

## Anti-Sabbatarian Scold

Thomas Rogers' Letter to Nicholas Bownd, April 29, 1598

By Chris Coldwell

Introduction  
Results of the Elizabethan Settlement (114)  
The Bownds and Richard Greenham (117)  
Nicholas Bownd (121)  
    The Ministry of Nicholas Bownd (122)  
    The Market Day of the Soul  
    The Works of Nicholas Bownd (123)  
    Conformity and Presbyterianism (125)  
    Bownd's Advocacy/Rejection of Presbyterianism (127)  
Thomas Rogers (129)  
    The Works of Thomas Rogers  
    Thomas Rogers, Proponent of Conformity (132)  
    Thomas Rogers and the Bury Exercise (134)  
Thomas Rogers versus Nicholas Bownd (136)  
    Assessing Rogers' Claims (139)  
    Whitgift's and Popham's Suppression  
Rogers' 1598 Letter to Bownd (141)  
    Time table of events (146)  
    Objections to the Propagandist Theory (148)  
    Nicholas Bownd Proves Rogers' Letter is Genuine (150)  
Conclusion  
Transcript: Thomas Rogers' Letter (152)  
Appendices  
    Appendix 1: Alexander Bownd (167)  
    Appendix 2: Will of Katherine Greenham  
    Appendix 3: Description of MS X.d.547 (168)  
    Appendix 4: Bownd's Answers to Rogers' Sermon (169)

### Introduction

The refinement of English Sabbatarianism in the latter decades of the sixteenth century produced one of the central features of Puritan piety, which would later be firmly ensconced in Presbyterian and Nonconformist doctrine via *The Westminster Standards* (1647), *The Savoy Declaration* (1658) and the *Baptist Confession of Faith* (1677).

WCF 21.7. As it is the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time<sup>1</sup> be set apart for the worship of God; so, in His Word,<sup>2</sup> by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men, in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven, for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him(k): which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week(l), which, in Scripture,<sup>3</sup> is called the Lord's Day (m), and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath (n).<sup>4</sup>

8. This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest, all the day, from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments,

---

THE AUTHOR: Chris Coldwell is general editor and publisher of *The Confessional Presbyterian* journal. Since 1987 he has published Presbyterian & Reformed books via the Naphtali Press imprint. In 1992 Mr. Coldwell began work on a new edition of Nicholas Bownd's *The True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1595/1606). During the effort to finally complete this work (forthcoming 2015, DV), he discovered and transcribed a 1598 letter from Thomas Rogers to Bownd which shed new light on Bownd's second edition of 1606 and on the first Sabbatarian controversy in English literature. This discovery and subsequent research led to the material presented here and in *Antiquary*.

1. The LBCF and Savoy, in addition to minor wording differences in both paragraphs, here insert "by God's appointment." Cf. The Westminster Confession of Faith (1646), The Savoy Declaration (1658), and The London Baptist Confession (1577), in *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation, Volume 4: 1600–1693*, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014) 259–260, 481, and 559.

2. The LBCF and Savoy read: "by His Word, in a positive...."

3. LBCF omits "in Scripture."

4. Scripture references: <sup>k</sup>Exod. 20:8, 10–11. Isa. 56:2, 4, 6–7. <sup>l</sup>Gen. 2:2–3. <sup>1</sup>Cor. 16:1–2. Acts 20:7. <sup>m</sup>Rev. 1:10. <sup>n</sup>Exod. 20:8, 10 with Matt. 5:17–18.

and recreations (o), but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of His worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy (p).<sup>5</sup>

Preaching, teaching, and the writings of late Elizabethan Puritans, particularly those of East Anglia<sup>6</sup> and “the intellectual center of English Puritanism,”<sup>7</sup> Cambridge University, were influential in the spread and acceptance of this Puritan conception of the Lord’s Day or Christian Sabbath. No work was more important in this regard than Nicholas Bownd’s *Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1595; enlarged ed. 1606), which also became the focus of the first Sabbatarian controversy in English literature. That controversy was fueled and championed mainly, if not solely, by the careerist conformist minister, Thomas Rogers. Though much has been written in the last forty years “by a small circle of scholars specializing in the study of the roots of puritanism and the sources of Sabbatarianism,”<sup>8</sup> revising and bringing a new look at the history of the Puritan movement, many of the circumstances, reasons, and events of this first Sabbatarian controversy remain murky. The full history, as has been said of the “history of conformity in Elizabethan Suffolk” itself, remains to be written.<sup>9</sup> However, the contents of a heretofore unnoticed copy of a 1598 letter written from Rogers to Bownd allow a few more pieces of the puzzle to be filled, while perhaps

introducing new questions at the same time. Before examining what Rogers wrote, a sketch of the times and of the letter’s author and recipient are needed.

### Results of the Elizabethan Settlement

The promising Reformation in England during the reign of the boy king Edward VI from 1547 to 1553 came to a horrifying halt under the Roman Catholic Queen Mary (1553–1558). After her bloody reign was ended, Mary’s half-sister Elizabeth came to the throne, and the national religion was established again as Protestant with the Acts of Supremacy of 1558 and of Uniformity in 1559—the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. “For the most part, the country adjusted itself to these successive ‘settlements’ with a resilience which historians have found remarkable.”<sup>10</sup> The state of affairs was quite mixed and tenuous, being bound up with Elizabeth’s political concerns in ruling a unified nation (the very viability of which was in question), the expectation that she would marry (protestant or papist?), her initial rejecting of the reforms under her brother and desiring the church of her father Henry VIII, and the press from Protestants for a yet more truly Reformed church than had been seen under Edward VI.<sup>11</sup>

There can be little doubt that when religion was altered in 1559, only a minority of the nation, clergy and laity, would have considered themselves to be protestants, or would have known what that meant. All the rest, insofar as they conformed to the new order of things, were not unfairly described as ‘cold statute protestants.’ The credibility gap between what people were supposed to believe and practise and where they actually found themselves, as religious persons, took years, in some parts of the country, decades, to bridge.<sup>12</sup>

The Elizabethan Settlement was “a compromise in the lively political sense that it was the outcome of manoeuvres in which both the queen and the protestants were forced to yield some ground.”<sup>13</sup> The settled religion would be but “halfly Reformed”; protestant, but retaining many of the superstitious ceremonies and hierarchical polity of the former religion which would be imposed due to Elizabeth’s unwavering insistence for absolute conformity to her uniformity: “obedience and order were the touchstones of Elizabeth I’s religious policy. She was famously uninterested in opening ‘windows into men’s souls.’ Obedience was all; men’s consciences were not to be meddled with.”<sup>14</sup> She desired no further reforms and viewed her settlement as the final word.<sup>15</sup>

5. The LBCF and Savoy add “the observation of the last day of the week being abolished.” Scripture references: °Exod. 20:8. Exod. 16:23, 25–26, 29–30. Exod. 31:15–17. °Isa. 58:13. Neh. 13:15–19, 21–22. ¶Isa. 58:13. Matt. 12:1–13.

6. East Anglia comprises the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire. Nearby Essex was the home of the Dedham conference, the records of which record the first debate over refinements in English Sabbatarianism. See *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church, 1582–1590*, edited by Patrick Collinson, John Craig, and Brett Usher (The Boydell Press, 2003).

7. Craig R. Thompson, *Universities in Tudor England* (The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1959; rpr. 1979) 23.

8. Edward Martin Allen, “Nicholas Bownde and the Context of Sunday Sabbatarianism.” Ph.D. Thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Theology, 2008, page 1.

9. John S. Craig, “The ‘Cambridge Boies’: Thomas Rogers and the ‘Brethern’ in Bury St Edmunds,” in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: a tribute to Patrick Collinson from his students* (Ashgate, 1998) 169.

10. Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (1967; repr. Trinity Press, 1971) 23.

11. *Ibid.*, 25–26, 29, 30, 35–36

12. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, xxiii–xxiv.

13. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 35.

14. John S. Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns, 1500–1610* (Ashgate, 2001) 26.

15. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 29–44.

This forced settlement resulted in a “curious concoction” of parties. On the one extreme, there were Roman Catholic recusants who refused to conform or go to the now protestant churches. A larger group conformed outwardly while harboring the old religion, hidden within the national majority that was content to change religion like the French fashion to suit their monarch. At the other extreme, there were the truly Reformed. These were “highly committed and fully informed protestants” who “stood out as so many sore thumbs, a minority group, often obnoxious to the majority, and identifiable to themselves as ‘the godly’”<sup>16</sup>—the Puritans, to use the originally pejorative smear given them by those who would persecute them.<sup>17</sup>

To accomplish the conformity craved by the queen, it was required,

of each bishop and archdeacon to conduct regular visitations that tested the degree to which parishes conformed to the Act of Uniformity. Articles were drawn up by ecclesiastical authorities seeking information from and about parish clergy and churchwardens concerning a variety of issues.... In theory, there were few areas of the life of the parish that escaped the probing of ecclesiastical authority, and the articles and injunctions passed down to the dioceses, cathedrals and colleges bear ample testimony to the vigorous effort made on the part of the Church to implement their policy of reformation.<sup>18</sup>

The true believers of Reformation principles sought a more godly and truly Reformed church and society. The main obstacle was the scarcity of preaching. The newly minted protestant clergy from the days of Henry VIII and bloody Mary were no longer Catholics only because the queen so declared. These were ‘dumb clergy’ who did not and could not preach, nor could “the second- and third-rate material which the early Elizabethan bishops were still obliged to ordain.”<sup>19</sup> It would take until the reign of Charles I before university graduates could normally supply and fill the parishes. Both conformist bishops and nonconformist Puritans knew the only hope of ensuring and establishing an enduring protestant church and nation was to fill the parishes with a competent preaching ministry.

Addressing an audience of Norfolk gentlemen, justices of the peace gathered for the quarter sessions, John More, the ‘Apostle of Norwich,’ harangued them:<sup>20</sup> ‘If ye will be saved, get you preachers into your parishes, ... bestow your purses to maintain them. We shall begin

to be riche in the Lord Jesus’... the Elizabethan MP Job Throkmorton told the house of commons that if he were to be asked what was the ‘bane’ of the Church and Commonwealth, he would answer ‘the dombe ministerye, the dombe ministerye, yea, yf I were asked a thowsande times, I must say, the dombe ministerye.’<sup>21</sup>

The ignorant clergy required ‘post-graduate’ studies to train them for pulpit ministries, and meantime the people would benefit from more preaching by some means. The English Reformers were familiar with the “prophesyings” of the Reformed churches in Europe. John Hooper had no doubt found the practice when in Zürich,<sup>22</sup> and later the Marian exiles had seen prophesyings while on the continent.<sup>23</sup> At root these were meetings of the clergy for instruction and conference while affording an opportunity for parishioners to hear sermons as well. These began to spring up early in Elizabeth’s reign and reached a peak in the 1570s. However, the queen viewed preaching with alarm and saw these prophesyings as unnecessary and a threat. A few preachers per shire were sufficient—Elizabeth preferred a ministry that was simply able to read the Scriptures and homilies to the people. When events came to a head in 1576, she ordered the suppression of the prophesyings and Archbishop Grindal essentially lost his position for refusing to do so. The godly ministers and preachers mourned the suppression, but it seems more than likely that the meetings continued in secret, and many

16. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, xxi, xxiii–xxiv.

17. The general usefulness of the term Puritan and Puritanism to classify those participating in the early days of the movement to continue the reformation of the Church of England is assumed in this article. For disagreement with the helpfulness of the terms see *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, volume 1, ed. Francis J. Bremer (New York: ABC-CLIO, 2006) xiii; Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sanicroft: Essays on English Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Continuum International Pub. Group, 2007) 101–128; Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson, *Practical Divinity: The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Ashgate: 1998) 121–126; John H. Primus, *Richard Greenham: the portrait of an Elizabethan pastor* (Mercer University Press, 1998) 6. Primus notes the historian’s concern about anachronism and lack of precision, but concedes early ‘godly’ such as Richard Greenham may be generally called Puritan (*ibid.*, 6; cf. Allen, 38–39). The same may be more securely said of Nicholas Bownd.

18. Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics*, 25–26.

19. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, xxvii–xxviii.

20. John More, *Three Godly and Fruitful Sermons* (Cambridge, 1595), 66–69. This was published under Bownd’s oversight. He had married More’s widow and become his ‘literary executor.’

21. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, xxvii.

22. *Ibid.*, xxviii–xxix.

23. On these exercises known as “prophesying,” see Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 168–207.

simply morphed into public exercises countenanced by the local bishop. These exercises were the combination lectures, held several times a month or weekly in places such as market towns like Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, in which Nicholas Bownd and Thomas Rogers participated in the 1580s. This particular lecture gathered on Mondays and was well attended. It seems to have been a popular event, and it may have been the success of the lecture that led to the founding of perhaps the first parochial library in England in about late August of 1595, housed at St. James in Bury St. Edmunds.<sup>24</sup>

The general form of these exercises was a public sermon attended by area preachers and parishioners, followed by a conference of the ministers, after which the clergymen went to dinner.<sup>25</sup> The Bury St. Edmunds lecture “was an exercise in biblical exegesis and expository preaching.”<sup>26</sup> Collinson describes the ministers of Suffolk of the period who gathered for this weekly lecture.

The Suffolk clergy were indeed a remarkable society, one of the first groups of English clergy to have realized the reformed ideal of the pastoral ministry, and to have achieved it in concert, as “brethren and fellow ministers,” “the reverend, wise and godly learned fathers and brethren.”<sup>27</sup> Most of the first generation had been contemporaries at Cambridge, no less than thirty at St Johns, where [John] Knewstub was twice a candidate for the mastership.... They were inveterate attenders of one another’s sermons, especially at the administrative centre of Bury St Edmunds, with

its regular Monday combination lecture and its ‘then famous school,’ from which Knewstub sent the young Richard Sibbes to Cambridge.... Many of them were comfortably off and died possessed of silver and pewter, four-poster beds and feather bedding, and sizeable libraries. They bred large families.... Many wrote books, in which there is sometimes evidence of familiarity with recent theological literature from the Continent, as well as with the Tremellius Bible, the most scholarly of the Reformation versions.<sup>28</sup>

With the passing of moderate influences of such men as Grindal, the hierarchy’s power shifted to those “who were glad to adopt as their own the queen’s view that the status quo must be strictly and equally maintained against both papists and puritans.”<sup>29</sup> There had been less ambitious and more restricted attempts to force conformity, but with the ascendancy of John Whitgift there was a full assault on all nonconformity within his purview. The narrow and academically minded archbishop, focusing solely on serving his queen’s goals, was oblivious to the damage he could do to the churches by depriving them of their ministers. There was no right of conscience; only obedience to an Erastian settlement bent on total conformity to the monarch’s will. His move ultimately proved a near disaster for his party.<sup>30</sup>

In 1583 John Whitgift was made archbishop of Canterbury, and Whitgift was a hammer of puritans who set out to deal with the problem once and for all. Yet, troubled as they were with demands to subscribe to Whitgift’s code of conformity, the three articles (the royal supremacy, the articles of religion, the prayer book), and with frequent summonses to the courts, very few of our ministers can be said to have been martyrs to Episcopal tyranny, and most remained more or less immune in their ministries. The loose and untidy textures of the Elizabethan church and society ... saw to that.<sup>31</sup>

As untidy as the process was, Whitgift’s “first round”<sup>32</sup> against the Puritan ministers was not so quickly over as not to cause hardship. The seeming brief subscription required by Whitgift was tailored to weed out all nonconformists.

The rub lay in the second article. Nonconformist ministers could accept the royal supremacy, and those articles of religion which related to faith and sacraments, and not to other matters such as the consecration of bishops.... But to assent to the ordering of bishops, priests and deacons, and to the legality of the Prayer Book, was

24. Craig, 116–121. See the list of books from the 1599 inventory in Appendix III, 205–212.

25. The ministers attending the Bury St. Edmunds Monday lecture dined at Michel’s. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, 169.

26. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvii.

27. Collinson is citing Bownd’s dedicatory epistles in *Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1595), and *Holy Exercise of Fasting* (1604).

28. Patrick Collinson, *Godly People* (The Hambledon Press, 1983) 451–452. Bownd cites Tremellius 27 times in his Sabbath books.

29. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 201.

30. “His [Whitgift’s] subscription formula was the product of a tidy, schoolmasterly mind which could tolerate no deviation from a rigidly conceived standard of clerical obedience. For the sake of what was surely an unattainable degree of uniformity, he made it more difficult to deal effectively with the hard core of extremists and placed his own Episcopal order in grave danger. In the long run, the Whitgiftian policy, continued in their generations by Bancroft and the Laudians, was as much responsible as any Puritan excess for destroying the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and its fully national character.” Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 246–247.

31. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, xxv.

32. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, “The First Round,” 249–262.

unacceptable both to Presbyterians and more moderate nonconformists. Professor Collinson has provided a thorough account of the subscription crisis of 1583–84, and here all we need note is that after pressure from privy councilors and other influential laymen, Whitgift was forced to accept either subscription to a modified version of the second article or a protestation glossing the minister's consent to the article. Though some were deprived or suspended, and others coerced into submission while still regarding the Prayer Book as unlawful, the majority were not dragooned into conformity.<sup>33</sup>

Whitgift delivered his demand for conformity October 29, 1583, and began culling the various counties of those unable to subscribe for conscience' sake —upward of four hundred ministers.<sup>34</sup> On December 28, 1583, the subscription was ordered in Norwich diocese. "The ministers of Norfolk and Suffolk conferred separately and each sent to Bishop Freke their own schedules of those doubtful points which restrained them from subscribing."<sup>35</sup> The objections of sixty-four of the Suffolk ministers are recorded in an MS collection in the Williams' Library.<sup>36</sup> Among the signers were both Nicholas Bownd and Thomas Rogers. However, of the two only Rogers appears on the list of sixty names actually suspended on January 22–23, 1583/84. This brings us to a detailing as far as possible of the lives of the two men of interest: Nicholas Bownd and Thomas Rogers.

### The Bownds and Richard Greenham

Nicholas Bownd (c.1552–1613) was the son of Dr. Robert Bownd and his wife Katherine.<sup>37</sup> The elder Bownd may

be the Robert Bownd recorded to have been a fellow at Corpus Christi, Oxford, leaving in 1551 to practice medicine.<sup>38</sup> Dr. Bownd<sup>39</sup> was physician to the fourth Duke of Norfolk, Thomas Howard.<sup>40</sup> While the Howards generally remained Roman Catholic, the duke apparently was ambivalent. Raised in and professing the Reformed religion during Edward's reign, he was later caught up in Roman Catholic plots which finally resulted in his execution for treason.<sup>41</sup> The martyrologist John Foxe (1516/17–1587) was Howard's tutor during the imprisonment of his father (the third Duke of Norfolk), and also a friend. After the Marian Exile Foxe lived for ten years in the duke's London house. Edward Dering served at one point as Howard's chaplain (c.1540–1576). Both these men were strong nonconformists, and it is certainly possible that Dr. Bownd was of similar metal. Whatever were the doctor's religious convictions, the elder Bownd's wife and children would go on to be associated with some of the leading "godly" (or Puritan) advocates of the Elizabethan church.<sup>42</sup> The Bownd children were Alexander (c.1548–1622),<sup>43</sup> Ann

Katherine may have been some years younger than Robert. Assuming she married in her mid twenties and that Alexander born in 1648 was her oldest, she may have been born as early as the early 1620s. However she could have been older if older children had died at early ages for which we have no record or younger if she was a second wife. The latter case raises the possibility at least that some of the Bownd children were her step-children ("widowers not infrequently married younger women; Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640*, {Cambridge University Press, 1987; paperback 1990, rpr. 1994} 140).

39. "On a square piece of black touch in the Wall. 'Here lyeth Richard Bound, Doctor of Physicke, the sonne of Robert Bound, Doctor and Physician to the late Duke of Norfolk. He departed this life at the age of 46, & left behind his elder brothers Alexander and Nicholas, Doctors in Divinity, Aug 8, 1603.'" *The Topographer, containing a variety of original articles, illustrative of the local history and antiquities of this kingdom*, Numb. XXIV For March, 1791. Being Number III. of Vol. IV. "Short Account of Louth, in Lincolnshire," page 164. Cf. Allen, 2–3. Thompson Cooper lists the *Topographer* as one of his sources and that may be the only source for Robert Bownd's profession which fuels the speculation he may be the same man noted in the *Alumni Oxonienses. Dictionary Of National Biography* vol. IV (1886) 75.

40. Howard was the Queen's second cousin and by 1568 was the richest man in England.

41. "Norfolk ... was not Catholic." Cyril Hamshere, "The Ridolfi Plot, 1751," *History Today* 26, 1 (1976) 32–39. "His sympathy seemed to be always with the Catholic party, but his policy was two-faced, and he was a professed adherent of the Reformed religion. Circumstances made it expedient for him always to temporize. He seems to have been led on by the course of events and not to have realized the result of his actions." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 15 vols. (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911) 11.102.

42. Allen, 2–3.

43. The birth years of the Bownd lads, which are unknown, are

33. Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, C. 1560–1660* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000)

31. Cf. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 243–272.

34. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 253.

35. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 252.

36. Some of this collection was published, including a list of Suffolk ministers resolved not to subscribe along with their reasons, and a list of those subsequently suspended. Cf. Albert Peel, *The Seconde parte of a register: being a calendar of manuscripts under that title intended for publication by the Puritans about 1593, and now in Dr. Williams's Library, London*. 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1915) 1.242–243.

37. The name is variously spelled Bownde, Bownd and Bound (and Bond(e) in some records). Herein Bownd is used.

38. "Bonde, Robert (Bownde, Bowne or Bundeus), fellow Corpus Christi Coll. 1537, from Dorset. B.A. 15 Feb., 1538–39, M.A. 20 June, 1543, sup[licated] 1551 for leave to practice medicine." *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1891) 147. Assuming Robert was about twenty years old when he became fellow, that places his birth about the year 1517.

(1550/54?–after 1612), Nicholas (c.1552–1613), Thomas (c.1556–1586), and Richard (c.1557–1603).<sup>44</sup> Alexander (who we know attended grammar school at Eton),<sup>45</sup> and Nicholas both went to Cambridge (King’s and Peterhouse respectively) and entered the ministry. Thomas died in 1586 at Cambridge; he had proceeded B.D. that year.<sup>46</sup> Richard, who was expelled for some reason from Peterhouse College, would become a physician like his father.<sup>47</sup> Ann, the only daughter, married John

estimates based upon their matriculation dates, for which there are records in the *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. According to Lawson and Silver, educational practice at the time was for children to attend a ‘petty school’ until age seven or eight and the best ‘witted’ would be prepared to go on to university at age fourteen or fifteen (John Lawson and Harold Silver, *A Social History of Education in England* [1973; 2013] 112). Others put the age of matriculation at Cambridge at sixteen and that seems to have been the general case with the Bownds.

44. We know Richard’s birth year a bit more precisely due to the previously noted memorial inscription his two surviving brother’s had made for his resting place. He may have died of the plague since there was a severe outbreak through most of 1603. In giving background for Bownd’s *Holy Exercise of Fasting* (1604) and *Medicine for the Plague* (1604), the latter preached during that outbreak, Allen notes that over 3,600 people died in London during the first weeks of August 4 and August 11 (Allen, 135).

45. I have not found any record of where the others attended grammar school. It may be financial circumstances changed or perhaps due to their father’s death, the younger sons could not be boarded at Eton. Or perhaps it was a privilege only afforded the eldest. Or since Thomas Howard lived most of the time in London, and it may be the Bownds lived there for a time (Eton would have been more accessible to them). However, the entry for Alexander in *Alumni Cantabrigienses* notes he was born in (1548) and from Cambridgeshire (1564). It may be Dr. Bownd was only on call to serve the duke while back in Norfolk or travelled as need required. While at Eton Alexander was one of those contributing to “Verses Addressed to the Queen at Windsor by Eton Scholars, 19 September 1563.” See Appendix 1.

46. Thomas Bownd was buried at Saint Bene’t’s, Cambridge, October 10, 1586. Elisabeth Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book-Lists from Vice-Chancellor’s Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), Thomas Bound, 1.363–364.

47. He was admitted to Queens’ College in 1587 and was fellow until leaving in 1594. “Matric. sizar from PETERHOUSE, Easter, 1575. Of Cambridgeshire. S. of Robert, M.D. (perhaps fellow of Corpus Christi, Oxford). B. c. 1557. B.A. 1577–8; M.A. 1581. Fellow, 1581 (expelled, 1586). Fellow of Queens’, 1587–94. Afterwards M.D. Died Aug. 8, 1603. Buried at Louth. M[onument] I[nscription] there.” *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, volume 1 (1922) 186. Bownd’s friend Humphrey Tindall, to whom he dedicates book two of *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1606), may have helped get Richard into Queens’ following his being expelled. Also, Tindall may have aided Bownd’s son Nathaniel some way who was admitted into Queens’ in 1605. Bownd thanks Tindall for some unspecified help in the dedication. Allen, 22–23.

48. “Johes. Dod & Anna Lewes 3 Aug 1585.” *Cambridgeshire Parish Registers. Marriages III* (London: Phillimore and Co., 1909) 70. This would appear to be the marriage in question given the date. It appears Ann was married previously to a Mr. Lewes, for which no

“Decalogue” Dodd (1649–1645), and moved to Hanwell, Oxfordshire, where her husband took up the ministry.<sup>48</sup> Dodd along with Robert Cleaver would author an oft reprinted and influential Puritan work on the ten commandments.<sup>49</sup>

In 1573 after Robert Bownd’s death, the facts and date of which are unknown,<sup>50</sup> Katherine married Richard Greenham (1535<sup>51</sup>/1543–1594), rector of Dry Drayton, only six miles away from Cambridge.<sup>52</sup> She had likely moved to the area to be near and to have the aid of family after her husband’s death.<sup>53</sup> Her sister Sibill was married to James Hutton, whose brother John had arranged for Greenham to take up the ministry at Dry Drayton, November 27, 1570. The Huttons had been granted the “dissolved Crowland Abbey’s manor and advowson” in 1543 by Henry VIII.<sup>54</sup> The then current master of

record was found. The average age for marriage was from the mid to late twenties (Ingram, *Marriage in England, 1570–1640*, p. 129). Given the spacing of the children and the lack of any progeny for the following decade, Ann (while she might have been oldest) may have been born between Alexander and Nicholas or between Nicholas and Thomas. This would put her age in 1585 at between 31 and 35, and a prior marriage possibly between 1574 and 1584. There is a Dry Drayton marriage for July 13, 1579 of a Henricus Lewes with no bride’s name given, but I have not found a death notice for Lewes. *Cambridgeshire Parish Registers. Marriages III*, 70. Ann was noted to be a very godly woman. The Dods had twelve children. John Dod’s second wife was a Mrs. Cleiton of Stratford-Bow. *Memorials of John Dod* (Oxford: 1875) 8.

49. *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Tenne Commandements* (1603; many editions).

50. There was a national outbreak of plague in 1563 which may have claimed his life given his profession. This may explain why the other Bownd boys did not attend Eton. On the other hand, it seems unlikely Katherine would have remained unmarried for a decade with young children and his death probably occurred closer in time to her remarriage to Greenham. Brian Williams, “Plague in England national epidemics 1348–1665,” <http://urbanrim.org.uk/plague%20list.htm> (accessed July 7, 2014).

51. Primus disputes the earlier questionable date noted in DNB, and Greenham’s matriculation in 1559, usually at age 16, suggests 1543 for the year of his birth. As already noted, unless she was a young second wife to Dr. Bownd, this puts Katherine at least fifteen to twenty years Greenham’s senior. It was not unusual for men to marry older women, particularly if they had property (Ingram, *Marriage in England, 1570–1640*, p. 140). As noted, there were other considerations as well.

52. “Richardus Grenehm., clericus, & Katherina Bonde [no day] Aug. 1573.” *Cambridgeshire Parish Registers. Marriages III*, 70.

53. Parker, *Practical Divinity*, 14–15.

54. “Perhaps from its foundation, Crowland abbey possessed an estate at Dry Drayton, assessed in 1086 at 7½ hides, which remained a demesne manor of the abbey until its surrender in 1539. In 1543 CROWLANDS manor was sold by the Crown to Thomas Hutton, who already possessed a substantial estate in the parish, besides being lessee of the abbey demesne since 1539. He died in 1552. His son and heir John Hutton (d. s.p. 1596) devised all his lands to his wife Elizabeth.

Pembroke, Matthew Hutton, perhaps a relative, may have helped arrange Greenham's placement. The marriage may have been one of domestic convenience, since Greenham believed celibacy to be the "higher calling."<sup>55</sup> It also proved politically or practically advantageous, as the connection aided the nonconformist preacher when conformist demands came calling. Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely had required in 1571 that all the clergy take an oath to support the Thirty-Nine Articles, Book of Common prayer, and the wearing of vestments (the surplice and cap). Perhaps through Hutton's intervention Greenham was left in peace for a couple of years, but in 1573 he was called out for nonconformity.

At that time Greenham wrote a letter to Cox, well crafted throughout with equivocating language aimed to placate the bishop. He made it clear he could not comply in good conscience; but neither was he willing to dispute and explain why; but he was not one to make trouble over the terms to which he could not conform.<sup>56</sup> Greenham, playing the sycophant, claimed he was simply a country preacher and was loath to argue or "match wits" with one of "such authority" as the bishop.<sup>57</sup> He begged to be left alone to preach the gospel. While these clearly were not indifferent matters to him, Greenham did share a guiding principle taught by Edmund Grindal (then archbishop, but who was master of Pembroke Hall when Greenham enrolled in 1559), who, through the earlier influence of Bucer, was vehement in denouncing contentions over supposed 'adiaphora' when it harmed the unity and peace of the church.<sup>58</sup> However, while Greenham comes across ambivalent on issues about which contemporaries made much more and obvious noise, such as the reform of church polity and *jus divinum* Presbyterianism, he was no conformist; rather he may be called a "conforming nonconformist."<sup>59</sup>

Greenham defended Cartwright and was a part of the Cambridge classis which at least points toward some inclinations favoring Presbyterianism, though he subsequently pressed peace over contentions about ecclesiology.<sup>60</sup> Neal does name him among nearly 50 names and above 500 others who subscribed to the "Book of Discipline" circa 1586. However, Neal gives no source and may have been over-extrapolating based upon associations. Though he does not dispute the named individuals, Collinson writes that there is no source prior to Neal that substantiates that number 500.<sup>61</sup> However, in another work defending his history, Neal cites Dudley Fenner who wrote that a third of the ministers of the time were covered with a cloud of suspension.<sup>62</sup>

Other than Neal's allegation, Greenham, much as

with his reticence for publicly commenting on objectionable ceremonies, left no clues as to his precise views toward Presbyterianism. He certainly never affirmed Episcopacy to be scriptural as some who repented of their Presbyterianism did (e.g. George Downame). As with the illicit ceremonies, Greenham seems to have resolved to be noncommittal for the sake of the gospel.<sup>63</sup> Reforming church government paled in comparison to the need of the country for the gospel and he would labor in the latter. He counseled, "Many meddle and stirre much about a new Church government, which are sensles and barren in the doctrine of new birth: but alas, what though a man know many things, and yet know not himselfe to be a new creature in Jesus Christ?"<sup>64</sup> Greenham struggled to balance nonconformity to unbiblical ceremonies with the primacy of the preaching of the gospel and unity of the church, and

She married successively in 1597 Sir William Hinde (d. s.p. 1606) of Madingley, with whom she obtained in 1603 a release of Dry Drayton from John Hutton's nephew and heir male Roger Hutton, and in 1609 Sir Arthur Capell (d. 1632) of Little Hadham (Herts.). When she died without issue in 1626, it passed to her brother Robert Lawrence of Brockdish (Norf.). Robert died in 1637 and his eldest son and heir William without issue in 1649, leaving Dry Drayton to his younger brother Aslack Lawrence." "Dry Drayton: Manors," *A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 9: Chesterton, Northstowe, and Papworth Hundreds* (1989) 74–77. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=15331> Date accessed: 16 June 2014.

55. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 24, 47; Parker, *Practical Divinity*, 14–15.

56. "Hee never was hard to deny the use of the ceremonies yet hee used them not Hee wished that such as would refuse them would labour for sound judgement to comfort ther own consciences to assure the church, to leave the world without excuse because that men should not go after the common cours of the world but against many learned men." *Practical Divinity*, 247.

57. Primus describes Greenham's manner here as "blatant toadyism," whereas Parker simply calls it disingenuous. *Practical Divinity*, 16. *Richard Greenham*, 60. These are overly harsh without qualification. Greenham clearly was willing to debase himself to preserve both his conscience and his ministry, and Cox surely was not fooled by the flattery and self deprecation. Greenham already had some reputation by this point. The bishop seems to have accepted the sycophantically couched refusal to conform because Greenham was not going to be a trouble maker, and could be useful to him.

58. *Practical Divinity*, 15–19; Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 56–61.

59. "Conforming nonconformist" is Primus' term.

60. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 67.

61. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 318–319.

62. Neal, *A Review of the Principal facts objected to the first volume of The History of the Puritans* (1734) 45; Dudley Fenner, *A Defence of the Godlie Ministers against the slaunders of D. Bridges* (1587) 48.

63. Greenham has left his privately expressed thoughts on some of the ceremonies (such as his comments against the use of the sign of the cross in baptism) in his table talk. *Practical Divinity*, 227.

64. *Richard Greenham*, 66, 67.

warned “against preoccupation with future hopes at the expense of” present realities. “It is often the policie of Sathan to make us travell in some good thing to come, when more fityly wee might be occupied in good things present.”<sup>65</sup> That he expressed no clear view on church polity does not mean he rejected the Presbyterian views of Cartwright et al, or at least wouldn’t have favored a more Presbyterian system over the persecuting prelacy of his day. And that Greenham includes discipline under those things commanded under the second commandment may point away from Episcopacy as well.<sup>66</sup>

This attitude certainly seems to have worked in Greenham’s case, as Bishop Cox was appeased, seeing in Greenham a shared concern that the incompetently

manned and vacant pulpits of the country be filled so that the people would be taught the gospel and any possibility avoided of a return to Catholicism (an overriding concern of the hierarchy throughout Elizabeth’s reign into the 1590s). Cox actually called upon Greenham to aid in turning Catholic recusants and those caught up in the sect Family of Love (or Familists). The pastor of Dry Drayton also set up a seminary of sorts at the rectory, a “happy nourcery’ for the church,” to use his words.<sup>67</sup> Those that passed through his influence included Henry Smith, who would become the “Chrysoſtom of England” for his preaching, Arthur Hildersham, who wrote down and preserved the ‘tabletalk’ of Greenham, and Robert Brown, the sometime separatist for whom that movement is named.<sup>68</sup>

Greenham’s reputation was firmly grounded when Whitgift intensely pushed the subscription issue again in 1583. His patron John Hutton wrote asking the archbishop for exception for some ministers to the imposed conformity, but Greenham’s name never came up. He was indeed left alone to labor for 21 years in Dry Drayton before ministering in London at Christ Church from 1591–1594.<sup>69</sup> He died approximately April 23, and was buried April 25, 1594 at Christ Church, London.<sup>70</sup>

Katherine remarried at least a third time to a Mr. Woode and outlived him and found herself in 1611 as she says in her will, to be of sound mind but poor health. She remained in or returned to Dry Drayton and died in April 1612. Her will was probated May 20, 1612. She does not mention either Alexander or Nicholas,<sup>71</sup> but bequeathed her house and lands which she held by copy from the wife of John Hutton, to her daughter Ann Dodd<sup>72</sup> (still living in 1611; husband John Dodd appears to have been named executor), and directs if there remained an unpaid debt of £3 which her husband, whom she only calls Wood, may have assumed from her “former husband Mr. Richard Greenham” that it be paid by the executor. She left £140 dispersed to various persons, including £10 each to six of John and Ann’s children.<sup>73</sup> Katherine did not die wealthy but she was certainly living comfortably at the time of her death.<sup>74</sup>

*Re-enactors* (Popinjay Press, 2008) 11–12. Katherine’s £140 would be about £15,680 or \$27,000 in 1998 currency (cf. <http://www.johnowen-smith.co.uk/histdate/moneyval.htm>). Land and copyhold are difficult or impossible to evaluate in most cases, but that £140 compared to the business class and the trades indicate she was by no means wealthy; but was far from poverty at the end of her life; indeed she left some money for the poor. She would probably have had some income from any land if of any size, as well as what she had inherited from her three marriages. “The provincial inventories reveal that most estates were below £500 and mainly below £100, though with some upward movement during the century. They included some merchants, but

65. *Practical Divinity*, 230.

66. “What is ſpecially commanded [in the second commandment]? I muſt use ſuch doctrine, praiers, ſacraments, and diſcipline of the Church, as be agreeable to Gods worde in the ſubſtance.” “A Short Forme of Catechiſing,” in *Works* (1599) 383. Episcopacy by divine right would not be argued until fourteen years after Greenham’s death.

67. “It was common for puritan clergy in the Elizabethan church to aſſiſt in the training of divinity ſtudents. With Cambridge ſo near by, and given Greenham’s exceptional abilities, it is not ſurpriſing that ſtudents ſought him out and came to reſide in Dry Drayton for a time of internſhip.” *Richard Greenham*, 42. “That we know ſo much of his [Greenham’s] pariſh miniſtry is due almoſt entirely to the houſehold ſeminary which ſprouted in Dry Drayton. It was the firſt of its kind and a truly ſignificant innovation in clerical education, filling a crucial gap: the abſence of any *practical* training for the miniſtry.” *Practical Divinity*, 21.

68. *Richard Greenham*, 42, 43. *Practical Divinity*, 21.

69. Neal referencing Peirce’s *Vindication Of The Diſſenters* (1717, p. 97) ſays that Greenham was ſuſpended about 1576 (*Hiſtory of the Puritans* [1837; rpr. 1979], 1.229). However, Peirce only ſays that Greenham reſuſe to ſubſcribe, clearly referencing the correſpondence with Biſhop Cox, indicating an error in date, and that this is in reference to the troubles of 1573.

70. *Practical Divinity*, 28.

71. While Alexander and Nicholas probably were in no need of any inheritance at this point, this may alſo be becauſe they probably had inheritance from their father and Ann may have not, or ſtood in greater need given her ſizable family and the greater degree of perſecution which John Dodd was facing (he was ſuſpended from his office in 1604; *Puritans and Puritanism*, 76). In addition, as noted earlier, that they could have been ſtep-ſons may have been a factor.

72. I have not diſcovered how the right of tenancy was diſpoſed, whether before, at or after Ann’s death. There is a large gap of the manorial records from before 1612 until 1633.

73. The text of the will is preſerved in MS records. See Appendix 2 for a tranſcript. Cf. The National Archives; Kew, England; *Prerogative Court of Canterbury and Related Probate Jurisdiſtions: Will Regiſters*; Class: PROB 11; Piece: 119. Cf. Anceſtry.com. *England & Wales, Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1384–1858* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA.

74. A houſehold ſervant in Elizabethan times made between £2 and £5 annually. Maggie Secara, *A Compendium of Common Knowledge, 1558–1603: Elizabethan Commonplaces for Writers, Actors &*

## Nicholas Bownd

Nicholas Bownd was born about 1551 or 1552. Thus he would have been a babe in arms or young toddler when Edward VI died (July 6, 1553), and would have spent his childhood years under the reign of bloody Queen Mary. Nothing is known about the family life of the Bownds, nor when exactly Dr. Bownd came into service of the Howards.<sup>75</sup> Nicholas would have attended a petty school and then grammar school, but not apparently Eton like his older brother Alexander. He enrolled in Peterhouse College, Cambridge in 1568 for the autumn term. Unlike Alexander (1564), he entered as sizar, as would Thomas (1572) and Richard (1575). This may indicate that just four years later in 1568 the family was less affluent.<sup>76</sup> His first year he would have studied rhetoric, the next two years, logic, and then philosophy,<sup>77</sup> before taking his B.A. "early in 1572, and that year became a fellow."<sup>78</sup> Nicholas apparently became unwell to the point he stayed out of Cambridge for the 1574–75 term.<sup>79</sup> He likely spent that year in Dry Drayton and may have partaken of Greenham's rectory seminary (Henry Smith would have been there the same time period).<sup>80</sup> Returning to school, Nicholas completed his studies and

took his M.A. degree in 1575, gaining "further study in logic, rhetoric, and natural and moral philosophy as well as studying metaphysics, history, geometry, astronomy, Hebrew, and Greek."<sup>81</sup> He may have resigned as a fellow of Peterhouse by the time he received his ordination as priest at Ely in 1580, and almost certainly by the time he had married.<sup>82</sup> He obtained his D.D. degree in 1594.

After his ordination in 1580 and by 1581, Nicholas Bownd moved to Norton and was likely a pastor apprentice, succeeding William Rushbroke at his death.<sup>83</sup> His first wife, whom he married before 1582, was named Priscilla, and their children were Hannah (bapt. January 12, 1581/82),<sup>84</sup> Nathaniel (August 9, 1583),<sup>85</sup> and Abigail (June 4, 1585) who died the following February 2, 1585/86. Priscilla died September 29, 1586. Nicholas married again to a woman named Susan and their son was named Eleazar (baptized July 5, 1590). Susan died August 3, 1591.<sup>86</sup> Two years later on October 3, 1593, Nicholas married a third and final time to Elizabeth (d. 1627), the recent widow of John More (buried January 16, 1591/92), minister of Saint Andrew the Apostle's church in Norwich. The marriage came with right to More's works yet unpublished and two stepdaughters, Elizabeth, who married a John Warren (June 22, 1597),

most were tradesmen and craftsmen. A small sample of inventories from fourteen counties, 1580–1700, puts the median for merchants at £1,084, mercers at £280 and the majority of trades much lower. Only five out of 127 chapmen were worth more than £50." Richard Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge University Press, 2002) 251–252.

75. Early notices of Bownd are brief and erroneous (e.g. confusing his relationship to Greenham and Dod). Further attention given to Bownd and Cambridgeshire Puritanism in the last several decades has yielded fuller though still brief biographical entries from Kenneth L. Parker and John Craig (Kenneth L. Parker, "Bownd, Nicholas (d. 1613)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); John Craig, "Bownd, Nicholas (d. 1613)," in *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 27–28; see also *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, "Biographical Register," 188–189). In 2008 Edward Martin Allen provided the most significant study to date of Nicholas Bownd's life and writings (*Nicholas Bownde and the Context of Sunday Sabbatarianism*). However, all these treatments contain omissions or errors concerning Bownd's life.

76. Primus writes of Richard Greenham who also enrolled as sizar, "That he was a sizar suggests that his family was not well-to-do and that he worked for his room and board, possibly by doing chores for the master or fellows of the college." *Richard Greenham*, 12.

77. Drawing on Costello's *Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*, Allen describes the scholastic studies Bownd would have undertaken (there was significant flexibility in the general guidelines). He was well prepared for writing a significant treatise, and his academic training is well displayed in *Doctrine of the Sabbath*. Allen, 7.

78. Parker, "Bownde, Nicholas," *DNB*.

79. Allen, 5.

80. Smith, Henry (1550?–1591), *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885–1900, Volume 53.

81. Allen, 8. "As a close examination of his work on the Sabbath will reveal, Bownde was well versed in history, Hebrew, and Greek" Allen, 8.

82. "The transition from University life to the parish often happened when a fellow of a college decided to get married." Allen, 9.

83. Allen, 11. Rushbroke had been inducted at Norton on June 22, 1563. Cf. "Norton Rectors," unpublished, compiled by Dr. Andrew Mason with the assistance of Mr. David Wordley and Mrs. Helen Taylor. The author's thanks go to Dr. Mason for providing this research.

84. A Hannah Bownde married a John Benson, Norton, Suffolk, July 5, 1605. Ancestry.com. *England, Select Marriages, 1538–1973* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2014.

85. Nathaniel also studied at Cambridge and served in the ministry. "Adm. pens. at QUEENS; Apr. 2, 1600. Of Suffolk. B.A. (? 1602–3); M.A. 1606; B.D. 1613. Fellow, 1605–12. Incorp. at Oxford, 1607. R. of Handsworth, Yorks., 1610. R. of Gt Braxted, Essex, 1612–38. R. of Springfield Richards till 1638. Died 1638. Admon. (P.C.C.) Oct. 2, 1638; to son Nicholas (? of 1635)." Ordained in 1608 (Ely). *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 1.186. Nathaniel may have had a son Nicholas who also attended Cambridge and was rector at Wickford, Essex (d.1661), *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 1.186.

86. Craig lists the Bownd children as Hannah, Nathaniel, Abigail, Priscilla and Susan. He provides no reference. *Puritans and Puritanism*, 27. Allen draws from the Norton Parish Register which he writes was "written in Bownde's neat handwriting from before 1581 through 1609." Allen, 9. Craig seems to have mixed the wives and children together.

and Sarah, who married Edmund Cartwright (January 16, 1603). Cartwright would succeed Bownd at Norton and was possibly a relative of Thomas Cartwright. John More had been a fellow at Cambridge University at the time Thomas Cartwright was preaching Presbyterianism (for which Cartwright was “denied the DD degree he had earned, removed from his position as lady Margaret professor of Divinity, and sent into exile”).<sup>87</sup> Some time before 1595 Bownd may have become a chaplain to the Earl of Essex.<sup>88</sup> After ministering at Norton for 26 years, Bownd became minister of John More’s old pastorate in Norwich in 1611.<sup>89</sup> He died two years later and was buried in the church, December 26, 1613.<sup>90</sup>

#### THE MINISTRY OF NICHOLAS BOWND

As noted already, Nicholas Bownd became rector at Norton, Suffolk, September 3, 1585. He had no other

87. Allen, 8–11.

88. Some deduce this from the elaborate coat of arms for Essex serving as the frontispiece to Bownd’s *Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1595), but he may simply have been the patron for the production of the book which the godly in Suffolk had encouraged to be published.

89. Bownd “took over from the late Thomas Newhouse as public preacher at St Andrew’s...” “Bownd came to Norwich to assume the Thursday lecture at St Andrew’s in 1611, receiving a £10 per annum pension from the corporation.... He had married John More’s widow, who continued to claim Bownd’s pension after his death in 1613.” Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c. 1560–1643*. (Woodbridge: The Boydell press, 2005) 84, 69. In 1902 the Thursday lecture was still active as “one of the noted religious ‘functions’ of the City.” *A Pictorial and Descriptive Guide to London ... twenty-fourth edition* (London, New York and Melbourne: Ward, Lock & Co., Limited, 1902) 270.

90. Nicholas Bownd left no will. “Grant of Administration. Bownde, Nicholas, clerk, of Norwich, Norfolk. 1613.” Norwich Consistory Court Administration Act Book 1605–1626, fo. 157. Cf. Norfolk Record Office online catalogue, Norwich Consistory Court Probate Records. <http://nrocat.norfolk.gov.uk/DSServe/public/searches/nroquick.htm> (accessed June 17, 2014).

91. Allen, 14. The current rectory dates to the early eighteenth century. “The Old Rectory, Norton,” British Listed Buildings, <http://www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/en-281203-the-old-rectory-norton-suffolk> (accessed June 18, 2014).

92. Primus, *Richard Greenham*, 127, 129.

93. *Ibid.*, 147.

94. *Ibid.*, 147–149. Bownd, *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1606) 383–418, critical text (Naphtali Press, forthcoming) 370–396.

95. *Richard Greenham*, 150–177.

96. John Knewstub, *Lectures upon the twentieth chapter of Exodus* (1577) 72, 73. Cf. James T. Dennison, *The Market Day of the Soul* (2001) 29.

97. Richard Greenham, “A Treatise on the Sabbath,” *Works* (MS c.1590; second edition, 1599) 290.

98. *The Morall Law Expounded*, 1. Largely, 2. Learnedly, 3. Orthodoxly (London: Michael Sparke, et al, 1642) 337.

99. *Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine and other minor works* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, MDCCCLVI) 157.

benefices, but was well provided for, judging from the size of the original rectory which was 4,000 sf.<sup>91</sup> His main focus was pastoral ministry, in which Greenham can be seen as his model. A central focus of Greenham’s “practical divinity” which characterized his ministry was the means of grace (or of faith, as the Dry Drayton pastor termed them in his “doctrine of means”).<sup>92</sup> The primary means which are mentioned throughout Greenham’s *Works* are preaching, the administration of the sacraments and prayer, to which are added in his catechism, discipline and affliction (which bring together “exercises for coping with adversity: self-examination, prayer, fasting, repentance, reading of the Word, and meditation on the future life”).<sup>93</sup> Another means for Greenham is meditation, which Bownd champions at length and to which he added conferencing (Christians conferring with one another to discuss the faith).<sup>94</sup> And the main thing—the “great means of the means”—whereby all these means of grace are made available to the people of God is the weekly gatherings on the Christian Sabbath or Lord’s Day.<sup>95</sup> Considering the focus of both Greenham and Bownd on this practical divinity, it is not surprising both wrote works on the fourth commandment.

#### THE MARKET DAY OF THE SOUL

Because it was the day wherein the means of grace were so freely to be available, Bownd’s generation were fond of the metaphor likening the Lord’s Day to a “market day of the soul.” The earliest use in print appears to begin with John Knewstub, Bownd’s fellow participant in the Monday combination lecture at Bury St. Edmunds. “Thus the right use and end of the Sabbath is clean altered, and not that only, but changed into a practice most contrary to the institution thereof. For being appointed to be the market day of the soul, to make provision for the days following.”<sup>96</sup> Greenham also extends the metaphor, “For seeing the Sabbath day is the school day, the fair day, the market day, the feeding day of the soul...”<sup>97</sup> Lancelot Andrewes uses the phrase in his 1578 lectures on the ten commandments given at Cambridge. “The last reason of the three; *Therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day*: he did not only rest Himself, but He hath consecrated it also; and besides His example, He hath annexed a solemn Institution: So that it shall be to us a *Mercatura animæ*, the market day of our soul...”<sup>98</sup> “... it is *mercatura animæ*, ‘the market day for the soul....’”<sup>99</sup> Andrewes, Knewstub and others when at university held weekly “meetings for conference upon certain portions of scripture”, and one may

speculate the metaphor derives from that time.<sup>100</sup> John Dod and Robert Cleaver use the metaphor in their *Exposition of the Ten Commandments*, and one of Dod's "sayings" was: "*Directions for the Lord's Day*. Make the Sabbath the market-day for thy soul. Lose not one hour, but be either praying, conferring, or meditating. Turn the sermon heard into matter of prayer: instruction into petition; reproof into confession; consolation into thanksgiving. Think much of it on the Sunday, and make something of it all the week."<sup>101</sup>

#### THE WORKS OF NICHOLAS BOWND

For Greenham and for Bownd preaching was the primary means of grace available on the Lord's Day. This can be seen in Bownd's presentation of the positive duties of the fourth commandment detailed in book two of his work on the Sabbath and the primacy he places on preaching the Word.<sup>102</sup> In keeping with his own practical and pastoral divinity, Bownd's published works are almost all sermon based and revolve around some of the means noted above.

1. John More, *A Table from the Beginning of the World unto this Day* (John Legate, Printer to the Universitie of Cambridge, 1593). Bownd dedicates the book to those of Norwich where More was minister, Edmund Scrambler, Bishop of Norwich (1585–1594), M. Major and other alderman and sheriffs, and "that whole corporation." The dedication is dated August 24, 1593. While this was a Cambridge imprint there is a Stationers' entry for April 12, 1593.<sup>103</sup>
2. "A sermon of comfort for the afflicted," in John More, *Three Godly and Fruifful Sermons Preached and written by ... M. John More ... and now first published by M. Nicholas Bownd: whereunto he hath adioyned of his owne A Sermon of comfort for the afflicted: and, A short treatise of a contented mind* (Cambridge: John Legatt, 1594). The dedication of the sermons by More is to the Knights, Esquires and Justices of Norfolk, and is dated August 26, 1594.
3. "A short treatise of a contented mind," in *Three Godly and Fruitful Sermons* (1594). This and the previous sermon by Bownd appear at the back of More's sermons and are prefaced with a dedication to Robert Jermyne, Knight and Robert Ashfield, Esquire, Justices for Suffolk, and is dated August 26, 1594.
4. *The Doctrine of the Sabbath plainly layde forth, and soundly proved by testimonies both of holy scripture, and also of olde and new ecclesiasticall writers. Declaring first from what things God would have us straightly to rest upon the Lords day, and then by what meanes we ought publikely and priuately to sanctifie the same: together with the sundry*

*abuses of our time in both these kindes, and how they ought to bee reformed. Diuided into two bookes* (London: Printed by the Widow Orwin for John Porter and Thomas Man, 1595). The book is dedicated to the Earl of Essex, Robert Devereux, dated June 1595. The preface to the reader is dated June 27, 1595. The date of entry in the Stationers' register is May 29, 1595.<sup>104</sup>

5. *The Holy Exercise of Fasting: described largely and plainly out of the word of God: with all the parts and causes, and seuerall kinds of the same: together with the most fit times, and conuenient seasons, when and how long it should be held: with the manifold fruite and commoditie that redoundeth to us thereby: and the whole nature and order thereof. In certaine homilies or sermons, for the benefit of all those, that with care and conscience intend at any time publikely or priuately to put in practise the same. Perused and allowed by publike authoritie* ([Cambridge]: Printed by John Legat, printer to the Universitie of Cambridge, and are to be sold at the signe of the Crowne in Pauls Churchyard by Simon Waterson [in London]). These nine sermons were preached consecutively on Wednesdays during the summer of 1603.<sup>105</sup> Books published outside of London such as those printed on the presses of the universities at Oxford and Cambridge were exempt from the requirement to enter them in the Stationers' registers. The vice-chancellors acted as licenser.<sup>106</sup> The epistle dedicatory addressed to John Jegon, Bishop of Norwich, is dated April 30, 1604.

100. Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans* (1813; repr. Soli Deo Gloria Pub., 1994) 2.308.

101. John Dod and Robert Cleaver, *Exposition of the Ten Commandments* (John Field, 1622) 136; 160; *Memorials of John Dod* (Oxford: 1875) 4.

102. *Ibid.*, 13. Bownd, *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1606) 317, critical text (Naphtali Press, forthcoming) 313. One of the reasons the first edition of *Doctrine of the Sabbath* was long delayed was due to the importance Bownd placed on his ministry. "I was of opinion, that he that bends himself unto writing, had need to have some relaxation from preaching, unless he be of great gifts, and marvelously fitted for both, and therefore being necessarily tied unto the one, I durst not undertake the other..." Epistle to the Reader (1595) A3; (Naphtali Press, forthcoming) 4.

103. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640 A.D.*, edited by Edward Arber, 5 vols. (London: Birmingham: Privately Printed, 1875–77, 1894) 2.629. An earlier entry for a Legate publication for August 1592, has the editorial note, "[?Printed at Cambridge, to which University Legatt was now Printer]" *Ibid.*, Arber, 2.619.

104. Arber, 2.298

105. Allen, 131. Jegon had called for meetings at churches to fast and pray for the removal of the plague which had broken out in December, 1602.

106. Suellen Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England: Volume 8 of Studies in Modern British Religious History* (Boydell Press, 2003) 10–11.

6. *Medicines for the Plague: that is, godly and fruitfull sermons upon part of the twentieth Psalme, full of instructions and comfort: very fit generally for all times of affliction, but more particularly applied to this late visitation of the plague. Preached at the same time at Norton in Suffolke, by Nicholas Bownd, Doctōr of Divinitie. And now published for the further good of all those that love and feare the Lord. Perused, and allowed* (London: Printed by Adam Islip [and Felix Kingston] for Cuthbert Burbie, and are to be sold at the Swan in Paules Churchyard, 1604).<sup>107</sup> The dedication to Dr. Humphrey Tindal and preface to the reader are dated May, 1604. The Stationers' entry has the title *Medicines for the Plague* and is dated June 4, 1604. There is a variant which lacks this front matter, having only the title page and the body of the work.<sup>108</sup> This version is *A Storehouse of Comfort for the Afflicted in Spirit, set open in certaine godly and fruitfull sermons, by Nicholas Bownd, Doctōr of Divinitie; and now published for the further good of all those that loue and feare the Lord* (London: Imprinted for Cuthbert Burbie, and are to be sold at the Swan in Paules Churchyard, 1604). If this was published first, it may have run into trouble because the printer presumed it was harmless and did not need to be reviewed and then licensed by the Stationers, requiring it to be re-issued with the front matter.<sup>109</sup> On the other hand, it may have been surmised that the front matter would be necessary to
- assuage any concerns Bancroft (who was still Bishop of London) and his censors might have had about Bownd due to Rogers' aspersions. This would argue that the version with the front matter was first issued. The body of both versions begin with signature B. Again, it may simply be a matter of the gravity of an error in the front matter which led to the second issue lacking the section altogether. The dedication to Tindal is signed Robert Bownd, though the epistle to the reader is correct.<sup>110</sup> These sermons were preached on Lord's Days sometime between mid-July and December, 1603.<sup>111</sup>
7. *Sabbathum Veteris et Novi Testamenti: or the true doctrine of the Sabbath, held and practised of the Church of God, both before, and under the law; and in the time of the Gospell: plainly laid foorth and soundly prooved by testimonies both of holie Scripture, and also of old and new ecclesiasticall writers: fathers and counsels, and lawes of all sorts, both civill, canon, and common. Declaring first from what things God would have us straightly to rest upon the Lords day: and then by what meanes we ought publikely and priuately to sanctifie the same. Together with the sundrie abuses of men in both these kindes: and how they ought to be reformed. Diuided into two bookes by Nicolas Bovvnd Doctōr of Diuinitie: and now by him the second time perused, and enlarged with an interpretation of sundrie points belonging to the Sabbath* (London: Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man and John Porter, 1606). This title does not appear in the Stationers' register. Reprints did not need relicensing up until 1637, and while this is a significantly enlarged edition, it is possible the printer and author took advantage, if not a risk, in not submitting the title for perusal by the bishop of London and archbishop and licensing by the Company of Stationers.<sup>112</sup> This could have been intentional given Bownd's troubles between 1597 and 1606, and clearly sorely vexed Rogers, as seen below. On the other hand, the London bishop at this time was lenient, and perhaps there was no cause for concern.<sup>113</sup> The dedication to Bishop Jegen prefacing book one is dated October 30, 1606, the preface to the reader, October 31, 1606 and the dedication to Humphrey Tindal prefacing book two, is dated September 29, 1606. The publication may have been available as early as November or December of 1606.<sup>114</sup>
8. *The Unbelief of St. Thomas the Apostle laid open for the comfort of all that desire to beleeve: with a comfortable treatise for all that are afflicted in soule, or bodie, or otherwise: the first armeth us against despaire in the houre of death, the second against impatiencie under the cross* (Cambridge: Printed by Cantrell Legge, Printer to the Universitie of Cambridge, 1608; repr. 1628). This work was dedicated to Robert and Anne Gardner, June 24, 1608. Apparently just the first part was reprinted in 1817

107. This was as noted in the title "perused and allowed," and there is an entry for Master Burby in the Stationers' register book for June 4, 1604. Arber, 3.263.

108. The Short Title Catalog (STC) states this is possibly an earlier imprint.

109. From 1530 new books had to be approved by some authority, which from 1586 rested with "the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury." But even though the regulation stated that every book had to have approval, it was not sought or obtained in all cases; "it seems unlikely that even the authorities themselves expected total compliance. Books that could offend nobody—books of mathematics, gardening, or cookery; funeral sermons in praise of uncontroversial dignitaries—were often published without authority, and no stationer is known to have been punished for failing to have an inoffensive text perused and allowed." That the title appears in the Stationers' register means that it was also licensed by them to be published. Peter W. M. Blayney, "The Publication of Playbooks," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997) 396–397, 398.

110. The example copy available on Early English Books Online has "Richard" scratched out and "Nicholas" written in by hand.

111. Allen, 135.

112. Suellen Mutchow Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 9.

113. Richard Vaughan (1604–1607) "became well known for his tolerance of Puritan deviation from the strict letter of the law." Margo Todd, *Reformation to Revolution* (Routledge, 2002) 58–59.

114. Details and analysis of Bownd's 1606 work are given in *Antiquary* in this issue of *The Confessional Presbyterian*.

