer was a call for balance, although Walker's debate with Norris suggests that turn-taking had become the standard practice, but his choice to respond requires further explanation. At previous events, Percy's approach and preparations suggest that he preferred the opponent's role. But in fact, his decision can be explained through his preferred question. Percy's demand for a detailed Protestant succession all but *required* his adversaries to oppose. As he saw it, Protestants were obliged to produce an induction – a list of visible professors – and thus had to be on the side introducing arguments. As respondent, Percy could then deny any induction attempted. The need to respond on this topic is further explained in a printed reply to Percy from the controversialist Henry Rogers, in the aftermath of this debate, which states: 'In those points in variance betweene us, *they are to prove*; because they are affirmative, we negative'. Here, the role of opponent is assigned as both a charge and consequence of innovation.[185]

For the debate's location, Lynde suggested White's house, to which Percy reacted badly, because 'last time he was there, it was given out... That M. Fisher would have killed D. White in his house.'[186] At the end of this initial meeting, Percy, deciding to await a further invitation, left his written questions and the agreed order

[183] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 4; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. Bb2^{r-v}.
[184] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 5.
[185] Rogers, *Answer to Mr Fisher*, p. 7; see footnote 38 above.
[186] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 5.

with Lynde, 'yet without any minde at al, to make any challenge'.[187] Returning to Buggs a day or two later, he was asked if he would accept 'a private meeting' at Lynde's residence, which he did. He was told that he should meet White and his associate the following Friday, to discuss his second question, bringing with him an assistant, four witnesses and two notaries.[188] On departing, he handed Buggs a paper on his first question: that the true church must have visible members in every age, whose names 'may be shewed out of good Authors'; and before the debate itself, this prompted a written exchange with Lynde. Here, Percy defined his second question, while the Protestant listed its flaws. Lynde also posed the counter-question of Catholic visibility.[189]

When the disputation began, on June 27th, Percy states that a large, mostly Protestant crowd was present. His account protests his own adherence to the condition of privacy: he was accompanied by Sweet, four witnesses and a notary, and had taken 'great care' to ensure secrecy. The Protestants, meanwhile, had allowed Lynde's house 'to be so filled, as [Percy] complained... of the inequalitie'; a complaint dismissed by Lynde, who 'could not help it'.[190] The debate, as Featley notes, took place after dinner, and it is possible that Lynde had simply dined with his household and guests – who, given that White and Featley were present, might well have learned of the debate there and then.[191] But again – and again in Percy's narrative – there is a suggestion of broad Protestant interest, and of the disputants' notoriety. The truth is further obscured by Featley's suggestion that neither he nor White had notice of the debate when invited to dinner, which the Jesuit claims is misleading.[192]

---

[187] Ibid., p. 5.
[188] Ibid., p. 6; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 4.
[189] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 6-7. These papers are printed, pp. 7-11.
[190] Ibid., p. 12. Sweet describes the ratio as 'ten to one': L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, p. 15.
[191] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 4-5. The subscription in Featley's longer work names several present as the Earls of Lincoln and Warwick, Buggs, Lynde, Featley's fellow chaplain Goad, Sir Henry Hastings, Richard Knightly, Richard Chamberlain (Lynde's close friend and clerk of the wards), Thomas Draper, Thomas Gataker and the divine Thomas Aylesbury, who served as a notary 'chosen by both parties': p. 46; ODNB Aylesbury, Thomas.
[192] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 5; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 13.

By all accounts, it was Featley who began the disputation. While Percy states that his preliminary papers were read aloud, Featley's account launches into an immediate critique of the question.[193] As described, however, this is identical to the written answer from Lynde, noting the question's problems (it required 'an historicall large volume', infallible faith was based on 'divine revelation' not 'deduction out of humane history', and the names of Protestants may have been lost) and introducing the counter-question of Catholic visibility.[194] Taking the accounts together, it is likely that all preliminary notes were read, each disputant highlighting his own side's contribution. In stating the Protestant counter-question, Featley recalls saying, accidentally, 'can be shewed and prooved out of... Gods Word', rather than 'good Authors', and when questioned offered the rebuke: 'God is a good Author, M[r]. Fisher, but it is true, I did mistake'.[195] Percy, meanwhile, echoes Laud's account of their 1622 debate, citing Featley for a breach of etiquette: 'D. Featly beginning to argue... did say: M. Fisher, I wish, I warne, I command, I conjure you, to answere truely and sincerely, in the sight of God, as you wil answer it at the Day of Judgement.' This exhortation was, according to Percy, 'willingly' accepted, but it nonetheless appears impetuous, having all the semblance of a challenge.[196] In Featley's report, this appears toward the debate's end, as a reaction to perceived evasion.[197]

After the preliminaries, the rules and order were set down. For an hour and a half, Featley would oppose Percy on the perpetual visibility of the Protestant church, after which White would respond to Sweet on Catholic visibility. Here, Sweet presented his conditions: that 'bitter speeches be forborne' and 'none speake but the disputants'; the latter was replaced in Catholic accounts with 'nothing should be

[193] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 15.
[194] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, pp. 6-7.
[195] Ibid., p. 7.
[196] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 15.
[197] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 25; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 15; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. Y3[v].

spoken, or heard, but to the purpose.'[198] The attestation in Featley's *Romish Fisher* asserts that this last '(though requirable & seasonable in all Disputes or Tractates), yet was not mentioned by Master Sweet, nor prescribed by any other in this Conference.' If the rule was indeed added with hindsight, it was an astute move: it holds Featley to Percy's question; and procedurally, no breach of it could be defended.[199]

After Sweet gave his conditions, Featley offered a third: 'that both the Opponent and Respondent be tied to Logicke forme.'[200] The demand is never mentioned in Percy's account, and despite Questier's assertion that such was the Jesuit's preferred method of debate, his reaction, as reported by Featley, was less than favourable; 'because the companie understands not Logicke forme.'[201] Though the chaplain has motive to paint the Jesuit as underestimating those assembled, the question of how far audiences could follow structured argument remains complex. Questier, partly in response to Barbara Donagan, takes a moderate view; positing an opinion *among polemicists* that simple forms of logic could be a good persuasive tool, and citing Percy's work – and that of others – as evidence of the same.[202] The question, however, requires a finer distinction; as demonstrated in White's 1624 treatise against Percy. Here, he apologises for his occasionally 'scholastic' mode of argument:

> Neither must the unlearneder sort be offended, if they light upon some hard passages, because the matter it selfe is many times very abstruse; and disputing with Adversaries which are Sophisters, I am compelled to use Schollasticke tearmes, and to turne their owne Weapons upon

[198] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 7; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 15-16; L. D., *Defence of the Appendix*, p. 19; see chapter 2 above.
[199] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 40; sig. Y3^{v}-Y4^{r}.
[200] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 8.
[201] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 16; Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 8; see chapter 2 above.
[202] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 16.

themselves: But so farre as I am able, I have endevored to be perspicuous.[203]

Two things must be remembered: first, the universities educated both laymen and the clergy; and thus a good portion of the audience (and White's readership) would have some training in logic form. Second, these forms were themselves in a state of flux; and polemicists' use of 'reasonably simplified' techniques is not in itself a simple observation.[204] The question is why, and to what extent they were being simplified; and how they were then perceived and presented. White's statement is not merely an apology – it is an expression of his own mode of thought, and a comment on that of his opponents. The ideal, for both White *and* Percy, was simplicity; but comparative intellectualism still offered a battleground, and thus the posturing of Featley – championing his audience's understanding – was a deliberate tactic. The Jesuit's objection here is also a symptom of those challenges facing public disputation: an audience's ability (or, more precisely, a disputant's *perception* thereof) hindering formal debate.

The first major point of contention concerned the format of Percy's question, and the method to be used in addressing it. By his own account, again demonstrating his allegiance to logic form, Featley defined the syllogism and induction, choosing to begin with the former.[205] He presented perpetual faith as the guarantor of continual visibility, to which Percy answered, 'You conclude not the question.' Featley's point, however, was that there were two *parts* to the question – first, that the Protestant church was visible in all ages, and second, that the names of its members could be shown – and these required different techniques.[206] Percy saw them as a single

[203] White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b5^{r}. One Catholic account of Campion's Tower debates has the Jesuit apologising: 'Because this is defyculte I muste be dryven to speake of it scholastically but I truste ther are some hear that can understande my meaninge'; Bodl. MS Rawl. D.353, f. 10^{r}.
[204] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, p. 16; see chapter 1 above.
[205] See chapter 2 above.
[206] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 11.

requirement necessitating a simple induction, but Featley was determined to proceed syllogistically, concentrating on the question's first, fundamental, part. This dispute would overwhelm much of the debate, and would continue to fuel argument in its aftermath.[207] As Featley himself later pointed out, 'by the orders of all Schools, it is the Answerers, and not the Opponents task, to state the Question'; and Percy cites this custom in his defence: 'if you wil dispute, you must dispute in my sense'.[208] Here, then, is the reason for the Jesuit's choice of roles; but his call for an induction also needs explaining. In this, the use and urging of 'simple' forms is crucial. His demand springs from Protestant divisions, and from the relative clarity of the Papal succession, but in addition, it again demonstrates his attitude towards the audience, and towards his intended readership.

Featley was eventually allowed to proceed, with Percy telling him, 'Conclude any thing syllogistically'. But instead, he persisted in arguing the dual nature of the question.[209] What is remarkable here is the involvement of the audience, particularly on the Catholic side. At one point, Featley was told, 'Name visible Protestants in all ages', and this soon grew into a chant of 'Names, names, names.' Here, the opponent did something extraordinary: he protested, 'What, will nothing content you but a Buttery booke? you shall have a Buttery booke of names, if you will stay a while.'[210] This is but the first of several indications that Featley was willing to yield a position *for the good of the debate*; an astonishing attitude, given that many disputants (himself included) would pounce at any sign of retreat. Throughout, Featley was faced with Catholic calls for an induction, *and* suggestions from the Protestant side that he withdraw, turning a cheek to Percy's obstinacy. By his own report, he handled these interruptions valiantly, but the crucial point is that all concessions here are made for the sake of the disputation. The chaplain acceded to the Jesuit's 'copulative' question

[207] See A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 13; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. T4^{r}.
[208] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. K4^{r}; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 17.
[209] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, pp. 11-13.
[210] Ibid., p. 13; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 34.

because he was ‘desirous to bring the disputation to some better issue’, and later he embarks on an induction because the company desires it.[211] Percy, of course, reports neither occasion: they are used by Featley to demonstrate his attitude to the *process*; and, conversely, that of his respondent.

