In our last lecture, we began a discussion of Elizabethan Puritanism, continuing the earlier theme of the English Reformation or the Reformation in England when we had looked at the reforming activities under Henry VIII and then the introduction of Protestantism under King Edward VI and then the reversion of England to Roman Catholicism under Queen Mary, known to history as Bloody Mary, and then the reintroduction of Protestantism when Elizabeth came to the throne as queen in 1558.

In our last lecture then, we began to notice that there was in the British tradition and the British church a point of view that came later to be known as a Puritan point of view which was unhappy and unsettled about the degree of reformation that had introduced in the church. That unrest, that unhappiness manifested itself in some quarters even in the reign of King Edward VI and reflected a strategy, a desire for a strategy that would move forward more quickly with change in the life of the church. That concern for more rapid change and more thorough change came also in Elizabeth’s reign and manifested a desire to see the Church of England conform more closely in doctrine and in practice with Reformed churches on the continent. Everyone in England was aware when Elizabeth came to the throne that she came to the throne in times and conditions of difficulty. They were aware that her Roman Catholic subjects and Roman Catholic foreign rulers regarded her as illegitimate and regarded her, therefore, as having no just claim upon the English throne. And, therefore, they were understanding when Elizabeth proceeded to cautiously and carefully in what came to be known as the Elizabethan settlement, that is, her settlement for the life of the church.

And so in her first parliament in 1559, Elizabeth proceeded to have enforced a number of acts, including an Act of Supremacy which declared that she was the supreme governor of the church in England. You remember Henry VIII, her father, had had himself
declared in an Act of Supremacy supreme head of the church in England. Elizabeth seemed to feel that it was inappropriate for a woman and a layman to be declared supreme head. And so she had herself declared supreme governor. But the effect was the same. There was no international jurisdiction of the church. The Church of England was now to govern and direct its own affairs internally in England. Elizabeth was determined that that church, the Church of England, should move in a Protestant direction.

Elizabeth also had passed an Act of Uniformity in that same parliament. The Act of Uniformity declared that there was to be only one legal form of worship in the Church of England. And that one legal form of worship was to be the form of worship as prescribed in Elizabeth’s Book of Common Prayer. You remember we discussed when we talked about the Reformation in England under Edward how there had been two Books of Common Prayer prepared. The first in 1549 had been very conservative and so little was changed explicitly that even one of the Roman Catholic bishops declared that he could use the book. Then a more Protestant book was brought out in 1552, the second Edwardian prayer book, which was much more clearly and decidedly Protestant in doctrine and practice.

Elizabeth, on coming to the throne, would have preferred to maintain the 1549 book, that earlier more ambiguous, more middle-of-the-road book, if you will. But there was a lot of pressure around her especially from the bishops to adopt the second prayer book. And Elizabeth, in a rather typical style of hers, made some accommodations between the two. It was primarily the 1552 book that was used but modified in the words of the administration of the Lord’s Supper to include the words from the 1549 book: “the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.” Those words with their ambiguity as to the relationship between the bread being distributed and the body of Christ were retained. Also, Elizabeth insisted that the vestments and church ornaments in the 1549 book were to be retained. The effect of these two actions was that, although the liturgy of the Church of England was now rather clearly Protestant in character, the decoration of the churches of England remained rather Roman Catholic in appearance. And so Elizabeth hoped that the transition for her realm in general might be eased and indeed that overseas Roman Catholic rulers, especially the king of Spain, might not feel that anything so terribly radical had been introduced. And indeed Elizabeth maintained a crucifix in her own private chapel to
which she from time to time would take the Spanish ambassador to place in his mind some uncertainty as to what Elizabeth’s real position and sentiments were.

Her chief apologist in this early reform of the church under her reign was John Jewel, a bishop who wrote in 1562 *The Apology of the Church of England* in which he defended the changes that had been made and insisted that the Church of England, as part of the Reformation as a whole, was returning to that primitive purity of the church that we talked about before. The staunch Roman Catholics in England had no doubts as to the reality and sincerity of Elizabeth’s Protestantism and were insistent that they would not accept Elizabeth’s settlement for the church, and indeed many of them refused to accept her as the legitimate monarch in England. As a result, a number of Roman Catholic intellectuals unwilling and unable to accept the Protestant settlement of the church exiled themselves to the continent and proceeded to try to find ways to influence Englishmen and to preserve the Roman Catholic Church in England.