(London: Nichols, Son, & Bentley, 1817). The Gardners were parishioners, apparently. Bownd noted appreciatively Sir Robert's presence and countenance of his ministry and Anne's coming to services for 20 years through summer and winter, though a long way from the parish church. He also mentions her son William Spring who was still a youth, which may indicate that she and her previous late husband were a longtime faithful family in the parish church. This work at a glance may seem to be a rejection of the Puritan aversion to pretended 'holy days.' While Bownd goes out of his way to title the work as he did and affirm in the first sermon the possible right use of such days if on a right footing, and disavows the superstitious observance and unlawful founding of them, his views really are not any different than those expressed in his books on the Sabbath. "Yet I do not see ... where the Lord has given any authority to His Church ordinarily and perpetually to sanctify any day, except that which He has sanctified Himself".<sup>115</sup> In his 1606 edition Bownd makes clear his views are similar to Perkins and Fulke (the latter whom he explicitly cites<sup>116</sup>). Bownd tolerated holding services on the old pretended holy days since the English Church did not purge itself of them; yet he held, in this work as well as that on the Sabbath, that such days were changeable and could be "taken clean away."<sup>117</sup> This question of making some practical use of such days was still debated amongst English Puritans up until the time of the Westminster Assembly when Parliament outlawed holy days such as Christmas and obviated the matter.<sup>118</sup> However, while Bownd is very sparing in addressing the subject, Rogers saw the doctrine expressed clearly enough to dig out the statement for special objection. This nod to some practical use may have been a deft move on Bownd's part to negate any damage Rogers had done.<sup>119</sup>

9. A *Treatise full of Consolation for all that are afflicted in minde, or bodie, or otherwise: Which armeth vs against impatiencie vnder any crosse by Nicolas Bovvnde Doctōr of Divinitie* (Cambridge: Printed by Cantrell Legge, printer to the Universitie of Cambridge, 1608). The work is dedicated to Henry and Frances Warner, also dated June 24, 1608. Also issued as part two of *The Unbelief of St. Thomas the Apostle* (1608). This dedication appears as with the previous to be more directed toward Frances and a former husband who was a godly example to the parish, showing justice and kindness to the poor and who led the family well in church duties (daily prayer, reading of Scripture and singing of Psalms). Parker notes that Henry Gardner "has been seen as hostile to the Bury classis,"<sup>120</sup> and he and others have suggested that these and other later dedications show Bownd as more a conformist than a conforming nonconformist. While he does address both Gardner and

Warner in both dedications, they seem incidental and the faithful support of the wives and previous husbands seem to be as much the occasion as any support the current husbands showed his ministry. His address to Warner is cordial and more as a pastor to a prominent leader of the community than to a friend; and unlike Gardner, he does not note his countenance and support of his ministry.

#### CONFORMITY AND PRESBYTERIANISM

As noted above, it is an intriguing mystery that Bownd was one of only a couple of men of over sixty in Suffolk not suspended by Whitgift in 1583. Unlike Greenham, we do not know what Bownd's exact practice or thoughts were on the disputed ceremonies, except that he agreed to the reasons advanced by the other Suffolk nonconformists.<sup>121</sup> There is no record stating Bownd subscribed at this time and the matter remains unclear. He was still only pastor apprentice and perhaps this was a factor. William Rushbroke whom he succeeded at Norton in 1585 similarly appears on the first but not the second list. Bownd also had a wife and young children, so he may have simply been one of those who felt "coerced into submission" and subscribed. Or he possibly found some means to subscribe that passed muster with the church authorities, debasing himself while humbly maintaining his inability to conform as Greenham had done. Greenham himself in a rare escape, appears not to have been harassed by Whitgift's press for subscription.<sup>122</sup> Perhaps some powerful advocate intervened, such as the godly magistrates of Suffolk who made common cause with their ministers?<sup>123</sup>

115. 1595 ed., 31; 1606 ed., 62.

116. Naphtali Press, critical edition (forthcoming) 89.

117. *Unbelief of St. Thomas* (1817) 9; *True Doctrine*, Naphtali Press forthcoming, 136.

118. See C. G. M'Crie, *Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1892) 91–92. Of course nowadays Confessional Presbyterians have to contend with the same question of whether to make practical use of the day.

119. See the notes in the transcription of Rogers' letter.

120. Parker, "Bownd, Nicholas," DNB.

121. The Suffolk ministers, while not being exhaustive, noted in particular objections to private baptism, the sign of the cross, and catechizing infants. *Seconde Parte of a Register*, 242.

122. Greenham "was not among the eleven Cambridgeshire ministers threatened with suspension by Archbishop Whitgift in 1584." *Practical Divinity*, 21; cf. *Seconde Parte*, 227–228.

123. "What made this [Puritanism in East Anglia] possible and gave the cord the strength to take the strain was the paradigmatic alliance of godly magistracy and ministry: the principle celebrated by the Norwich minister who spoke of 'the magistrates and ministers embracing and seconding one another, and the common people affording due reverence and obedience to them both.'" "Godly Preachers and

Robert Ashfield the magistrate of Norton and Robert Jermyn another Suffolk Justice of the Peace, were strong advocates for the reform movement of the godly. Ashfield installed Bownd to the Norton rectory in 1585, and Bownd dedicated his first work in 1594 to both men. Allen notes the two justices were “out of favor,” due to losing a power struggle over the Bury feoffments (land grants), parishoners’ rights to choose their own preachers, and control of the Bury grammar school. The struggle had pitted Puritan magistrates/gentry/tradesmen against an alliance of conservatives (i.e. protestants in name only) and conformists.<sup>124</sup> Jermyn and another godly justice, John Higham, were “removed from the commission of the peace,” and “Jermyn suffered the added indignity of being made to serve on a common jury.” Despite loss of this round between the godly and the coalition of the ungodly, it was a local

humiliation with no wider consequence.<sup>125</sup> The men were still knights of the shire and held important positions and could conceivably try to intercede with the archbishop in London.<sup>126</sup> However, similar supplications were not moving Whitgift and the question is why would they have only succeeded with Bownd who was not the only minister to which they were patrons? Bownd also had other important connections besides various magistrates, including Andrew Perne, the Master of Peterhouse, Peter Baro, Lady Margaret professor of divinity,<sup>127</sup> as well as Richard Greenham and the Huttons of Dry Drayton.<sup>128</sup>

Another possibility is that Bownd’s possible connection to the second Earl of Essex, Robert Devereux (1565–1601) was a factor. Robert was the queen’s first-cousin-twice-removed (his great-grandmother was sister to Anne Boleyn). The first earl died in 1576, and Devereux became ward to Lord Burghley in 1576. William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520–1598) was the queen’s chief adviser for most of her reign. He cared little for the church hierarchy and strongly opposed Whitgift’s suspensions of 1584, and along with the queen’s ‘spy-master’ Francis Walsingham, was chiefly responsible for forcing the archbishop to back down.<sup>129</sup> Also, in 1578 Robert’s mother married the Earl of Leicester, Robert Dudley, a close friend of the queen. Robert was admitted fellow-commoner at Trinity College, Cambridge in 1577. Despite the age difference, Devereux and Bownd’s time at Cambridge overlap. Robert graduated M.A. in 1581, the same year Bownd appears to have moved to Norton. Devereux first went to the queen’s court in 1584 and became her master of horse in 1587. It is speculated that since Bownd dedicated *Doctrine of the Sabbath* to the earl, and that an elaborate frontispiece of his coat of arms decorates that work, that Bownd may have been one of his chaplains. It seems reasonable to suppose their connection was made at Cambridge, as otherwise it is not clear how Bownd would have come to the earl’s attention. Perhaps the young earl, who had no currency himself as yet, was able to enlist his connections to Burghley and Dudley to aid Bownd, who may have solicited the earl on behalf of himself as well as Rushbroke? The powerful connections Bownd may have had access to through Devereux are intriguing. However, it presumes the two had met by this time, and that Devereux was not merely the patron and/or dedicatee for the publication of Bownd’s book in 1595.<sup>130</sup> This brings attention back to the other anomaly in the suspensions, which was Greenham’s ability to completely escape notice. Perhaps some high estimation of the Dry Drayton minister by someone close to Whitgift also

Zealous Magistrates in Elizabethan East Anglia: The Roots of Dissent,” in *From Cranmer to Sancroft: Essays on English Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (2007) 36.

124. Allen, 11. Craig, 86–132.

125. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, xlix.

126. For background on the “Bury stir” and conflict involving Jermyn and the other magistrates, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500–1600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). “The shifting fortunes, moves and counter-moves in the Bury stir are reminders that there was always more than one road to Westminster in the Tudor period. Jermyn and Highman might have been publicly humiliated at the 1583 assizes, but they had become too central to local administration to be dispensed with entirely; the weird result was that while they spent most of the next decade excluded from the commission of the peace, they remained commissioners for musters, and subsequently became deputy lieutenants, more exalted places than those of the mere JPs. They also remained commissioners for examining recusants....” *Ibid.*, 214.

127. Baro would eventually lose his professorship in 1596 for rejecting Calvinism, but he had managed to have good relations with all parties until he publicly rejected the Lambeth articles. He appears to have had the respect and friendship of men such as Whitgift (who unsuccessfully warned him not to declare against the articles) and Bancroft who ordered and officiated at an elaborate funeral for the professor when he died in 1599. Bownd knew Baro well enough to have contributed an ode prefacing the professor’s work on Jonah. *Petri Baronis Stempiani, Sacrae Theologiae in Academia Cantabrigiensi? Doctoris ac Professoris, in Jonahm Prophetam Praelectiones* 39 (London, 1579). Cf. Allen, 218–219.

128. Cf. Allen, 11–16.

129. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 264.

130. Allen discounts the idea that Essex was the intercessor (Allen, 18), but does not discuss the earl’s connections to Burghley and Dudley. The dedication indicates the immediate cause for Bownd’s choosing Devereux was a late favor done by the earl, but also implies other reasons. “MacCulloch says that the Earl of Essex recommended that Sir Robert Jermyn be reappointed to the commission of the peace in 1593 and that Sir Robert’s son had been one of Essex’s companion-in-arms at the siege of Rouen.” Allen, 18. Cf. MacCulloch, 218.

covered Bownd and Rushbroke from suspension?<sup>131</sup> There are no clear tracks toward an explanation for the apparent escapes of Greenham, Bownd and Rushbroke from suspension; but it is true that throughout his ministry Bownd retained good connections with influential people who may certainly have been helpful in times of difficulty.

By June 1584 Whitgift was softening his stance on insisting on the second article and required only that ministers who could not subscribe "would observe the Prayer Book and the orders of the Church."<sup>132</sup> This weaker subscription was largely acceptable to the suspended ministers. Bownd subscribed when installed as rector in 1585, and likely took advantage of this as well.<sup>133</sup> That he subscribed may lend credence to his apprenticeship status being a factor in his not being suspended; but it remains a mystery what exactly occurred. Whatever Bownd may have done during the subscription controversy did not harm his status with the Suffolk ministers. Not long after his installation at Norton, he was chosen to give the Bury St. Edmunds sermon at the Monday exercises, preaching a series that would become his famous work on the fourth commandment.

Whitgift was not defeated however. Humiliated and his "first round" against the nonconformists thwarted, Whitgift initiated a "second" and much more effective round where he targeted the leaders of the Puritan movement. By the end of 1592 the Puritan movement was outlawed.<sup>134</sup> A minister could not even own a sermon expressing Presbyterian sentiments, nor a more circum-spect bishop avoid the term Christmas without penalty or rebuke.<sup>135</sup> Even the opportunity for representatives of a moderate Puritanism failed to obtain any reform at Hampton Court in 1604 with James I, effectively dispatched by Whitgift's successor, Richard Bancroft. The Puritans would get a new Bible, but not much more.<sup>136</sup> English Presbyterianism was publicly a dead movement, though it continued secretly to have some influence.<sup>137</sup>

#### BOWND'S ADVOCACY/REJECTION OF PRESBYTERIANISM

Bownd probably was convinced of, or at least sympathetic to, some form of Presbyterianism.<sup>138</sup> His many connections to men who were so convinced and to the Bury St. Edmunds lecture would point that way. "The Suffolk ministers, with Knewstub as their acknowledged president, were a formidably well-qualified and essentially Presbyterian body of men, although quite happy to acknowledge the benevolent, if remote, patronage of [Bishop] Freke's more sympathetic and pragmatic successors as bishops of Norwich, such as the Jacobean

bishop, John Jegon."<sup>139</sup> Also, he is one of ten who wrote to complain about Thomas Rogers' sermon attacking Presbyterianism in 1590. Another indication is that while he did not write on the second commandment, there is a statement in *Doctrine of the Sabbath* on what the commandment prescribes which amounts to a *ius divinum* view of church polity:

But if we further demand what are the parts of God's service that we should be occupied in, surely to speak of the true manner of worshipping God does not properly belong to this place; it was sufficiently opened unto us in the second commandment. But generally whatsoever is the true worship of God, in that are we bound to serve Him publicly and privately, as at all other convenient times, so wholly and altogether upon this day; and to do nothing but that, that so it might be a *holy day* indeed, *consecrated unto the Lord, and the Lord's Day alone*, as we have seen it to be called in the scriptures {Isa. 58:13; Rev. 1:10}.<sup>140</sup> Therefore whereas the Lord is served in the ministry of His Word, sacraments, prayer, and all other parts of His holy discipline and government, which He has appointed for His Church; these are the very things in which the day is to be consumed and spent, and without the which we cannot sanctify it in the least tolerable measure.<sup>141</sup> In so much that

131. Bishop Aylmer is mentioned as possibly making it possible for Greenham to obtain a license for preaching when he went to London in February 1591/92. *Practical Divinity*, 24–25.

132. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 264. MacCulloch, 208–209.

133. Part of Whitgift's compromise was that for the "future subscription would be required only of those who were about to be ordained or admitted to livings." Collinson, *ibid.*, 264.

134. Collinson, "the second round," *Ibid.*, 263–272.

135. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 431.

136. *Ibid.*, 433.

137. From her work with the MS of the Elizabethan proponent of Presbyterianism, Walter Travers, whom Whitgift forbade to preach in 1586 but who lived until 1635, Polly Ha shows that while not a broad movement, Presbyterians did continue working; functioning in secret, hiding their papers, writing in code, still maintaining that Episcopacy was unbiblical, and ironically interacting with and witnessing the birth and growth of a polity more 'radical' than their own, congregational independency. *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640* (Stanford University Press, 2011) 1–3.

138. Allen, 19.

139. "Godly Preachers and Zealous Magistrates in Elizabethan East Anglia: The Roots of Dissent," in *From Cranmer to Bancroft: Essays on English Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (2007) 36.

140. The scripture references in braces were added in Bownd's 1606 edition. See the forthcoming Naphtali Press edition, pp. 312–313.

141. Rogers cites this passage in his letter clearly with the view of holding Bownd out as some kind of Presbyterian troublemaker.

as we have seen the sanctifying of this day so highly commended unto us in the Word, so we shall see the practice of all these set down in particulars, in sundry places of the same Word, as the only means whereby it is sanctified of us.

Whatever form of polity may have been in view, it would not have implied the episcopacy of Bownd's day. It would be another twelve years before it would begin to be customary to take a page from the Presbyterians' playbook and argue that polity of prelacy from an alleged scriptural institution.<sup>142</sup>

Some have read an implicit renunciation of Presbyterianism into Bownd's 1604 dedication of the *Holy Exercise of Fasting* to Bishop Jegon.<sup>143</sup> Certainly some of "the adulatory language of the time was to a great extent conventional and 'common form.' That was an age of honorific expression and unreserved eulogy," and too much should not be drawn from it.<sup>144</sup> Bownd opens the dedication, "To the right Reverend father in God, and right honourable Lord, Doctor John Jegon, Lord Bishop of Norwich, the continuance, and daily increase of all those heavenly virtues and graces, which the Apostle S. Paul requireth in a Bishop, 1. Tim. 3.2." This is not in itself an indication that Bownd abandoned any belief or preference for Presbyterianism. The fact he made no alteration to his view of what the second commandment governed in his 1606 edition of *Doctrine of the Sabbath* should put that suspicion to rest. He no more renounced the wisps of Presbyterianism he may allude to than he renounced any other of his views. By the time Bownd published his work on fasting, the Presbyterian movement had been squashed and forced underground for a decade and it was clear that the results of the Hampton Court Conference were dismal. Bownd was working with the present reality his stepfather might have stressed.

142. The Bishop of London George Bancroft created a storm of protest in the privy council in 1588 for proposing "that episcopacy was of apostolic institution." It was not until after James I came to the throne that it became acceptable to argue such a *jus divinum* for episcopacy, as George Downname first did in 1608, creating much controversy. George Downname, *Two Sermons, the one commending the ministerie in generall: the other defending the office of bishops in particular* (1608). Reid Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne: A Life* (Oxford University Press, 2013) 19. Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640*, 75. John William Allen, *English Political Thought, 1603–1660*, volume 1 (London: Methuen, 1938) 129–130. *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America*, 76. Charles W. A. Prior, *A Confusion of Tongues: Britain's Wars of Reformation, 1625–1642* (Oxford University Press, 2012) 41.

143. Parker, "Bownd, Nicholas," DNB; Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft*, 110. Similar changes of heart are read into his 1608 dedications, for which see above.

144. Douglas Maclean, *Lancelot Andrewes and the reaction* (1910) 126.

When one reads the epistle, it is clear that Bownd is primarily thankful for Jegon's calling and requiring fasts during the plague and ordering parishoners to come and hear the preaching of the Word of God. Since his series of sermons was a result of that prescription, he dedicated the work to Jegon. He avowed that he and others would be ready to obey similar "godly" injunctions, such as required services of thanksgiving when the plague was ended. As with his fellow nonconformists, Bownd was willing to serve under a bishop who did the right things and did not impede the ministry of the Word by harassing men over conformity. Another clue Bownd had not wavered from his earlier views, is that he picks up a familiar theme as in his *True Doctrine*, when he complains that many ministers remain unfaithful to their callings ("idol shepherds & hirelings, who seeke the fleece rather than the flock" i.e. ministers that do not preach!) and had done nothing in regard to the plague until the bishop had ordered fasting and prayer (ordinances which Bownd bemoans were yet uncommonly practiced). Stripping away the language, the dedication was a polite "thank you" for Jegon's diligence in promoting the preaching of the Word and ordinances which were important to Bownd's practical divinity, with hope that such godly proceedings would continue. He also indicated thanks for some other weighty reasons that lead to the dedication, which perhaps may allude to the bishop's clearing him of any aspersions brought on by Thomas Rogers (for which more anon).

Whatever were his specific views on church government, when Bownd began to publish his works in 1594, not only was the battle for Presbyterianism over (it would take a civil war to revive a mere trial interest in an English Presbytery), it would have been suicidal to his ministry to publicly criticize episcopacy. So whether it was because of a Greenham-esque attitude toward controversies over ceremonies and church polity or a realistic attitude toward what was prudent, or both, Bownd's published works were generally non-controversial. Even his first work on the *Doctrine of the Sabbath* was not intended to create a contentious public dispute and his book was immediately well received and influential; it was the first great and would become the quintessential work on its subject.

Yet the life of this amiable and noncontroversial country parish minister was about to be troubled. There was one person who was so dissatisfied with Bownd's Sabbath doctrine, that he chose to fan the flames of controversy into a conflagration, with the aim to suppress the book and bring down upon its author the hammer of ecclesiastical and civil authority. This was Bownd's

fellow Suffolk minister, Thomas Rogers, who had ironically, unlike Bownd, apparently paid the price of suspension from his ministry in 1584.

### Thomas Rogers

John Craig furnishes a succinct biographical note of the minister of Horringer, encompassing the few details known about his life.

Thomas Rogers was born in London about 1550 and matriculated at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1571. He graduated BA on 7 July 1573 and commenced MA on 6 July 1576. He was ordained priest by John Aylmer, bishop of London, on 25 March 1578, giving his age as about 25. Instituted no fewer than three times (23 November 1581, 10 December 1581 and 13 May 1582 [and possibly again in 1584]) to the living of Horringer, Suffolk, a parish two miles from Bury St Edmunds, the confusion perhaps stemmed from doubt about who was the true patron. He was presented in November 1581 by Thomas Sackville by grant from Thomas Lord Paget, and in December 1581 by the queen. On 28 August 1588, he married Bridget Wincol, the daughter of John Wincol of Netherhall in Little Wadingfield, Suffolk, a wealthy clothier, and their only child, a son Robert, born in October 1589, probably died in infancy. He served as rector of Horringer until his death in 1616<sup>145</sup> when he was succeeded by William Bedell, town preacher of Bury St Edmunds and future bishop of Kilmore. He became chaplain to Sir Christopher Hatton and Richard Bancroft, although the details of these appointments are not known. Such are the known facts of an unremarkable Elizabethan clerical career.<sup>146</sup>

Anthony à Wood writes that he was “a most admirable theologian, an excellent preacher, and well deserving every way the sacred function.... took holy orders very early, and afterwards the degree of master of arts, scil. an. 1576, before which time he was a sedulous and constant preacher of God’s word.”<sup>147</sup> From what we know of Rogers, this seems to be at least a bit hagiographical. Rogers was a prolific writer. However, unlike Bownd whose published works are almost all sermons and point to a diligent preaching ministry following Greenham’s practical divinity, Rogers’ writings contain only one published sermon, a diatribe against Presbyterianism which would envelope the Bury St. Edmunds Monday exercise in controversy.

The bulk of his work consisted of translations of “various texts and making them acceptable to godly opinion.

Between 1577 and 1592, Rogers produced no fewer than twelve separate translations of works by Niels Hemmingsen, Johann Habermann, Philippus Caesar, Joannes Rivius, Diego de Estella, Thomas à Kempis and meditative texts attributed to Augustine; ten of these appeared between 1577 and 1581. This was translation with a twist, as the titles invariably read ‘corrected, translated and adorned ... ‘translated, purified and adorned’ ... or ‘purged from divers superstitious points...’ *The Imitation of Christ* by à Kempis and *Ende of this worlde and second comyng* of Christ by Geveren were popularly received and reissued.<sup>148</sup>

When Thomas Rogers arrived in the area of Bury in 1581, it has been presumed he was received without much question into the ranks of the godly Suffolk ministers participating in the combination lecture, even though he was an Oxford rather than a Cambridge man. His scholarship translating works such as Augustine’s *Meditations* may have impressed, and he condemned impious books and stage plays; subsequently as already noted, he seems to have been suspended with fifty-nine other nonconformist ministers in 1584.<sup>149</sup> However, it may not be that straightforward. Conformists did not favor corrupt books and stage plays any more than nonconformists,<sup>150</sup> and there is nothing about Rogers’ publications that would uniquely indentify him as one of the ‘godly.’ A detailing of Rogers’ publications yields some useful information.

### THE WORKS OF THOMAS ROGERS

1. *A Philosophicall Discourse: entituled, the anatomie of the minde* (London: By I[ohn] C[harlewood] for Andrew Maunsell, 1576). The front matter includes English poetry from Josua Hutten and Abraham Fowler, Latin verse from

145. Rogers’ wife died shortly after he did in 1616.

146. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cv. Paget was Roman Catholic who was involved in plots against the queen; he had been in prison in 1580 and fled the country in 1583. This almost certainly explains the confusion over right of patronage and the multiple installations, and why the queen herself stepped into the process. *Ibid.*, note 336. Questions over the legitimacy of Rogers’ installation would arise again in the late 1590s. Cf. Craig, “Rogers, Thomas,” DNB. Cf. *Horringer Parish Registers, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials, with Appendices and Biographical Notes, 1558–1850* (Woodbridge: George Booth, 1900) 254.

147. Introductory Notice, *Catholic Doctrine of the Church* (1854) v. Cf. *Athenæ Oxonienses*, volume 2 (1815) 162.

148. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvi.

149. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvi.

150. Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre* (Cambridge University Press, 1980; 2007) 28.

- Justinian Baldwin, and a Latin epigram from William Camden. Rogers dedicated this work to Christopher Hatten: “Worthy sir, what your happy estate hath wrought in others no hard thing it is to conjecture, what it doth in me, by this my dedication it may be gathered, for were it not I perceived an especiall excellency in your worship (which deserveth an especiall fame) more than in many, I could not, leaving all, reserve the patronage of my first fruits of study (by an especiall prerogative) to you alone.” The front matter bear no dates and there is no dated entry in the Stationers’ book. An abridgment of this work was published as: *A Paterne of a Passionate Minde* (London: Thomas Eaſt, 1580).
2. *Of the Ende of this Worlde, and the Seconde Commyng of Christ, a comfortable and necessary discourse, meete for these miserable and dangerous dayes* (London, for Andrew Maunsel, 1577; 1578; 1580; 1582; 1583; 1589). This is a translation of an unknown work by Sheltoꝝ to Geveren. The Stationers’ entry is dated June 5, 1577.<sup>151</sup> There is an undated dedication to both Archbishop Edmund Grindal (1575–1582) and John Aylmer the new Bishop of London (March 24, 1577–1594).
  3. *A General Discourse againſt the Damnable Sect of Vsurers: grounded uppon the worde of God, and confirmed by the auctoritie of doctōrs bothe auuncient and newe ... whereunto is annexed another godlie treatise concerning the lawful vse of ritches ... Seene and allowed accordyng to her Maieſties iniunçtions* (London: [By John Kyngſton] for Andrew Maunsell, 1578). This is a translation of Philip Cæſar’s *Doctrina de usura* (1569) along with *Lawful use of riches* which is a translation and adaptation of Niels Hemmingsen’s commentary on James which can be found in *Commentaria in omnes epiſtolas apōſtolorum* (1572). This work also has an undated dedication to Rogers’ “singular patron” Christopher Hatton and he encourages him to back the anti-usury measures of Dr. Thomas Wilson. The Stationers’ entry is dated May 28, 1578.<sup>152</sup>
  4. *The Enimie of Securitie or A dailie Exercise of Godly Meditations ... Seene and allowed according to the Queenes Maieſties Iniunçtions* ([London : H. Denham], 1579;<sup>153</sup> 1580 third ed.; 1583 fourth ed.; 1586; 1591; 1593; 1603; 1605; 1608; 1611; 1615; 1625?). This is a translation of John Habermann’s *Chriſtliche Gebet*. Rogers’ dedication dated October 10, 1579 is addressed to Francis Walsingham, the queen’s ‘ſpymaſter.’ The Stationers’ entry is dated March 24, 1579.<sup>154</sup>
  5. *A Golden Chaine, taken out of the Rich Treasurehouse the Pſalms of King Dauid: alſo, the pretious pearles of King Salomon. Allowed by her Maieſties Iniunçtions* (London: Henrie Denham, 1579; 1587). This work is dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. The Stationers’ entry is dated September 18, 1579.<sup>155</sup>
  6. *The Professions of the True Church, and of Poperie compared together: a diſcourſe for the comfort of the godlie, confirming of the weake, and conuerting of the well inclined, by the working of the holie ſpirit: exceeding neceſſarie* (London: Andrew Maunsell ... 1578 [1579]). This is a translation of a work by Niels Hemmingsen. The Stationers’ entry reads: *A contention betwene Religion and poperie drawn into Engliſhe for the comforte and commodytie of the well inclyned*, and is dated January 20, 1579. There is an undated preface to the reader signed T.R.<sup>156</sup>
  7. *Of the Imitation of Chriſt, three, both for wiſedome, and godlines, moſt excellent bookes; made 170. yeeres ſince by one Thomas of Kempis ... Cum priuilegio Regiæ Maieſtatis* (London: Henrie Denham, 1580; 1583; 1584; 1585; 1587; 1589; 1592; 1596; 1600; 1602; 1607; 1609; 1611; 1614; 1617; 1629; 1636). There is an undated Latin dedication to Thomas Bromley, Lord Chancellor.<sup>157</sup> There is no Stationers’ entry for license.
  8. *The General Session, conteining an apologie of the moſt comfortable doctrine concerning the ende of this world, and ſeconde coming of Chriſt. Allowed by auctoritie* (London: H. Middleton for A. Maunsell, 1581). This is Rogers’ commentary supplementing the work by Geveren. The dedication is again to Thomas Bromley, Lord High Chancellor, dated November 20, 1581. The Stationers’ entry is dated October 17, 1581.<sup>158</sup>
  9. *S. Auguſtines Manuel and A Pretious Booke of Heauenlie Meditations, and A Right Chriſtian treatiſe, entituled S. Auguſtines Praiers: published in more ample ſort than yet it hath bin ... purged from diuers ſuperſtitious points ... Cum priuilegio Regiæ Maieſtatis* (London: Henrie Denham, 1581; 1591; 1597; 1600; 1604; 1607; 1612; 1616; 1621; 1634–35; 1640). These all appear to be customarily issued together. There is a dedication to the aforementioned Thomas Wilson, one of the queen’s “principal Secretaries,” dated January 1, 1581/[82]. There is no Stationers’ entry.

151. Arber, 2.313

152. Arber, 2.327.

153. There is a second edition of 1579. In the preface to the reader Rogers notes some of the faults of the compositor which had been corrected.

154. Arber, 2.349.

155. Arber, 2.360

156. Arber, 2.345. The Early English Books example is a fragment of just the title page. An example held by New College Library, University of Edinburgh, contains an undated preface by T.R. My thanks for this information go to Chriſtine Love-Rodgers, Academic Support Librarian—Divinity and Social &amp; Political Sciences.

157. Cf. Maximilian von Habsburg, *Catholic and Proteſtant Translations of the Imitatio Chriſti, 1425–1650: From Late Medieval Classic to Early Modern Bestseller* (Ashgate, 2013) 122.