Questions of method have, broadly, been addressed, but the disputants’ performances have yet to be discussed. Featley was not above playing to such an active crowd: where Percy distinguishes an argument on the authority and truth of the Protestant church, rather than denying it, Featley proclaims: ‘Mark, I beseech you... his conscience will not suffer him simply to denie, that the Protestant faith is the Catholike primitive faith’. Using Percy’s method against Laud, that of absolute denial, he thus offers the more forceful argument.[212] Percy’s account does not alter this image of the chaplain’s tone, but expresses disapproval: he ‘rather sought to please his Audience, and to gain applause to himselfe, then soundly to satisfy that most important Question, of the visibility of the Protestant Church’ – Featley’s intemperance is thus presented as a form of deviation.[213] However, the Jesuit’s own methods are subject to many a Protestant triumph. Where Featley, by his own account, cited perpetual faith to show the truth of the Protestant church, Percy accused him of *petitio principii*; to which Featley replied that he was arguing from a separate, causal point: ‘Is it not a sounder argument to prove the visibilitie of the professors from the truth of their faith, then as you do the truth of your faith from the visibilitie of professors?’ Percy here stated that proof through experience was more demonstrative, at which one of the audience declared: ‘Here Mr. Fisher sheweth his Academicall learning... Is not a demonstration of the effect from the cause, more excellent then of the cause by the effect?’[214] The Jesuit’s account states that he made no such

[211] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, esp. pp. 13-14, 23.
[212] Ibid., pp. 21-2.
[213] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 63-4.
[214] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, pp. 14-15.

observation, although he *might* have done: his question required it, and it would benefit – as he rather tellingly puts it – 'al sorts of men'.[215]

Percy's broader process was also open to criticism. Featley provides a long paragraph detailing the ritual that accompanied the Jesuit's answers:

> M. Fishers answers to every one of these Syllogismes were penned by him verbatim, with the advice of M. Sweet and one other, advising privatly and amending what they thought fit, which breeding much delay, irksome to the hearers, and the Opponent then saying, You are very long M. Fisher. A stander by said, Let him alone, for he and his learned councell are not yet agreed.[216]

As described, Percy's method would have had a restrictive effect on the disputation – one not wholly reflected in either account. Again, the distance between the events themselves and the accounts that followed is thrown into sharp relief: there is an immediacy to the dialogue in most reports, which this paragraph denies. It is important to remember that every disputant had his own approach, whereas disputation – and accounts thereof – kept to a recognisable formula. This outline of Percy's process calls into question the back-and-forth of his debates with White, James, Laud and Walker – a reminder that disputation accounts present the action through a lens of custom, in addition to those of bias and intent.

Questier describes this debate as a misstep on Featley's part: a demonstration of that Protestant weakness and division Percy habitually worked to exploit. He finds a 'polemical inconsistency' in Featley's assertion first, that there was no need to show a visible Protestant succession, and second, that he was willing to produce one, thus presenting the disputation as an instance of moderate Calvinism being left open by its

[215] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 20.
[216] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 18.

awkward concept of 'relative invisibility'.[217] There is some truth in this: Featley's urging of Protestant visibility beyond institutional continuity – which sits at some remove from the position of White and Laud on schism – is reminiscent of the latter's answer on salvation in 1622: helplessness in the face of certainty. But in this particular instance, there was more to it. Featley's inconsistency was not occasioned *exclusively* by his standpoint – indeed, as both he and Lynde make clear, a full list of Protestant professors was not *necessarily* possible. His motives can only be explained fully when the demands of the audience and the imagery of disputation are taken into account: his induction was *literally* for the sake of argument; necessitated by rhetoric, opponent, custom and circumstance. In this, Percy had certainly forced him into a corner, but in part through the ideals of private conference and formal debate. For all his loyalty to disputation, Featley had fallen victim to its practical, personal application.[218]

Thus, the debate was less a polemical misstep than a procedural failure, on a question that – as Lynde maintained from the outset – was not suited to this type of exchange.[219] As an instance of disputation, the encounter foundered on several things. Firstly, the inability of the disputants to agree on the requirements of the question. It is impossible effectively to form arguments where forms of argument are themselves in dispute – the disputants' methods were incompatible, so where formal argument *did* occur it was questioned at every turn. This was exacerbated, secondly, by the unwillingness of either to compromise until late in the day; and that under direct, increasing pressure. What is remarkable, indeed, is that the debate lasted so long – although capitulation would have amounted to a challenge denied and an admission of defeat. Finally, for intensifying and trying to control the exchange, the audience must bear a measure of responsibility.

Featley's induction did not last long. With an hour and a half gone, White briefly tried to take over, but it soon became clear that Percy would accept nothing

[217] Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, pp. 34-5.
[218] On the debate's purpose, see A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 27.
[219] Ibid., p. 9; see BL Add. MS 28640, f. 22^{v}.

less than an answer to *his* question, and shortly thereafter, Featley started on his list.[220] He began by (syllogistically) announcing his intent to proceed one age at a time, before naming the Protestants of the first age as Christ and his Apostles, St Paul and Ignatius the martyr. This was to be the debate's final stumbling-block.[221] Percy urged him to proceed to the next age, but Featley asked to dispute on those already named – here, by his own account, the chaplain made his plea to the Jesuit: 'I charge you, as you will answer it before Christ himselfe at the dreadfull day of judgement... whether you beleeve that Christ and his Apostles taught our faith or yours'. But Percy persisted, and the debate broke up. As Featley tells it, a number of the Protestant side drew him away, saying that 'he ought not to talke any longer with such a one who refused to answer Christ and his Apostles.'[222] Percy, meanwhile, states that Featley cried out in triumph to the audience: 'He grants Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants'; and, when the Jesuit complained, asked again if he would dispute on the first age. Percy, taking his arm, said that he would if he would stay, at which the chaplain departed in an 'abrupt manner'.[223] Featley's attestation in *The Romish Fisher* depicts this as an attempt to clear the Jesuit of discredit; and, as noted, offers compelling practical detail to back this up.[224]

The final stages thus brought the disputation full circle: the disputants posturing over challenges refused. In the aftermath, Featley states that Buggs was satisfied, thanking Lynde for the conference.[225] Percy, however, declares that 'there was no cause given... of any such effectuall resolution', ironically citing Buggs' ability as evidence. In describing him as 'well resolved', Featley made the gentleman

[220] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, pp. 20-23.
[221] Ibid., p. 23; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 35-6.
[222] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 25.
[223] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 36-7.
[224] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, pp. 42-45; see chapter 2 above. John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carlton that at the close 'the Jesuites fell to wrangling and tore the paper written by their owne notarie, which by those that stoode by was not so much imputed to passion as cunning': Norman Egbert McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1939), p. 507. He further indicates that the debate was spread over two days.
[225] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 26.

'to be but of a weake capacity, or of a very mutable nature', and pronouncing his satisfaction so soon after the debate 'would argue to to[o] much want of capacity'.[226] Percy reiterates that Buggs 'did not understand' Featley's syllogisms, let alone his central argument.[227] As the Jesuit saw it, the debate hinged on the nature of the question: anyone, he maintained, could see that Featley had not answered.

By all accounts, Percy and Sweet attempted to arrange a second debate, secure in the knowledge that Featley had more to do. Percy's account notes the involvement of the Earl of Warwick, present at the conference, in suggesting a second meeting – indeed, the Jesuit sent a letter to Warwick which was then, according to Featley, copied and distributed.[228] But this tactic proved unsuccessful; Percy's appeal was subsumed by the genuine involvement of the king. In a striking reversal of the Musket debate, the Jesuit states that 'the next meeting was prohibited', ostentatiously refusing to blame the Protestant side: 'I will not Censure... [they] laboured to have all future meetings, touching this occasion, forbidden, because they cannot make good that which they have undertaken about naming of Protestant Professors in all ages; yet I can[n]ot hinder men to have such like suspicion'.[229] Featley explains the situation in detail: James had only heard about the debate in its aftermath, and – using Richard Neile as his mouthpiece – had asked that the details be sent to him, and that any further meeting be 'staid'.[230] There is certainly some truth in Percy's assertion that the Protestants were troubled by his question; but what is clear is that the exchange had gone too far without royal approval, and had fallen foul of the changing climate. In late June, Charles' negotiations in Spain had reached a point of acute religious delicacy, and the king's use of Neile as an intermediary is indicative of his own

[226] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 43-4.
[227] Ibid., p. 49.
[228] Ibid., p. 44; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs Oo4^{r}-Pp3^{r}; BL Add. MS 28640, f. 22^{r-v}. Warwick later wrote to Lynde, all but disowning the event ('I knew of it but halfe an howre before it was, and I came at the request of another Gentleman') and expressing disapproval of the Catholic side: Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs Pp3^{v}-Pp4^{r}.
[229] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 38.
[230] Featley, *Fisher Catched*, p. 26.

direction and concerns.[231] As a remarkable counterpoint, the final statement of the Catholic side reflects a curious (indeed, ironic) trend on their part: Percy's account closes with an all-too-familiar place in Tertullian, cautioning against such encounters. On the subject of heretics, the Jesuit clearly states: 'we... may *examine* them'.[232]

Solomon Sleeps

The limited tolerance of the early 1620s, and the opportunities that came with it, continued to fluctuate with the Spanish negotiations. By late 1623, complications including provision for the Palatinate, papal dispensation, and the attitude of Buckingham had caused Anglo-Spanish relations to deteriorate; Charles returned in September without his bride.[233] The triumphant parliament of 1624 resulted in a proclamation enforcing recusancy laws and ordering priests and Jesuits again to leave the country.[234] Although James was not enthusiastic about such measures, and toleration would again be discussed when he and Charles turned towards the French marriage prospect, the situation to 1623 was not to be repeated.[235] As Wadkins notes, a return to balance in religious policy allowed for the printing of disputation accounts stalled during the negotiations, including Featley's full *Romish Fisher* and Walker's *Fisher's Folly Unfolded*; but instances of fully reported, cross-confessional disputation dwindled.[236]

In a letter of September 1624, Richard Smith made reference to 'a publik disputation' at the residence of the French ambassador, involving the Scottish Jesuit

[231] Pursell, 'End of the Spanish Match', pp. 713-14. The use of Neile rather than Abbot – a natural choice for communication with his own chaplain – reflects the marginalisation the latter faced as an opponent of the match: Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 39.
[232] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 70 (emphasis added).
[233] Pursell, 'End of the Spanish Match', pp. 715-26; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, p. 345; Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 4.
[234] Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 349-352; Questier, 'Catholic Loyalism', p. 1158; Larkin and Hughes, *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, pp. 591-3.
[235] Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 82-3, 96-7; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 353-6.
[236] Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', pp. 166-7; Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 96.