One of the most ardent in this regard was William Allen, who founded a seminary in Douai in 1568 in which he hoped to have trained English clergymen who could reinfiltrate the country and preserve what to him seemed to be the true faith. And indeed, if you travel to England you can still visit certain country homes that have a “priest’s hole,” a hiding place for a priest should the magistrates come and find the priest there. So there were secret priests ministering in England under Elizabeth’s reign. Pope Pius V in 1570, believing that Elizabeth might be toppled by civil war in England, proceeded to excommunicate and depose Elizabeth from her throne, and he thought thereby to aid the northern rebellion of 1569 against England. But his interference was not helpful and indeed allowed Elizabeth to maintain throughout her reign that Roman Catholicism and treason were closely linked together and therefore allowed certain laws to be introduced that made life even more difficult for Roman Catholics in England. Between 1577 and 1603 it is estimated that 189 Roman Catholics were executed in England for their commitment to the old church.

So we see that on the one hand, Roman Catholics, in spite of Elizabeth’s caution and slow proceeding, were not at all satisfied with the ways in which she was changing the church in England. But it is also true that there were those within the Protestant church who wanted to see more change and more rapid change. And it was these in particular that came to be known as the
Puritans, those who wanted to see further change and faster change. And indeed, many expected initially that that would happen. They expected that what some of them called at the time “this mediocrity” of Elizabeth’s would change. “Mediocrity” in the sixteenth century was an English word that didn’t have a negative meaning. It meant this sort of middle-of-the-road, this median way would continue to result in further reforms in the life of the church.

But as time went on, people began to feel that perhaps things weren’t going to change. And Elizabeth herself didn’t want change. She was perfectly satisfied with the church. And so there developed gradually in different ways a party that has come to be known as the Puritan party, those who wanted more purity and faster change in the church. Leonard Trinterud in his book *Elizabethan Puritanism* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1971] has argued that these Puritans can be divided into about four groups with somewhat different concerns and somewhat different strategies. The first group that Trinterud mentions is a group he calls the anti-vestment party. These were men within the Church of England who, at an early point, became unhappy with the numbers of vestments and church decorations that were still required. They were often older men who in the 1560s wanted to see more change. They had perhaps some of them been on the continent and seen the changes in the continental churches and wanted the practices of the Church of England to conform more closely to those continental practices. They were not radicals. In fact some of them were bishops of the church. Most of this early group were quite prepared to accept episcopacy as the form of government of the church, but they felt that there needed to be a stripping away of some of these externals in the Church of England so that any notion of the superstitious, sacrificial practices of the Roman Catholic Church might be removed.

This group, therefore, at this initial stage in the 1560s had quite modest goals for itself and rather expected that these goals might be met. By the 1580s, the members of this group tended to recognize that this was an inadequate reforming program, and many of them had moved on then to further goals for change in the church. The second element within the Puritan movement that Trinterud identifies, he calls the passive resistance party. And he feels that these are the majority of the Puritans under Elizabeth, particularly in the later years of Elizabeth’s reign. Such men as Edward Dering, Richard Greenham, William Perkins, and John Preston belonged to this group. And this was a group who
indeed thought the ceremonies and the vestments of the Church of England needed to be changed. They wanted a purification therefore in the external rites of the church. But they were also a group who had come to be convinced that some changes needed to be made in the government of the church. They believed that the present episcopal structure was not able to provide the kind of spiritual discipline and oversight that the church needed. You remember that Thomas Cranmer back in the days of Edward had been concerned about this same issue and had suggested that there needed to be many more bishops in England. He felt that the current rather elite group and number of bishops were not able to provide the kind of spiritual care and supervision of their diocese that was needed. And he wanted to have the number of bishops increased for that reason. But Cranmer's project was never approved because of the early death of King Edward VI, and these passive resistance Puritans then said we are going along with the church. We're part of the church. We recognize that it's a legitimate church as it stands, but nevertheless we think there are things that could well be improved. And either by modifying the episcopacy, that is, by having more bishops, or for some of them abolishing the episcopacy they felt the church could be helped and the situation much improved.

This group looked primarily to the parliament to lead the reform, and they tried to exert whatever pressure they could. They began to attract some important support among some of the noblemen. But they recognized that this was part of the well-being of the church. It was not part of the essence of the church to have these changes made. They regarded the Church of England as a true church of Jesus Christ. They regarded it as conforming to the marks by which the true church could be recognized and distinguished from the false church and felt that these kinds of changes would be a way of improving the life of the church. That's not to say they didn't feel strongly about it; they did. Some of them particularly feel very strongly for the need of change, but they were conformists. They did go along with the Elizabethan settlement. They recognized the right of the queen and the Parliament to make these decisions. And while they thought the church could be made much better, they felt the church as it stood was tolerable.