158. Arber, 2.402.

10. *The Faith of the Church Militant: moste effectualie described in this exposition of the 84. Psalme, by ... Nicholas Hemmingius* (London: H. Middleton for Andrew Maunsel, 1581). The dedication dated November 4, 1581 is to "the comitisse of Sussex," which appears to be Frances Radclyffe, Countess of Sussex, Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Elizabeth. The Stationers' entry is dated June 7, 1581.<sup>159</sup>
11. *Of the Foolishnes of Men in Putting-off the Amendement of their Liues from Daie to Daie: a godlie and profitable treatise for the present time; written in the Latine tongue by that reuerend and worthie member of Christ his church in this age, John Riuius* (London: [J. Charlewood] for Andrew Maunsel, 1582; corrected edition 1583; 1586). This is a translation of Rivius' *De stultitia mortalium, in procrastinanda correctione vitæ*. There is no dedication by Rogers and there is no entry in the Stationers' register.
12. *The English Creede: consenting with the true auncient catholique, and apostolique Church in al the points, and articles of religion which euerie Christian is to knowe and beleue that would be saued. The first parte, in most loyal maner to the glorie of God, credit of our Church, and displaieng of al hæresies, and errors, both olde and newe, contrarie to the faith, subscribed vnto by Thomas Rogers. Allowed by auctoritie* (London: John Windet for Andrew Maunsel, 1585). There is an undated Latin dedication to Edmund Bishop of Norwich. The preface to the reader is dated "6 of February Anno 1585" (86?). This may have been a slip anticipating the production to have been completed after March 25 (the new year). The dedication only reads Edmund. Edmund Freke was translated to Worcester, December 5, 1584, and Edmund Scrambler was confirmed January 15, 1584/85. The Stationers' entry seems to confirm the year as 1585. The license reads for November 4, 1584, "Andrewe Mansell, Received of him for his licence to printe a Booke intituled *the Englishe Creede* Compiled by master Thomas Rogers, and aucthorised under th[e h]andes of Th[e]archbishop of Canterburie."<sup>160</sup>
13. *Methode vnto mortification. Allowed by auctoritie* (London: John Windet, 1586). This is a translation of Diego de Estella's *La Vanidad del Mundo* (1584; 1608). This is dedicated to "good friends, M. H. Blage and T. Pooley, Esquires," justices for Suffolk, and dated October 1, 1586.
14. *The English Creede: consenting with the true, auncient, catholique, and apostolique Church in al points, and articles of religion, which euerie Christian is to know and beleue that would be saued. The second part, in most loyal manner to the glorie of God, credit of our Church, and displaieng of al hæresies, and errors, both olde and newe, contrarie to the faith, subscribed vnto by Thomas Rogers. Allowed by auctoritie* (London: Robert Walde-graue, for Andrew Maunsel, 1587). There is an undated Latin dedication to Christopher Hatton. The Stationers' entry reads: "April 3, 1587, Andrewe Mansell, "Fforasmuche as he dothe bind his pretises to fremen of this cumpanie to th[e] intent to make them free of this said cumpanie: and for that he hathe and dothe promise to shewe him selfe conformable to th[e] ordonnances here: yt is thought convenient to alowe unto him for his copie, *the second parte of the Englishe crede* aucthorised as lafull to be printed: by the Archbishop of Canterburie."<sup>161</sup>
15. *An Historical Dialogue Touching Antichrist and Poperie: drawn and published for the common benefit and comfort of our church in these dangerous daies, & against the desperate attemptes of the vowed aduersaries of Iesus Christ, his gospell, and this florishing state ... Allowed by auctoritie* (John Windet for Aundrew Maunsel, 1589). The entry for the Stationers is dated August 29, 1589.<sup>162</sup> This work is also dedicated to Christopher Hatton, dated September 19, 1589.
16. *A Sermon vpon the 6.7. and 8. verses of the 12. chapter of S. Paules epistle vnto the Romanes: made to the confutation of so much of another sermon, entituled, A fruitful sermon &c. as concerneth both the depriuation of the præsent gouernment, and the perpetual, and vniforme regiment of our Church by certaine their described officers to be in euerie particular parish through-out al her maiesties dominions; more fullie penned, than could by mouth be expressed, the tyme limited to the speaker being verie short. Published at the request of certaine frendes by Thomas Rogers. Allowed by auctoritie* (John Windet, April 13, 1590). There is no dedication or dated preface. This is the sermon that scandalized the Bury brethren. There is an entry for the Stationers' register for March 22, 1590.<sup>163</sup>
17. *Miles Christianus: or A iust apologie of all necessarie writings and writers: specialie of them which by their labored writings take paines to build vp the Church of Christ in this age and in a publike, and diffamatorie epistle lately set forth in print, are vniuistly depraued. Allowed by auctoritie* (London: John Wolfe, 1590). There is an undated epistle addressed to Miles Mosse. The Stationers' entry is dated November 2, 1590.<sup>164</sup>
18. *Soliloquium animæ: The sole-talke of the soule. Or, a spirituall and heauenlie dialogue betwixt the soule of man and God. Which, for the great affinitie it hath with other bookes of the auctor published heeretofore in our natieue tongue, is now entituled The fourth booke of the Imitation*

159. Arber, 2.395.

160. Arber, 2.436.

161. Arber, 2.467.

162. Arber, 2.529.

163. Arber, 2.541.

164. Arber, 2.567.

of Christ. Translated and corrected by Thomas Rogers. Neuer before published (London: [R. Yardley and P. Short],... Andrew Maunsell, 1592; 1598; 1608; 1616; 1628; 1640). There is no dedication and none of the front matter is dated. While there is a Stationers' entry dated July 3, 1587 for a fourth part of the *Imitation*, no translation by Rogers or any other are found prior to this 1592 'never before published' edition. The Stationers' entry for this edition is dated February 17, 1592.<sup>165</sup>

19. *The Faith, Doctrin, and Religion, Professed, & Protected in the Realme of England, and dominions of the same: expressed in 39 articles, concordable agreed vpon by the reuerend bishops, and clergie of this kingdome, at two seuerall meetings, or conuocations of theirs, in the yeares of our Lord, 1562, and 1604: the said articles analised into propositions, and the propositions prooued to be agreeable both to the written word of God, and to the extant confessions of all the neighbour churches, Christianlie reformed: the aduersaries also of note, and name, which from the apostles daies, and primitiue Church hetherto, haue crossed, or contradicted the said articles in generall, or any particle, or proposition arising from anie of them in particular, heereby are discouered, laid open, and so confuted. Perused, and by the lawfull authoritie of the Church of England, allowed to be publique* (John Legatt, printer to the Universitie of Cambridge, 1607/08; 1621; 1625; 1629; 1633; 1639; 1658; 1661; 1625; 1668; 1675; 1681; 1691; abstract 1776; 1844; 1854). This is another Cambridge

165. Arber, 2.604.

166. "Yea, this booke came abroad with injunction from the Arch-Bishop that then was that there should be one of them bought for every Parish in the Province of Canterbury." Cornelius Burges, *Baptismal Rengeeration of Elect Infants* (1629) 68, marginal note. Lincoln and Norwich dioceses alone had 2,376 parishes and the total parishes including the northern province of York was approximately 10,000 parishes (Gary G. Gibbs, Beat A. Kumin, and Katherine L. French, *The Parish in English Life 1400-1600* {Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1997} 77, 78). If this order was actually followed, the Cambridge printer would have had to have created perhaps as many as 7,500 copies, more than four normal print runs. A quick unscientific search of worldcat yielded thirteen physical copies of this work held by libraries while twelve libraries held copies of Bownd's 1606 *True Doctrine of the Sabbath*. More research is needed to determine if the order or similar were usually followed or enforced to any degree. The very order of course would have given significant reasons to Thomas Rogers to crow.

167. Rogers noted it was twenty-two years previous that he had published his English Creed (1585), which aligns with standard practice of following Julian reckoning of the day. Preface, [¶¶¶¶4]; (1854) 30. England which had followed the Julian calendar since 1155, would not change to the Gregorian calendar until 1752.

168. "Prior to 1587, there appears to have been an extremely informal arrangement of who might preach and when. John Knewstubb, the long-serving rector of Cockfield and 'principall Senior present at the boorde,' determined who preached. There was no rota, just an informal process of being nominated and approved 'with moste voices.'"

imprint which does not appear in the Stationers' registers. This was dedicated to Archbishop Richard Bancroft, March 11, 1607 who supposedly ordered a copy be purchased for every parish in the Province of Canterbury.<sup>166</sup> There is no reason to suspect a typographical mistake in the date of the preface, and the assumption must be this was published in 1608, going by the Julian Calendar wherein the first of the year is March 25.<sup>167</sup>

20. *Two Dialogues, or conferences (about an old question lately renewed, and by the schismaticall company, both by printed pamphlets, and otherwise to the disturbance of the Churches quiet, and of peaceable minds, very hotly pursued). Concerning kneeling in the very act of receiuing the sacramental bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord: The former betweene two ministers of the word, the one refractarie, and depriued; the other not so. The latter betweene an humorous schimatike and a settled professor* (Henry Ballard, 1608). This is dedicated to Thomas Ravis, Bishop of London, dated May 4, 1608. There is no entry in the Stationers' register. Arber estimates Henry Ballard only printed from 1597–1608, and notes that Ballard only has one entry in the Stationers' records for March 7, 1607/08 for one impression of "the homilies." A search of titles shows Henrie Ballard printed one or two works in 1597. A Henry Ballard was quite active from 1607–1609. He printed the visitation articles for Ravis for 1607 and also some selections from Richard Rogers, Richard Greenham and Thomas Cooper (*Christians Daily Sacrifice*, 1608).

#### THOMAS ROGERS, PROPONENT OF CONFORMITY

The works do not particularly commend a nonconformist outlook; but the 1584 suspension complicates an easy assessment. Was this Rogers' brief moment in the sun as a nonconformist, or part of a subterfuge to spy on the hated Presbyterians? What is clear from this list of his publications is not only that Rogers' dedications were geared toward advancement and preferment, but that he is associated with Christopher Hatton as his patron from his very first book of 1576. This is followed by a 1578 dedication to his "singular patron." Hatton was the queen's favorite since the mid-1560s, and by 1573 he was clearly viewed as an opponent by the Puritans. Hatton with Whitgift would lead the attack against nonconformity for thirty years, and Richard Bancroft his chaplain would be a particularly vicious attack dog. With two works dedicated to Hatton already under his belt, there should have been some cause for wariness upon Rogers' arrival to the Bury area in 1581. Whether this was a factor why he was not called upon to preach in the Monday exercises until after 1587 is not clear.<sup>168</sup>

What is clear is that whether there was subterfuge or not, after the suspensions of 1584, Rogers immediately becomes a champion for conformity, publishing the first volume of *The English Creede* about February or March of 1584/85, and he likely had to have been working on the title for some portion of 1584. Whether Bownd had conformed or not had done little harm to his standing with the Bury ministers, and he probably began preaching at the Monday exercise on the ten commandments in 1585.<sup>169</sup> Rogers, however, grumbles in the preface to his *Creed* about a fellow not getting the chance to preach, a first glimpse of how the man would react to perceived slights.<sup>170</sup> There was no difference in seniority since both arrived in 1581; indeed Rogers had more time in office than Bownd. There was some other factor and it is likely the leaders of the exercise, if not before, then certainly now, simply did not trust Mr. Rogers.

In 1587 Rogers' dedicatee for the second part of *English Creed* is once again the archenemy of the Puritans, Christopher Hatton. The Puritans took great offense at Rogers' personal interpretation of the articles, and the dedication to Hatton should have been cause for keeping the minister of Horringer at arms' length. With his *Creed* of 1585 and 1587 which had been personally approved by Whitgift,<sup>171</sup> Rogers had become a propagandist for the "second round" of the archbishop's conformity campaign, which was to focus narrowly on the leaders of the nonconformist Presbyterian movement, eventually forcing it underground in the early 1590s.<sup>172</sup>

Rogers preface to volume one of his *Creed* seems irenic and the exposition does not unfairly attack the godly nonconformists as he would later.<sup>173</sup> However, the proffered olive branch of unity, love and conformity and downplaying of what the hierarchy saw as adiaphora and "petie and trifling things," was covered with thorns. Clearly with himself in mind, he accuses his fellow Bury St. Edmunds ministers of sin for keeping out of the Lord's vineyard such as would instruct the ignorant in the Faith, as he expounds it in his *Creed*, and "confirm" (he might as well have said "conform") the learned in it. Collinson describes how the Presbyterian leadership saw Rogers' work:

Previously, the ringleaders [of the Presbyterian movement] had been dealt with in the same fashion as moderate and almost conformable men; not only had they benefited from the public outcry against this general onslaught on the whole godly ministry, but they had evaded inquiry into their more subversive offences.<sup>174</sup> Now the complaints of the Council and the country

gentlemen were partly satisfied by allowing easy terms for the majority while the activities of the militant extremists were subjected to a more searching investigation. It is not difficult to imagine that Whitgift's new policy placed an intolerable strain on the solidarity of the puritan movement. The mass defection of the conditional subscribers enabled the apologists for the bishops to claim that the puritan ministry as a whole had "allowed all" and retracted. Typical of this disturbing propaganda was the preface to a commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles published by Thomas Rogers, Hatton's chaplain. Rogers's book bore the splendid title of *The English Creede*, and its theme was the catholicity and harmony of the reformed English Church. Although he was forced to admit that some held back from subscribing the Prayer Book "in every point," this apologist professed to believe that there were none "that proudly contemn it, none that disdainfully despise it, none but in the fear of God and in public churches always and only do use it." The offences for which some held back

---

*Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvii. Under this scheme, Rogers was apparently never nominated, or at least never got sufficient votes to get to preach.

169. Bownd wrote in his 1595 "To the Reader," that he was importuned to publish his sermons on the ten commandments about nine years prior. If we judge from May 1595 that places the time of the importunity as late as May 1586. There is likely more than enough material in his work on the fourth commandment to have taken up most or all of the previous months of that year, and the rest of the commandments push the beginning of the sermon series back sometime in 1585. It is difficult to estimate as there are no clues how many sermons were preached on each commandment. It is possible the fourth commandment was covered in at least a dozen sermons.

170. "... there was a touch of frustration in his irenic tone when he spoke of the sin of fellow ministers keeping 'out of the Lord his vineyard, such as both for abilitie could and for their zeale would, either implant this Faith in the ignorant, or cofirme it in the learned.' This well-read preacher and author from Oxford was clearly beginning to chafe at the restrictions he faced in the vicinity of Bury St Edmunds where so much of the clerical running was in the hands of the Cambridge godly, led by John Knewstub." *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvii.

171. As noted previously, it was in 1586 that the authority to publish was vested in the archbishop and bishop of London. This implies that this project, if not conceived by Whitgift, certainly met with his approval, and given its nature, likely had to meet with his approval to move forward. If Rogers indeed had been suspended in 1584, he may have conceived of this project to repair the damage he may have perceived had been done to his steady campaign for preferment.

172. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 268, 263–272; Antoinina Bevan Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (Oxford University Press, 2011) 103. For the case the Presbyterian movement did not simply die, but the leaders and adherents simply went underground, see Polly Ha's work.

173. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvii.

174. Collinson is speaking of what he calls "round one," Whitgift's

from subscription were “for number but very few . . . and remain for the most part in the directions and rubrics.” Yet Rogers lived in West Suffolk! This was what Field<sup>175</sup> had feared from the beginning; the beneficed clergy had succumbed to the temptation to win their freedom by understating their case. The reformist cause was discredited because most of those supposed to maintain it had signed it away in their tortuous subscriptions.<sup>176</sup>

Rogers clearly had taken up the role of propagandist for conformity. This was certainly in keeping with his literary career to date, which was largely made up of making other authors palatable to what he thought

failed move to force a strict wide conformity on all ministers. As noted earlier he was forced to allow most ministers an “out” by taking conscientious exceptions. As Collinson notes, the propagandists for the hierarchy twisted this allowance into an acceptance of the status quo of conformity. Whitgift then shifted to “round two” which was to go after the leaders of the reform movement. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 268.

175. John Field (1545–1588) was the leader for the Presbyterian reform movement in England. The author of *The Unlawful Practices of Prelates* (possibly Field), exposed this propaganda. “Alas, good men, how much their good desires and intents were abused. . . . Yet it is certain, many to this day hold out.” Collinson writes, “John Udall, was confident ‘if it were to do again, hundreds of them would never do it, because they were subtly circumvented and deceived.’ Since Whitgift knew that the subscriptions counted for very little, one wonders who was deceiving whom in 1584. But there is little doubt that the subscriptions gave the Church an appearance of specious solidarity in its imperfectly reformed state which could not have been more damaging to the cause of further reformation.” Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 268–269.

176. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 268.

177. “. . . many protestants of a middle temper were much offended thereat. Some conceived it presumption for any private minister to make himself the mouth of the church, to render her sense in matters of so high concernment; others were offended that his interpretation confined the charitable latitude formerly allowed in those Articles. . . .” Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, edited by J. S. Brewer. 6 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1845) 5.81.

178. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 236, 245, 268; *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cv; Craig, “The Cambridge Boies,” 156; Craig, “Rogers, Thomas,” DNB.

179. Joseph Harrison, *The Practice of the Court of Chancery*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: 1807), Introduction, 1.56.

180. Collinson refers to the “active patronage” displayed by Bancroft and Hatton toward Rogers publications. Collinson, “The Beginnings of English Sabbatarianism,” 220.

181. While as with Bownd and Essex, it may be speculated that significant patronage implies a chaplaincy, I have not found the claim that Thomas Rogers was Christopher Hatton’s chaplain prior to *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Sources such as Wood, Strype, the *Alumni Oxonienses* and MacCaffrey, do not mention it. Craig states the matter as fact but notes the details of the appointment are unknown. Recent claims simply cite Craig. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, iv. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 236, 245, John Strype, *Historical and Biographical Works: The history of Edmund Grindal* (1821), 453;

was correct. And this was the offense taken by many, that he presumed to put forth a singular interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles.<sup>177</sup> Rogers would later add to this talent an even more prevaricating flipside, putting his own mischaracterization of his opponents’ words in their mouths to place them in as bad a light as possible.

If these indicators were not worrisome enough to the Bury ministers, there should have been even greater cause for concern if it were indeed the case that Thomas Rogers was actually one of Christopher Hatton’s chaplains.<sup>178</sup> When Hatton was appointed Lord Chancellor April 19, 1587, he had right to have three chaplains;<sup>179</sup> but while Sir Christopher was a “singular” patron of Rogers,<sup>180</sup> I have not found evidence he was actually one of his chaplains.<sup>181</sup> Richard Bancroft had become Hatton’s household chaplain about 1581 and served in that capacity until the Chancellor’s death in 1591. However, while Rogers claims to be Bancroft’s chaplain in the preface to his 1607 work, in no earlier work does he similarly claim that position of Hatton, which is probably a telling omission.<sup>182</sup>

#### THOMAS ROGERS AND THE BURY EXERCISE

Whether Rogers was actually Hatton’s chaplain or not, the leaders of the Bury St. Edmunds exercise changed their manner of choosing preachers in 1587, which had effectively kept the now out-of-the-closet conformist from having a turn preaching since he came to the area in 1581. Rogers was finally included in the rotation; but the leaders maintained the reins of control.<sup>183</sup> Whether he preached more than once for the exercise after 1587 is not clear. However, by the end of 1589 Rogers would get his long pined-for opportunity to preach.

At the beginning of 1589, prospects would turn even darker for the reform movement. Lord Chancellor Christopher Hatton gave a speech at the opening of Parliament February 4, 1589, equating Puritans and Papists; indeed charging that the queen was more grieved by the former than the latter.<sup>184</sup> This was followed by a sermon preached before parliament of similar content by the archdeacon of Sudbury, Suffolk, John Still. On February 9, Richard Bancroft preached his infamous

Wood, *Alumni Oxonienses, 1500–1714* vol. 3 (1691–92; Oxford: 1891) 1276; Wallace T. MacCaffrey, “Hatton, Sir Christopher,” DNB.

182. Given Rogers’ quest for preferment, it would be likely he would have made use of the appellation ‘your humble chaplain,’ or similar in his dedications, if he had held that position.

183. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cvii.

184. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 396.

sermon at St. Paul's Cross which vehemently attacked Puritanism, published about March 3, 1589.<sup>185</sup> Hatton's chaplain equated those desiring further reformation with treason against her majesty the queen.<sup>186</sup> Collinson writes of this dark historical "landmark,"

If we believe what Whitgift later testified, the preacher was even at this time engaged in hunting Marprelate and his press, and he was to devote much of the next four years first to the prosecution and then to the literary exposure of the presbyterian movement. This sermon was a foretaste of his disclosures and of the forensic ruthlessness of his use of them, which may recall for the modern reader the methods of Senator Joseph McCarthy in our own time. The puritans were "false prophets," seeking after singularity, all one with Arians, Donatists, anabaptists and other sectaries.... Never had Paul's Cross heard such a confident defence of the established Anglican polity. Bancroft did not go so far as to assert directly the *jus divinum* of Episcopal government, but it is significant that some at the time and many since have read the highest doctrine of episcopacy into his words.... it was published within the month, according to Whitgift, "by direction" from Hatton and Burghley.<sup>187</sup>

Subsequent to this, Thomas Rogers had been busy with a short 115 page work fueled no doubt by the defeat of the Spanish Armada, *An Historical Dialogue Touching Antichrist and Poperie*. The dedication dated September 19, 1589, was for a final time again directed to Christopher Hatton. Two months later Rogers was given the opportunity to preach at the Monday exercise in Bury which was then beginning expository sermons on Romans 12:6-8 concerning various gifts given by the Lord to the Church. There had been a stir apparently created by an anonymous book published some years before in 1584 which expounded the passage as teaching a "prescribed form of church government consisting of pastors, doctors, elders, deacons and widows." The ministers all apparently knew that the author was the Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Laurence Chaderton. The leaders of the exercise knew this would need to be handled with care by the older wiser ministers. Perhaps they had Rogers specifically in mind as someone who needed to be controlled since he was amongst those to whom the preaching was to normally fall in the rotation. The portions of the passage of concern were assigned to Robert Holt, Walter Allen, Reginald Whitfield and the acknowledged leader of the exercise, John Knewstub. Apparently rather than pass over Rogers,

he was assigned the portion of verse nine, "let love be without dissimulation"! When it was time for Rogers to take his turn, instead of carrying on with verse nine, he "pulled out of his pocket" a copy of Chaderton's work and delivered an intemperate rebuttal amounting to a diatribe, to everyone's great offense. "What appears to have irritated his fellow ministers most of all is that Rogers 'reproached the author of that Sermon comparing <him> the penner thereof firste to H.N. the familist, and afterward to Campion and Reignoldes, two traitorous Papiſtes, with other thinges he inserted, ... some true but slenderlie proved, ... some untrue and so ... confidentlie avouched as that ... the mislike of th'auditorie did openlie appeare therein, judging by his manner of dealing that he came rather to make an invective than a Sermon."<sup>188</sup> Indeed, it seems Rogers was determined to follow the example of Bancroft, Hatton and Still. Gone was any pretense of love and pleadings for unity. The way of advancement, which still had not come to Rogers, would be pursued via intemperate tirades. Name calling, smears and lying mischaracterizations of the views of his puritan opponents were the order of the day.

The end result was the Bury ministers excluded Rogers from preaching, fearing any more tirades causing greater scandal. Rogers was furious and complained to Bishop Scambler who wrote the ministers to which they replied with a letter, April 1, 1590. With some idea of either presenting a rebuttal case, or maybe with some idea of a publication, Rogers wrote out a detailed rebuttal to this letter, which is the surviving document known as Chicago University Library Codex MS 109. There is no need to examine this manuscript in detail except to note that Rogers hovers over and rebuts every phrase of the Bury ministers' letter, retorting with his own interpretation of the events, concluding with a disrespectful and satirical list of articles disparaging the ministers of the Bury exercise.

However, this controversy was not apparently enough for Rogers, as he was soon drawn into another more public spat with Miles Mosse, the minister in Bury and founder of the Parish Library of St. James, and the man Rogers was most angry with for the dressing down he received after delivering his sermon. Mosse republished

185. Arber, 2.517. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 9. of Februarie, being the first Sunday in the Parleament, Anno. 1588 by Richard Bancroft D. of Divinitie, and Chaplaine to the right Honorable Sir Christopher Hatton Knight L. Chancellor of England* (London: E. Bolliant for Gregorie Seton, 1588).

186. Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642* (Oxford University Press, 2011) 208.

187. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 397.

188. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cviii, 163-164.

“the extremely popular catechism by John More and Edward Dering with a short preface dedicated to the bishop of Norwich in which he complained that ‘men will speak before they have learned’ and that ‘manie ministers of the word write much but preach little,’ statements which the suspicious and sensitive Rogers interpreted as an attack upon his own efforts as a writer.”<sup>189</sup> Rogers published a direct attack entitled *Miles Christianus: or A iust apologie of all necessarie writings and writers* (1590). The title is entered in the Stationers’ register for November 2, 1590. He again goes line by line answering in a fuming fashion in keeping with his previous answer to the Bury men. Indeed, this was not cathartic enough for Rogers, whose personal copy of *Miles Christianus* is preserved. It is interleaved with annotations which he added to and changed, clearly continuing to “stew” over the whole affair. In that same copy is preserved a letter Rogers wrote to the aforementioned Dr. Still who had delivered the anti-puritan sermon before parliament after Hatton’s speech. More than a year after the Bury diatribe and as long as nine or ten months after publishing *Miles Christianus*, he wrote Still in the summer months of 1591,

I find that M. Mosse is much grieved at me for two thinges, viz. 1. for my sermon wch I made last at Burie (and since through bad dealing offend me for the same, I have bine urged to imprinte) and for an answer unto his epistle prefixed to that catechisme by him published. What he wil object against either by bothe of these books I know not: and though unto whatsoever he can object, or might answere, I have donn nothing which is not sufficientlie approved by theauctoritie of our Church....<sup>190</sup>

This letter at the very least is interesting in that it ties Rogers to yet another person ramping up the rhetoric against the Puritans at this time. And it reveals as implied already, that Rogers even knowing he was acting the controversialist in departing from the sermon text and scurrilously attacking Chaderton and his sermon, could not bear the rebukes he received from Mosse and others. The editors of Rogers’ account of the Bury controversy write of the letter to Still,

Rogers complained to Still that Mosse had attacked his sermon ‘with most reproachful speeches ... and in the

189. It surely does appear that Rogers was a fit for the model which Mosse was targeting. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cx.

190. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cxi.

191. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cxi.

hearing of divers both godlie and learned ministers of the Word depraved the same exceedinglie.’ ‘Hence that shameful (as themselves call it) secluding me from the Burie exercise; Hence the consperring of no lesse than tenn of the chiefeſt ministers of the faction in Suffolk in a letter against me and my sermon unto my Lord of Norwich [Bishop Scramble],’ which Rogers deemed ‘a präsident of greater audacitie I verily think since your worships coming into Suffolk you never knewe’ and promised to tell the full story ‘with thanswere thereunto at large.’ It is not clear why Rogers made his appeal to Dr. Still. Perhaps he thought that Still would be more sympathetic to his stance than Scrambler’s officials, as it was clear that some kind of investigation by the diocese had been initiated. ‘Midsomer is at hande, before which time our matters muste be heard and ended or els Mr Chancelour himself will resume into his owne handes and set such order as in justice he shall think most meete.’<sup>191</sup>

The ten men whom Rogers blamed for his self-created misery were John Knewstubb, Gualter Alen, Reginald Whitfield, Thomas Seffray, John Warde, Rychard Grandidge, Robert Lewis, Leonard Greaves, Lawrence Whitaker, and Nicholas Bownd. There is no record that the Bury matter ever went anywhere, or that Rogers sent his rebuttal to the bishop or when exactly he returned to the exercise from which he had withdrawn himself or been summarily booted. He would preach at least once more in 1599. He seems to imply by “Mr. Chancelour,” that he hoped to bring this before the consistory court of the diocese. It may be that either the bishop or the consistory court told the disputants to cease. Or Rogers may have been given specific access to the Bury lecture in order to preach his rebuttal to Sabbatarianism in 1599.

#### Thomas Rogers versus Nicholas Bownd

The strife caused by Rogers’ 1589 sermon was some way resolved, lightly patched over, or perhaps ignored. Yet Rogers’ mindset was clearly such that he could easily pick a fight with any of the Bury men if they were to ‘disrespect’ him again. So how did Rogers get crossways with Nicholas Bownd, one of the ten Presbyterians who ‘shamed’ him for his scurrilous attack on Chaderton, and ignite the first Sabbatarian controversy in English literature?

The late Patrick Collinson defined English Sabbatarianism as,

... the doctrinal assertion that the fourth commandment is not an obsolete ceremonial law of the Jews but a perpetual, moral law, binding on Christians; in other words, that the Christian observance of Sunday has its basis not in ecclesiastical tradition but in the Decalogue. The more important propositions of the Sabbatarians are that the Sabbath derives from the creation<sup>192</sup> and so antedates both man's fall and the Mosaic law, although its use was defined in the Decalogue; that the hallowing of the Lord's day in place of the Sabbath was of apostolic or even divine appointment, and more than an ecclesiastical convention; so that the Sabbath is still in force in this altered form, commemorating the second creation in Christ's resurrection, and robbed only of some of its ceremonial detail; that the whole day should be kept holy and devoted to the public and private exercise of religion; and that this precludes all otherwise lawful recreations and pastimes as well as the work of one's calling, unlawful games and mere idleness.... The first extensively argued, dogmatic assertion that the fourth commandment is morally and perpetually binding was published in 1595, *The doctrine of the Sabbath* by the Suffolk puritan divine, sometime fellow of Peterhouse and rector of Norton, Dr Nicholas Bownd.<sup>193</sup>

Still craving advancement and perhaps fueled by continued stewing over his shaming and the resulting isolation from his Bury brethren, Thomas Rogers turned his attention at some point to Bownd's sabbatarianism. How it came about has been heretofore unclear, but he eventually preached against Bownd's doctrine at the Bury exercise on December 10, 1599. Happily someone took notes, and while they are difficult to read, they have survived. Primus transcribed the key portion:

That we Christians of the Church of England are bound to keep the Sabbath day is antichristian and unsound; 2. that the Sabbath is of the nature of tithes, of new moons, and Jewish feasts; 3. not possible to be proved that the Jews before the coming out of Egypt kept a Sabbath; 4. no certain day commanded for Christians in the Word of God more than other; 5. the Lord's day is not enjoined by God's commandment but by an human civil and ecclesiastical constitution. 6. He thinketh that the days commonly called the Lord's days, Sabbath days, or Sundays may be called the Queen's days and that he would so call them, and so did oftentimes in his sermon. 7. Those which hold that opinion against which he himself preached he called Sabbatarians and Dominicans. 8. Since weekly days have gone up her majesty's days have gone down ... [from] papistry and

Brownism sects of sabbatarians and dominicans have sprung up. 9. The Queen bindeth us by her days but she bindeth us not, our Dominicans do bind and fetter us. 10. The observation of the Queen's day do [sic] not make or hinder salvation but if we keep not the Lord's day we shall perish say the Sabbatarians. 11. He finally declared that if this might deny God he would not further proceed in this question, otherwise this his speech was but an entrance. Master Rogers' sermon preached at Bury the 10. Dec. 1599.<sup>194</sup>

Eight years later Rogers put his objections in print, when in 1608 the now chaplain to the new Archbishop Richard Bancroft published a new edition of his *English Creed*. In it Rogers attacked openly and viciously the doctrine of his former nonconformist brethren. Amongst the 'errors,' he singled out Presbyterianism and Sabbatarianism, and in his diatribe on the latter focused on Bownd under the initials D.B. In his dedicatory preface to Bancroft, Rogers claimed to have influenced Archbishop Whitgift and Lord Chief Justice John Popham to suppress Bownd's book eight years earlier. Parker describes Rogers' assault and the chaplain's accounting of the years since Bownd first published *Doctrine of the Sabbath*:

This preface contained a history of sound doctrine in the English church and described the threats to orthodoxy during Elizabeth's reign. Noting the attacks on episcopal government and discipline, Rogers praised Bancroft as one of the first to recognize the Presbyterian threat and expose their plot. He reported that the archbishop and

192. The argument from the lesser to the greater necessity for a Sabbath on the basis of Adam's need before the fall for such a day appears in Bownd and was also used earlier in the Dedham Conference debate of 1583–1584 with papers produced about the Spring of 1584 (cf. John H. Primus, "The Dedham Sabbath Debate: More Light on English Sabbatarianism," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 17, no. 1 [Spring, 1986] 90). *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, 56. Bownd, *True Doctrine* (1606) 29, 375; critical edition (Naphtali Press, forthcoming) 61, 363. Greenham also makes use of this argument. *Richard Greenham*, 159.

193. Patrick Collinson, "The Beginnings of English Sabbatarianism," in *Studies in Church History, volume one, Papers read at the first winter and summer meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Thomas Nelson, 1964) 207–209.