Patrick Anderson.[237] The house had opened its doors to Jesuits and secular priests, and would host another debate the following February, between the minister and disputant Pierre Du Moulin and one Kelly, another Scot.[238] More generally, however, at the end of the reign anti-Catholic disputation was at the mercy of an unfavourable political, religious and intellectual climate. As a mode of polemic, it would soon be subject to the criticisms of Laud, Richard Montagu and others, eager to get away from immodest arguments.[239] White, in recounting his debate with Percy, called for a work that contained nothing but clear argument, without either side's 'Yea and Nay'; and even Featley felt the need to justify disputation at length in *The Romish Fisher*.[240] At a more basic level, formal disputation was feeling the strain of public application. Into the 1620s, it had been required to meet the needs of increasingly involved 'private' audiences, and for all the talk of shared customs and procedures, disputants – and particularly the Jesuits – were reacting with a remarkable level of flexibility. As demonstrated several times in 1623, full disputation was not suited to the clashing methodologies that could result, and was itself being questioned by audiences. Beyond the developing religious climate, disputation faced practical challenges to its use in controversy.

In 1625, James settled – or, in his own fashion, moderated – a dispute over Featley's licensing of two puritan works, responding to arguments from Featley with Neile at his side. Featley recalls the king's 'apt solutions', 'pithie and sinewie Arguments' and clear reading of the Fathers, and departed satisfied; all of these he relates in an account dedicated to Charles, emphasising his father's learning.[241] The year before, James had reportedly involved himself in a disputation during a visit to

[237] Smith to Thomas More, in Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 294, 295. Anderson had conferred with Protestant divines whilst imprisoned in Edinburgh, which led to his treatise *The Ground of the Catholike and Roman Religion in the Word of God* (St Omer, 1623).
[238] According to Thomas Roper, Percy was also in attendance. The debate covered two points, including clerical marriage, and broke up because it 'was confused, every one speakinge without order, and no judge appointed.' Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 70 and Roper to More, ibid., p. 351.
[239] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 63-6.
[240] White, *Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere*, sig. b4^{r}; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs H2^{v}-K^{r}.
[241] Featley, *Cygnea Cantio*, esp. sig. A4^{r}, pp. 9-10, 19, 25-8, 30-3.

Cambridge, against the fellow of Christ's and future Irish bishop William Chappell – a 'subtile Disputant, equally excellent with the Sword and Shield, to reply or answer.'[242] The outcome is said to have been a defeat for the king, and as such offers a fitting postscript to any history of Jacobean disputation. Chappell had adopted Ramist logic in his early years, later moving from a puritan standpoint to Arminianism; and thus his academic career embodies the period's religious climate *and* its emphasis on clear intellectual forms.[243] James died the following March. As John Williams put it, 'Solomon slept'.[244]

[242] Fuller, *Worthies*, p. 317 (sig. Sss.2[r]); ODNB Chappell, William.
[243] In the 1630s, Laud's patronage would grant him preferment in the Irish Church: ODNB Chappell, William.
[244] John Williams, *Great Britains Salomon* (London, 1625), *passim*; Willson, *King James VI and I*, p. 446.

Conclusions

James' death was followed by a growth in toleration for English Catholics, explained through Charles' impending nuptials, which involved the pardoning of recusants and priests including Percy. But this was accompanied by continuing recusancy prosecutions; and Questier, though focusing on its diplomatic surroundings, notes the situation's similarities to that of Catholics through much of the early seventeenth century.[1] Parliament's anti-Catholic drive was spurred on by the efforts of Charles and Buckingham to secure war with Spain, and this would soon be followed by a conflict with France.[2] January 1626 saw a proclamation against recusants, and measures including the return of prison searches appeared through the spring, prompted by domestic and international fears.[3] Opportunities for cross-confessional debate were briefly reminiscent of those early in James' reign; but their public expression was subject to changed political concerns. Charles himself, though he maintained a comparable degree of flexibility, did not share his father's academic enthusiasm for controversy, and had developed a complex attitude towards Rome – expressed in his refusal of support for Chelsea College, now headed by Featley: 'too much time is spent on controversies which displease me', the king is reported to have said. 'I would rather study were devoted to reunion'. Anti-Catholic polemic lost much of its popularity at court after 1625.[4] Moderate clergymen continued to gain favour, and a broader atmosphere of temperance developed where Catholicism was concerned.[5]

Some fascinating connections can be drawn between the challenges Charles faced and the private religious disputations surrounding his accession. The first concerns arrangements made by English Catholics for his bride. The composition of Henrietta Maria's entourage was subject to much speculation, and although the Jesuits

[1] Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 113-4.
[2] For early signs, see Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 346-8; Questier, 'Catholic Loyalism', p. 1159.
[3] Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 125-7.
[4] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 61-3; Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policies', pp. 36, 38-9.
[5] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 61-2; Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policies', pp. 36-8.

were ultimately excluded (a reflection of the prevailing atmosphere at court), Richard Smith, now Bishop of Chalcedon and head of the English secular clergy, alleged that their efforts to get close to her had been conducted through the Countess of Buckingham, who was still attended by Percy.[6] The tensions of the reign are further evident in a debate of January 1626, between Featley and the elderly Jesuit and translator Thomas Everard, at the London residence of Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland.[7] Featley, by his own account, was discussing the necessity of bishops with Lady Falkland over dinner, when Everard – 'disguized in the habit of a Lay-Gentleman' – interjected: 'if there may bee a Church without a Bishop, who shall ordaine the Priests in that Church?'[8] Featley at once queried his identity ('It seemes you are a Romish Priest'), and on his denial took him to be a Jesuit ('For you can equivocate'). They soon fell to disputation, although this was stalled by the lack of books, and interrupted by the arrival of supper and the meat course.[9]

The topics here moved from the bishops to relative Catholic and Protestant unity, prayers for the dead and communion in one kind – all apparently raised by the audience.[10] At times, their interjections make the debate seem closer to dinner conversation than disputation, but again Featley describes use of the formal practice: the arguments proceed syllogistically, and on the final topics the divines take up the roles. Each gives an opening statement, before Everard insists: 'Dispute... syllogistically'; Featley then opposing for much of the exchange.[11] Where the roles switch, it is marked in Featley's account with:

[6] Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, pp. 114, 116-7; Wadkins, 'Percy-"Fisher" Controversies', p. 158; ODNB Smith.
[7] Arnold Hunt places this in 1628, noting the presence of 'an unnamed nobleman'; although in this he overlooks clear references in Featley's account: ODNB Featley; Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, from p. 233 (the account can be found at pp. 237-78, and Lady Falkland is named at p. 246). On Everard's connection with Lady Falkland, see Foley, *Records*, vol. 2, p. 408.
[8] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, pp. 237-9.
[9] Ibid., pp. 233, 239-40, 246, 268-9.
[10] Ibid., pp. 242, 246, 248.
[11] Ibid., p. 255.

M. Everard, opponent.

D. Featly, respondent.[12]

Thus, as Featley describes it, this event developed into a full disputation, in part directed by the audience; and throughout, they raise no objection to the disputants' use of the practice or formal logic – although again, this might reflect Featley's enthusiasm more than theirs.[13] It is, however, worth noting that Everard was an older, more detached disputant than Percy, and – more importantly – that Elizabeth Cary was no Edward Buggs.

Lady Falkland was a writer and translator, and her involvement here, raising questions dividing the English and Catholic churches, can be tied to the climate of the period, and the problems accompanying changing views of Rome. Her interest was not idle curiosity, for that year she would publicly convert to Catholicism, to the dismay of the king.[14] Remarkably, however, in describing his debate with Everard, Featley asserts that she was drawn to convert by way of Arminianism. Though he and the Jesuit were not called upon to deal directly with salvation (and Arminianism was a frequent bête noire in the Calvinist's works), this is echoed elsewhere.[15] Milton notes that Lady Falkland was associated with less aggressively anti-Catholic clergymen, and describes her conversion as a potentially 'fatal' blow to the views championed by Laud. It is interesting that whilst Featley disputed before her on the question of communion in one kind – upon which Protestants were agreed – his nemesis John Cosin, chaplain to Neile, and the controversial moderate Richard Montagu had tried, in desperation, to persuade her with anti-Catholic aggression, echoing John Percy in

[12] Ibid., p. 264.
[13] Featley describes the disputation thus, referring to 'diverse Knights and Gentlemen there present, religiously devoted to the Truth': 'at their instance, I undertooke Master Everard, and for many houres sometimes opposed, and sometimes answered in divers points': Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, sig. B2^{v}.
[14] ODNB Cary [*née* Tanfield], Elizabeth.
[15] Featley, *Grand Sacrilege*, sig. B2^{r}; see *idem*, *A Second Parallel* (London, 1626), and *Pelagius Redivivus* (London, 1626).

1622: 'dying an English Papist,' Montagu reportedly told her, 'she died in a state of damnation.'[16]

Featley's account of the Everard debate thus highlights some of the difficulties posed by the period's continuing – though at times hesitant and politically motivated – shift towards moderate divines and views; a move that was further precipitating a decline in formal, public anti-Catholic debate.[17] With the ascendancy of divines like Laud, critiques applied to intra-Protestant aggression in the 1610s were being extended – by a different movement – to anti-Catholicism. Montagu contrasted the world of the Fathers with 'these our dayes of gall and wormwood', in which contention fuelled 'neglect and contempt of the Truth'.[18] Politically and theologically, a new emphasis was being placed on caution and sophistication in dealings with Rome – attributes that could soon fall by the wayside in formal, public disputation.[19]

These attitudes were not new: indeed, they can be traced in the pattern of accounts through preceding decades, particularly in the use or championing of the disputation process. Those eager disputants of the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries shared or moved through that broad strain of Calvinist thought in which some have argued for an established, then declining, consensus in the Church of England: Fulke; Rainolds and his pupil Featley; George Walker.[20] The lines of

---

[16] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 85-6 (on communion in one kind, see p. 218). Milton asserts that these arguments were drawn partly by circumstance and matched the Laudian emphasis on conformity. Questier notes that 'a few cases where Arminianism apparently led to Catholicism' did not mean a natural link between the two, and that moderate positions were defended by Laud and Montagu as more likely to win Catholics to the church: Michael Questier, 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s', *The Historical Journal*, 49 (2006), p. 59. It should be emphasised that the later 1620s saw Laud and Neile urging their distance from, and distain for, Arminianism: Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policies', pp. 38-9. On Cosin and Featley, see Anthony Milton, 'Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), p. 634.

[17] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policies', pp. 38-9.

[18] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 63; Richard Montagu, *The Acts and Monuments of the Church before Christ Incarnate* (London, 1642), pp. 67, 383.

[19] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 64-5, 66-72; *idem*, 'Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy', from p. 635. In this, Questier notes a tendency to equate the Jesuits with radical puritans – a stance common to moderate Protestants and secular priests: Questier, 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism', pp. 58, 60, 67.