A third party mentioned by Trinterud adopted a rather more extreme position. And this group is labeled the Presbyterian party. The Presbyterian party emerged in the 1570s and was led by people like Thomas Cartwright, John Field, Thomas Wilcox,
William Foulke. They were people who had become convinced that the government of the Church of England was not legitimate, was not tolerable, and began to argue that the Church of England needed to have Presbyterian government, that episcopacy needed to be outlawed, that the power of the bishops was unbiblical, that the office of bishop was unbiblical. And therefore the very life of the church in their mind depended upon the abolition of the episcopacy and the establishment of presbyteries to govern the church to allow all ministers to be regarded as equal and to allow the ministers in meetings together to govern the life of the church. And this Presbyterian party began to argue that this is what God required, that God in the Scriptures had established a form of church government, namely, Presbyterianism, and if that government was not introduced in law then it raised serious questions as to whether the Church of England was a true church at all.

Thomas Cartwright became a particularly prominent spokesman for this point of view. He entered into controversy with John Whitgift, who became Elizabeth's Archbishop of Canterbury for the latter part of her reign. Whitgift argued that the episcopacy was a matter of indifference, that it was a useful way of governing the church. It was supported by long tradition in England and throughout the church universal. But he did not argue that episcopacy was required by the Scripture or by God, simply that it was pragmatically useful. And therefore he felt the queen and Parliament had every right to introduce such a form of government for the church. Richard Hooker, the great apologist for the Church of England in the early seventeenth century, took the same position. He saw the episcopacy as a pragmatic form of government that worked, and he did not, as Whitgift also did not, regard the bishops as a separate, superior order of clergy.

Richard Bancroft, who succeeded Whitgift and was the first archbishop under King James I, did indeed see bishops as a higher order of clergy, but even he did not regard the episcopacy as absolutely required in the life of the church. And so we have this interesting debate that becomes very strong in the 1570s and 1580s and even results in some efforts to establish secret presbyteries or secret classis in the life of the church. But the issue was one of discipline and one of faithfulness to the Scriptures as Cartwright and others saw it. How can the church best be served in its government? And what does the Scripture require of the church in the matter of government? Cartwright went so far as to say that the issue of church government was even more important...
than the issues of grace. Now both Whitgift and Cartwright were Calvinists. Whitgift even wrote what became known as The Lambeth Articles as a doctrinal summary which are staunchly Calvinistic and which he wanted all of the clergy of the Church of England to adopt. Whitgift said that he thought Cartwright’s point of view was ridiculous about church government being more important than the doctrines of grace. Whitgift said we must teach that God has predestined His elect to eternal life and given them life by a free act of His grace and that that’s a much more important doctrine than the government of the church. And so we see that some within the Puritan party were willing in the name of what they saw to be biblical requirement to go much further than others in arguing for church government issues and in beginning to regard the Church of England as a perhaps not a true church at all.

This Presbyterian party was relatively small compared with the passive resistance majority among the Puritans in Elizabeth’s reign. And they also are to be contrasted with a fourth group that we can call the separatist party. That is, there were those within the Puritan tradition who became so disenchanted, and perhaps we can say so radicalized in their point of view, that they did in fact separate themselves from the Church of England and usually did so in the name of Congregationalist church principles. Now you know the Presbyterians believe that the church must have a connectional form, that one congregation is connected with another and that congregations acting in concert through presbyteries or synods or general assemblies can involve themselves in the discipline of the local church and indeed have a biblical responsibility to do so under certain circumstances.

Congregationalists on the other hand felt that every local congregation had a biblical right to govern its own affairs entirely on its own. It might be advised by other congregations, but fundamentally discipline was always a matter of the local church, and the local church’s independence could not be compromised by the involvement of other churches. Those who held to a radical view of Congregationalism, then, a small group of them in Elizabeth’s reign, promoted the notion of separation. The separatists said that while there may be aspects in which the sacraments and preaching of the Church of England are correct and valid, nonetheless the discipline of the Church of England is so inadequate that it cannot justify itself as a true church.
And so the separatists felt that in faithfulness to God and in their desire to find a true church, they needed to separate themselves from the Church of England and to form themselves into separate congregations.