194. John H. Primus, *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Mercer University Press, 1989) 86–87, citing Townshend Papers, vol. 1, ms. 38492, fol. 104, The British Library, London. This is perhaps the earliest use of the term Sabbatarian. "With characteristic Erastianism he preferred to call Sundays 'the Queen's dayes.'" Brief notes of the sermon survive among the papers of Sir Edward Lewkenor of Denham, Suffolk.... Collinson, "The Beginnings of English Sabbatarianism," 220, note 5.

others “defended the prelacy, stood for the prince and state ... and so battered the new discipline as hitherto they could never, nor hereafter shall ever fortify and repair the decays thereof.”<sup>195</sup> He reported that, defeated in their presbyterian scheme, the brethren sought to recover some advantage “by an odd and a new device of theirs, in a special article of their classical instruction.” This ploy was a new doctrine of the sabbath. Rogers observed that this doctrine could be summarized in two parts: first, that “the Lord’s-day, even as the old sabbath was of the Jews, must necessarily be kept, and solemnized of all and every Christian, under the pain of eternal condemnation both of body and soul;” and second, that “under the same penalty it must be kept from the highest to the lowest, both of king and people, in sort and manner as these brethren among themselves have devised, decreed, and prescribed.” He asserted that sabbatarians were judaizers who spread heretical doctrine, teaching that to work on the Lord’s day was as great a sin as killing a man or committing adultery. He also accused them of encouraging licentiousness and profaneness because they condemned the use of holy days. Recalling his horror on hearing these notions preached and reading them in Nicholas Bownde’s [i.e. D.B.’s] *Doctrine of the Sabbath*, Rogers explained that he soon recognized this teaching as a presbyterian plot and noted that the doctrine had made an impression on people’s hearts throughout the kingdom. He stated that “this stratagem of theirs was not observed then, neither, I fear me, is regarded as it should be yet.” However, he rejoiced in the knowledge that he was the man who exposed these sabbatarian errors and impieties and achieved the suppression of Bownde’s book by both Archbishop Whitgift and Lord Chief Justice Popham in 1599 and 1600. He concluded that these censures confirmed “that this doctrine of the brethren agreeth neither with the doctrine of our church, nor with the laws and orders of this kingdom.”<sup>196</sup>

195. Rogers, *Catholic Doctrine* (1854) 17.

196. Ibid, 17–20. Kenneth Parker, “Thomas Rogers and the English Sabbath: The Case for a Reappraisal,” *Church History* 53, no. 3 (September 1984) 333–334.

197. William Twisse (1578–1646) who was about thirty years of age at the time of Rogers’ charge, calls the account into question in his *Morality of the Fourth Commandment* (1641) which Gilfillan picks up in his dueling work with Cox in the mid-nineteenth century. James Gilfillan, *The Sabbath Viewed in the Light of Reason, Revelation, and History: with sketches of its literature* (1862) 76–77. Cf. Robert Cox, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question* (1865) 212–213.

198. The other authors named in the reference are Solberg, Greaves, and Sprunger. Also see Allen’s useful “Historiographical Review of Nicholas Bownde’s Writings on the Sabbath,” 24–36.

199. Parker, “Thomas Rogers,” 332–333.

Rogers’ account was picked up by the royalist/Laudian historians and became the ‘official’ storyline of this first Sabbath controversy, casting the doctrine as a Puritan novelty and plot by rascally Presbyterians. The problem is that it is a fabrication, something nonconformists had pointed out as early as 1643 and Presbyterians would also do in the nineteenth century.<sup>197</sup> This distorted account has now been seriously questioned by modern historians as well. In 1984 Kenneth Parker wrote,

From the publication of Peter Heylyn’s *History of the Sabbath* in 1636 to the most recent studies of this doctrine, sabbatarianism has been treated as an important and controversial issue in the post-Reformation period. These studies portray sabbatarianism as a puritan innovation, which that party introduced in an effort to reform the church from below, having failed to convert the English church to presbyterianism.... This “novelty” is thought to have created a division between church authorities and puritans by the end of Elizabeth’s reign. By denying the importance of ancient or medieval precedents for “puritan” sabbatarianism and highlighting selected events in the Elizabethan and early Stuart period, these studies have provided a convincing account of puritan doctrinal innovation and agitation for sabbatarian reforms.

This outline, established by the Laudian propagandist, Peter Heylyn, has dominated historiographical approaches to sabbatarianism for 350 years, influencing the works of Thomas Fuller and Jeremy Collier, as well as M.M. Knappen, Christopher Hill, and others.<sup>198</sup> However, his source of inspiration was an earlier account, published in 1607 by Thomas Rogers.... Although his story is the earliest surviving record of this controversy, there are many reasons to distrust Rogers’s account, for while his reputation as an ambitious careerist and inveterate controversialist suggest caution, his distortion and misrepresentation of evidence and events confirm suspicions about his reliability. Indeed, evidence from the period establishes that late Elizabethan sabbatarians were not innovators, but were elaborating a doctrinal tradition which had medieval origins and was part of the authorized teaching of the English church.<sup>199</sup>

Given the church’s sabbatarian teaching and episcopal efforts to suppress Sunday abuses, Rogers’s account of a late Elizabethan controversy seems inconsistent with the reality. Agreement on this issue at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 emphasizes this point. While historians have agreed that this conference accentuated

and sharpened the differences between church leaders and puritans, sabbatarian concerns cannot be counted among the divisive issues.<sup>200</sup>

Again, to repeat the summary of Parker's case,

Rogers's account is crucial, for it is not only the earliest surviving record of this late Elizabethan controversy, but also the source of an inaccurate and misleading historiographical model. While he succeeded in identifying Bownde and others with extreme sabbatarian notions, an examination of their works reveals that they did not deviate from the authorized teaching of the church, and in some cases they condemned the notions Rogers ascribed to them. Rogers's claim that the sabbath doctrine was a new, unauthorized teaching and part of an extremist and crypto-presbyterian plot is demonstrably untrue. Although Rogers claimed that the concept of a morally binding sabbath was a "subversive" doctrine devised by puritans in the 1580s and 1590s, it in fact was defined first by thirteenth-century scholastics and used by such pillars of the English Reformation as Heinrich Bullinger, John Hooper, Thomas Becon, and others.<sup>201</sup>

The somewhat demurring John Primus concurs,<sup>202</sup>

... it is a mistake to believe that Sabbatarianism was simply and solely the direct offspring of the Puritan-Presbyterian movement in late-sixteenth-century England. There was not a cause-and-effect relationship between Puritanism and Sabbatarianism. Although he overstates his case, Kenneth Parker's work should effectively lay to rest this misguided view once and for all.

Sabbatarian tendencies are discernible in several early English reformers. Sunday absolutism is even apparent in the reformer who has been called a forerunner of Puritanism, John Hooper.<sup>203</sup> There is considerable evidence that high Sabbath views were broadly accepted as protestant orthodoxy in the Church of England early in Elizabeth's reign, if not even earlier in the brief reign of Edward VI. The mature Sabbatarian views that developed after 1580 in greater detail and with increasing sophistication had their roots in these earlier decades of the English Reformation.<sup>204</sup>

#### ASSESSING ROGERS' CLAIMS

John H. Primus grants that Kenneth Parker is right that there was "an early Sabbath consensus in England...."<sup>205</sup> Parker demonstrates that strict observance of the Lord's

Day was simply not novel; indeed it was Rogers anti-sabbatarianism that was the novelty. Whitgift's and Bancroft's views would have been too Sabbatarian for Rogers!<sup>206</sup> Even when James I put out the Book of Sports, the public was generally aghast and Archbishop Abbot refused to have it read in the churches. In fact, in 1614 while Rogers was yet alive, the parliament with Abbot's blessing passed strict regulations against lawful recreations on the Lord's Day.<sup>207</sup> Concerns for stricter observance of the Sabbath cut across nonconformist and conformist lines. Rogers' objection to Bownd's view that it be observed equally by all, is a crass appeal to the selfish interests of the ruling class. His charge that Bownd and others insisted the Sabbath be observed upon pain of eternal punishment is a mischaracterization which Bownd addresses in his 1606 dedication to Bishop Jigon: "14. Lastly, though no man can perfectly keep this commandment, either in thought, word or deed, no more than he can any other; yet this is that perfection that we must aim at; and wherein, if we fail, we must repent us, and crave pardon for Christ's sake. For as *the whole law is our schoolmaster to lead us to Christ* (Gal 3:24); so is every particular commandment, and namely this of the Sabbath. And therefore we are not to measure the length and breadth of it by the over-scant rule of our own inability, but by the *perfect reed of the Temple* (Ezk 40:3); that is, by the absolute righteousness of God himself, which only can give us the full measure of it."<sup>208</sup>

#### WHITGIFT AND POPHAM'S SUPPRESSION OF BOWND'S BOOK

What about Rogers' claim that he was responsible for causing Bownd's book to be suppressed by civil and ecclesiastical authorities? Twisse questioned whether this even happened; there have been no records found supporting Rogers' claims. His writings are the only

200. Parker, "Thomas Rogers," 343.

201. Parker, "Thomas Rogers," 334.

202. See also the analysis of Bownd's work in *Antiquary*.

203. By "Sunday absolutism" Primus means the view that the day was changed to the first day of the week because of the resurrection of Christ and that it cannot be changed by human convention to any other day.

204. Primus, *Holy Time*, 17.

205. *Holy Time*, 13.

206. *Ibid.*, 337. Parker, *The English Sabbath: A Study of Doctrine and Discipline from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge University Press, 1988) 117–118.

207. Parker, *The English Sabbath*, 6, 133.

208. Bownd, *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (Naphtali Press, forthcoming) 9.

evidence. Yet as we have seen, Rogers *modus operandi* appears to be twisting of the facts, not necessarily making things up altogether. Parker sketches the issues and questions raised.

Rogers's account remains a problem, for despite the volume of evidence contradicting his story, it is nevertheless the earliest surviving account. If we are to discount his story, we must not only note the errors in his work but also discover his motive for distorting the evidence. Professor Collinson has provided a convincing description of Rogers as a controversialist who wrangled frequently with his neighbors and a careerist in hot pursuit of preferment. The troubles he had with neighboring clergy in Suffolk, of whom Bownde was one, and his dogged pursuit of advancement in the church would be two good reasons for a 'smear campaign' against Bownde and other precisionist sabbatarians. Indeed, his ambitious nature was reflected in the 1607 preface where he included himself among the great men who had defended the church against heretical doctrine. No doubt he had observed the way Whitgift and Bancroft had used the presbyterian controversies to gain preferment; and it seems plausible to suggest that he attempted to use sabbatarianism for the same purpose—a ploy that did not succeed.<sup>209</sup>

Striking inconsistencies in his account support these suspicions. The most obvious problem is his misrepresentation of Bownde's *Doctrine of the Sabbath*, published in 1595. Although Bownde was a precisionist who favored presbyterian discipline and opposed holy days, he was circumspect on these issues, and his elaboration of the sabbath doctrine did not conflict with the *Homilies* or other authorized works on the subject. The extreme sabbatarian doctrine Rogers ascribed to Bownde was not a part of his work...

However, even if Rogers's account were accurate, it would not explain why he waited four years before reporting Bownde's supposed nonconformity to the authorities. It also seems unlikely that Whitgift would have allowed such a work to go unmolested until the rector of a Suffolk parish brought it to his attention, so long after publication.

Parker raises the interesting theory that Rogers' success, if he indeed had anything to do with bringing Bownde's work to Whitgift's and Popham's attention, may have

had to do with national politics and little to do with the content of the book. The Earl of Essex to whom Bownde's book had been dedicated, was in disgrace and had been scheming to control the government.

[Sir Edward] Coke's years in this office [attorney-general] were the same years [1590s] in which Robert Cecil and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, fought steadily to outmaneuver the other, each seeking to control the government of England—and, it went without saying, the succession to the English throne....

Coke and Cecil set in motion a counterplot. The year before, while Essex was in Ireland [1599], a history-book had caused a sensation in London. It was *the first part of the life and raigne of King Henry VIII*, by Sir John Hayward, a civil lawyer. The book had appeared in February 1599, with a dedication to Essex. Within a month, Archbishop Whitgift had ordered that the dedication be cut out of all unsold copies. A second edition came out in May; Whitgift had all the copies seized and burned. The Queen had been "mightily incensed" at Hayward's book, Francis Bacon recorded. She thought it "a seditious prelude ... [and] said she had good opinion that there was treason in it." Given the royal displeasure, Whitgift seems to have suppressed Hayward's book in order to protect Essex. The archbishop was the earl's most loyal ally on the Privy Council; their friendship went back two decades, to the days when Robert Devereux had been Whitgift's student at Trinity.

By February 1600, Coke and Chief Justice Popham had turned their attention to Hayward. Questions were drafted, written to uncover any political reasons for the book. In mid-summer, after the York House proceeding, the pace of this inquiry intensified. "Although Hayward's book had been carefully scrutinized almost from the time of its publication," Richard Dutton has aptly put it, "it was not found to be of treasonable intent until it was politically convenient that it should be so." On July 11, Coke interrogated the historian. Present were the Lord Keeper, Lord Admiral, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Robert Cecil—but significantly, not Archbishop Whitgift. Coke forced a confession out of Hayward, "that the Doctor selected a story 200 years old, and published it last year, intending the application of it to this time." Hayward admitted to writing on the theme of a king who governed badly, conferring benefits on favorites, until these abuses led to his deposition and murder. Hayward further confessed that he had brought into the tale material not found in earlier

209. Parker, "Thomas Rogers," 344.

chronicles, stories “tending to prove that deposers of kings and princes have had good success.”

On July 13, Hayward went to the Tower. That same day, Coke questioned John Wolfe, the printer who had published the book. Within a week, Coke was demanding further answers from Samuel Harsnett, the cleric who had licensed the history's publication. Wolfe testified that he had repeatedly tried to ask Essex, face to face, what the earl thought of the dedication, but each time had been rebuffed. Harsnett complained that the introduction had been “foisted” upon him, without his knowledge. This was hardly clear-cut evidence of treason, but Coke considered what might be made of it.<sup>210</sup>

Charges were never brought but Essex was put under house arrest. The earl grew increasingly desperate and prepared for a coup attempt. “In October [1600], as tensions built, came bloodshed at Norwich. It was a political quarrel, a friend of Cecil maiming a follower of Essex—Sir Robert Mansell fighting a duel with Sir John Heydon. The two knights fought savagely, clumsily, “as if they ran at tilt with their rapiers.”<sup>211</sup> Heydon wounded Mansell eight times. Mansell wounded Heydon twelve times and finally cut off his hand.” Events moved rapidly in February 1601 with the government summoning Essex who declined to appear. When Popham and others went to seek him, he seized them hostage and then led 300 men in a coup attempt which failed. He was tried and executed.

Parker proposes that Rogers took advantage of this political climate to preach his sermon as a means to entrap Bownd and bring his book with its dedication to Essex to Whitgift's attention. “Such a sermon was certain to provoke an outburst from his fellow clergy, particularly Nicholas Bownde. While the evidence is far from conclusive, it seems reasonable to suggest that Bownde may have been manipulated into a politically sensitive position. Rogers's erastian assertion may have been rebutted sharply with arguments from scripture in order to deny the authority of the church and state in this matter. Armed with such a dispute and Bownde's book, with its dedication to Essex, Rogers could have presented a convincing account of religious nonconformity and potentially seditious behavior.”<sup>212</sup> The speculation is that this led to Whitgift's and Popham's suppression of *Doctrine of the Sabbath*.

The theory is an interesting one and we are prepared to now shore it up a bit more. Parker poised the question which he was unable to answer, why did Rogers wait four years to attack Bownd's Sabbath doctrine? First, it

is clear that if Essex was indeed Whitgift's friend, until he fell into disgrace and Whitgift's hand was forced, Essex patronage of Bownd's book insulated the minister of Norton; at least it is not conceivable Rogers would publicly or scurrilously go on the attack. But it is now clear Rogers did not wait until 1599 to address the issue of Sabbatarianism with Bownd; he just did not do so openly on the public stage. This is what we learn from Thomas Rogers letter to Nicholas Bownd.

### Rogers' 1598 Letter to Bownd

This brings our attention to the letter of April 29, 1598 written by Thomas Rogers to Nicholas Bownd. The MS letter is currently owned by the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC.<sup>213</sup> Prior to this investigation, the letter had not been transcribed or referenced in studies of English Sabbatarianism. Does Rogers' letter yield any new information regarding the first Sabbatarian controversy in English Literature? Does it cast Rogers in a different light than the last fifty years of scholarship on the subject? The answer to the first question is happily “yes,” to the second, a resounding and unfortunate “no.” The Thomas Rogers of Codex MS 109, of *Miles Christianus* and of *The faith, doctrine, and religion, professed*, is on full display.

The library description is correct that the letter is apparently a copy owned at some point by Rogers (an author's copy, not the copy sent to Nicholas Bownd).<sup>214</sup> The handwriting seems similar to that of the Chicago Codex, and beyond Rogers himself, there is no compelling reason that comes to mind why anyone else would have forged such a letter.<sup>215</sup> It appears to be genuine. While certainly tainted with what the political class today calls “spin,” the contents ring true to events and to the portrait of Thomas Rogers which history paints for us. In addition to the text addressed to Nicholas Bownd, Rogers continued to record periodic postscripts as events unfolded.

At first glance, the letter does not appear to be something that was drafted with the intent of affixing it to some publication, but is a copy of a personal letter, albeit with a purpose beyond communicating with Bownd. On

210. Allen D. Boyer, *Sir Edward Coke and the Elizabethan Age* (Stanford University Press, 2003) 242, 278–280.

211. Boyer, 280.

212. Parker, “Thomas Rogers,” 346.

213. See appendix 3 for the description, history and provenance of this letter.

214. See appendix 3.

215. See a facsimile of a page of the Chicago Codex 109 in *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, 152.

the other hand, while it seems a bit severe and personal to publish, this is the author of *Miles Christianus* after all, and there do appear to be headers on the left and right pages, “A 2[nd]. Letter” and “Unto the Author.”<sup>216</sup> Or this may have been done to prepare the document to go with others such as a ‘first letter to the author,’ as some form of report. The postscripts are intended for someone whom at the end Rogers addresses as “your Lordship,” which given the contents seems most likely to imply Archbishop Richard Bancroft. If so it is conceivable this communication may have led to the new edition of *English Creed* in 1608. It may even be the case the contents of this letter were maintained and prepped and envisioned to serve as front matter to that or some other publication.

So what exactly do the contents of this letter from Thomas Rogers tell us; and why did he write it? Though being ever cognizant of Rogers’ prevaricating ways, what becomes clear from the letter is that while the circumstances are a bit different and occurred earlier than theorized, the scenario which Kenneth Parker speculated might have happened did take place. While Rogers did wait four years to publicly take on Bownd, he almost immediately began to harass and eventually caused him to defend himself, which placed the Norton rector in a position Rogers could manipulate.

However, while at this early date we cannot rule out Rogers’ ambitions and designs to use Sabbatarianism as a means of advancement, as his seeming models Whitgift and Bancroft had done with nonconformity and Presbyterianism—indeed his letter may confirm this—the real fuel for the flames of contention seem to be the same as his previous conflicts. Bownd may have allowed himself to be manipulated into a conflict by something Rogers did, but it should not be surprising that the root cause of the Bury contention, the conflict with Miles Mosse, and with Nicholas Bownd, were the same. The origin of the first Sabbatarian controversy in English literature was bruised ego: an intolerance of correction, an inability to bear any slight, an insistence on being given presumed due respect—all the trappings of an over-inflated sense of self.

The letter makes clear that after the publication of Bownd’s *Doctrine of the Sabbath*, Rogers began regularly pestering Bownd to answer his objections. This

may have occurred at the Bury exercises if Rogers had begun attending them again by then or perhaps on other occasions or in correspondence. Bownd would politely put off Rogers’ queries promising to address them. It is likely he anticipated doing so in a second edition, which he apparently was planning about the time of Rogers’ letter. After 18 months from the time he first brought his questions formally to the rector of Norton, it became clear to Rogers that Bownd was not going to give him any satisfaction.

Frustrated, Rogers wrote Bownd, or preached a sermon or sermons, or communicated to authorities (perhaps Redman or Bancroft), or all of these, actions which he claimed were ‘private’ (as opposed to public, by which he means Bownd’s published discourses), all of which resulted in stirring Bownd to take action and to formally complain to the Bishop of Norwich, William Redman. This complaint caused the bishop to ask Rogers to come to Norwich.

The letter opens with Rogers’ attempt to wax eloquent, portraying two storms he witnessed going up to the cathedral (5r). The one was a real tempest with thunder and lightning assailing the steeple of the cathedral, which withstood the storm; and the second was Bownd’s complaint which assailed Rogers, which he likewise withstood. Bownd was not there and apparently Rogers turned the situation to his advantage.

Continuing for four pages (5r–7r), Rogers castigates Bownd in a withering fashion for constantly rebuffing his attempts to get answers to his questions. Rogers denies he offended—it is Bownd’s doctrine publicly offending the church; what Rogers had done was private. “Have I offended? it is against your selfe onlie, and as a meane degree; you have transgressed, so farre as I can judge, after an heinous manner and offended greatelie the church of God with unnecessarie discourses: mine act is private, yours publique...” He downplays his offense; ‘he never would call any man to an open account for his public doings howsoever scandalous’ (forgetting *Miles Christianus* apparently), but Bownd had Rogers hauled up to the bishop ‘for a private and petty wrong if it was any wrong at all?!’ (5r). “Be thou vexed with others? Thank yourself M. D[r]. Bownde” (5v).

Rogers complains Bownd dallied and would not answer his queries for 18 months despite fair promises to answer. “Be thou yet latelie again, and afresh come into some mens hands? Thank your self stil.” The inquisitor complains Bownd publicly continued to defend every bit of his book even though he promised in his 1595 preface to hear out his godly brethren’s critiques, which Rogers considered as his license to keep pursuing

216. This may indicate and have in view an earlier letter in which Rogers first complained to Bownd about his sabbath doctrine. Since the early provenance and history of the letter remains unknown, we can only speculate what the intentions were for the copy of the letter or why it was not used. However, it may be that this letter is the MS mentioned by Anthony à Wood (see appendix 3).

the matter. Bownd's book has several examples of language deferring to his godly brethren. Particularly in his 1595 preface he writes,

And here (dearly beloved in the Lord) as I have simply, and as it were with a naked breast declared unto you, the causes of my beginning and proceeding in this work, and that I have not rashly, and on the sudden fallen into these opinions, and thrust forth myself into the world, so I most humbly crave of you this favor, that all prejudice and sinister affections being laid aside, all things might be weighed in an even balance, before they be refused, as not having their just weight, even there where they might carry some show of untruth, according to the canonical rule of the Apostle, much more that all frivolous wranglings, contentions, gainsaying, ambitious desire to overcome, and perverse drawing of things to a wrong sense, being forborne, where I seem to err (as I acknowledge myself subject unto it) I might charitably and Christianly be admonished by your godly wisdoms, that so I might also either by better proofs second the truth, or else upon more mature deliberation retract mine error, if there be any. For I do most willingly submit myself unto the Church of God, by it in all things to be censured and reformed, according to His word.<sup>217</sup>

Rogers shows himself in his letter to be a master manipulator of these and other words of Bownd. He obviously believed he was owed the right to criticize; but it is interesting that Bownd was already forecasting some of the undesirable reaction to his doctrine, such as "wranglings, contentions, gainsaying, ambitious desire to overcome, and perverse drawing of things to a wrong sense." Perverse twisting of words to a wrong sense pretty much characterizes Rogers' 1598 letter. Bownd had very good reason to avoid committing himself to or answering Rogers' "questions." In a passage of his letter it becomes clear Rogers had been after Bownd for years (perhaps since Bownd first lectured on the fourth commandment in 1585/86) and apparently had not only preached against Bownd's doctrine, but written and complained to some authorities.

But the truth is I have not wronged you at all, unless either in *mine one* charge to preach the truth (from which you vary) about the matter of the Sabbath; or with some few men of good place, and credite in the contrie and church if England, to communicate the naked and bare assertions which you have preached openlie among the vulgar people; communicated privatelie with your

zealous Brethren; and at last, after nyne yeares conference, and consultation (I wot not with what men) of fensivelie divulged among all sortes and callings of men in this land, be a wrong, and such a wrong also offered unto you as by none other *men/mean*, and manners, but onlie by my Lord himself and by his auctoritie hee beareth over us, must needes, and that speedlie be understood. (5v).<sup>218</sup>

Rather than the true Lord of the Church, Rogers may be speaking of Whitgift in his last comment, or of Redman. Whichever prelate may be in view, he clearly intimates he had communicated to authorities and detailed his objections to Bownd's doctrine, no doubt in the prejudiced way we have recorded in this letter. This may be a clue to what moved Bownd to complain to Redman. Perhaps Rogers wrote directly to or his communications found their way into the hands of Bancroft, who had become Bishop of London the year before? Bancroft was an enthusiastic censor of books and Bownd's publisher was in London, Thomas Man (Mann).<sup>219</sup> In his 1606 preface, Bownd wrote the following,

When as more than eleven years past I had first published this treatise of the Sabbath, I was in good hope that I had made an end of my labors in that argument; until such time as all the books of the first impression being quickly dispersed into the hands of men, I was solicited about two years after both by the printer and some others unto a second edition .... And so I condescended unto them at last, and within a few months sent them my book with some additions; which not long after it came safely into their hands (I know not through whose default) miscarried, as an untimely birth, and so hitherto has been suppressed. Whereupon I thought myself much more discharged from undertaking this burden anymore....<sup>220</sup>

If Bownd's recollection is accurate, and assuming nine months to cover both the selling out of the 1595 printing, pondering a new edition and finally submitting material, the two years of time he mentions puts the faltering of the publication around the time of Rogers' letter. It may be that Rogers had facilitated through Bancroft

217. Naphtali Press edition, 5–6.

218. Words in italics are transcribed with some degree of uncertainty.

219. Thomas Mann was one of the producers of the 1595 edition (the Widow Orwin for John Porter and Thomas Man) and the 1606 edition (Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man and John Porter), and it is a good assumption he would have been involved in the suppressed c.1598 edition.

220. Epistle to the reader (1606), Naphtali Press edition, 9–10.

the suppression of the planned edition. In fact Thomas Man (Mann) was known as Bancroft's 'familiar'<sup>221</sup> and Bancroft would have had access to knowledge about Bownd's book, and Man may have been directly involved some way in the suppression at that time.<sup>222</sup> Bownd writes that he did not know by whose hand the printing had been waylaid; but he may have known Rogers had mischaracterized his doctrine to authorities and that may have been the motivation for him to have complained to Redman. It may be the publication was simply delayed and then suffered suppression later under the alleged orders by Whitgift or Popham. This may explain Bownd's uncertainty as to what exactly occurred.<sup>223</sup> There are no records of anyone suppressing the publication so this must remain speculation.

Rogers accuses Bownd of being unwilling to listen and proceeds to call his doctrine heretical and Jewish. In reaction to Bownd's complaint and in Rogers' mind Bownd's unwillingness to interact with his criticisms he writes: "Maie not these thinges be knowen, but you are offended? Howe wil you then take them when thei come, as needes thei must, to the publique intelligence even of my Lord himself?<sup>224</sup> And for this also you must stil thanke your selfe. Some men wilbe sirring when thei

better sit stil." "You were not wel advised M. D[r]. to complaine of mee;<sup>225</sup> neither do you wel for your selfe, though passing wel for the church, and mee in following such advise. For hereby shal appear how the Church by you is abused; and by the lawful auctoritie of the our saide Church. I am also-moved to discover the same..."

To put it mildly Rogers was incensed, and he clearly did not like whatever 'private' things he had done called into question. One gets the picture that Rogers is thinking, 'You're the heretic, and you complained to the bishop ABOUT ME?!' Rogers was after all the self-appointed interpreter of English doctrine as the author of *English Creed*. The kindest interpretation of Rogers' piling up of invectives and excusing of whatever it was he had done to provoke Bownd would be to say that it indicates the overcompensation of a guilty conscience.

This gatekeeper of orthodoxy then proceeds to outline and remind Bownd of his objections to *Doctrine of the Sabbath*, which takes up the next seventeen pages of the letter before closing (7r-13r).<sup>226</sup> These are divided into eleven sections filled with quotations from Bownd's work with marginal notes indicating the location in the 1595 edition. These are not just quotations. Rogers casts Bownd's words prejudicially, so if they are simply affirmed the minister of Norton parish would be admitting his teaching was out of accord with the doctrine of the church. No wonder Bownd had not been answering Rogers directly for so many years!

The untitled first section contains general propositions that Bownd taught regarding the Sabbath (creation ordinance, that all are to keep it, etc.), but cast together with the opening line of Rogers' (borrowing from the Athanasian Creed), that "whosoever will be saved," it is necessary to believe such things.' This is the first clue that these interrogatories to which Bownd was to answer would involve a kind of self incrimination worthy of an inquisition. Nine titled sections follow: "§2. Against prescribed holie daies. §3. The Sabbath daies rest, al precise. §4. The precise rest, what? Jewish. yea, more than Jewish. §5. Abuses to be reformed on the Sab. daie. §6. No moral duties of the second table to be so much as thought upon of on the Sabbath. §7. Everie man must, and may do al his worldlie businese in the 6. daies of the weeke. §8. The exercises of the Sab. without which the daie is not sanctified but prophaned. §9. The Sab. necessarilie to be kept, mode and forme as is above prescribed, under the paine of eternal condemnation. §10. The fate of them which in al pointes reforme not themselves according to the Sab. doctrine.

The final §11 is again without a marginal heading. Here Rogers pulls together snippets of Bownd's words

221. In the Roman Catholic Church a familiar is person performing certain services for a bishop's household.

222. "Bancroft's appointment [to act as censor] was arranged by the courtier-statesman Robert Cecil in 1598. Functioning in this case as Cecil's deputy, Bancroft was directed to control London Presses in order to prevent the dissemination of propaganda against the Tudor government." Man was involved in Bancroft's scheme to control Catholic recusants by causing a division amongst the various factions by authorizing four printers to produce prints for English Catholics. These printers all worked for Man (Jeremy L. Smith, *Thomas East and Music Publishing in Renaissance England* {Oxford University Press, 2003} 99). Presenting another troublesome fact for Rogers' claim Bownd's book was suppressed for its Sabbatarianism is the fact Man had produced editions of Dod and Cleaver's work on the ten commandments, Greenham's *Works*, as well as the 1606 edition of Bownd's book. Man's handling of the production may be another reason Bownd was reticent to look too deeply into who exactly was at fault.

223. It is certainly possible Bownd simply did not want to even mention Rogers rather than stoke his critic's vanity. In the 1606 edition as will be seen, he interacts with Rogers' criticisms, but never names him; perhaps with a similar goal of the writer of Ruth's "such a one" (Ruth 4:1).