[20] The debate on a Jacobean 'consensus' challenged by Arminian or Laudian divines began in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*. Further, see Questier, 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism, pp. 55-6.

aggression and moderation were not so clear-cut, of course: divisions were continuous and fluid, and subject on all sides to that mode of polemic curbed by the London godly.[21] This, and the continued role of disputation as an educational staple must be kept in mind; but enthusiasm for its *procedural* aspects – the roles; logic form; the sanctity of the question – is weighted in the surviving evidence towards one point on the Protestant spectrum, and those who were combative in controversy more generally. In 1630, Laud became chancellor of Oxford, and the subsequent disappearance of Calvinism from the Act was not accompanied by a turn towards Arminian points – because, as Nicholas Tyacke observes, Laud's preference was 'silence rather than counter-assertion.'[22]

In February 1626, Arminianism was the subject of two semi-public exchanges at York House, Buckingham's London residence.[23] It was a conference born from clerical divisions, but occasioned by lay religious concerns: on positions expressed by Montagu in *A New Gagg* (1624) and *Appello Caesarem* (1625).[24] Tyacke suggests that the conference was intended to address Calvinist attacks on Montagu, which threatened to spread to Charles' religious policy and Buckingham's religious alignment. On the one hand, it was a concession, with Charles and Buckingham hoping – as so many had before – that 'some name of disputation' would settle the opposition.[25] On the other, its conduct and outcome suggest an official vindication of

[21] Barbara Donagan, however, notes that 'contemporaries recognized the danger' of such argument: Barbara Donagan, 'The York House Conference Revisited: Laymen, Calvinism and Arminianism', *Historical Research* 64 (1991), p. 312.
[22] Tyacke, 'Religious Controversy', p. 585. See Hughes, 'Public Disputations', pp. 28-9 for an alternate view.
[23] Manuscript accounts are held at the British Library and the Bodleian (BL Harl. MS 6866, ff. 73-81 and BL Burney MS 362, ff. 86^{r}-95^{v}; Bodl. MS Tanner 303, ff. 32^{v}-47^{v}), and versions are printed in Samuel Clarke, *A Generall Martyrologie* (London, 1651), pp. 505-11, and in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin*, vol. 2, ed. J. Sansom (Oxford, 1845), pp. 38-64. Cosin's account, Tyacke suggests, was entitled the 'Sum and Substance of the Conference lately had at York House' in a conscious echo of Barlow's report after Hampton Court: Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 166n. For an overview of the sources, see Donagan, 'York House Conference Revisited', pp. 329-30. Donagan follows the account of Tyacke in *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 160-80.
[24] Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 165-6. Episcopal concern followed clear lines, with Abbot (still at Canterbury) on one side, and Andrewes, John Buckeridge, Laud and Neile on the other. Montagu owed his meteoric rise in the church to Neile.
[25] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 78.

Montagu, and an attempt to *directly* silence critics of the regime.[26] Though the conference was reportedly occasioned by Montagu's lay opponents in the Lords, (Warwick and Viscount Saye), it was managed by the sympathetic figure of Buckingham.[27] In organisation and intent, it can thus *partly* be compared to Hampton Court and Westminster, but the new climate and the nature of the divisions concerned produced a very different event. The political focus was internal, looking to parliament and the clergy, and this is reflected in the lack of a full, printed account. Buckingham stressed the private nature of the debate in the event.[28] Moreover, the reports produced by John Cosin and others in the aftermath do not emphasise the authorities' role. The one echo of Hampton Court in this regard is Cosin's final, brief assertion that the king 'swears his perpetual patronage of our cause'.[29] By the standards of *The Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, Barlow, or even Travers in 1584, this is a fleeting invocation of authority.

Neither is the conference itself described as a presentation or successful settlement of national doctrine. The disputants suggest balance: Thomas Morton, now Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and John Preston represented the Calvinist side, though Preston first declined the conference and arrived towards the end of the first session; and White, Cosin and John Buckeridge of Rochester defended Montagu (himself only present for the second day).[30] The first day's topics covered general councils, doctrinal fundamentals (and thus the distance between the English and Catholic churches), and justification; the Arminian charges levelled at Montagu's works were only discussed towards the end. On the second day, these points were

[26] Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, esp. pp. 166-7; see Donagan, 'York House Conference Revisited', p. 313, and (on Buckingham's dealings) Clarke, *Generall Martyrologie*, p. 506.
[27] See Clarke, *Generall Martyrologie*, p. 505; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 165-6; Donagan, 'York House Conference Revisited', esp. pp. 314-5, 316. Contemporary accounts generally do not refer to the Lords by name: for example, BL Harl. MS 6866, f. 73^{r}.
[28] Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 166.
[29] Ibid., p. 167.
[30] BL Harl. MS 6866, f. 73^{r}; Donagan, 'York House Conference Revisited', p. 315; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 171.

revisited, along with ceremonies, and Montagu's answers were heard.[31] These topics, and the focus on Montagu, distance York House from earlier 'establishing' debates – by all accounts, the only attempt to change national doctrine was made by two of the lay Calvinist auditors, who argued for the conclusions of the Synod of Dort to be applied in England. On both days, this was attacked by White, with Buckingham's approval.[32] The second – perhaps most important – comparison to be made with events like Hampton Court is the inconclusive nature of the conference, as it appeared at the time. Tyacke finds its impact 'in retrospect', as an affirmation of royal support for Montagu and Richard Neile's Durham group, but this was neither firmly defined nor immediately presented through the debate.[33] The conference was, in some respects, an attempt to settle national doctrinal conflict through disputation, and in this was the last of its kind. But the role and image of such debate – political and intellectual – had already changed. Lay interest and positions had developed, the emphasis was – to use Featley's terms – on private conference rather than public disputation or display, the division to be handled was no longer one between central and fringe elements in the church, and the king did not play an active role. It is significant that the emphasis in reports of York House is on points of theology, rather than figures of authority.

This conference also provides a fascinating *coda* to the question of lay involvement in religious disputation. Here, Donagan finds a reminder that the laity did not share 'the refined difficulties of theological academics.'[34] The engagement of those present meant that the disputants had to adapt methods and questions to suit 'educated, religiously serious... laymen who were not, however, theologians.'[35] Donagan notes the company's weariness at formal debate – 'contingent and indefinite

[31] An outline is given in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 172-80.
[32] Ibid., pp. 176-7, 179; Clarke, *Generall Martyrologie*, p. 508.
[33] Tyacke notes the religious and political outcome in *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 180.
[34] Donagan describes the early seventeenth century as 'a time when it was becoming increasingly difficult to ignore intellectual conflicts and ambiguities': Donagan, 'York House Conference Revisited', pp. 312-13.
[35] Donagan, 'York House Conference Revisited', p. 314.

propositions and antecedents and consequents' – and a preference for 'substantive issues', but emphasises that 'weariness' does not mean 'inability': these were not the 'unlearned' individuals Percy often invoked.[36] This event, then, shows the developing relationship between the educated laity and academically-framed religious debate. Indeed, Donagan is here trying to chart the truth behind those competing claims on interest and ability outlined above. At the opening of the first day, Buckingham spoke to lay ability in judging religious points (again elevating 'substance' over what Donagan terms 'polemic *and dialectic*'), and argued for the right of the state to contain public religious disputation.[37] This was matched, Donagan notes, by parliament's view that a simple form of such debate should not be separated from their deliberations.[38] Donagan's definition of 'layman' here is not just used in opposition to 'clergyman': in religious matters, it is also antithetical to 'expert'.

These 1626 events, then, return us to Howell's distinction between logic and rhetoric, as the mode of discourse between experts and that between expert and 'layman'. As outlined early in this thesis, scholastic forms were being questioned into and through the seventeenth century in practical and aesthetic terms; and here, in the 'public' religious disputations of the mid-1620s, those concerns are writ large in the views of divines and audiences.[39] Percy urged the difficulty of logic form for men like Buggs, and the Lords at York House visibly tired of its twists and turns. Thus, the problem was not simply one of tone, as the example of Walker and moderate critiques might suggest. It was fundamental; structural, and a sign of the times.

Gall and Wormwood?

Public religious disputation in post-Reformation England was seen as a distinct phenomenon: separate from pamphlet controversy, infused with – but not beholden to

[36] Ibid., pp. 318, 319, 320-1.
[37] Ibid., p. 317 (emphasis added).
[38] Ibid., p. 326.
[39] See chapter 1 above.

– academic tradition. Accounts and discussions of the practice reflect this in their language and acceptance of custom, and at times in clear definitions: Ley recognised disputation as distinct from written controversy, but in this followed the argument of Featley, more than three decades before, that it held a special significance.[40] Featley urged the benefit of confuting opponents and confirming one's own faith through direct confrontation; and whilst this is weighted towards Protestant events and positions, Persons' history of disputation similarly argues for its correct use in controversy.[41] Both writers recognise the place of disputation and work to appropriate it for their own side. Moreover, the unique qualities and force of the practice were cited in imperative, as well as reflective, works. In James' reign, divines at the margins of the church can be seen urging formal debate in an effort to bring authorities to account and make their own arguments heard, be they nonconformist ministers or future Catholics. These challenges can be directly tied to the views expressed by prisoners in the 1580s: that disputation ought to be 'fair' and 'free' – they speak to established ideals of orderly, equitable debate – the need for a common, defined field on which truth could naturally *and justifiably* triumph. In the 1620s, George Walker cited a claim from Sylvester Norris that he could disprove the English Church by '*disputation*, and... invincible arguments': a challenge penned by a forward Calvinist, attributed to an English Jesuit, and placed in the hearing of an educated gentleman, and whose significance – it is implied – would have been clear to all involved.[42]

References to disputation are complicated, however, by the use of varied terminology. The constellation of events described above is centred on participants and structure; and is therefore most useful where questions of audience, equity and purpose come into play. Those disputing in prison drew clear distinctions: Campion

[40] See Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. I^{v}.
[41] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs I^{r}-I2^{r}, *idem*, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 18-21; N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, *passim*.
[42] Walker, *Summe of a Disputation*, sig. A2^{r}.

reportedly argued that his Tower debates were but 'conferences', being removed – in location and ideal – from the universities, and the separatists Barrow and Greenwood juxtaposed 'Christian conference' with examination.[43] Featley, meanwhile, distinguished the fundamentals of ordered debate from the niceties of academic custom, and thus whilst championing the former could describe himself as 'conferring rather than disputing' with Smith.[44] In 1624, he could echo the assertion of Charke and Hanmer that the time for debate had passed, whilst justifying his role in 'private occasionall conferences'.[45] Throughout this period, 'disputation' was defined and redefined in terms of participants, purpose, setting and (on occasion) method, but such distinctions only clarified shared forms and ideals. The boundaries of a *spectrum* of disputation were being described, and each of these divines makes assumptions about the basic process and idea. The separatists criticise academic forms, but – like Persons – *assume* their application in religious debate. Campion, in part metaphorically, places 'disputation' in the universities, but still argues for *procedural* balance, while his opponents work to discredit him through the same forms. Featley draws distinctions of etiquette and purpose, but his allegiance to disputation is beyond doubt. In the opening chapters of this thesis, it was argued that a relatively clear range of events could be termed 'disputations', and for all the care that needs to be taken with individual cases, the works considered here confirm that contemporaries shared this view.