This variety of points of view then that are already emerging under Elizabeth would continue under James and well into the seventeenth century as differing theologies and differing strategies among the Puritans. At the time of the English civil war in the 1640s, we would see if we had time to go on to study that how some of the Puritans were Presbyterian and wanted a connectional church to continue, and some of the Puritans were Congregationalists and wanted every congregation left to itself. And this came to be an important issue of division between them as to what the Bible required and what would most promote the well-being and health of the churches. Some of those same issues were taken over into New England in the American colonies in the seventeenth century. The Plymouth colonies were founded by separatist congregational Puritans who felt they must leave the Church of England as a false church. The Puritans who went to Boston were also Congregationalists by conviction, but they were convinced that the Church of England was not so bad that they had to separate and tried to practice their Congregationalism still in their own minds as part of the Church of England. So there were quite different strategies that developed already under Elizabeth and would cast quite a long shadow in the history of the church in England and later in the United States.

Now we might look at one way in which that separatist point of view could radicalize itself, and we might do that by looking at the case of John Smith. John Smith, although his life goes beyond that of Queen Elizabeth, nonetheless illustrates the ways in which in the cases of the separating Puritans their convictions could become increasingly radicalized and how there was this tendency then on the radical end of Puritanism to a greater and greater fragmentation of points of view. John Smith entered Cambridge University in 1586 and studied at Christ’s College there, which was a center of Puritanism. There was a lot of Puritan ferment there. And no doubt he got his first taste or at least extensive taste of Puritanism there at Cambridge. In 1596 he was ordained to the ministry in the Church of England, which shows that at least at that point, his commitment to Puritanism and his theological convictions were such that he thought the Church of England was a valid church, a true church, and he could minister there. In 1600 he was appointed a lecturer at Lincoln.
Now this may point to some radicalizing of his thought.

By 1600, some Puritan noblemen, recognizing and feeling a need for better preaching as they saw it, preaching more in conformity with the Puritan ideal of the church, had begun to endow lectureships. These lectures were not held at the same time as official church meetings, but they were sort of like special study groups that we might have today where people could go and hear what they regard as more edifying and more biblical lectures and presentations on biblical themes. And it was sometimes the case that the men who were appointed lecturers were those who would not have been ordained into the church because they had objections and either they were considered too radical by the bishops or were themselves in conscience unwilling to take part in the official ministry of the Church of England.

Whatever John Smith’s own exact position here, it does seem to be an indication of some radicalizing of his thought that he moves from the parish ministry to a lectureship. In 1602 he was dropped from his lectureship, and that probably signals that he’d become too radical even for the patrons of the lectureships and by 1606 had founded a separatist congregation. Here clearly he has arrived at a point where he feels as a matter of principle he must separate himself from the Church of England and organize on Congregationalist principles a separate and distinct congregation.

The government in England was not at all well-disposed to the separatist congregations. You remember there is an Act of Uniformity in England which requires not only Roman Catholics but also all Protestants to worship according to one form of worship. And so Smith and his congregation experienced various forms of harassment and what we might well call persecution. The result was that in 1608 they left England and went to Holland, where they felt there was a more sympathetic environment and where they hoped to be able to continue to live according to their principles.

In Holland now Smith began to reflect further and to begin to argue, if the Church of England is not a valid church, is not a true church, then the sacraments are not valid either. And so Smith came to the conclusion that he and his congregation had never been rightly baptized. If the Church of England, he said, was a false church, and if I have received baptism in that church, then I must never have been really baptized. This line of thinking is also a more radical form of Puritan thinking because the Reformers in
the sixteenth century, while declaring that the Roman church was not a true church, had recognized the validity of its sacraments, at least its sacrament of baptism. And so when Roman Catholics had become Protestants, they were not rebaptized. And so there was this sense among sixteenth-century Reformers that Roman Catholic baptism, even though it was not a true church, because it was done with the biblical words and the biblical sign, was valid. But Smith with his more radicalized theology is beginning to feel that the Church of England’s baptism is not valid. And he persuaded his whole congregation of this, and they were all baptized according to his principles.

After this baptism had taken place, Smith begins to have contact with some Dutch Mennonites who maintained the Anabaptist principle that only believers ought to be baptized. Smith at this point becomes convinced that the Mennonites are the true church and that true baptism should be received from them and that true baptism ought to take place by immersion. And so he appeals to his congregation to be baptized yet again. At this point his congregation splits in two, and some of them follow Smith into the Mennonite church and others stay out and continue to hold to Smith’s earlier position as a separatist congregation.