224. This probably refers to Redman.

225. Emphasis added. This rather amazing display of self importance is remindful of the Rogers who, amongst other self aggrandizing things, wrote of himself, "And yet, though yee are now tenn to on[e], M. Rogers is not alone. He hath his favorers, and moe coadjutors than yee thinke, or than yee would he had." *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, 177.

226. See the transcription below.

from throughout his book, declaring several ways that all the forgoing was truth which he believed, and also pulling together various places where Bownd affirmed he was not infallible and was subject to error and would place his views for examination before his brethren—all again with the aim, that by simply affirming the words Bownd would be affirming his guilt. This is all of course very despicable, and the reason why this can fairly be called an inquisition on Rogers' part. If Bownd affirms the words, he is guilty; if he denies the words, he is lying. It clearly took a lot of time to comb through Bownd's 1595 book, picking out this phrase to put with another and another, all with the goal of trapping the man, rather than to understand him or reflect his views fairly.

At the end of the letter Rogers begins recording his account of events that unfolded over eight years after Bownd presumably received the letter (13r–14v). Again, these are clearly tainted with Rogers' biased perspective and questionable motivations. However, in this letter written ten years prior to Rogers 1607/08 edition of *English Creed*, he makes the same allegations that Whigift and Popham suppressed Bownd's book. He also appears to use some of his critical comments recorded in this letter in that work.

According to Rogers, the events following the sending of his letter to Bownd unfolded like this: First, Bownd, upon receiving Rogers' letter, was so stricken in conscience that he skedaddled immediately off to Norwich to repent before the bishop. He begged Redman that he not be urged any further by anyone to continue to defend Sabbatarianism and promised he would no longer write about the Sabbath if Rogers would cease his contention. Rogers portrays this as Bownd being so astonished by his letter and unable to disprove Rogers' case, that Bownd could neither defend nor insist on his doctrine—but neither would he retract his Sabbath doctrine. This last detail indicates more was going on, and of a different nature than Rogers casts. But stripping away the self-aggrandizing aura, some of it rings true. We know Bownd found that with a full-time pastorate it was very difficult for him to take the time to write, and it was only at the urging of his supporters that he would finally be moved to do so. This is clear in the long delay in the first edition of his book, and he also indicates in his 1606 edition that it took some opportunity to convince him to undertake the second. It is easy to believe Bownd would have traded a second edition to avoid trouble. It is very doubtful Bownd was so astounded by Rogers' letter that he in essence 'couldn't think straight.' More likely Bownd took a page from his stepfather's playbook and played a toady or sycophant,

and simply asked not to be forced to defend his doctrine; he would simply keep his peace for peace sake. This seems much more likely in light of the other entries Rogers makes.

Bownd's trip to see Redman seems to have short circuited Rogers' plans for an inquisition, at least for a while. Nothing happened for another 18 months, when in an entry dated October 1599, Rogers asserts that Whitgift called in Bownd's book within the diocese of Norwich. On February 18, 1599/1600, Bownd was, according to Rogers, convented before the bishop and made to answer whether or not he held to a list of beliefs Rogers had drawn up in his letter. Bownd denied they were in his book. However, if there is any truth to this, what is much more likely is that Bownd simply denied maintaining views as prejudicially portrayed by Rogers. A year later in January 1601 Rogers records that Chief Justice Popham prohibited Bownd "from divulging" any more of his Sabbath books. Rogers writes that this was in "consideration of some of his said assertions."

In the final undated entry of the postscript, it is clear things had not gone as planned. Rogers is clearly frustrated and flummoxed. He notes that lately in the last year Bownd had so repented himself of "his doinges" that he published an expanded edition for which Rogers gives the title, *Sabbatum veteris et novi Testamenti*. Exasperated he notes some of the most "grave, and reverend persons and prelates of this Church" had commended it (e.g. Jegon, Willet, etc.). This new edition had "divers novel, and strange paradoxes" but left "out not so much as one of his former and formerlie forsworne assertions...." Rogers sounds defeated and perhaps was trying to pursue some means of relief from Bancroft. This may have set Rogers on course to revise and publish a new edition of the *English Creed*, to get his revenge.

As far as how Rogers casts Bownd's behavior, it is certainly possible Bownd repented of refraining from no longer writing about the Sabbath; but that conclusion rests upon giving full credence to Rogers' 'interpretation' of events. Even if Rogers was accurate, rather than the issue being about Sabbatarianism, it may have been about what course Bownd thought was best to avoid contention. With a new bishop, Bownd may have believed he was no longer under any obligation to a promise to Redman, particularly if Jegon encouraged the work.

It is true that, prior to things turning around, Rogers may have had some success in prejudicing Redman against Bownd, making the most he could of passages in *True Doctrine* that reflect a *jus divinum* view of worship and of church government. This and the horribly prejudicial cast Rogers gave to Bownd's book in his

1599 sermon could have been enough to have Bownd convented before Redman. That is, if that truly happened—though there is no reason to suppose that it did not. When Jegon first took office in 1603 and surveyed his diocese, the entry for Bownd notes the rector of Norton was “a doctor of divinity and preacher ‘of honeste life and conversation.’” However, “the words ‘scismatically affected’ following his name” have been marked out.<sup>227</sup> The black mark now removed may have been the only result of Bownd’s appearance before Redman.

But what are we to make of the two suppressions Rogers claims Bownd’s book suffered? If Rogers’ ‘facts’ are put in a table with other events, things are a bit clearer (see Table of Events).

#### TIMETABLE OF EVENTS (\*CLAIMS MADE BY ROGERS)

- February 1585. Part one of Rogers’ *English Creed* is published.
- 1586. Bownd concludes a series of sermons on the ten commandments.
- April 1587. Part two of Rogers’ *English Creed* dedicated to Hatton is published.
- February 4, 1588/89. Hatton gives a speech at the opening of Parliament, equating Puritans and Papsts.
- February 9, 1588/89. Bancroft preaches his infamous sermon against Puritanism.
- December 1589. Rogers preaches his sermon attacking Presbyterianism at the Bury exercises.
- July/August? 1595. *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* is published.
- \*October 29, 1596. About this time Rogers claims to have formally asked Bownd privately to satisfy his questions.
- May 8, 1597. Bancroft is consecrated Bishop of London and due to Archbishop Whitgift’s age and health, manages ecclesiastical matters. His duties as bishop include censoring publications.
- July 1597–1601? A second edition of Bownd’s book likely in the hands of Thomas Man is suppressed at some point.
- 1598. Published (but not apparently licensed), R[obert] C[leaver], *A Godly Forme of Houshold Government*. Comments on the Sabbath are copied from Bownd’s book.<sup>228</sup>
- \*April 29, 1598. Letter of complaint from Thomas Rogers to Nicholas Bownd.
- \*April/May, 1598. Bownd supposedly asks Bishop Redman that he no longer be urged to write on the subject of the Sabbath.
- 1598. Bancroft begins acting as Cecil’s deputy in censoring anti government propoganda.
- March 1, 1598/1599. Censure of Hayward’s dedication to the Earl of Essex.
- March 7, 1598/99. Licensed to publish: Richard Greenham, *Treatise of the Sabboth*, in *Works*.<sup>229</sup>
- May, 1599. All printings of a second edition of Hayward’s book are seized and burned.
- October 1, 1599. Earl of Essex is put under house arrest.
- \*October, 1599. Whitgift supposedly calls in copies of Bownd’s book within the Diocese of Norwich.
- December 10, 1599. Rogers preaches his sermon against Sabbatarianism at Bury St. Edmunds.
- 1600. Published (but not apparently licensed), another edition of Dod and Cleaver’s *A Godly Forme of Houshold Government*.
- \*February, 1599/1600. Bownd is supposedly convented before Redman.
- May, 1600. Another book associated with Essex is suppressed.
- July 11–13, 1600. Hayward is forced to confess and is sent to the Tower.
- September 1, 1600. License: 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> parts of a third edition of Richard Greenham’s *Works*.<sup>230</sup>
- October 1600. A follower of Essex and a friend of Robert Cecil, the Earl’s political rival, fight a notoriously bloody duel in Norwich.
- \*January 1600/1601. Popham supposedly prohibits Bownd from publishing.
- February 8, 1600/1601. The Earl of Essex is arrested and executed February 25.
- November 2, 1601. Licensed: George Estey, *Exposition upon the Tenne Commandements*.<sup>231</sup>
- October 19, 1602. Licensed: George Estey, *Certain Godly and Learned Expositions*.<sup>232</sup>
- 1603. Bishop Jegon removes the suspicion that Nicholas Bownd was “schimatically affected.”
- 1603. Published (but not apparently licensed), another edition of Dod and Cleaver’s *A Godly Forme of Houshold Government*.
- 1603. Published (but not apparently licensed), Dod and Cleaver’s work on the ten commandments.
- January 16, 1603/1604. License for another edition of Greenham’s works.<sup>233</sup>
- June 27, 1604. Licensed: George Widley, *Doctrine of the Sabbath*.<sup>234</sup>

227. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, 189.

228. Dennison, *The Market Day of the Soul* (2001) 50, n153.

229. Arber, 3.105–106.

230. Arber, 3.170.

231. Arber, 3.194.

232. Arber, 3.219. A reprint of the above, published in 1603.

233. Arber, 3.251.

234. Arber, 3.266.

- May 9, 1605. Licensed: Andrew Willet, *Hexapla in Genesin*.<sup>235</sup>
- June 5, 1605. Licensed: Robertus Loeus, *Effigiatio veri Sabbathismi*.<sup>236</sup>
- February 3, 1605/06. William Burton, *An Abstract of the Doctrine of the Sabbath*.<sup>237</sup>
- Late 1606/early 07. Bownd publishes a second edition.
- December 18, 1606/07. Licensed: John Balmford, *Three positions concerning the 1 Authoritie of the Lords day...*<sup>238</sup>
- February 2, 1606/07. Licensed: John Sprint, *Propositions ... the necessarie use of the Christian Sabbaoth or Lord's day*.<sup>239</sup>
- March 11, 1607/08. Date of Rogers' preface to *Faith, doctrine, and religion*.

Other than Rogers' account, there is no evidence that the two suppressions of Bownd's book had to do with the work's Sabbatarianism; nor is there evidence of a general Sabbatarian controversy at this time. No other Sabbatarian books were recalled, and books proclaiming Sabbatarian views freely continued to roll off the presses, including unlicensed works issued without controversy. As Parker surmised, the two suppression events occur during periods where there was intense activity concerning the Earl of Essex. The suppression by Whitgift, who had already seized the second printing of Haywood's book, occurred the same month the earl was put under house arrest. Popham's suppression came at the height of fears of rebellion and not too long after a notoriously bloody duel in downtown Norwich between a supporter of the earl and a friend of his chief rival Robert Cecil, and a month or less before the attempted coup.

We only have Rogers' account of these suppressions. There are no official records proving they took place, and both Whitgift and Popham were dead by the time Rogers published these claims in 1608.<sup>240</sup> If they occurred, it is not certain what form the suppressions took. One or both may have involved the aborted second edition, rather than a physical recall of the 1595 book. Rogers does write that Whitgift, at "synods and general counsels" in the diocese of Norwich only, had copies taken from the common peoples' hands. Were folks walking around with the book, or were the justices going from house to house? The concerns over Essex were very keenly felt and while it is possible a dedication with an elaborate frontispiece of the earl's coat of arms could have ignited such an order, it hardly seems possible the general content of Bownd's book would have done so.

Why is there a gap of 20 months from Bownd's first meeting with Redman and the bishop's finally requiring him to answer Rogers' charges? What the table of

dates shows is that Whitgift's recall of Bownd's book 16 months after Bownd's troubles began is closely followed less than two months later by Rogers' sermon at Bury against Sabbatarianism, December 10, 1599. Bownd was then convented before Redman in February. It does seem that rather than Whitgift reacting to Sabbatarianism, it was Rogers who was taking advantage of the political tensions to recast events toward an anti-Sabbatarian narrative, preaching a very public sermon which placed Bownd back before Redman.

We now know that Rogers objected to Bownd's teaching from at least the first publication in 1595, and was irate at the delays and avoidance tactics Bownd was wisely putting up in dealing with the vinegar-tongued careerist conformist. Subsequently he also clearly was seething from the perceived indignity of Bownd's complaint to Redman. However, Rogers could not dare make a move openly against Bownd's book and doctrine until Whitgift had abandoned Essex. Once any barrier was removed, Rogers' way was clear to publicly denounce and attack *Doctrine of the Sabbath*.

Did Thomas Rogers some way influence Whitgift to call in Bownd's book? While his letter focuses on strict Sabbatarianism, it also spotlights Bownd's nonconformist views on worship and government, even though his views on holy days are brief and moderately expressed, and there is only the barest hint of *jure divino* Presbyterianism. By 1608 in *Faith, Doctrine, and Religion*, out of Rogers' suspicious imagination and/or vengeful fabrication, Sabbatarianism had evolved into a subversive Presbyterian plot against the established church. In Rogers' mind the two were linked as issues challenging church authority; Sabbatarianism in insisting on a divinely appointed Lord's Day, and Presbyterianism in requiring a form of government prescribed in Scripture. However, while in his letter Rogers was clearly trying to showcase Bownd's nonconformist views, this 'plot' aspect is not developed. So as with Redman, while it is possible Rogers contributed some way by prejudicing Bancroft and Whitgift against Bownd's book over the question of *jure humano* versus *jure divino* authority, there is no indication this could have been a prevailing factor in the alleged suppression of 1599.

235. Arber, 3:290.

236. Arber, 3:291.

237. Arber, 3:312.

238. Arber, 3:335.

239. Arber, 3:338.

240. John Popham died June 10, 1607. This statement presumes Rogers was following Julian dating in his dedication to Bancroft as discussed above.

There is also no evidence that Rogers had anything to do directly with actions taken by Popham in 1600. Nor would the chief justice have suppressed a Sabbatarian book, because Popham himself had some notable Sabbatarian habits. We know this because in his 1606 edition, Bownd inserts by way of commendable example in justices, Popham's practice of stopping while on circuit to observe the Lord's Day. If there had indeed been some suppression of Bownd's book by Popham, this makes it clear it was not over any Sabbatarian "assertions" in it as Rogers implied; and this added text may well have been Bownd's subtle way of setting that record straight.<sup>241</sup>

Whatever if any influence Rogers may have had in the suppressions of Bownd's book, with the downfall of the Earl of Essex, Rogers freely went after Bownd's *Doctrine of the Sabbath*. Was this attack fueled from Rogers' indignation at Bownd's complaint against him, or from his endless quest for preferment? These two prevailing

impulses appear to be too intertwined to distinguish a simple motivating factor in Thomas Rogers's dispute with Nicholas Bownd. Regardless of the motivations, Rogers perpetrated a fraudulent Sabbatarian controversy over one man's work which had no impact on Sabbatarian literature or Sabbatarian beliefs in general; in fact, such views became more widely held. As has been noted out of Parker, this fabricated controversy was resurrected by later royalist/Laudian propagandists for their own revisionist histories. However, this propagandist theory has not been embraced by all scholars of English Sabbatarianism.

#### OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPAGANDIST THEORY

While granting in large measure that Parker's work offers a corrective, Primus objected in *Holy Time* (1989),

Parker is right, in other words, in his view of an early Sabbath consensus in England and even partly right in his thesis that Sabbatarianism was not a Puritan innovation; however, he is wrong in his argument that "Puritan Sabbatarianism" was therefore essentially the fraudulent invention of later Anglican propaganda. Sabbatarianism was much more than that. It was a well-developed position in its own right, and by the turn of the century was properly understood as intimately related to the Puritan movement. Failure to see this relationship is to be robbed of an important lens through which to view Puritanism and results in an impoverishment of our understanding of that movement.<sup>242</sup>

No one disputes that Sabbatarian theory went through a period of refinement of which the publication of Bownd's work was the high point of the Elizabethan period. While not denying this,<sup>243</sup> Parker does understate the distinctions in uncovering a long historical consensus of a morally binding sabbath (that Sunday should be observed, disregarding Puritan theological distinctives such as<sup>244</sup> the moral rather than ceremonial nature of the fourth commandment, strict observance, and the divine appointment of the first day of the week as the Lord's Day).<sup>245</sup> Primus however equally misstates Parker's view. It is not that Parker rejects such a distinctive view, which he calls 'precisionist.' The fraud is that there was a legitimate conformist-nonconformist divide over Sabbatarianism during the time from Bownd's first book in 1595 until Rogers *Faith, Doctrine, and Religion* in 1608. Parker contends that the Sabbath controversy did not really heat up until the Laudian extremism of the 1630s.<sup>246</sup> Richard L Greaves writes that he knew of no

241. "The actions of Whitgift and Popham have a certain amount of mystery attached to them. Bownd's high praise of Popham's stringent Sabbath keeping in his revised book of 1606 seems incongruous if Popham was such an enemy of his work." Allen, 25. Cf. *True Doctrine* (1606) 231–232; Naphtali Press (forthcoming) 240–241. Allen reviews Parker's theory about the Earl of Essex on pages, *ibid.*, 248ff.

242. *Holy Time*, 13

243. Parker does "explicitly state what is not being questioned. This study does not deny the special attention given to this issue by precisionists—especially Elizabethan presbyterians. There is also no attempt to minimize the sharp differences over the extent of this observance: the length of the sabbath day, the activities to be used, the recreations to be avoided, and the institution of Sunday as the Lord's day. However, this work does challenge the commonly accepted view that the doctrine of a morally binding Sabbath was a late Elizabethan, 'puritan' innovation that divided precisionists from conformists. It also questions the notion that this doctrine was used in a 'puritan' conspiracy to undermine the authority of the established Church." *The English Sabbath*, 6–7.

244. Summing Greaves, Primus states that the definition of Puritan "Sabbatarianism has three components: the moral nature of the fourth commandment, Sunday absolutism, and strict Sabbath observance. As Sabbatarian doctrine evolved in sixteenth-century England, all three of these elements eventually surfaced, most clearly in the works of Nicholas Bownd, which must be regarded as the epitome of Sabbatarian doctrine." *Holy Time*, 11. See Richard L. Greaves, "The Origins of English Sabbatarian Thought," *Sixteenth Century Journal* XII, No. 3 (1981) 19.

245. Cf. Richard L. Greaves, "Book Reviews: *The English Sabbath* ... by Kenneth L. Parker, *The Catholic Historical Review*, 74, No. 4 (Oct., 1988) 617.

246. "Rejecting the assertion that this doctrine was a long standing source of tension, this study reveals that sabbatarian doctrine and discipline were used as a theological football during the 1630s, in efforts to justify two different visions of the English Church: in support of the reformed tradition with its emphasis on scripture as the ultimate authority; and in defence of a 'catholic' vision, with Church authorities recognized as interpreters and arbiters of doctrine and discipline." Parker, *The English Sabbath*, 6–7.

historical specialist who gave credence to the Heylyn/Rogers theory of a Presbyterian plot to use Sabbatarianism to undermine the established church.<sup>247</sup> However, as noted already, while the truthfulness of Rogers' account of the suppression of Bownd's work has long been suspected,<sup>248</sup> Primus did not buy into the theory that the suppression of Bownd's book had more to do with the Earl of Essex than with Sabbatarianism.<sup>249</sup>

Primus finds understandable logic in Rogers' (and, he deduces, Whitgift's) suspicions of a Presbyterian plot in Puritan Sabbatarianism due to its rejection of their view of church authority.<sup>250</sup> It is certainly true that the continental divide between Puritanism and the high Anglicanism of Whitgift, Bancroft, Laud et al., was the authority of the church to devise ceremonies and appoint holy days. That is certainly the tack Rogers' criticisms take in trying to paint Bownd as a Presbyterian subversive in his prejudiced casting of his views. But granting that Rogers' fraudulent prosecution had a twisted logic in no way diminishes the case that Parker and others before him have made, that Rogers' earlier attack of Bownd was manufactured and opportunistic, apparently rooted as much in his false sense of wounded pride as in his false sense of the church's authority.

Parker essentially 'solves the mystery of 'why did the dog not bark?''<sup>251</sup> The Essex theory accounts for the singling out of Bownd's work for suppression, an anomaly until the real Sabbatarian-anti-Sabbatarian controversies began under Laud. Not a single other Sabbatarian book was suppressed in the earlier period, which seems to prove the limited nature of this first Sabbatarian controversy to a personal vendetta or quest for preferment. Thomas Man, Bancroft's "familiar," continued to publish Sabbatarian works and was also Bownd's publisher! Indeed, just prior to Rogers' 1608 diatribe, the conformist John Sprint published a work just as Sabbatarian as Bownd's. Sprint also held to "Sunday absolutism."

For Primus, this tenet of the divine appointment of the Lord's Day was the bridge too far taken by Bownd and Sabbatarianism, which he faults equally with the anti-Sabbatarianism reaction for the division in the English church which resulted.

Although Sabbatarianism was built on a long tradition of high Sabbath views in England, when it reached full bloom in Nicholas Bownd it contained some important innovative Puritan elements, especially the dogmatic insistence on the divine institution of Sunday as the New Testament Sabbath. Similarly, anti-Sabbatarianism, although built upon a tradition of anti-Presbyterianism, was something of an Anglican innovation. This

anti-Sabbatarianism drove Sabbatarianism completely into the Puritan camp and was equally responsible for the increasing polarization of English Protestantism in the seventeenth century. Its insistence upon reading Presbyterian motives into Sabbatarianism alienated an important and valuable part of the church, eventually to the point of removing that authentic element of Reformed Protestantism altogether.<sup>252</sup>

Of course it is not Bownd's and his fellows' fault that their seeking a consistent biblical view of the Lord's Day (the same now embodied in the Westminster Standards) provoked a wicked reaction in men holding such an anti-Reformational view of church authority in instituting ceremonies.

At the end of the day, while he doubted the Essex theory and retained a belief in a broader controversy than one man's quest at this time, Primus does correctly concur with the inherent injustice in the anti-Sabbatarian reaction, and agrees that Rogers' work set the pattern for future anti-Sabbatarian polemicists.

Sabbatarianism was not a radical movement with a hidden revolutionary agenda spawned by frustrated Presbyterians but was an honest, well-meaning effort on the part of moderates basically loyal to church and state to bring about spiritual and moral improvement in the lives of the people and hence to the nation. This effort was to be undertaken within the framework of traditional government and without a particularly "revolutionary" impulse."

247. See Greaves' one page review, *ibid.* "I know of no current specialist who espouses such a conspiracy theory...."

248. Cf. footnote 176 above and Collinson, "The Beginnings of English Sabbatarianism," 221.

249. *Holy Time*, 2-4, 8-13, 51, 84-99. "Sunday absolutism was regarded by the establishment as another presbyterian attempt to nibble away at the Church's authority." *Richard Greenham*, 164. "More recently, another scholar, after reviewing the evidence, has arrived at a more boldly stated conclusion, namely, that the so-called 'Puritan Sabbath' at the end of the sixteenth century did not really exist, but was a misnomer cleverly concocted by anti-presbyterians in an attempt to prejudice official opinion against the puritans. Their 'sabbatarian novelties' were just another example of their trouble-making tendencies in the church. First presbyterianism, then sabbatarianism, what next?" *Ibid.*, 151.

250. "In fact, beginning with Thomas Rogers, anti-Sabbatarians tended to read all the teachings of the Sabbatarians in light of the authority issue." *Ibid.*, 91.

251. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "Silver Blaze," *Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*. Holmes famously solves the mystery of a stolen racehorse and murder of his trainer from the fact no one heard the watchdog barking during the night.

252. *Holy Time*, 99.

Anti-Sabbatarianism, on the other hand, was an unnecessarily harsh response to this moderate movement. It was a reactionary move to the right, a deeper and more conservative retrenchment into conformity rather than reformation. In anti-Sabbatarianism there are traces of a theological position that departed from the Reformation norm of Scripture alone as its authority, and deliberately and self-consciously adopted tradition and the law of reason as the determinatives for action. Typically, Puritanism is charged with introducing a “new basis for obedience and a new form of authority” into the English church. But if Luther and Calvin provide the norm, it was the Anglicanism of Whitgift and Hooker, and especially of Laud, that adopted a new form of authority.<sup>253</sup>

And specifically regarding Thomas Rogers’ extravagant attacks against Sabbatarianism, Primus writes,

Such allegations, to be repeated many times, led to the polarization of the Church of England into Anglican and Puritan camps in the seventeenth century. When Rogers’s view of the situation became the official party view, it became more and more difficult for Sabbatarians to remain loyal Anglicans. Anglicanism and Puritanism were tragically driven apart in the seventeenth century, not only by intemperate Puritans but also by intemperate Establishment figures who could no longer tolerate Puritan Sabbatarians in the church. The Establishment refused to believe that Sabbatarians such as Nicholas Bownd were capable of basic loyalty to church and state and only wanted the parish churches to use the day of worship more effectively to bring about a higher level of Christian knowledge and virtue in the lives of the people for the benefit of church and commonwealth. If the church’s hierarchy could have accepted that, the course of seventeenth-century English history might have been profoundly altered. They adopted an approach that polarized rather than healed, and the results were disastrous.<sup>254</sup>

#### NICHOLAS BOWND PROVES ROGERS’ LETTER IS GENUINE

We must now revisit the question of whether this copy of a letter to Nicholas Bownd is genuine? Perhaps the clearest evidence attesting that at least some form of this letter was received comes from Bownd himself. Apparently not one to renege on promises, the minister of Norton did in a manner answer Rogers’ prejudicial

253. *Holy Time*, 98.

254. *Holy Time*, 90.

allegations. As we know, Bownd eventually was able to publish a second edition in 1606, in a greatly expanded form. A careful collation of the two editions reveals an interesting fact. To a large extent, the size of the second edition is doubled because Bownd has added material addressing charges, assertions, and mischaracterizations which Rogers had made both in his 1599 sermon and this 1598 letter, often citing Rogers verbatim. This must lead one to conclude not only that Bownd had some form of notes from Rogers’ sermon, but some form of Rogers’ letter as well. This proves that Thomas Rogers confronted Nicholas Bownd in some fashion with his charges, and that to some extent, though difficult to determine, there are kernels of truth in his prejudicial account that in some measure fill in the missing gaps in the story of this first English Sabbatarian controversy.

#### Conclusion

What is the end of the matter as far as our two protagonists are concerned? Bownd was minister at Norton for twenty-six years. It is unclear how much if any his local ministry was affected in the late 1590s and early 1600s by Rogers’ troublemaking over Sabbatarianism. Perhaps it was harmed very little. His published works testify that the gospel ministry was Bownd’s priority and we see in him one carrying out the practical divinity of his stepfather. While he appears to have remained by conviction a nonconformist and some type of Presbyterian, like Richard Greenham he seems to have been able to mesh those convictions with present reality. Perhaps he managed to continue to minister somewhat unmolested in a half-reformed church through both the aid of influential protectors, and by finding a conscience honoring conforming nonconformity.

Bownd seems to have maintained good relations with the Bishops of Norwich despite some troubled years under Redman. He clearly saw the benefit of making friends over making enemies. Rogers may have tried to get the last word, but Bownd effectively undid any damage by showing the trapped rector of Horringer how one effectively uses patronage and book dedications. Toward the end of his life and ministry Bownd received a call to More’s old church of St. Andrew the Apostle in Norwich. Allen notes just how significant this was:

Since it was one of the few churches in England that had the right to appoint its own minister, it was a focal point for local piety and a gathering place for the leading magistrates and ministers of England’s second

largest city. Bownd's ministry in Norwich meant that he had reached one of the pinnacles of influence among the godly. It is probable that neither academic nor ecclesiastical advancement were open to him because of his well-known orientation to religious precision evident in his writings on the Sabbath. The Church of St. Andrew the Apostle may have been as good as it could get for someone with such precise convictions.<sup>255</sup>

Bownd died after serving as minister of St. Andrew's for only two years, and was buried in the church, December 26, 1613. His ministry had lasting effects into the next generation, remembered along with John More as "stalwarts of the evangelical legacy at St. Andrew's."<sup>256</sup> More broadly, Nicholas Bownd's *Doctrine of the Sabbath* helped lay a consensus that would become the hallmark of Puritan piety and Presbyterian doctrine when embedded in the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith and Larger and Shorter Catechisms.

Thomas Rogers was rector at Horringer for what must have been a very long thirty-five years. Fuller records that he was a 'painful preacher' and well respected by his parishioners. In light of what we know this appears dubious. Perhaps it is true and the Rogers we know from his publications and his carefully preserved and famously contentious manuscripts only show one side of the man? On the other hand the last thing we learn about Thomas Rogers may serve as his epithet. When he died in 1616 he was buried under an unmarked slab of stone in the church in Horringer. Whether this was from a desire of friends and family to preserve any memorial from vandalism so Rogers' body would be left in peace after the scars left by his contentious ways, or from some long delayed display of humility from a man who felt he never got the accolades and advancement he craved, or simply from a general desire of the local people long ready to be over and done with Thomas Rogers, must remain interesting speculation.

While the minister of Horringer seemingly crows triumphantly about the suppression of Bownd's book and his personal victory in exposing Sabbatarianism, it really was one big fiction—the putting into print of what were otherwise delusions or at worse deliberate lies in some last hope of preferment which never came. Rogers' furious manner in the revision of his *English Creed* must stem from knowing he had been bested by Nicholas Bownd. Not only had the parish minister of Norton finally taken the field again, he effectively answered Rogers' aspersions of his Sabbath doctrine, accompanied by the accolades of some of the best clerics

in England! Bownd effectively out-maneuvered Rogers in the use of patrons and book dedications. And, perhaps more galling, he answered Rogers' objections without ever naming the preferment-starved minister. Rogers' letter proves he knew of Bownd's second edition more than a year prior to his 1607/08 preface; yet he ignores Bownd's answers which he had claimed so long interest in obtaining. One has to conclude Rogers was never interested in Bownd's true views; else he would have made an honest interaction with the 1606 text instead of continuing with his wonted hatchet job of the 1595 first edition. Rogers' frustration is palpable in his postscript at the end of his letter!

Of this his doinges, the Author has so repented him, as of late, even the last yeare hee re-divulged his Sabbath doctrine, entitling it *Sabbatum veteris et novi Testamenti*; inscribing the same unto everie grave and reverend persons and prelates of this Church; inserting therein divers novel and strange paradoxes, but leaving out not so much as one of his former and formerlie forsworne assertions... (14r).