The structures of disputation represent a long-standing mode of reasoning, whose scholastic elements were buoyed, as well as questioned, by the period's concern with discourse. Within controversy, it influenced private conversations, interrogatory proceedings and written exchanges, as well as a range of public debate. As a respected form, it was taken up – in whole or in part – by those in authority: to show fair dealing, but also, crucially, to give their arguments a *procedural* weight:

[43] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. H^{r}; Barrow, *Letters and Conferences*, sig. A.ii^{r}; *idem*, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sig. C^{r}.
[44] Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 15.
[45] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs H3^{v}-H4^{r}.

thus it was applied, with qualification, to present doctrine at Westminster and Hampton Court, to respond to the Jesuit mission, and in efforts to dissuade converts. Its continued influence is particularly visible where an adversary sought to associate his arguments with a particular type of scholarship: the practicality of Campion was countered with the elevation (and manipulation) of disputation, and then with humanist eloquence *framed within it*. Although enthusiasm for *public* disputation is weighted in the surviving evidence towards a particular type of divine, recognition of the form as a measure of authority crossed confessional lines: Alabaster's rejection of 'conference' in favour of disputation conveys a martyr's reverence on a form more often questioned by Catholics, and Jacob's *Christian and Modest Offer* of 1606 invokes it as a full, fair and *accepted* mode of debate, in opposition to Hampton Court.[46] The range of accounts, depictions and challenges produced in this period demonstrates the relative independence of disputation from the most entrenched of post-Reformation divisions.

Where differing views *are* expressed, they turn on the form's scholastic element – its potential for wrangling at the expense of truth, its encouragement of aggression, and its dubious public use and beauty. Those who were evangelical in their approach to conversion and religious discourse came to question the stark complexity of the process – Renaissance fears about formal logic coming to the fore with the changing purpose and setting of religious debate. Equally, the oppositional nature of the form led it to be questioned by those seeking a productive means of addressing divisions – in godly circles, and in anti-Catholicism under the auspices of Laud. In the 1590s, Barrow's ideal of 'Christian conference' concentrated on method *almost* as much as balance and authority. But despite these critiques, divines engaged in public debate generally adhered to a measure of the scholastic form, including

[46] Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, esp. pp. 12-13; Jacob, *Christian and Modest Offer*, pp. 3-5. On Protestant confidence, see Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, Papists and the "Public Sphere"', p. 600, and (for example) Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, pp. 16-21; Savage, *Conference betwixt a Mother*, esp. p. 118.

formal logic. At the most basic level, this was how they had been taught to confront their adversaries, but there was more to it than academic tradition. Calls for equitable, formal disputation suggest a reverence going beyond custom; and the sanctity of the question frequently observed is an expression of basic intellectual ideals. In the aftermath of Featley's debate with Smith; both sides worked to align their methods with the full, formal process.[47] Even the most outspoken critics of disputation (John Percy; Henry Barrow) were drawn to it by training, opponent and circumstance, as their own accounts readily acknowledge.

This acceptance of disputation, and its formal trappings, raises a number of questions. It shows a gap between idealism and necessity in attitudes toward human learning and reason, rendering warnings against controversial debate prescriptive, rather than demonstrative. In the wake of the Reformation, the cautions of Thomas More proved difficult to follow.[48] Of course, warnings against disputation were still being expressed in these terms: Persons, whilst appropriating the practice, noted that it was 'not alwayes sufficient to resolve [a man's] judgement, for that yt moveth more doubts then he can aunswere or dissolve', observing that in church councils 'disputatio[n] serveth not to determine but to examine.'[49] This concern, arising from the nature of Catholic authority, is echoed by Percy, in relation to private interpretation of scripture and the cautions of Tertullian.[50] Neither were such views exclusive to Catholics: their ideas of authority and the needs of the unlearned (a concern that can be traced from the *Rationes Decem* through to Percy's debate with Featley) are similar to those voiced by White and other moderate Protestants.[51] Even

[47] See chapter 5 above.
[48] See chapter 1 above.
[49] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, pp. 19-25; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 68-70; see William Acton's preface to A. C., *True Relations*, sigs *2^{v}-*3^{r}; chapter 1 above.
[50] N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 26. Persons' solution mirrors Laud's observations on Tertullian, urging correct use of the practice: R. B., *Answere to Mr Fishers Relation*, p. 37; see chapter 6 above.
[51] In France, responding to a challenge of 1600, Jacques du Perron is recorded as saying 'the shifts and sleights of the disputers [in examining doctrine and scripture]... might make the truth uncertayne to the

those who favoured disputation pointed out its flaws: Featley took the reformed answer on Tertullian to its logical conclusion in stating that he had 'earnestly contended against all contentions, and publick Conferences' with Catholics, citing the potential danger to spectators.[52] Clergymen of all stripes criticised public religious disputation, in terms of harm to authority and truth, a lack of modesty, and – crucially – wrangling at the expense of *assumed* beneficial effects. But for none is it *always* inappropriate: most warnings leave room for its considered application. Caution in theory and rhetoric was often joined by enthusiasm in practice.

The more immediate question is one of purpose. A detailed study of these accounts, and related works, suggests that where formal debate – or an element thereof – was applied, it was rarely with the sole purpose of fuelling polemic. Motivations varied with occasion and participants: in the context of 1581, Fulke's Wisbech conference may well have been *printed* for polemical purposes, but his interactions with the prisoners – and the alternative methods used – suggest a more complex aim in the event. The same can be said for Rainolds' debate with Hart; its persuasive tone enhanced by Rainolds' approach, reports of Hart's attitude and, again, other methods used in the Tower.[53] Campion's opponents reported losing hope for his conversion only at a third debate; their expressions of optimism were compelled by imperatives beyond (though including) polemical necessity.[54]

In discussing purpose, the question to ask is where the focus lay: on the question, the disputants, the audience, a doubting individual, or the objective of truth demonstrated or discovered. Barrow described the purpose of a 'conference' as the equal consideration of both sides, confident that *his* truth would emerge. Meanwhile,

---

hearers': N. D., *Relation of the Triall*, p. 23. This account was printed in English by Persons; and later, in asserting the bishop's victory, it cries 'would god these meanes were used in England' (p. 31).

[52] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. ¶3^{r}.

[53] See chapters 3 and 4 above. Rainolds tells Hart, 'as I seeke to winne you to the truth, so I seeke to do it by true and right meanes': Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 503.

[54] Field, *Three Last Dayes*, sig. O.ii^{r}; Nowell and Day, *True Report*, sig. C.i^{r}. Where polemical display *was* the principal motivation, accounts cover this with the language of intellectual enquiry or personal satisfaction: see Anon, *Declaracyon of the Procedynge*, sig. 1^{v}.

his accounts describe his and Greenwood's adversaries as trying to make the separatists themselves the focus, through their questions ('I would know the causes of your forsaking our Church').[55] At Lambeth in 1584, Travers describes himself, Sparke *and* the audience as focusing on the questions, and it is this – as much as the allocation of roles – that gives his account its tone of equitable inquiry.[56] The cross-confessional disputations of the Jacobean period were generally held for the benefit of doubting individuals, who were presented as the object of debate.[57] But the focus could still fall on the disputants themselves, turning persuasion into personal display. The role of disputation – and all controversy – in confirmation further adds to its complexity of purpose. Featley, in asserting Buggs' resolution in 1623, argued: 'Though a man be never so well resolved in poynt of Religion, yet hee may desire to heare Divinity-Disputations, and make good use of them'.[58]

The polemical nature of most disputation accounts means we must be wary of the gap between reality and presentation in considering an event's purpose. But to posit intentions beyond polemic we need not rely on the conflicting reports of disputants and notaries. Lay involvement in religious disputation itself makes the case for a variety of purpose: we need to ask *why* each occasion was arranged, what roles laymen took within it, and how its arguments and mechanics were perceived. In every case, the evidence argues against 'mere' polemic. Members of the laity commissioned and attended disputations to have controversial points settled in their own minds or to contribute to the arguments themselves, for the benefit of unsettled associates or to see particular 'experts' perform.[59] The interest displayed by Lady Falkland and the Lords

[55] Barrow, *Certain Letters*, sig. A.ii^{r}, p. 16; Barrow, *Sclaunderous Articles*, sigs C^{r}.
[56] BL Add. MS 48064, ff. 50^{r}-63^{r}.
[57] See chapter 6 above. In the 1580s, relatives of Edward Walpole (later a Jesuit) commissioned disputations to demonstrate the errors of Catholicism: ODNB Walpole.
[58] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, p. 135; see the introduction.
[59] See (for example): BL Add. MS 48064, esp. f. 50^{r}, Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, pp. 2-3, Featley's Paris debates in chapter 5 and that between Walker and Norris in chapter 6, and depictions of the Earl of Warwick at Featley's 1623 debate in A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 38, 40, 42, 44, and Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. *3^{r}, pp. 142-7 (along with the role of Lynde and claims made about Buggs, in chapter 6 above).

at York House is not without precedent. References and appeals to the audience – a recognised practice, regardless of the truth of individual reports – present them as the object of debate, as well as moderators. Critiques of logic form and formal disputation through this period centre on the needs of audiences and readers, underlining the belief that disputation and related endeavours could – or, more precisely, *should* – be tangibly effective. Given this, and the persistence of public disputation into the seventeenth century, accounts of individuals converted as a direct or – more likely – indirect result of a debate should not be dismissed out of hand. Persons' history cites at least one disputation intended to save.[60]

An examination of process, audience and terminology indicates that a public religious debate was intended, by all involved, to be an effectual procedure. Although there were some exceptions, disputation was more than a polemicist's tool, or a showy intellectual frame for doctrinal arguments, and was not seen as inherently distant from – or unrelated to – personal religious experience. This is echoed in the imagery surrounding the practice. The language of public religious disputation in this period is that of the trial, the tourney and the battle; the last of these by far the most prevalent.[61] Each can be associated with a purpose: a trial is aimed at truth, a tournament at comparing champions, and a battle – crucially – at claiming or defending a specific prize or cause. Points of controversy, and disputation itself, are often termed a 'field' in accounts and related works: the Catholic account of Featley's debate with Smith, for instance, has the latter leaving 'his fort... and comming out into the open field'.[62] Such images cover a wide chronological and confessional range, and they present

[60] A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, pp. 43-46; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs A^{v}-$A2^{r}$; Edward Weston, *The Repaire of Honour* (St Omer, 1624), p. 3; N. D., *Review of Ten Publike Disputations*, p. 72. Featley took the purpose of debate with religious adversaries to be 'to convert them to the Truth, or convince them with the Truth': Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. $H3^{r}$.