What we see in the case of John Smith is then a progressive radicalization of thought whereby he moves from an Episcopalian minister to a lecturer, perhaps with Presbyterian sentiments, although we can’t be sure about that, and from that to a separatist Congregational point of view, and from the Congregationalist point of view to a Baptist point of view. Although Smith’s own movement to the Baptist point of view is influenced by Anabaptist, Mennonite influences, that takes place in England as well among other groups. And so we can see that the modern Baptist movement is largely born of English Calvinist Puritan concerns an attempt on their part to work out a more consistent and radical Puritan point of view. From a non-Baptist point of view, it seems that they are moving in an increasingly individualistic and voluntaristic idea of the church which for Presbyterians was excessive.

In any case, we can see then that already under Elizabeth are emerging significant differences among the Puritans as to how they ought best to serve God and what the implications of their theology meant for the discipline and life of the church. The Puritan concern manifested itself in less radical ways than the separatist founding of new congregations. And one of the ways in which the Puritans tried to improve the life of the church that
we’ve already seen is through these lectureships. I suppose it’s a little like our experiments in audio and video taping in the twentieth century whereby hopefully useful material is passed on to other people, more than they could get just in their local congregation. So lectureships are one way in which the Puritans hoped to improve the spiritual life in England. Another way in which they hoped to do that was by an institution known as prophesyings. The prophesyings in England were practices that had originally been taking place in Zurich as early perhaps as the 1520s. And it was an opportunity for the clergy to get together and to discuss among themselves a sermon that they had heard. And often lay people were invited to attend and to listen to these prophesyings. It was a little like a spiritual emphasis weekend. It was an opportunity for one or more of the preachers to present a message and then to have that message discussed and talked about and to elaborate on both the biblical interpretation and on the practical implications of what was being done.

These prophesyings had taken place in England rather uncontroversially down till about 1574, when Elizabeth ordered them stopped, at least one place. And this caused a great deal of consternation. Once again, some of the Puritans were very tempted to think that the queen was interfering in what they saw as an important element in the spiritual development of the life of the church. In 1575, a new Archbishop of Canterbury was appointed by Elizabeth. This new archbishop was Edmund Grindal. And Grindal was himself rather sympathetic to some of the Puritan concerns and perhaps even more surprising than being sympathetic is that he seemed willing at times to stand up to the queen and to try to point out to her that she was harming the church and that some of the things the church were doing were not a problem and shouldn’t be opposed. And the prophesyings were one of the things that Grindal thought was spiritually profitable and good for the church, and he could not see why the queen ought to oppose it. He was unwilling then to try to enforce her ban against the prophesyings.

Elizabeth was not at all pleased about this, and she placed Grindal under house arrest in 1576. This action on Elizabeth’s part reflected her longstanding suspicions about preaching. Elizabeth, as a monarch, was not at all convinced of the wisdom of allowing large numbers of people to stand up every Sunday in church and at other times to say what was on their mind. She thought this was potentially far too revolutionary a situation. Potentially people could be fomenting all sorts of bad ideas, perhaps even
civil war and revolution. And so Elizabeth would have been much happier if there could have been an elimination of free preaching altogether. In fact, she experimented with the thought of having homilies that would be read every Sunday by churchmen, approved sermons that she could be sure what the content of them was. That idea of only certain homilies being read was never approved, but she did feel at least these prophesyings could be stopped. And when Grindal was unwilling to do it, she had him placed under house arrest. Grindal remained under house arrest from 1576 till shortly before his death in 1583. So the experiment to try to improve the life of the Church of England in legal and peaceable ways was rendered more difficult by Elizabeth and contributed greatly to the frustration of the Puritans in England.

Another way in which they tried to improve the life of the Church of England was in various ways to press what they saw as the ethical claims of the gospel. The Puritans felt that they were called to walk carefully before the Lord. They were called to serve Him with purity, or as the Dutch counterparts came to be known, with precision. And so they sought to work out carefully the ethical implications of the gospel. That effort has gained them the reputation in some circles of being sort of killjoys and do-gooders and moralists and being sort of generally grim and unhappy about life and trying to spoil everybody else’s happiness. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. The Puritans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries enjoyed life, were able to have a good time, had all sorts of parties at which wine and beer were drunk, and they had nothing to say against those sorts of practices. But they felt there were things that were illegitimate and that Christians ought to avoid. And they criticized such picky matters as adultery and dueling and violent fighting and murder and blasphemy and cursing, things which many people in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries didn’t seem to think were so terribly wrong and regarded the Puritans as being rather picky about. They attacked the theater when they thought it was licentious. And so the Puritans in many ways were pursuing a rather reasonable ethical program, reasonable, that is, from the perspective of biblical Christianity.