Rogers had attempted to piggyback on the success of Bancroft in suppressing Presbyterianism, by trying to force his anti-Sabbatarianism onto the doctrines of the English Church. But while a generation later Bownd's doctrine would be enshrined in the last and greatest of the Reformed creeds, the fuming lies of the conformist scold of Horringer, which had little effect in stemming the growing embrace of English Sabbatarianism, were only resurrected later to bolster the deceitful accounts of Laudian revisionists. Historians have corrected these distortions which had claimed that this jewel of Puritan doctrine had been a subversive Presbyterian plot, but have puzzled over the singular anomaly Rogers' account presented and how exactly he drew Nicholas Bownd into a dispute. This surviving manuscript, one of several created and preserved by a man who stewed over and could not abide any perceived fault, further shores up the theory that the first Sabbatarian controversy in English literature occurred not just because of the lies and ambitions, but because of the vain, arrogant, hypersensitive and vindictive nature of one Thomas Rogers.

255. Allen, 18–19.

256. Allen, 19, n57. Citing Mathew Reynolds, Allen notes, "Bownde's name was invoked, along with that of John More in the Arminian controversies at St. Andrew's in Norwich in 1633. Bownde was considered one of the stalwarts of the evangelical legacy of St. Andrew's." Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and their Opponents*, 177.

## Thomas Rogers' Letter to Nicholas Bownd, April 29, 1598

### A Transcript

5r To the worshipful, M. D[r]. Bownde Parson of Norton<sup>1</sup>

Sal[utations]. in Chris[t]. At my being at Norw[ich] the 25. and 26. of this April (through my Lord, our chiefe Ordinaries appointment, and your procurement, M. D. Bownde) two thinges there happened suddenlie, unlooked-for on my part, to <my> some amazement for the present tyme *thru* a greate thunder, lightning, and horrible tempest; thither was your grevous complaint there made unto my Lord. The thunder, and lightening terrified manie, but through God his goodness, hurt no man, onlie it lighted-upon, and furiously assaulted the maine and mightie steple of the cathedral church: the Complain[t] fastened upon myself, as lowe, and ob{s}cure place in the church of England. But, God be thanked, though the Steple was battered, yet it continueth, and shal (maugre that fel assault): and my selfe I hope shal stand though strecken by you and scarified somewhat at the instant. The foundation of that Steeple is not so strong, as the grounde whereon I am builded is firm and sure. By the common voice of sondrie persons, Witchas had a *struake/stroake* in that so raging tempest and haile or rather hot-shot against the house of God: and questionless had you not bene bewitched, to speake plainlie, I think you never would and never could have complained, on mee, as you did.

Have I offended? it is against your selfe onlie, and in a meane degree; you have transgressed, so farre as I can iudge, after an heinous manner and offended greatlie the church of God with unnecessarie discourses: mine act is private, yours publike: I cal not you, neither anie man all that I knowe, unto an open<sup>2</sup> accompt, for your publike doings, howsoever scandalous; should not this move [5v] you to beare with mee for a private, and pettie, if anie wrong at al? But the truth is I have not  
 5v wronged you at al, unless either in *mine one* charge to preach the truth (from which you vari) about the matter of the Sabbath; or with some fewe men of good place, and credite in the contrie and church if England, to communicate the naked and bare assertions which you have preached openlie among the vulgar people; communicated privatelie with your zealous Brethren; and at last, after nyne yeares conference, and

1. Folger Shakespear Library in Washington, DC, Manuscript X.d.547. See the description in Appendix 3. Words in italics indicate a reading with some level of doubt. Common abbreviations and contractions such as *ye* for *the*, *wch* for *which*, are expanded silently unless there is doubt about the text. Square brackets [ ] are editorial insertions. Arrow braces < > indicate words the author inserted above the line or marginally in the original. Faint letters or strokes are in braces { }. Illegible letters crossed out are indicate by ~~????~~. Some words were apparently singled out for emphasis with a curved line. These, which are underlined in this text, were interline rather than close under the word and not always exactly centered or targeted. Faint lines and those with unclear reasons for emphasis have been included. My thanks to Chad Van Dixhoorn for his suggestions and input.

2. [The “e” is not as the author normally writes, and could be a filled in “o” or “i.”]

consultation (I wot not with what men) offensivelie divulged among al sortes and callinges of men in this land, be a wrong, and such a wrong also offered unto you as by none other *men/mean*, and maners, but onlie by my Lord himself and by his auctoritie hee beareth over us, must needs, and that speedlie be understood.

You would be moved much, I perceive, and pursue more hotlie, had I verily charged you, when you *convent* mee before his Lordship for discovering trulie the manifold untruthes, and perilous doctrine that you hold, at least-wise heretofore have published. And those *Assertions*, more then bi mee collected, and put-down in wrighting? Thanke your self, Sir; you moved that I would so do and that in most-*earnest* maner, promising al-privatlie in wordes to *revoke* publiquelie what soever in your booke should be shoven to be offensive, or unsound. For otherwise I had never drawn them together?

Be thou vexed with others? Thanke yourself M. D[r]. Bownde. You dallied with, or deluded me rather with honie sweete wordes, promising much, performing nothing; saeing you would heede the churches good, and Gods glorie more than your owne credit, and praise among men, and yet (as it falleth-out) meant nothing lesse. For in three, yea sixe, yea twelve, yea 18. monthes [6r] space, after your receaving of mine advertisements, you satisfied neither the Church publiquelie, nor mee privatelie in anie reasonable sorte, according to your honest promise both by word, and wrighting, publiquelie, and privatelie by your self made. 6r

Be thou yet latelie againe, and afresh come into {s}ome mens hands? Thank your self stil. You have latelie to my face, and before diverse godlie, and learned men (as you knowe) *Stiflie* stood in the maintenance of your booke, and of everie part ~~????~~ and parcel of the same. You have moreover (which you cannot but remember and some of us shal not easelie forget) offered to iustifie some thinges (being the varie groundes and material pointes of your Sabbath doctrine) which be al unsounde, and I might but I *bel{eeve}* to saie, Jewish and heretical; and ere this had so proved them to your selfe, had you not recoiled before *us* al, when you should have subscribed unto your own *Assertions*, as you promised you wold and yet wold not when you were urged thereunto according to your promise.

Maie not these thinges be knowen, but you are offended? *Howe* wil you then take them when thei come, as needs thei must, to the publique intelligence even of my Lord himself? And for this also you must stil thanke your selfe. Some men wilbe *sirring* when thei better sit stil.

You were not wel advised M. D[r]. to complaine of mee; neither do you wel for your selfe, though passing wel for the church, and mee in folowing such advise. For hereby it shal appear how the Church by you is abused; and by the lawful auctoritie of ~~the~~ our saide Church. I am also-*moved* to discover the same. And therefore the more cheerfullie do

- 6v I set-upon this worke; the [6v] more-orderlie I am called there-unto; and that through the instant petition of your verie selfe (as it falleth-out) though peradventure you had another meaning, when at the first you made the complaint.

The first thing there{f}ore that I wil do shalbe once-againe to put before your eies (as it were by a formal warning *peece shot-of* after another forme, and sounding more-shriller perchance than the former alreadie by you, to the verie *eaes* of your inward soule) the diverse positions by you broached about the Sabbath daie, praieing you instantlie to take the cause to hart and in your bookes the thinges which {be} strong and good, iustifie; that be weake, fortifie with substantial proofes; that be crooked and untoward, righten; obscure, illustrate; doubtful, explain; intricate, open, and unfold them; when you are singular in anie opinion, get help, or give it over; when you are mistaken, signifie it; when you have mistaken anie thing, confesse it on Gods name that the truth maie appeare which is amiable; and error be disowned, which is dersable;<sup>3</sup> and peece among the people of God be *continued*,<sup>3</sup> which above al is to be wished, and to be preferred, being in truth, and according to the truth, afore al other thinges.

- 7r Be not offended with me, good M. D[r]. Bownde, the matter *ansring* is yours and I know not whose els, approving, and applauding the same; the methode onlie is mine. The marginal [7r] quotations bring you to your varie wordes, best knowen to your selfe.

---

### §1

Whosoever wilbe saved (a),<sup>4</sup> it is necessarie that hee hold the Catholike faith, gathered “from the Fathers, Greek and Latine, newe and old, so manie” as wee have (b),<sup>5</sup> concerning the Sabbath daie and the due sanctification of the same.

---

3. [Read *desirable*. The reading of *continued* is challengeable.]

4. a. Book 1, 147, 148. [Rogers is setting up an indictment (derisively borrowing language from the Athanasian Creed), that Bownd’s Sabbatarianism is not orthodox, deceitfully weaving citations together, and often leaving off necessary context. This unfair dealing is self-defeating, as it clearly leaves Bownd free to consciously make the denials he does, at least according to Rogers’ account at the end of his letter. This first citation is from the conclusion of book one; yet Bownd is clear there that none can keep any of the moral law and all must flee to Christ for forgiveness and grace to grow in sanctification. Bownd does take the breaking of the fourth commandment very seriously, and warns against treating it in a careless and cavalier manner. Rogers repeatedly highlights this necessity to keep the commandment upon pain of eternal damnation in an attempt to cast Bownd as unorthodox, who will again make his meaning very clear in his 1606 dedication to Jegon (p. A2, Naphtali Press (forthcoming) 8–9, hereafter NP). What follows are eleven sections containing citations from *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1595). There is no indication of Bownd’s words versus Rogers’ in the MS and quotation marks have been inserted silently (ignoring spelling differences, etc.). Otherwise Rogers is paraphrasing, summarizing or commenting on Bownd’s positions. In the MS the letter references refer to marginal notes that were presented on the left-hand side of the pages. These marginal notes are presented in footnotes in the transcription. Marginal side headings are set in the text.]

5. b. Preface.

Which daie, except "everie man, in his several roome, place, or calling, high or lowe, bond or free, old or yong, ruler or ruled" (c),<sup>6</sup> do keep-holie, and undefiled (according to our doctrine, and articles here-under specified) without doubt hee shall perish everlastingly (d).<sup>7</sup>

And our doctrine is this, that wee sanctifie, and keep-holie not one day of seven in everie week (as some are of opinion that wee should) but everie seventh daie unto the worlds ende (e).<sup>8</sup> For this "is natural, moral, and perpetual" (f),<sup>9</sup> as wee do beleve.

"For so soone as the seventh daie was, so soon was it sanctified, that wee might knowe that as it came in with the first man, so must it not goo out but with the last" (g).<sup>10</sup> "Therefore it is not lawful for us to use it unto anie other ende, but" ~~only~~ unto "this holie, and sanctified ende, for which God" himself<sup>11</sup> "created it" (h).<sup>12</sup>

Then wee beleve that the seventh daie, and none but it, was sanctified before "the giving of the law," even of Adam himself; 'and from Adam before the flood until Noah; and after the flood of al [the?] Patriarches until Moses' (i).<sup>13</sup>

Wee beleve that the Sabbath or Seventh daie "which hath that commendation of antiquitie, ought to stand stil in his proper force" (k).<sup>14</sup>

7v

Wee beleve that the sanctification of the Seventh daie "was none of those Ceremonies which were justlie abrogated at the coming of Christ" (l).<sup>15</sup> For "it is commanded in the Decalogue, which containeth in it nothing ceremonial, nothing typical, nothing to be abrogated" (m);<sup>16</sup> and so "is not to be rekoned among the figures and ceremonies of the Jewes" (n).<sup>17</sup>

6. c. Book 1, pages 9, 82, book 2, 258, 259. [The first quotation is from page 79; Rogers later references text on page 82; NP, 185.]

7. d. Book 1, pages 98, 121, 148. [NP, 205, 247, 284.]

8. e. Book 1, pages 6, 9, 34 [sic? 33]. [NP, 46.]

9. f. Book 1, page 7. [Bownd added a significant amount of new text here and at the next reference to page 6 in his second edition. Cf. NP, p. 41.]

10. g. Book 1, page 6. [NP, 41. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 315.]

11. [Bownd's text reads "for which God in the beginning created it."]

12. h. Book 1, page 4. [NP, 39.]

13. i. Book 1, pages 6, 7, 52. ["the"? A short word is blotched and faint.]

14. k. Book 1, page 9. [NP, 57. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 89, 315.]

15. l. Book 1, page 11. [Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 89.]

16. m. Book 1, page 21. [NP, 67. The quotation is Bownd's citation from Heinrich Wolf's *Chronologia*.]

17. n. Ibid. [i.e. book 1, page 21. The text is from the same quotation from out of Wolf. In this section of the 1595 edition, containing three objections answered, Bownd adds two more for the 1606 edition (the old second and third becoming the fourth and fifth objections). "Objection 2: The Sabbath was ceremonial and therefore now taken away," NP, 67-69; "Objection 3: The fourth commandment is partly moral and partly ceremonial," NP, 70-81. The new objection two represents Rogers' view, and Bownd's fifteen page defense of Wolf's statement may well have been sparked by Rogers' letter.]

## §2

Against prescribed holie daies<sup>18</sup>

Item wee believe that this Church hath none auctoritie “ordinarilie, and perpetualie to sanctifie anie daie” besides that the Lord himself hath sanctified (a).<sup>19</sup>

Item wee believe that the Lord hath sanctified the Seventh daie, and no daie but the Seventh (b);<sup>20</sup> and therefore is then “no daie” to “be set-up like unto” this Sabbath daie (c).<sup>21</sup>

Wee believe, and confese that it is no more lawful for the Church to sanctifie anie other daie than the Seventh for the worship of God, than it is lawful to take as Baptisme anie other liquor for water; or at the L. Supper, anie other matter for bread, and wine (d).<sup>22</sup>

Wee are bownde unto the Seventh daie (e).<sup>23</sup> And therefore not bownde are wee to keep anie other daie holie in the week but onlie the Seventh, which is our ordinarie and bownded Sabbath.

- 8r So that the daies for th’open and publique worship of [8r] God in his Church, are by his fourth Commandement (f),<sup>24</sup> onlie 52 in number, neither more nor Fewer anuallie to be sanctified.

Hee therefore that wilbe saved must they thinke of the Sabbath daies; and that so much the rather, “leaſt that fearful iudgment” of “do fall upon him, which the L[ord] Jesus himſelfe threatned to bring upon” them “that shall diminish anie thing contained in the booke” of S. Johns revelation; “and therefore which shal in whole, or in part, take awaie this daie, which is so honored there” (g).<sup>25</sup>

## §3

## The Sabbath daies rest, al precise.

Furthermore it is necesarie t’everlasting Salvation that everie man do knowe rightlie the manner howe to sanctifie, or keep-holie the Sab. daie.

18. [The section headings in the MS were in the left-hand margin with the book references.]

19. a. Book 1, page 31. [NP, 89. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 187, 322.]

20. b. Book 1, page 34, 31. [NP, 102, 89. Bownd added another significant section further arguing the day may not be changed between the old page 31 and 34.]

21. c. Book 1, page 47. [NP, 131.]

22. d. Book 1, page 34 [33–34]. [NP, 102.]

23. e. Book 1, page 35. [NP, 104.]

24. f. Book 1, page 51. [NP, 146. While he opposed more holidays than the one the Lord appointed (52 annually is Rogers’ phrasing), nowhere does Bownd limit public worship to only Lord’s Days. Evidencing receipt of Rogers’ letter, he makes a large insertion including a quotation from Fulke. “Although the Church in days and times, which are indifferent, may take order for some other days and times to be solemnized for the exercises of religion; or that the remembrance of Christ’s nativity, resurrection, ascension, as the coming of the Holy Ghost, may be celebrated either on the Lord’s Day, or any other time; yet there is great difference between the authority of the Church in this case, and the prescriptions of the Lord’s Day by the apostles.” NP, 89, 94.]

25. g. Book 1, page 11. [NP, 58.]

Nowe wee beleewe that the rest upon this daie must be “a rare and singular kinde of rest” (a);<sup>26</sup> “a most” “exact, and precise rest” (b),<sup>27</sup> which “may not by anie fraud, deceit, or circumvention whatsoever be broken, but that he wil most-severlie require it at our “handes,” under “the paine of his everlasting displeasure” (c).<sup>28</sup>

From this rest “there is none of anie calling, or state whatsoever, nor of anie kinde, or sexe,” “that may be exempted” (d);<sup>29</sup> “naie the higher” a man “is in calling, and the more hee hath under his government, the more straightlie is hee bownde unto it” (e).<sup>30</sup>

And as the rest is al-precise, and exact, so must it be kept the whole daie (but whether the whole daie natural, or artificial, wee canot ~~saie~~ preciselie saie, nor daie as yet ????????? define) and not a peece of it (f).<sup>31</sup>

“Wee can never looke to be exempted from” this rest (g).<sup>32</sup> For it must ??? continualie be kept everie Seventh daie “from the beginning to the ende of our lives, without anie interruption, under the paine of everlasting condemnation” (h).<sup>33</sup>

8v

#### §4

#### The precise rest, what? Jewish. yea more than Jewish.

Wee are of believe that wee are “bownde unto the same rest with the Jewes” (a);<sup>34</sup> and that “wee be restrained upon this day from worke, both hand and foote, even as the Jewes were” (b).<sup>35</sup>

26. a. Book 1, page 124. [NP, 254.]

27. b. Book 1, page 53. [NP, 148. Bownd writes, “a most careful, exact and precise rest....”]

28. c. Book 2 1, page 98. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 319. [NP, 205.]

29. d. Book 1, page 82 (“or sex, or age....”), book 2, page 259. [NP, 190, 200, 420.]

30. e. Book 1, page 92, book 2, page 260, 270, 274. [NP, 430, 434. Rogers omits the reason Bownde says this, that the governor must not only observe it, but see to it that his charges do as well.]

31. f. Book 2, page 195. [This parenthetical commentary by Rogers seems to have caused Bownd to address the 24 hour nature of the Lord's Day in the 1606 edition, the largest addition of text in book two. NP, 357.]

32. g. Book 1, page 63. [NP, 158. Several additions and changes were made to this section in 1606 including the addition of a comment from Viret just prior to this cited portion.]

33. h. Book 1, page 146. [Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 19, 233–234, 315, 319. In the next paragraph Bownd writes, “so great cause have we to be humbled before God, and to repent us not only for our sins generally, but particularly for breaking the Sabbath; that so we might see how greatly we do stand in need of Christ Jesus, without whom we should have perished so many thousand times; and how unspeakable the love of God is towards us in Him, in delivering us from so endless misery, so many times deserved by the testimony of our own conscience; but much more by the judgment of Him *who is greater than our conscience, and knoweth all things* (1 John 3:20).” 1595 ed., p. 147, NP, p. 283.]

34. a. Book 1, page 125. [This and the next citation are taken from Bownd's answer to the objection that if our rest is as strict as the Jews' we are still in bondage to the law. He explains in response that we are freed from their reasons for resting and their ceremonies and have more liberty in the manner of sanctifying the Lord's Day. This comment by Rogers also seems to have provoked a revision, as this section was significantly amended in the 1606 edition, beginning with four reasons to prove “there is great reason why we Christians should take ourselves as straitly bound to rest upon the Lord's Day, as the Jews were upon their Sabbath,” and redacting reference to the Jewish Sabbath looking also toward hope “of the Messiah to come....” Some large additions were made under the subheading, “God's punishments upon breakers of the Sabbath.” NP, 256, 258ff.]

35. b. Book 1, page 127. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 315. [NP, 256, 258.]

Wee beleeve that (saving that men are to serve God, and to preserve things which otherwise, if they were not presently seen-unto, would perish) no man either by himselfe, or anie other unto him appertaining (c),<sup>36</sup> maie do anie “worldie businesse upon the Lords daie” which might afore, or maie be done after the Sabbath (d).<sup>37</sup> Wee acknoledg “that in needful things we maie labor” (e):<sup>38</sup> but “wee must be sure that the things we go about could not have bine done before,” “deferred anie longer” (f).<sup>39</sup> “For that onlie the Lord iudgeth to be necessarie” on the Sabbath to be done, “which by no heedful remembrance, or marking wee could have done before” (g).<sup>40</sup>

## §5

## Abuses to be reformed on the Sab. daie.

9r Therefore, for the reformation of certain persons, and callinges, which considerablie do breake the Sabbath, not [9r] observing this holie, and precise Jewish rest, through much unnecessarie imploiments, wee saie that

“The Marchant, and chapman must rest from buieng, and selling” so much as “viĉtuals, fish, or flesh, meate, bread, or drink. For the sixe daies are given them to make their provision” (a):<sup>41</sup> that

“To rest upon the Sabbath is so necessarie, that the imagined necesitie of Harveſt wil not excuse the Husbandman working before God” (b):<sup>42</sup> that

“The Lawier” “muſt” “not onlie rest from going to Westminster hal, but also from studieng the case, reading of evidences, and such like” (c):<sup>43</sup> that

“The Physition must leave of[f] the reading of Galene, and Hippocrates” (d):<sup>44</sup> that

“The Juſticer and Judge must rest from” “examining of causes” “particularly at home, “reserving” “malefactors” “to some other daie” (e):<sup>45</sup> that

The Prince “that sitteth upon the throne” “muſt rest from” his “ordinarie workes,” and so from consulting about the affaires of the common-wealth, upon the Sabbath daie (f):<sup>46</sup> that subiectes, and al under

36. c. Book 1, page 89. [NP, 198, 225.]

37. d. Book 1, page 106. [Rogers parenthetically acknowledges here and following the exceptions to laboring that Bownd gives more briefly in this section and expounds upon at greater length in book two, that men may perform acts of necessity and mercy upon the Lord's Day.]

38. e. Book 1, page 121. [NP, 249.]

39. f. Book 1, *ibid.*

40. g. Book 1, page 118. [NP, 244.]

41. a. Book 1, page 75. [NP, 178.]

42. b. Book 1, page 69, 114. [NP, 168, 237.]

43. c. Book 1, page 78. [NP, 183.]

44. d. Book 1, *Ibid.* [NP, 184.]

45. e. Book 1, page 79. [NP, 185.]

46. f. Book 1, *ibid.*

auctoritie, “must be willing rather with patience to suffer their” governors “displeasure, to beare their rebukes and chidings, yea undergo al their chastisements, and corrections,”<sup>47</sup> than (by doing that upon the Sab. daie, at their governors commandment, what maie be afterward, or might be done afore) (g),<sup>48</sup> “to be drawn one foote from this obedience which God requirieth at our ~~???~~ handes, and wil not leave unrewarded [9v] with manifold blessings both in this world, and in the world to come” (h).<sup>49</sup> For “let men awaie with these pretenses, which wil not serve to say, I am under auctoritie, and therefore must obeie” (i).<sup>50</sup>

We saie more-over, that

No man must make anie marriage dinner, or “other needlese feastes” (nor ~~an~~ stil counte them needless that maie be made before or after) upon the Sabbath (k):<sup>51</sup> that

None maie ring moe Bels than one t’assemble God’s people together unto the divine service, or sermon, upon the Sabbath (l):<sup>52</sup> that

No man maie travel towards Westminster in the Tearme time,<sup>53</sup> what need soever his businesse doth require, upon the Sabbath daie (m):<sup>54</sup> that

No man maie reape anie benefit for his worldlie consaile<sup>55</sup> or labor, necesarilie given or taken upon the Sabbath; neither is to “make a gaine of his travaile upon” this “daie, if necessitie drive” him thereunto (n):<sup>56</sup> that “the physicion or chirurgian, and such as attend upon the sick, or

47. [Rogers does not note it, but this is cited from book 1, page 93. NP, 201.]

48. g. Book 1, page 121. [“that seeing the Lord of his great liberality, even upon that day wherein he requires our rest most precisely, has not cast us into that bondage that we should do nothing at all; but has left us that freedom that in needful things we may labor; it stands us in hand so much the more carefully to look to ourselves, that we be sure that the things we go about could not have been done before, nor deferred any longer; and therefore were necessary to be done at that time.” Emphasis added. Bownd added a good bit more to the 1606 edition prior to the place Rogers is paraphrasing, to further elaborate on the equity of getting our business done in the six days given us by the Lord to labor. NP, 249.]

49. h. Book 1, page 93. [NP, 201.]

50. i. Book 1, *ibid.*

51. k. Book 1, page 94. [Some words are hard to discern but it seems this is another parenthetical comment/question by Rogers. Bownd did expand significantly on the subject of marriage and other feasts on the Lord’s Day in the 1606 edition, adding several pages of material to the subsequent heading “And to prepare necessary and convenient food for everyone.” NP, 202.]

52. l. Book 1, page 105. [Bownd nowhere says this but suggests that one bell was sufficient due to the abuses at that time with ‘professional’ bell ringers. Rogers scurrilously turns his manufactured charge into fact in *Catholic Doctrine*. “It was preached in Suffolk (I can name the man, and I was present when he was convented before his ordinary for preaching the same), that to ring more bells than one upon the Lord’s day to call the people unto the church is as great a sin as to commit murder.” Rogers, *Catholic Doctrine*, 19. See NP, 216–217.]

53. [Short three letter? word obscured or scratched out.]

54. m. Book 1, page 117. [NP, 240.]

55. *Consail*: counsel.

56. n. Book 1, page 122. [NP, 249.]

be anie waies employed about him,” must “take nothing for their paines taken upon the Sabbath” (o).<sup>57</sup> that

10r Th’apothecarie, though hee take monie for his sake,<sup>58</sup> yet must his labor be free upon the Sab. daie (p).<sup>59</sup> “The like must be understood (in our iudgment) of al other workes [10r] of necessitie” (q).<sup>60</sup>

“If the Lawier, Counselor, or Sergeant wil needes travaile” upon the L. daie “about his clients cause,” yet must hee “do it onlie for Gods sake,” “at least wise” hee must “dedicate it unto the poore, and taking it with th’one hand,” he is to “give it” away “with th’other” (r).<sup>61</sup>

Besides “upon the Lordes daie” everie man, of which calling, or degree soever, must “rest from al honest recreations, and lawful delightes”(s).<sup>62</sup>

“And generalie in one worde,” “Everie man in his several roome, place, or calling,” “Ruler or ruled, one or other, even from Him that sitteth upon the Throne, to the maide servant that is at the mil, and the captive that is in prison, must rest from their ordinarie workes” (f).<sup>63</sup>

For wee are of believe that mens “ordinarie workes, which are upon other daies not onlie lawful and commendable, but also necessarie,” yet not necessarlie done (as before is saide) upon the Sabbath daie, “can in no wise agree with the Sab. daie workes, no more than light agreeth with darkenes” (v).<sup>64</sup>

“It is a greater synn to work upon” this “daie than<sup>65</sup> it is taken to be” (x).<sup>66</sup>

## §6

### No moral duties of the second table to be so much as thought ~~upon~~ upon on the Sabbath.

10v Yea, seeing that (as our S. Christe expoundeth the Lawe) hee that is angrie with his brother unadvisedlie, is guiltie” “of murder; and whosoever looketh on a woman [10v] to lust after her, hath committed adulterie <already> with her in his hart (Matth. 6, v. 22, 28): whie should” not we saie with mouth, as we beleve in hart, “that he,” wee saie not that worketh, but that onlie “looketh on his businesse, with a mind desirous to be occupied about them” upon the Sab. daie, “hath broken the commandement of resting alreadie in his hart” (a)?<sup>67</sup>

57. o. Book 1, page 123. [NP, 249, 253.]

58. [“... and the apothecary though he receive money for his stuff, yet let his labor be free.” NP, 253.]

59. p. Book 1, *ibid.* [NP, 249.]

60. q. Book 1, *ibid.* [NP, 249.]

61. r. Book 1, *ibid.* [NP, 249, 253.]

62. s. Book 1, page 131. [Rogers is paraphrasing and quoting from the marginal heading. NP, 267.]

63. t. Book 1, page 79.

64. v. Book 1, *ibid.*, 80. [Bownd added material in 1606 following the cited text. NP, 185.]

65. [The words “daie than” are ink smudged (rather than crossed out).]

66. x. Book 1, page 56. [NP, 151.]

67. a. Book 1, pages 143–144. [NP, 280.]

Wee cannot wee knowe, “so easily cast all worldlie imaginations out of our heads, as wee can cast the thinges themselves out of our handes; neither can wee so farre remove our affections from them, as we can separate our bodies from them, which notwithstanding unless we do (such is our assured persuasion) as th’other” (be it our preaching, praieng, hearing of Gods worde, frequenting of holie exercises, or whatsoever all we do perform unto God in his church, or otherwise) it “is but Popish, and ceremonial, and wherebie we cannot attaine unto the sanctification of the” day “in anie tolerable measure” (b).<sup>68</sup>

## §7

**Everie man must, and may do al his worldlie businesse  
in the 6. daies of the weeke.**

But though worldlie thoughtes can hardlie, and yet they must utterlie be expelled our heds upon the Sab. daie: yet may we finish al our worldlie busines before the Sabbath. For “everie man in sixe daies maie do al his worke” (a),<sup>69</sup> especiallie if he “wil prairie unto” ~~his~~ [11r] “God for wisdom in” his “calling” (b).<sup>70</sup> 11r

And doubtless theie which “take upon” them “so manie things that” theie “are over-whelmed with them, and cannot bring them to an ende with the ende of the sixe daies,” such persons (let them *assure* themselves) they have “inter-meddled with that which belongeth not unto” them; theie “have entered as it were upon other mens businesse; and it is not the Lord, but the Divel that hath set” them “on work,” who “wil on[e] daie” (when it shal lit) “paie them” theire “hire” (c).<sup>71</sup>

## §8

**The exercises of the Sab. without which  
the daie is not sanctified but prophaned.**

Nowe wherein chiefelie the daie is to be comprised; and of the principal exercises of the same summarilie.

Wee beleeve therefore that the Sab. daie cannot in anie parish, either of minister or people, “in the least measure” (a);<sup>72</sup> yea “in the least tolerable measure” (b)<sup>73</sup> be sanctified without a sermon (c).<sup>74</sup>

68. b. Book 1, page 145. [NP, 281–282.]

69. a. Book 1, page 119. [NP, 244, 246–247.]

70. b. Book 1, page 121. [As noted under section 5, note g, Bownd added a significant amount of text following the section Rogers is citing. The sarcastic lead-in comment at the head of this section may have provided additional provocation to elaborate on the equity of six days in which to get our weekly labor completed. NP, 249.]

71. c. Book 1, page 119. [NP, 245.]

72. a. Book 2, page 277. [NP, 313.]

73. b. Book 2, page 165. [“Therefore whereas the Lord is served in the ministry of His Word, sacraments, prayer, and all other parts of His holy discipline and government, which He has appointed for His Church; these are the very things in which the day is to be consumed and spent, and without the which we cannot sanctify it in the least tolerable measure.” Emphasis added. NP, 313.]

74. c. Book 2, page 174. [“And let us confess as the truth is, that the Lord would have *every Sabbath*

Wee beleeve that without their have a sermon everie Sab. daie, the people are “nothing neere that manner of keeping-holie the” Sab. daies “which the Lord requireth at our handes” (d).<sup>75</sup>

And therefore we thinke that al parishioners whatsoever having not a sermon at their owne church everie Sab. daie, are bownde to leave their ~~????~~ ministers whersoever they preach not, and to repaire unto [11v] those places where the worde is preached (e).<sup>76</sup>

Furthermore the Sacraments are so needful to be ministred everie Sab. daie, that without them wee cannot sanctifie the daie in the least tolerable measure (f).<sup>77</sup>

In like sort without that holie discipline, and government, which God appointed for his people, we cannot sanctifie the Sabbath in the least tolerable measure (g).<sup>78</sup>

Manie other thinges the Lord requireth at our hands, for the daie, and serious sanctification of his holie Sabbath, but these of al are the principal.