[61] Walker has Percy 'drawne into the lists to fight a single combat' with him: Walker, *Fishers Folly Unfolded*, p. 2. On the trial, see S. N., *True Report*, p. 56. Featley and Percy both compare their disputation to a hunt: Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. $V2^{v}$; A. C., *Answer to a Pamphlet*, p. 65.

[62] S. E., *Conference Mentioned*, pp. 20-1. Further, see: Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 150; S. N., *True Report*, pp. 15, 61; Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sigs Bb^{v}, $H2^{r}$, $Ff2^{r}$; *idem*, *Grand Sacrilege*, p. 282. Featley extended the metaphor to all controversy: Featley, *Transubstantiation Exploded*, p. 28; *idem*, *Romish Fisher*, sig. $T3^{r}$.

disputation as a challenge or duty, underpinned by a *definite* concept of victory. The classical and Renaissance ideal behind dialogue and disputation was the attainment of truth through discourse, but in dealing with *fundamental* truth, this was adapted to describe its defence and demonstration.[63] Truth was no longer the object of debate – instead, it was the weapon by which victory (persuasion or conversion) could be achieved. Justifying religious disputation in *The Romish Fisher*, Featley cites the convert Caecilius in *Octavius* by Marcus Minucius Felix: 'We are both, saith he, winners in this Game: *you have wonne mee*, and I have won the truth... We are both Conquerors: *you have conquered me*, and I triumph over my owne error.'[64] The purpose of a public religious disputation, as perceived by contemporaries, can be determined only by considering classical ideals through a lens of faith, and in this, images of combat offer a good starting point. As noted above, it is the level of *outspoken* conviction on display that separates these events from Shuger's controversial academic disputations, hidden behind their procedural mask; and through this, battle metaphors become clear, *genuine* indicators of purpose.[65] Just as Alexandra Walsham has urged sensitivity to contemporary attitudes on persecution and toleration, they must be viewed as positive analogies: though combative, they do not reflect an aggressive or cynical application of the form.[66]

For controversialists, however, disputation was superbly demonstrative; a common, ritualised field in which direct trial and combat could be shown to validate one's argument. The need to respond to polemical attacks found its ultimate expression in challenges accepted or refused: withdrawal from disputation signified inability, disrespect for the form, disregard of scriptural instruction (to 'be ready always to give an answer...') and a lack of faith in one's cause. Thus, disputation was

[63] The latter is best expressed in Alabaster, *Unpublished Works*, p. 120. As demonstrated by Henry Rogers, the roles could thus be connected to charges of innovation: see chapter 6 above.
[64] Featley, *Romish Fisher*, sig. I^{r-v} (emphasis added).
[65] See chapters 1 and 2.
[66] Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 1-2 and throughout.

effective in terms of expressing arguments, but also in revealing attitude: enthusiasm for the practice was as much tied to the epideictic preoccupations of the period as to developments in controversy. These imperatives were most often invoked by Protestant divines, but the competitive element can be seen in William Allen's Douai training procedures, and in Smith's debate with Featley – an attempt to show the skill *and eagerness* of secular priests for this type of encounter.[67]

Underpinning all of these attitudes was the perceived authority of formal disputation and religious conference. The former retained much of its intellectual weight through the post-Reformation period, and the latter was seen to have at least the *potential* to be effective – certainly in preparing the understanding and moving the will to conversion. Though the use of formal disputation in polemic might, with hindsight, appear detrimental to its authority, the role of faith (by which I mean religious conviction *and* academic certainty and training) must not be underestimated. Discussing cross-confessional interactions, with specific reference to Elizabethan persecution and controversy, Peter Lake has made a crucial observation in this regard: that officials and divines engaged in such efforts 'believed in the master narratives and organising tropes, the claims, assumptions and prejudices, that they were also instrumentally, perhaps even rather cynically, manipulating'.[68] Though 'cynicism' should be used carefully in relation to religious interactions, this can be applied without reservation to public religious disputation: in terms of purpose, but also in relation to the *intellectual* form and ideal. As the chapters above show, a genuine belief in disputation could certainly co-exist with its exploitation – indeed, a broad acceptance of the form's authority was precisely what authorities, disputants and the authors of accounts were relying upon.

Public disputations in this period provided a heightened, intensified arena for religious controversy, and thus offer a unique opportunity for those hoping to examine

[67] McCoog, ''Playing the Champion'', p. 122; Questier, *Catholicism and Community*, p. 376.
[68] Lake, 'A Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys', p. 154.

its mechanics. These debates – held to form, recorded as dialogue – illuminate patterns in the arguments and authorities used by controversialists, as well as their intellectual assumptions and practices. This being said, they also need to be considered in relation to broader trends. The lines drawn in this thesis are open borders, and the disputations considered here ought to be studied in closer relation to their at times highly influential academic counterparts, to puritan gatherings and, at greater length, to methods used in written polemic. More generally, public religious disputation must take its rightful place in Reformation and post-Reformation inquiry – not just as a front line of controversy, but as a meeting point of controversy and Renaissance intellectualism: an opportunity to bridge ideological and intellectual narratives.

The examples highlighted here show the benefits to be had in studying disputation as procedure and performance – through structure and imagery, as well as content. Attention to intellectual trends adds depth to reactions to the Jesuit mission in the 1580s. An examination of the roles underlines the position of Whitgift – as Travers would have it – at Lambeth in 1584, and details the political and self-imposed restraints that affected James I in discussing national doctrine. Their performative and academic aspects offer insight into lay engagement in controversy – a point that needs to be explored further with private conference and public debate in mind – and reveal good practice as a layer of conflict beneath theological argument. Public religious disputation did not develop as a face-to-face variety of pamphlet polemic: it formed and re-formed around scholastic structures and Renaissance ideals. These encounters describe a convergence of academic concepts with religion and – by extension – state power, accounts of the practice having as much to tell us about their interaction as about controversy in itself. Disputations shed light on religious arguments, but also show how those arguments were processed through logic, rhetoric, history and philosophy, at a time when the authorities placed a high premium on such arts. It would be easy to dismiss these encounters – and the evidence for them – as another

mass of partial polemic, but at their best they reflect a desire to triumph, engage, prove and understand that fuelled change, threw cautions to the wind, and tested the religious movements of the period.

'*Come Mephastophilis let us dispute again*'.[69]

[69] Christopher Marlowe, *The Tragicall History of the Horrible Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* (London, 1609), sig. C3^{r}.

Bibliography

Manuscript Material

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Additional C.197	Account of Peter Martyr's 1549 disputations.
Barlow 13	James Ussher's account of a disputation with Henry Fitzsimon
Rawlinson D.47	Daniel Featley's letter book
Rawlinson D.353	Catholic account of the second and fourth Campion debates
Rawlinson D.399	William Alabaster's poem on the Rainolds brothers
Tanner 71, 72, 80	Correspondence between Jerome Beale and Samuel Ward
Tanner 303	Account of the York House conference

British Library, London

Additional 8978	Account of a meeting between James I and puritan petitioners in 1604
Additional 11055	Catholic account of the second and fourth Campion debates
Additional 28640	Copy of John Percy's letter to the Earl of Warwick after his debate with Featley (1623), with commentary from John Rous
Additional 32092	Examination of James Gibson by James VI of Scotland

Additional 34250	Catholic account of the efforts of Thomas Bell and others with prisoners at York Castle
Additional 38492	Anonymous account of the Hampton Court conference
Additional 39828	Account of a debate between John Aylmer and one Merbury Account of the first Campion debate
Additional 48064	Walter Travers' account of the 1584 Lambeth conference
Burney 362	Account of the York House conference
Harley 422	Catholic account of the third and fourth Campion debates
Harley 828	Account of the Hampton Court conference
Harley 3795	Anonymous account of the Hampton Court conference
Harley 3888	Account of the efforts of English Capuchins, including William Fitch's debates
Harley 6866	Account of the York House conference
Lansdowne 33, nos 17, 18	John Aylmer on Campion's *Rationes Decem*
Lansdowne 33, no. 61	Thomas Norton to Lord Burghley on the Campion debates

Lambeth Palace Library, London

402	Incomplete manuscript version of John Rainolds' *Summe of the Conference*

Printed Primary Works

HMC, *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections*, vol. 3 (London, 1904)

HMC, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury*, vol. 17 (London, 1938)

Abbot, Robert, *A Mirrour of Popish Subtilties* (London, 1594)

Alabaster, William, *Unpublished Works by William Alabaster (1568-1640)*, ed. Dana F. Sutton (Salzburg, 1997)

Allen, William, *A Briefe Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of XII Reverend Priests* (1582)

Anderson, Patrick, *The Ground of the Catholike and Roman Religion in the Word of God* (St Omer, 1623)

Anon, *The Declaracyon of the Procedynge of a Conference* (London, 1560)

Anon, *A Discourse of the Conference Holden Before the French King* (London, 1600)

Anon, *A Reply to D. White and D. Featly* (St Omer, 1625)

Anon, *Campian Englished* (1632)

Anon, *The Black Box of Roome* (London, 1641)

B., R., *An Answere to Mr Fishers Relation of a Third Conference* (London, 1624)

B., R., *The Life of Dr. Thomas Morton, Late Bishop of Duresme* (York, 1669)

Bacon, Francis, *Bacon's Essays: with Annotations*, 3rd edn, ed. Richard Whately (London, 1857)

Bagshaw, Christopher, *A True Relation of the Faction Begun at Wisbech* (London, 1601)

Barlow, William, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference* (London, 1605)

Barrow, Henry, *A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles* (Dort, 1590)

Barrow, Henry, *A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences* (Dort, 1590)

Barrow, Henry, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson (London, 1962)

Barrow, Henry, and John Greenwood, *The Writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow, 1591-1593*, ed. Leland H. Carlson (London, 1970)

Barwick, John, *A Summarie Account of the Holy Life and Happy Death of the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Late Lord Bishop of Dureseme* (London, 1660)

Bell, Thomas, *The Popes Funerall* (London, 1605)

C., A., *An Answer to a Pamphlet* (St Omer, 1623)

C., A., *True Relations of Sundry Conferences* (St Omer, 1626)

Campion, Edmund, *Ten Reasons*, ed. J. H. Pollen (London, 1914)

Carleton, Dudley, *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters*, ed. Maurice Lee, Jr. (Rahway NJ, 1972)

Chamberlain, John, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 volumes, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia, 1939)

Charke, William, *An Answere to a Seditious Pamphlet* (London, 1580)