One of the issues that became prominent for the Puritans particularly in the seventeenth century but began to emerge already under Elizabeth was the issue of Sabbath keeping. The Puritans have become well-known for their position on the Sabbath. And the Puritan position on the Sabbath is incorporated in a document like the Westminster Confession of Faith which
declares that the whole of the Christian Sabbath, namely, Sunday, should be spent in either the public or private worship of God except for works of mercy and necessity. This Puritan conviction came in time to mark them off from Anglicans and came to be precious to the Puritans. And the question has been raised, Where did this Puritan doctrine and practice of the Sabbath come from? And the older history books tended to regard it as a kind of innovation that the Puritans attempted to introduce to the Church of England and which the Church of England resisted rather appropriately.

More recent studies have been arguing, I think rather convincingly, that the Sabbath is not a Puritan innovation but something that the Puritans received from the medieval church and took more seriously and more consistently. It was the medieval theologians who argued that the fourth commandment of the Ten Commandments, namely, to honor the Sabbath day and keep it holy, was a binding and perpetual aspect of the moral law and that in the new covenant applied to Sunday. And so in the Middle Ages, a number of laws were adopted that made various sorts of work and various sorts of recreational activity illegal on Sunday. The Puritans then in the Reformation period in the 1560s and 1570s, 1580s under Elizabeth, sought to enforce those laws and to preserve and extend those laws. And in the early days under Elizabeth, they were supported by many who were not in other regards Puritans. This Sabbath issue was not initially just a distinctively Puritan issue but had a number of supporters who went along with it.

On the continent as well various Reformed thinkers and writers were continuing to argue that the Sabbath was a natural, universal, moral requirement from God’s Word. That was the position that Heinrich Bullinger had argued in his famous sermons known as “The Decades.” And those sermons were required reading of all English clergy after 1587 and seemed to have been well-accepted in many areas of the English clergy. What the Puritans then proceeded to investigate was, if this is a perpetual moral law and if we have not only received that as part of the divine revelation but also enforced it in specific statues in England, what is the full ethical implication of that? And a couple of different treatises in the late sixteenth century were written to that end. Nicholas Bownde in 1595 wrote his famous book *The Doctrine of the Sabbath*. And then later Richard Greenham in 1599 published a treatise on the Sabbath.
In the late sixteenth century then there was growing Puritan stress upon the question of how exactly the Sabbath should be preserved. The Puritan position came to be attacked, however, by some royalists as an innovation, and indeed one Thomas Rogers, a militant anti-Puritan and a fierce Erastian, insisted that the Puritan doctrine of the Sabbath was un-Christian and unsound and declared that this was all part of a Presbyterian plot and that Sundays ought to be recognized as the queen’s day, not as the Lord’s day. This confrontation was to raise an issue that would increasingly polarize English thought and English action in the early seventeenth century between the Sabbatarians and the anti-Sabbatarians. But I think it’s important to bear in mind that it appears that it was the Puritans who were trying to extend an already existing institution and that some of the emerging Anglican opposition to Puritanism were the ones who were introducing an innovation.

In any case, we can see in the Sabbath a Puritan theological concern which was turned into a strongly ethical concern as well. And the Puritans were those who were very concerned about pastoral theology. They were concerned about the impact of doctrine on life, and they sought to be faithful pastors in proving the doctrinal knowledge and the spiritual well-being of people in England. And they produced as a result a number of very important theologians. The most important under Elizabeth undoubtedly was William Perkins, often called the father of Puritanism, who lived from 1558 to 1602 and wrote a number of treatises. The one whose title I’ve always particularly liked was his treatise “A Reformed Catholic.” And in that, Perkins is making the basic Protestant point that Protestants are Catholics. They embrace the catholic, the universal tradition of the church, but they have wanted to see the church reformed. And the Puritan impulse under Elizabeth was a desire to see the church continuing to reform itself and to improve its theology. But to see the detail and elaboration of Puritan thought, we would have to look also at Stuart Puritanism, which would take us beyond the scope of our study here. Next time we’ll turn to some concluding observations on the Reformation.