---

*to be sanctified, by the minister and the people; and that in the church he ought to preach the Word, and they to hear it every Sabbath day. And though we be not so grossly blinded to imagine that it is not necessary one whit upon that day, {as some do}; we must not also be deceived to think that now and then is sufficient—once a month, or twice a quarter; and so sometime both minister and people should be exempted from it, as though they could sanctify the day after some other manner, {and without it.}* Bracketed text are additions to the 1606 edition. NP, 324, 436.]

75. d. Book 2, page 182. [Bownd writes, “Therefore let us confess that these <i.e. preaching of the Word, public reading of the scripture, sacraments, common prayer> are, though not all, yet the most especial parts of God’s service, wherein we are to be occupied upon the Sabbath, and without which we are nothing near that manner of keeping holy the day, which the Lord requires at our hands. {And the rather that we might do so, let us consider how the Church of God from time to time has been careful to use all these parts of God’s worship upon the Sabbath day, according to the means which this way the Lord has bestowed upon them, and they have not contented themselves with some one or two of them, neglecting the rest. . . .}” As in other cases, following the cited text, Bownd has inserted new text in the 1606 edition, citing the practice of the early church from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Ignatius, Sozomen, and wrapping up with quotations from Zanchius and Chemnitz. NP, 338.]

76. e. Book 2, page 173. [Rogers repeats the criticism in *Catholic Doctrine*, p. 327. Bownd wrote: “Which if it be so (as we cannot with the least show of reason deny it), then what cause have we to be sorry for ourselves and others? which have so many times broken this law by willful absenting ourselves from the church without any just cause; or by not seeking to the prophets to teach us, when we had not them at home; and which do so continually see our brethren in many places, for want of teaching, willingly to break this law; and which must needs foresee, ours and their posterity to fall into the same sin, nay to continue and die in it, unless by establishing a preaching ministry everywhere,—which we are commanded publicly to pray for {[margin: in our English Litany] in these words, *Give grace, O Heavenly Father, to all bishops, pastors, and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and only Word.*}—the disease be now cured, and so to be prevented in time to come.” NP, 322, 323, 324. Bownd inserted the explicit prayer for preaching from out of the prayer book in the 1606 edition (the text in braces). In the next paragraph Bownd excoriates those ministers that would not preach, a consistent concern of Bownd’s and in this case, a pretty clear jab at Thomas Rogers who had taken so personally the criticism from Miles Mosse, who had complained of those who “will speak before they have learned” and “write much but preach little.” *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cx.]

77. f. Book 2, page 165. [NP, 313.]

78. g. Book 2, Ibid. Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 315. [NP, 313.]

## §9

The Sab. necessarilie to be kept, *modâ* and formâ as is above prescribed, under the paine of eternal condemnation.

Nowe if religiouslie, as is expressed, wee observe the same, then shall we be rewarded with manifold blessings, both in this world, and in the world to come (a).<sup>79</sup>

“But if we be thold men wee had wont to be, and be no more careful to observe the rest of the Sabbath than wee have bene in times past, then are we not as yet partakers of the benefit of Christe, and so are under the curse of the Lawe, which one daie wil seaze upon us to our endless confusion” (b).<sup>80</sup>

For of our salvation in Christe “then maie we <be> assured that we are trulie partakers when (besides the persuasion of the forgivenes of our synes) wee have [12r] power from him to die unto syn, and live unto righteousnes” (c),<sup>81</sup> as is above enioined. 12r

## §10

The fate of them which in al pointes reforme not themselves according to the Sab. doctrine.

And therefore in fine (to drawe al into a yet more narrowe roome, and to explaine our thoughtes more fullie), wee beleve that

Whosoever keepeth not holie the Seventh daie; whosoever keepeth-holie

79. a. Book 1, page 93. [“yet when men command us to work at the same time that the Lord would have us to rest, we must with all humility and reverence answer them, as the apostles do in the like case, *whether it be right in the sight of God to obey you rather than God, judge ye* (Acts 4:19). And we must be willing rather with patience to suffer their displeasure, to bear their rebukes and chidings, yea to undergo all their chastisements and corrections as the apostles were, when they so said, rather than to be drawn one foot from this obedience to God, which he requires at our hands, and will not leave unrewarded with manifold blessings both in this world, and in the world to come.” NP, 200, 201.]

80. b. Book 1, page 148. [“And thus we truly understanding and rightly applying the law, it shall be indeed (as it is most properly called) *our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be made righteous by faith* (Gal. 3:24), and lead us by the hand unto our Savior, *when it lets us see* (James 1:23), *as in a glass* how in ourselves we are more than lost; and that none can save us, but only He who is truly called *Jesus, because He saves His people from their sins* (Matt. 1:21). Of whose salvation then may we be assured that we are truly partakers, when (besides the persuasion of the forgiveness of our sins) we have power from Him to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness, as well in this commandment, as in any other; seeing that He has not only borne the punishment of sin, but also took sin away. And as He became a sacrifice for sin, so He came *to destroy the works of the devil* (1 John 3:8); *and having ascended up on high, hath led captivity captive, and spoiled the prince of darkness* (Eph. 4:8), who is thrown out, and *hath given rich gifts unto men* (Col. 2:15); not only unto His Church generally, but particularly to every member of the same; so that now *if any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature* (2 Cor. 5:17), and he himself now lives no more, *but Christ Jesus liveth in him* (Gal. 2:20). But if we be the old men we had wont to be, and be no more careful to observe *the rest of the Sabbath* than we have been in times past; then *are we not as yet partakers of the benefit of Christ* {1 John 1:6}, and so are under the curse of the law, which one day will seize upon us, to our endless confusion.” Bracketed references were inserted in the 1606 text. NP, 283ff.]

81. c. Book 1, page 147. [NP, 283–284. See the quotation in the previous note.]

anie other daie in place of the Seventh; whosoever ordinarlie, and perpetualie keepeth holie anie other daie, or daies besides the Seventh:

Whosoever upon the Sabbath observeth not th' exact and precise Jewish rest, as wee have prescribed;

Whosoever doth anie thing upon the Sabbath (except serving of God, and things upon urgent necessitie) which might afore, or maie be done after the Sabbath:

Whosoever buieth, or selleth anie number of victuals upon the Sabbath; that Lawier that readeth anie evidence upon the Sabbath; the physicion that readeth anie part of Galene, or Hippocrates upon the Sabbath; that Justice of Peace that examineth anie malefactor upon the Sabbath;

That Prince that shal sit in consaile about the affaires of the Commonweale upon the Sabbath;

12v That Subiect which doth anie of his masters, or magistrates, or Princes worldie busines upon the Sabbath, if it might be done afore, or after;

Hee that maketh a marriage dinner, or Feast upon the Sab-[12v]bath; theie which ring moe bells than on[e] unto the divine service, or Sermon upon the Sabbath; Hee that upon necessitie worketh in the tyme of Harvest on the Sabbath; Hee that taketh anie thing for his consaile &[etc.] upon the Sabbath, and giveth it not forthwith unto the poore; Hee that useth anie honest, and lawful recreation upon the Sabbath; hee that ceaseth not from al his worldie workes upon the Sabbath; hee that s̄peaketh, naie hee that but thinketh of anie worldie thing upon the Sabbath;

The minister of the worde that preacheth not everie Sabbath;<sup>82</sup> that Parishoner, man or woman, that heareth not a Sermon everie Sabbath; Hee that having no Sermon at his owne church, leaveth not his parish everie Sabbath to go unto another church where the worde is preached;

That minister that celebrateth not, and that parish that hath not the Sacraments administred in it everie Sabbath;

That Congregation which exerciseth not God's holie discipline,<sup>83</sup> and government everie Sab. daie, violateth the Sabbath, and so is not partaker of the benefit of Christe, but is under the curse of the Lawe, and shal everlastingly be damned, unlesse hee, or shee, or theie repent.

#### §11

This is the "truth of God" (a), "Gods truth" (b), "Gods holie truth" (c); this is the verie "message of" God (d); this is our doctrine of the Sabbath (e);

82. [Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 315, 233–234, 271.]

83. [Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 315.]

this wee have preached (f), this wee have praised (g); and this must everie one continualie, and {seriouslie practise,}<sup>84</sup> that would be saved (h).<sup>85</sup>

And albeit wee are not ignorant, howe wee may right {wel} be deceived 13r  
(this doctrine of "the Sabbath being ful of controversy (i),<sup>86</sup> more than anie point of" religion (k)[]);<sup>87</sup> and knowing that our above raised articles, and assertions have manie (l),<sup>88</sup> and mightie (m)<sup>89</sup> enemies, and a "cloude of adversaries" (n);<sup>90</sup> and those not adversaries yet to our religion, but verie friendes (o),<sup>91</sup> and godlie persons (p);<sup>92</sup> nor of th'ignorant sort, but "learned men" (q);<sup>93</sup> and those not of the baser reckoning, but such as deserve both for their greater varietie of al learning singularlie to be admired (r),<sup>94</sup> and for their painful labors in Gods church, highlie to be revered (s):<sup>95</sup>

Wee must yet, we cannot, wee dare not but saie, and wee desire al those that sigh, and saie, as wee do, for a thorough, and speedie reformation of Gods church, hereunto with us to saie, Amen, Amen, So be it.



Manie other uncouth pointes of Divinitie, here and there dispersed through your booke, I have hereupon, long since acquainted you with, and do againe, and againe commend to your serious consideration: here you have onlie epitomized your new doctrine of the Sabbath.

You have in minde my Lordes order, and so with your best proofes I hope wil fortifie such assertions, as you wil defend, and iustifie: which what thei be I do *expect* to knowe.

If you wil deale breiflie in this controversie, and perspecuouly you shall please mee passing wel, and wee shall [13v] therebie provide both with 13v  
more *facilitie*, and delight unto our selves and profit unto others, which shall *read* our doinges.

And so wishing an happie issue to both our labors, I ende this 29. April. an. 1598.

In Christe yours  
Tho. Rogers

84. [The text after "seri-" are the last line on page 12v with almost no bottom margin to the page. There appears to be the word "practise" partially blotched out.]

85. a-d. Epist. dedic. e. Fore[ward] of the booke. f. Pref. and book 1, page 30 [NP, ]. g. By Nicholas Bownde Doctor of Divinitie. Fore. and Preface. h. Book 1, page 146 [NP, 3-6, 87-88, 282-283.]

86. i. Praef.

87. k. Book 1, page 30. [NP, 87-88.]

88. l. Praef. and Book 1, page 22 [NP, 81].

89. m. Book 1, page 29. [NP, 87.]

90. n. Book 1, page 124. [NP, 254.]

91. o. Book 1, page 30. [NP, 87-88.]

92. p. Praef.

93. q. Book 1, page 30, 124. [NP, 87-88, 254.]

94. r. Praef.

95. s. Book 1, page 31. [NP, 89.]

---

The foresaid Letres, as daggers so peirced the hart of D[r]. Bownde as presently upon the perusal of them hee road to Norwich, and humblie requested the Bishop that hee might not be urged unto further wrighting in this cause; promising his Lordship, that if the writer and sender of the said Letter would surceasse, hee wold deale no further in the question of the Sabbath (so astonished was hee at the consideration of his owne doings, and altogether unable anie waie either to disprove the contents ~~the copy~~ of the Letre, or to defend his doctrine; or to retract his errors; or to iustifie anie thing by him done, either publiquely in his booke, or privatelie by his complaint).

In the month of October ~~next following, viz an.~~ <99> 99 the said bookes of D[r]. Bownde touching the Sabbath, by special letres from the Archb. of Cant. at Synods and Generals throughout the Diocese of Norwich, were called out of all mens, especially out of the common peoples handes.

14r The 18. of February next following was D[r]. Bownde convented<sup>96</sup> before the B. of Norwich, D[r]. Redman, and being sworne to make true answers unto such articles as hee should be examined of, hee took his [14r] oath, and sware, that hee did beleve that it could <not> bee founde in {his} booke of the Sabbath, that his doctrine is to be approved, and beleved of all men under paine of damnation; or that they shall perish everlastingly, from the highest to the lowest which observe not the Sabbath according to his Inventions;<sup>97</sup> or that the Elements of the sacraments maie aswel be altered as the Lords daie; or that the Sabbath cannot be sanctified without a Sermon in everie parish; or that no Lawier maie read any evidence; or no justice arraign any malefactor; or that the King or prince maie not sit in Counsel about the affairs of the Common-weale; or that no man maie use anie honest and lawful recreation upon the Sabbath; or that no man maie so much as speak, yea nor think of anie worldlie thing upon the Sabbath, etc. These thinges and divers more, which are most palpable, hee sweareth, and taketh God to record, are not in his booke.

In consideration of some of his said assertions, so denied by him, the L. chiefe Justice of England, S<sup>r</sup> John Popham, in Janu. next ensuing, viz. an. 1600,<sup>98</sup> very straightlie inhibited the said Bownde from divulging anie moe of his bookes concerning the Sabbath.

Of this his doings, the Author has so repented him, as of late, even the last yeare hee redivulged his Sabbath doctrine, entitling it Sabbatum

---

96. ["It was preached in Suffolk (I can name the man, and I was present when he was convented before his ordinary for preaching the same), that to ring more bells than one upon the Lord's day to call the people unto the church is as great a sin as to commit murder." *Catholic Doctrine*, 19. See the previous footnote, 52.]

97. [Cf. *Catholic Doctrine*, 19, 319.]

98. [January 1600/01.]

veteris et novi Testamenti; inscribing the same unto everie grave, and reverend persons, and prelates of this Church; inserting therein divers novel, and strange paradoxes, but leaving out not so much as one of his former and formerlie forsworne assertions, howe offensive soever, and derogatorie both to the glorie of God, and astimacion [read *estimation*] of this church of England.

Now th'almightie, which hath brought this thinge to your knowledg, enspire your Lordship so with his holie Spirit, as in this great cause, and, [14v] and controversie you maie do that which shal make for the preventing, and rooting out of Schism and Erronious doctrine; and for the continuance of sound religion, and the Christian veritie, among us; and that for his holie Names sake. 14v

Amen. //

## Anti-Sabbatarian Scold: Thomas Rogers' Letter to Nicholas Bownd, April 29, 1598

### Appendices

#### APPENDIX 1: ALEXANDER BOWND

"Alexander Bound (1547/8–1622), author of nine epigrams (nos. 2, 3, 11, 39, 40, 47, 48, 62, and 71), the second largest contribution in terms of the number of poems, and the third largest in terms of the number of lines. Bound was a King's Scholar at Eton, 1561–4; a scholar of King's College, Cambridge, Aug. 1564 (aged 16); Fellow of King's 1567–81; B.Th in 1579, D.Th. in 1595; Fellow of Eton in 1582; and rector of Petworth, Sussex, 1591–1622." Elizabeth Goldring, Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Clarke, *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources* (Oxford University Press, 2013) 322. Alexander Bownd was ordained at Buckden chapel, April 10, 1574. *Lincoln Episcopal Records in the time of Thoms Cooper, S.T.P. Bishop of Lincoln, A.D. 1571 to A.D. 1584*. The Lincoln Record Society, volume 2 (Lincoln: Morton & Sons, 1912) 84. Alexander Bound. "Adm. at KING'S (age 16) a scholar from Eton [Buckinghamshire], Aug. 13, 1564. Of Cambridge. S. of Robert. Matric. 1564; B.A. 1568–9; M.A. 1572; B.D. 1579; D.D. 1595. Fellow, 1567–81. Incorp. at Oxford, 1612. Ord. deacon and priest (Lincoln) Apr. 10, 1574. Fellow of Eton, 1582. Viceprovost. R. of Petworth, Sussex,

1591–1622. Died 1622. Will at Chichester. Brother of Nicholas (1568) and Richard (1575)." *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, volume 1 (1922) 186. The online record compiled from the *Alumni Cantabrigienses* and other sources further notes, "Born [at] Cambridge, [Cambridgeshire]; Married Alice Cropley (or Croxlye) of Ely, [Cambridgeshire] (lic. to m.) 1580:03:06; Lecturer at Windsor, [Berkshire]." University of Cambridge, ACAD: A Cambridge Alumni Database. A database of all alumni of the University of Cambridge 1200–1900. <http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/Documents/acad/intro.html> (accessed June 13, 2014).

#### APPENDIX 2: WILL OF KATHERINE WOOD/GREENHAM<sup>1</sup>

In the name of God Amen. I Katherine Woode of Dridrayton in the countie of Cambridge widdowe beinge nott well in bodie but whole in mynde thankes be given to God Doe make my laſt will and Testament in

1. Tentative transcriptions are in italics, and insertions in [ ]. The National Archives; Kew, England; *Prerogative Court of Canterbury and Related Probate Jurisdictions: Will Registers*; Class: PROB 11; Piece: 119. Cf. Ancestry.com. *England & Wales, Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1384–1858* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA.

manner and forme followinge, ffirst my soule I recomende to the mercie of God in Jesus Christ my Saviour and Redeemer by whome alone I trust to be saved, my bodie to be buried at the discretion of my executor, and for these worldie goodes w[hich] God hath lent mee, I will and bestowe them *thene*,

In *prime* the house and landes and all thereto belonging w[hich] I houlde by coppie of my Ladie [Elizabeth] Capell some tymes the wife of *Sir* William Hynde knight of Maddingley in the countie of Cambridge I will and bequeath to my daughter Anne Dodde the wife of John Dodd of Hanwell in the countie of Oxforde clerke to her and to heres for ever? and I have surrendered the same accordinglie.

Item I will and bequeath to my sister Cibill Hutton widdowe the some of ffortie shillings. Item to John Hutton her oldeste sonne I will and bequeath the some of Tenne poundes to be bestowed amongst his children. Item to Zacharie Hutton the youngest sonne I will and bequeath fifteen poundes. Item to her ffoure daughters Elizabeth, Anne, Josabeth and Deberra, I will and bequeath a peece ffortie shillings. Item I will and bequeath to Roger Warfield my godsonne the sonne of Richard Warfield of Dridrayton[,] clerke, ffortie shillings.

Item to the poore of Dridraiton I will and bequeath ffortie shillings to be distributed by the Minister there and *mercy wardens* att the tyme beinge.

Item to my goddaughter Elizabeth Gifford the daughter of Rowland Gifford deceased I will and bequeath Tenne shillings. Item to my goddaughters Marrie Thodie the daughter of John Thodie deceased and to Marrie Mittin the daughter of William Mittin deceased and to Daniel Memmes? my godsonne I will and bequeath five shillings a peece.

Item to my sister Elizabeth Parke widdowe I will and bequeath five poundes.

Item *report* is one Hampton dwelling sometimes att Little Latham in the countie of Hartforde challenged of my Husband Woode for the debte of my former Husband Mr. Richard Greneham the some of three poundes w[hich] whether it be done or no I knowe nott yet if it be timelie done I will it shall be paid by my executor. Soe that he will upon the faith of a Christian averr it to be a true debt.

Item to Mr. Thomas Knight of Longstanton in the countie of Cambridge[,] clerke I will and bequeath ffortie shillings.

Item to Mrs. Marie Doddridge the wife of William Doddridge of Bake in St. Germans in Cornewall in Devon Kent I will and bequeath Tenne poundes.

1. I first came across the entry, October 18, 2013.

Item to Elizabeth Hutton the daughter of Roger Hutton dwelling w[ith] me at this *pointe* I will and bequeath tenne poundes to be paid unto her at the age of one and twentie yeares or att the daye of her marriage w[hich] shall first happen to come.

Item to John Dodd the sonne of John Dodd of Hanwell in the countie of Oxford[,] clerke and to his other two sonnes and to his daughters Anne, Jeane and Martha I will and bequeath tenne poundes a peece.

Item of this my last will and testament I doe make my sonne in law Mr. John Dodd of Hanwell in the countie of Oxforde, my exector. For witness whereof I have caused this to be written and have putt my hande and seale thereto, the tenth? daye of Marche in the yeare of the reigne of our soveraigne Lord James by the grant of God kinge of great Britayne France and Ireland defender of the faith & the church and of our lord God 1611. Katrene Wood, the last will and testament of Katherine Wood abovesaid was acknowledged to be as her acte and deed her hand and seale thereunto putt in the *presence* of ?? John Grass, Benjamin Gifford.

#### APPENDIX 3: DESCRIPTION OF FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY, MS X.D.547

“Copy of Thomas Roger’s refutation, April 29, 1598, of Nicholas Bownd’s Doctrine of the Sabbath, 1595 [manuscript], 1607?”

Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC has the following entry in their catalog:<sup>1</sup>

Call Number: X.d.547 (formerly MS Add. 987). Title: Copy of Thomas Roger’s refutation, April 29, 1598, of Nicholas Bownd’s Doctrine of the Sabbath, 1595 [manuscript], 1607? Caption title: To the worshipful M.D. Bownde, parson of Norton. Description: 10 leaves ; 18 x 13 cm. Notes: Disbound with complete text; leaves numbered 5-14. Title devised by cataloger. Caption title (leaf 5r): To the worshipful M.D. Bownde, parson of Norton. Some water damage.

The library describes the contents as follows:

Contains Roger’s unpublished epistolary essay refuting Bownd’s Doctrine of the Sabbath with detailed commentary keyed to book and page of Bownd’s work. The letter is followed by an anonymous postscript (in the same hand as the copy) claiming that when Bownd read this letter he was immediately moved to repent his opinions, a claim for which there is no evidence. The

only published response to Bownd's work by Rogers was Faith, doctrine and religion, 1607.

The pagination appears to be written later in pencil and on the final page at the bottom someone has inscribed in pencil, "Gift in honor of John, Henry and Sam Haskell." What appears to be cataloging information is written in faint pencil top left and in blue pencil top right on the opening page (5r). This letter may have been a manuscript mentioned by Anthony à Wood (c. 1691), who wrote that Rogers,

... was a zealous opposer of the doctrine of the Sabbath, and the first that publicly stood up against Dr. Nich. Bownd's opinion of it in his preface to the *Exposition on the 39 Articles*, &c. which made the other party (the Puritan) angry, and so far to be enraged, as maliciously to asperse and blemish him. Whereupon he wrote a vindication of himself in MS. now in the hands of a near relation of his.<sup>2</sup>

The editors of the Chicago Codex MS 109 concluded Wood was referring to that manuscript. This MS had been owned by the antiquary Sir Henry Spelman (1562–1641), whose collection was auctioned in 1709.<sup>3</sup> However, the Chicago Codex MS 109 does not deal with the contention with Bownd, but Rogers' earlier exclusion from the combination lecture. If Wood has not conflated the description (which is likely whichever MS was intended) and the facts are correct as recorded, this letter would seem to be the more likely candidate. However, it too predates Rogers' attack on Bownd in 1607/08 and it may be the case, if Wood is accurate, that neither is the MS in question (and there may be another surprise in Rogers' hand awaiting discovery).<sup>4</sup>

If the letter is not the MS noted by Wood, there is no other information on its existence until the early nineteenth century when it was acquired by Richard Heber (1773–1833). It was subsequently auctioned with some other MS papers. The Heber auction catalogue entry reads: "1128 Miscellanies. A Parcel of Miscellaneous MS. Papers, consisting of Autograph Letters, Copies of Historical Documents, Academical Orations, Pieces of Poetry, Transcripts, Catalogues, Note Books, &c. &c."<sup>5</sup> Lot 1128 was purchased by Thomas Phillipps, who apparently bound all or at least twelve of these pieces including the letter into one volume (the newest of which was a piece of poetry penned in 1803).<sup>6</sup> In 1928, when the majority of the volume was sold to the Wellcome Library, some of the pieces including the letter had by that point been separated from the volume.<sup>7</sup> The Folger

Shakespeare Library obtained the Rogers letter in 1994 from H. P. Kraus.<sup>8</sup>

#### APPENDIX 4: BOWND'S ANSWERS TO ROGERS' ANTI-SABBATARIAN SERMON

Nicholas Bownd's 1606 edition was enlarged in good measure to address Thomas Rogers' criticisms, both in his letter and in his sermon.<sup>9</sup> Below are eleven points

2. Wood, *Alumni Oxonienses, 1500–1714*, vol. 2 (1691–92; Oxford: 1891) 165; cf. Introductory Notice, *Catholic Doctrine*, ix.

3. *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, cxv–cxvi. "On the twenty-seventh [November, 1709] instant will be sold by auction at London, the library of the famous sir Henry Spelman..." *Reliquiae Hearnianae: the remains of Thomas Hearne, extracts from his MS. diaries* (Oxford, 1857), 171. The auction had sessions into 1710.

4. If it can be shown whether or not Rogers and the Spelman family were related that might be conclusive proof whether or not the Chicago Codex MS 109 is the document Wood had in mind. For now, that this letter survived in private collections and seems to better match Wood's description, points to it as the MS intended and to Wood having some of his facts not quite straight.

5. *Bibliotheca Heberiana: catalogue of the library of the late Richard Heber, Esq., Part the Eleventh. Manuscripts. Which will be sold by auction by Mr. Evans, at his house, No. 93, Pall Mall. On Wednesday, February 10th, and Nine following days, Sunday excepted* (Printed by W. Nicol, 51, Pall Mall, [1836]), 118.

6. Phillipps meticulously created catalogues for his vast collection. "8439 21. A Miscellaneous Collection beginning with R. Smith's Catalogue of his Library 1657. The Title and Preface only ¶ A Poem, Incip. "Go might Prince." ¶ Thos. Roger's letter to M. D. Bownde, Parson of Norton." *The Phillipps manuscripts. Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in bibliotheca D Thomæ Phillipps* (London, 1968), p. 131.

7. See the description of MS.6083 held by the Wellcome Library. Describing Phillipps' item 8439, the entry reads: "Miscellany of texts, written in a variety of hands, and bound as one volume. The sections wanting from the manuscript are recorded in *The Phillipps manuscripts* ..." "From the library of Richard Heber (1773–1833), sold by Evans of Pall Mall, 17 Feb. 1836, lot 1128. Acquired by Sir Thomas Phillipps (Phillipps MS. 8439)." "Purchased from Oppenheimer, London, 1928." "1 volume: 211 × 165 mm., foliated 24–39, 47365, 66392, 1253183. Phillipps Middle Hill binding, damaged."

8. The only information on the acquisition which the library has on file is a price quotation from H. P. Kraus dated July 9, 1994 (Correspondence with Heather Wolfe, Curator of Manuscripts, Folger Shakespeare Library, May 10, 2014.). This may indicate the MS does not appear in any of the H. P. Kraus catalogues. I did not find the MS listed in relevant catalogues from 1994.

9. Primus transcribed the crucial part of the MS of the sermon notes. John H. Primus, *Holy Time: Moderate Puritanism and the Sabbath* (Mercer University Press, 1989), 86–87, citing Townshend Papers, vol. 1, ms. 38492, fol. 104, The British Library, London. This is perhaps the earliest use of the term Sabbatarian. "With characteristic Erastianism he preferred to call Sundays 'the Queen's days.'" "Brief notes of the sermon survive among the papers of Sir Edward Lewkenor of Denham, Suffolk..." Collinson, "The Beginnings of English Sabbatarianism," 220, note 5.

from Rogers' sermon with the corresponding answer in *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (citing the forthcoming Naphtali Press edition). Rogers' points 8 and 9 are not clearly addressed by Bownd.

That we Christians of the Church of England are bound to keep the Sabbath day is antichristian and unsound; 2. that the Sabbath is of the nature of tithes, of new moons, and Jewish feasts....

{The Sabbath is not of the nature of new moons & Jewish feasts

So the Sabbath was never of the nature of new moons and Jewish feasts....} *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, forthcoming, 116–118).

3. not possible to be proved that the Jews before the coming out of Egypt kept a Sabbath....

{It may be proved that the Jews before the[ir] coming out of Egypt did keep the Sabbath}

{And for the practice of it, first of all....} *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, forthcoming 46–55).

4. no certain day commanded for Christians in the Word of God more than other....

{For as we have heard it already.... Therefore it cannot be in the power of the Church to substitute into the room of it either the eighth or ninth, much less the tenth or twelfth. But as for that unsavory position, to say that no certain day is commanded for Christians in the Word of God, more than another....} *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, 103).

5. the Lord's day is not enjoined by God's commandment but by an human civil and ecclesiastical constitution.

{... Therefore this new learning, lately set abroad,<sup>10</sup> that the Lord's Day is not enjoined by God's commandment, but by human, civil or ecclesiastical constitution....} *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, forthcoming, 113–115).

6. He thinketh that the days commonly called the Lord's days, Sabbath days, or Sundays may be called the Queen's days and that he would so call them, and so did oftentimes in his sermon.

{... and they all learned thus to speak of St. John the apostle and of the rest; whose examples we ought to follow, and not to call it by any new name unknown to the world, and not properly belonging unto it, as the King's day, the Queen's day,<sup>11</sup> the Emperor's day, as some divines have done....} *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, forthcoming, 142–145).

7. Those which hold that opinion against which he himself preached he called Sabbatarians and Dominicans. 8. Since weekly days have gone up her majesty's days have gone down ... [from] popistry and Brownism sects of sabbatarians and dominicans have sprung up.

{... And so he does in urging of the Lord's Day upon Christians, justly put off the imputation of Sabbatarians....} {as well as Zanchius before, cleared them which urge the true doctrine of the Sabbath from the slanderous name of Sabbatarians....} *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, forthcoming, 90–101, 125–126).

9. The Queen bindeth us by her days but she bindeth us not, our Dominicans do bind and fetter us. 10. The observation of the Queen's day do [*sic*] not make or hinder salvation but if we keep not the Lord's day we shall perish say the Sabbatarians.

14. Lastly, though no man can perfectly keep this commandment, either in thought, word or deed, no more than he can any other.... *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (NP, forthcoming, dedication to Bishop Jegon, 8–9).

11. He finally declared that if this might deny God he would not further proceed in this question, otherwise this his speech was but an entrance.

Master Rogers' sermon preached at Bury the 10. Dec. 1599.■

10. [Ed. 'Lately set abroad'—i.e. lately flowing out. Note that Bownd is making it very clear that Thomas Rogers was the innovator!]

11. ["6. He thinketh that the days commonly called the Lord's days, Sabbath days, or Sundays may be called the Queen's days and that he would so call them, and so did oftentimes in his sermon." Thomas Rogers, 1599 MS Sermon against Sabbatarianism. Primus, *Holy Time*, 87. This would seem to be a clear reference to Rogers' sixth point in his sermon and the reason for the addition of this section of text in Bownd's 1606 edition.]