Clarke, Samuel, *A Generall Martyrologie* (London, 1651)

Clarke, Samuel, *The Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines* (London, 1677)

Cosin, John, *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin*, 5 volumes, ed. J. Sansom (Oxford, 1843-55)

D., L., *A Defence of the Appendix* (St Omer,1624)

D., N., *A Relation of the Triall Made Before the King of France* (St Omer, 1604)

D., N., *A Review of Ten Publike Disputations* (St Omer, 1604)

Dent, Arthur, *The P[l]ain-Mans Path-way to Heaven* (London, 1654)

Du Moulin, Pierre, *A Conference Held at Paris* (London, 1615)

Du Perron, Jacques, *A Trew Discourse of the Order Observed* (1600)

E., S., *The Conference Mentioned By Doctour Featly in the End of His Sacrilege* (Douai, 1632)

Featley, Daniel, *The Fisher Catched in His Owne Net* (London, 1623)

Featley, Daniel, *The Romish Fisher Caught and Held in his Owne Net* (London, 1624)

Featley, Daniel, *An Appendix to the Fishers Net* (London, 1624)

Featley, Daniel, *Cygnea Cantio* (London, 1629)

Featley, Daniel, *The Grand Sacrilege of the Church of Rome* (London, 1630)

Featley, Daniel, *Transubstantiation Exploded* (London, 1638)

Featley, John, *Featlaei Paligenesia, or, Doctor Daniel Featley Revived* (London, 1660)

Fenton, Geoffrey, *Actes of Conference in Religion* (London, 1571)

Field, John, *The Three Last Dayes Conferences* (London, 1583)

Field, Nathaniel, *Some Short Memorials Concerning the Life of that Reverend Divine Doctor Richard Field* (London, 1716-7)

Fulke, William, *A True Reporte of a Conference had betwixt Doctour Fulke, and the Papists, Being at Wisbiche Castle* (London, 1581)

Fuller, Thomas, *Abel Redivivus: or the Dead Yet Speaking* (London, 1651)

Fuller, Thomas, *The History of the Worthies of England* (London, 1662)

Gataker, Thomas, *Saint Stevens Last Will and Testament* (London, 1638)

Gataker, Thomas, *An Answer to Mr George Walkers Vindication* (London, 1642)

Greenwood, John, *The Writings of John Greenwood, 1587-1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson (London, 1962)

Hanmer, Meredith, *The Great Bragge and Challenge of M. Champion a Jesuit* (London, 1581)

Heylyn, Peter, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1668)

Hooker, Richard, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker*, 3 volumes, ed. John Keble (Oxford, 1888)

Hooper, John, *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper: Together with His Letters and Other Pieces*, ed. Charles Nevinson (Cambridge, 1852)

Hoyle, Joshua, *A Rejoynder to Malone's Reply Concerning Reall Presence* (Dublin, 1641)

Isaacson, Henry, *An Exact Narration of the Life and Death of the Late Reverend and Learned Prelate, and Painfull Divine, Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1651)

Jacob, Henry, *A Christian and Modest Offer of a Most Indifferent Conference* (Middelburg, 1606)

Jewel, John, *The Works of John Jewel*, 4 volumes, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge, 1845-50)

Laud, William, *A Relation of the Conference* (London, 1639)

Laud, William, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud*, 7 volumes, ed. William Scott (Oxford, 1847-60)

Lechmere, John, *The Relection of a Conference Touching the Reall Presence* (Douai, 1635)

Leech, Humphrey, *A Triumph of Truth* (Douai, 1609)

Ley, John, *A Discourse of Disputations Chiefly Concerning Matters of Religion* (London, 1658)

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Tragicall History of the Horrible Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* (London, 1609)

Marten, Anthony, *Another Collection of Certeine Divine Matters and Doctrines of the Same M. D. Peter Martyr* (London, 1583)

Matthew, Tobie, *A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew*, ed. A. H. Mathew (London, 1904)

Melville, James, *The Autobiography and Diary of James Melville*, ed. Robert Pitcairn (Edinburgh, 1842)

Milton, Anthony and Alexandra Walsham, 'Richard Montagu: 'Concerning Recusancie of Communion with the Church of England', in Stephen Taylor (ed.), *From Cranmer to Davidson: a Church of England Miscellany* (Woodbridge, 1999), 69-101

Milton, John, *Complete Prose Works*, vol. 8, ed. Maurice Kelly (New Haven and London, 1982)

Montagu, Richard, *The Acts and Monuments of the Church before Christ Incarnate* (London, 1642)

More, Thomas, *The Complete Works of Thomas More*, vol. 6, part 1, ed. Thomas M. C. Lawler et al. (New Haven, 1981)

Morton, Thomas, *A Defence of the Innocencie of the three Ceremonies of the Church of England* (London, 1618)

Munday, Anthony, *A Discoverie of Edmund Campion* (London, 1581)

Munday, Anthony, *A Breefe Aunswer Made unto two Seditious Pamphlets* (London, 1582)

N., S., *A True Report of the Private Colloquy* (St Omer, 1624)

Nowell, Alexander and William Day, *A True Report of the Disputation or Rather Private Conference had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Jesuite* (London, 1583)

Paule, George, *The Life of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury in the Times of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I* (London, 1699)

Peel, A. (ed.), *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1915)

Perkins, William, *A Golden Chaine* (London, 1612)

Persons, Robert, *A Defence of the Censure* (Rouen, 1582)

Rainolds, John, *The Summe of the Conference betwene John Rainolds and John Hart* (London, 1584)

Rogers, Thomas, *The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion, Professed, & Protected in the Realme of England* (London, 1621)

Savage, Francis, *A Conference betwixt a Mother a Devout Recusant, and Her Sonne a Zealous Protestant* (Cambridge, 1600)

Sutcliffe, Matthew, *A Briefe Refutation of a Certaine Calumnious Relation* (London, 1600)

T., G., *An Epistle of the Persecution of Catholikes in Englande* (Douai, 1582)

Travers, Walter, *A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Discipline Ordayned of God to be Used in His Church* (Middelburg, 1588)

Vives, Juan Luis, *On Education: a Translation of the De Tradendis Disciplinis*, ed. F. Watson (Toronto, 1971)

Walker, George, *Fishers Folly Unfolded: or The Vaunting Jesuites Vanity* (London, 1624)

Walker, George, *The Summe of a Disputation* (London, 1624)

Walker, George, *A True Relation of the Chiefe Passages betweene Mr. Anthony Wotton, and Mr George Walker* (London, 1642)

Walsingham, Francis, *A Search Made into Matters of Religion* (St Omer, 1609)

Weston, Edward, *The Repaire of Honour* (St Omer, 1624)

White, Francis, *A Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere to Certain Questions* (London, 1624)

Williams, John, *Great Britains Salomon* (London, 1625)

Wotton, Anthony, *Mr Anthony Wotton's Defence against Mr George Walker's Charge* (Cambridge, 1641)

Secondary Works

Books

Anstruther, Godfrey, *The Seminary Priests*, 4 volumes (Ware, 1969-77)

Armstrong, B. G., *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison, 1969)

Armstrong, C. J. R., 'The Dialectical Road to Truth: the Dialogue', in Peter Sharratt (ed.), *French Renaissance Studies 1540-70: Humanism and the Encyclopedia* (Edinburgh, 1976), 36-51

Babbage, Stuart Barton, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London, 1962)

Bald, R. C., *John Donne: a Life* (Oxford, 1970)

Bauckham, Richard, *Tudor Apocalypse* (Oxford, 1978)

Buisseret, David, *Henry IV* (London, 1984)

Cardwell, Edward, *A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings* (Oxford, 1849)

Challoner, Richard, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests, as Well Secular as Regular*, 2 volumes (London, 1741-2)

Collinson, Patrick, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967)

Collinson, Patrick, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983)

Collinson, Patrick, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference', in Howard Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War: Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government* (London, 1983), 27-51

Collinson, Patrick, John Craig and Brett Usher (eds), *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church: Dedham and Bury St Edmunds 1582-1590* (Bury St Edmunds, 2003)

Colclough, David, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2005)

Como, David, 'Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-Century England', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), 64-87

Costello, William T., *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge Mass., 1958)

Cox, Virginia, *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo* (Cambridge, 1992)

Cromartie, Alan, 'King James and the Hampton Court Conference', in Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), 61-80

Curtis, Mark H., *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642* (Oxford, 1959)

Dillon, Anne, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535-1603* (Aldershot, 2002)

Dodd, Charles, *The Church History of England, from the Year 1500, to the Year 1688*, 3 volumes (London, 1737-42)

Dures, Alan, *English Catholicism 1558-1642: Continuity and Change* (Harlow, 1983)

Durston, Christopher, 'James I and Protestant Heresy', in Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), 123-34

Elsky, Martin, 'Reorganizing the Encyclopaedia: Vives and Ramus on Aristotle and the Scholastics', in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, 1999), 402-8

Feingold, Mordechai, 'The Humanities', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1997), 211-358

Fincham, Kenneth, 'Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1997), 179-210

Fincham, Kenneth, 'Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), 125-58

Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), 23-49

Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007)

Foley, Henry, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 7 volumes (London, 1877-83)

Ford, Alan, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford, 2007)

Frere, W. H., *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I* (London, 1904)

Gaffney, Declan, 'The Practice of Religious Controversy in Dublin, 1600-1641', in W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood (eds), *The Churches, Ireland and the Irish* (Oxford, 1989), 145-58

Gardiner, S. R. (ed.), *Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty* (1869), pp. 58-9.

Gardiner, S. R., *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*, 10 volumes (London, 1883-4, reprinted 1894-6)

Gee, Henry, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion* (Oxford, 1898)

Green, Ian, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530-1740* (Oxford, 1996)

Green, Lawrence D., *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Newark NJ, 1986)

Greenslade, S. L., 'The Faculty of Theology', in James McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1986), 295-334

Guy, John, 'The Rhetoric of Counsel in Early Modern England', in Dale Hoak (ed.), *Tudor Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1995), 292-310

Harrison, B. A., *A Tudor Journal: The Diary of a Priest in the Tower, 1580-1585* (London, 2000)

Hathaway, Baxter, *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy* (Ithica, NY, 1963)

Haugaard, William P., *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1970)

Holleran, James V., *A Jesuit Challenge: Edmund Campion's Debates at the Tower of London* (New York, 1999)

Howell, Wilbur Samuel, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (New York, 1961)

Hughes, Ann, 'The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England', in Anne Laurence, W. R. Owens and Stuart Sim (eds) *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88* (London, 1990), 31-50

Hughes, Ann, 'The Meanings of Religious Polemic', in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston Mass., 1993), 201-29

Hunt, Arnold, 'Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference', in Susan Wabuda and Caroline J. Litzenberger (eds), *Belief and Practice in Reformation England* (Ashgate, 1998), 207-228

Jones, Norman L., *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion 1559* (London, 1982)

Kirby, W. J. Torrance, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Boston Mass., 2007)

Knox, S. J., *Walter Travers: Paragon of Elizabethan Puritanism* (London, 1962)

Lake, Peter, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982)

Lake, Peter, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought* (London, 1988)

Lake, Peter, 'Anti-Popery: 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, 1989), 72-106

Lake, Peter, 'Defining Puritanism – Again?', in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston Mass., 1993), 3-29

Lake, Peter, 'Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660,* (Woodbridge, 2000), 179-210

Lake, Peter, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Manchester, 2001)

Lake, Peter, 'Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), 80-97

Lake, Peter, and Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', in Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007), 1-30

Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier, 'Prisons, Priests and People', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (London, 1997), 195-233

Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000)

Larkin, James F., and Paul L. Hughes (eds), *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1973)

Loach, Jennifer, 'Reformation Controversies', in James McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1986), 366-96

Loades, D. M., *The Oxford Martyrs* (London, 1970)

Mack, Peter, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge, 2002)

Marotti, Arthur F., *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame, 2005)

Marsh, Christopher W., *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630* (Cambridge, 1994)

Marsh, David, 'Dialogue and Discussion in the Renaissance', in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, 1999), 264-70

McConica, James 'Elizabethan Oxford: The Collegiate Society', in James McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1986), 683-732

McCoog, Thomas M., ''Playing the Champion': The Role of Disputation in the Jesuit Mission', in Thomas M. McCoog (ed.), *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits* (Oxford, 1996), 119-39

Merritt, J. F., 'The Pastoral Tightrope: a Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London', in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), 143-61

Milton, Anthony, 'The Church of England, Rome, and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), 187-210

Milton, Anthony, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995)

Milton, Anthony, 'A Qualified Intolerance: the Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism', in Arthur F. Marotti (ed.), *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999), 85-115

Milton, Anthony, ''Anglicanism' by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), 159-76

Milward, Peter, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1977)

Milward, Peter, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978)

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

Moss, Ann, 'Humanist Education', in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, 1999), 145-54

Nichols, John, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court*, vol. 1 (London, 1828)

Ollard, S. L., *Fasti Wyndesorienses: the Deans and Canons of Windsor* (Windsor, 1950)

Ong, Walter J. *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge Mass., 1958)

Patterson, W. B., *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997)

Peck, Linda Levy, 'Kingship, Counsel and Law in Early Stuart Britain', in J. G. A. Pocock (ed.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1993), 80-115

Pilarz, Scott, '"Campion Dead Bites With his Friends' Teeth": Representations of an Early Modern Catholic Martyr', in Christopher Highley and John N. King (eds), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), 216-34

Porter, H. C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958)

Powell, William S., *John Pory, 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill, 1977)

Prest, Wilfrid R., *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (London, 1972)

Quantin, Jean-Louis, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 2009)

Questier, Michael C., *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge, 1996)

Questier, Michael, ''Like Locusts Over all the World': Conversion, Indoctrination and the Society of Jesus in Late Elizabethan and Jacobean England', in Thomas M. McCoog (ed.), *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits* (Oxford, 1996), 265-84

Questier, Michael C. (ed.), *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead*, Camden 5th series, vol. 12 (London, 1998)

Questier, Michael, 'Conformity, Catholicism and the Law', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), 237-61

Questier, Michael C., *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 2006)

Questier, Michael C., *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics 1621-1625*, Camden 5th series, vol. 34 (Cambridge, 2009)

Reynolds, E. E., *Campion and Parsons: The Jesuit Mission of 1580-1* (London, 1980)

Rickard, Jane, 'The Word of God and the Word of the King: the Scriptural Exegeses of James VI and I and the King James Bible', in Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), 135-49

Sawyer, Edmund, *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I*, vol. 2 (London, 1725)

Sharratt, Peter, 'Peter Ramus and the Reform of the University: the Divorce of Philosophy and Eloquence?', in Peter Sharratt (ed.), *French Renaissance Studies 1540-70: Humanism and the Encyclopedia* (Edinburgh, 1976), 4-20

Simpson, Richard, *Edmund Campion: a Biography* (London, 1896)

Sommerville, Johann P., 'Papist Political Thought and the Controversy over the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', in Ethan Shagan (ed.), *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2005), 162-84

Story, G. M., and Helen Gardner (eds), *The Sonnets of William Alabaster* (Oxford, 1959)

Strype, John, *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Aylmer* (London, 1701)

Strype, John, *The Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Whitgift* (London, 1718)

Trim, D. J. B., 'Calvinist Internationalism and the Shaping of Jacobean Foreign Policy', in Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (London, 2007), 239-58

Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987)

Tyacke, Nicholas, *The Fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603-1640* (London, 1990)

Tyacke, Nicholas, 'Archbishop Laud', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), 51-70

Tyacke, Nicholas, 'Religious Controversy', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1997), 569-620

Tyacke, Nicholas, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700* (Manchester, 2001)

Usher, Brett, 'The Fortunes of English Puritanism: An Elizabethan Perspective', in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge, 2006), 98-112

Usher, Roland G., *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, 2 volumes (New York, 1910)

Venn, John, and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I, vol. 4 (Cambridge, 1927)

Vickers, Brian, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford, 1988)

Walsham, Alexandra, ''Yielding to the Extremity of the Time': Conformity, Orthodoxy and the Post-Reformation Catholic Community', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), 211-36

Walsham, Alexandra, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2006)

White, Peter, 'The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke, 1993), 211-30

Williams, Penry, 'Elizabethan Oxford: State, Church and University', in James McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1986), 397-440

Willson, David Harris, *King James VI and I* (London, 1956)

Wolfson, H. A., *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, vol. 1 (Cambridge Mass., 1934)

Wood, Anthony à, *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. 1 (London, 1721)

Wood, Anthony à, *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1796)

Zlatar, Antoinina Bevan, *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (Oxford, 2011)

Journal Articles

Bauckham, Richard, 'Science and Religion in the Writings of Dr. William Fulke', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 8 (1975), 17-31

Breen, Quirinus, 'John Calvin and the Rhetorical Tradition', *Church History*, 26 (1957), 3-21

Briggs, William Dinsmore, 'On Certain Incidents in Ben Jonson's Life', *Modern Philology* 11 (October, 1913), 279-88

Campbell, Ian W. S., 'Aristotelian Ancient Constitution and Anti-Aristotelian Sovereignty in Stuart Ireland', *The Historical Journal*, 53 (2010), 573-591.

Collinson, Patrick, 'Puritans, Men of Business and Elizabethan Parliaments', *Parliamentary History*, 7 (1988), 187-211.

Collinson, Patrick, 'Separation In and Out of the Church: The Consistency of Barrow and Greenwood', *The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society*, 5 (1994), 239-58

Colthorpe, Marion, 'Edmund Campion's Alleged Interview with Queen Elizabeth I in 1581', *Recusant History*, 17 (1985), 197-200

Curtis, Mark H., 'Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', *History* 46 (1961), 1-16

Cust, Richard, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 60-90

Donagan, Barbara, 'The York House Conference Revisited: Laymen, Calvinism and Arminianism', *Historical Research* 64 (1991), 313-330

Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *The Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), 169-207

Freeman, Thomas, 'The Power of Polemic: Catholic Responses to the Calendar in Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (2010), 475-95

Graves, M. A. R., 'Thomas Norton the Parliament Man: An Elizabethan M.P., 1559-1581', *The Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), 17-35

Hanson, Elizabeth, 'Torture and Truth in Renaissance England', *Representations* 34 (1991), 53-84

Houliston, Victor, 'The Fabrication of the Myth of Father Parsons', *Recusant History*, 22 (1994), 141-51

Hudson, Hoyt H., 'Jewel's Oration against Rhetoric: a Translation', *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 14 (1928), 374-92

Hughes, Ann, 'Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic', *History Today*, 41 (1991), 27-33

Jenkins, Gary W., 'Whoresome Knaves and Illustrious Subjects at the 1559 Westminster Disputation', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 75 (2006), 315-339

Lake, P. G., 'Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match', *The Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), 805-25

Lake, Peter, 'A Tale of Two Episcopal Surveys: The Strange Fates of Edmund Grindal and Cuthbert Mayne Revisited', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 18 (2008), 129-63

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

Marshall, Peter, 'John Calvin and the English Catholics, c. 1565-1640', *The Historical Journal*, 53 (2010), 849-70

McConica, James, 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford', *The English Historical Review*, 94 (1979), 291-317

McCoog, Thomas M., '"The Flower of Oxford": The Role of Edmund Campion in Early Recusant Polemics', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24 (1993), 899-913

McCutcheon, R. R., 'Heresy and Dialogue: The Humanist Approaches of Erasmus and More', *Viator*, 24 (1993), 357-84

McKim, Donald K., 'The Function of Ramism in William Perkins' Theology', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16 (1985), 503-17

Milton, Anthony, 'Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), 624-51

Pursell, Brennan C., 'The End of the Spanish Match', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), 699-726

Puterbaugh, Joseph, '"Your selfe be judge and answer your selfe": Formation of Protestant Identity in *A Conference betwixt a Mother a Devout Recusant and Her Sonne a Zealous Protestant*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 31 (2000), 419-31

Questier, Michael, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', *The Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), 311-29

Questier, Michael, 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s', *The Historical Journal*, 49 (2006), 53-78

Questier, Michael, 'Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England', *English Historical Review*, 123 (2008), 1132-1165

Quintrell, B. W., 'The Royal Hunt and the Puritans, 1604-1605', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1980), 41-58

Rose, Jacqueline, 'Kingship and Counsel in Early Modern England', *The Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), 47-71

Shriver, Frederick, 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), 48-71

Shuger, Debora, ‘St. Mary the Virgin and the Birth of the Public Sphere’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 72 (2009), 313-46

Vickers, Brian, ‘Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance’, *New Literary History*, 14 (1983), 497-537

Visser, Arnoud, ‘How Catholic was Augustine? Confessional Patristics and the Survival of Erasmus in the Counter-Reformation’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (2010) 86-106

Wadkins, Timothy H., ‘King James I Meets John Percy, S.J. (25 May, 1622): an Unpublished Manuscript from the Religious Controversies Surrounding the Countess of Buckingham’s Conversion’, *Recusant History*, 19 (1988), 146-54

Wadkins, Timothy H., ‘The Percy-“Fisher” Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622-1625’, *Church History*, 57 (1988), 153-69

Wormald, Jenny, ‘James VI and I: Two Kings or One?’, *History*, 68 (1983), 187-209

Online Resources

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (online edn, 2008): http://www.oxforddnb.com