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Thou Lord, who walkest in the midst of the golden candlesticks, remove not, we pray thee, our candlestick out its place: but set in order the things which are wanting among us, and strengthen those which remain and are ready to die.

Epigraph of T.S. Eliot's *For Lancelot Andrewes, Essays on Style and Order*. 
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- It means something more impossible than I can say. His work in Bodley consisted in reading all the sermons that were ever published.

- And have a lot been published? I don’t think I’ve ever seen any.

Jane laughed a little desperately.

- Far more of them than anything else in the whole world.

INTRODUCTION

The sermon is one of the most persistent and pervasive of literary genres. Yet its very pervasiveness, the fact that it is a regular feature of public worship in Judaeo-Christian religion, has led to its neglect as a subject for literary study. Familiarity has bred contempt and even the emergence of everyday culture as a subject for academic study has come too late for the sermon, which has become a victim of that culture's secularisation. As part of redressing the neglect of this outstanding form of public discourse this thesis focuses on the issue of authority which, it is argued, is the crucial and necessary feature of sermon literature. During the seventeenth century, preachers and writers on homiletics all acknowledged the importance of authority in their work. None attested to the truth and consequences of this proposition more than William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1633 to 1645. Laud's eight printed sermons form the canon of this thesis, and they disclose the multitude of vital ways in which authority functioned in sermons.
All authors have some sense of their authority; it is a status conferred by their experiences or their insight and it validates and justifies the pronouncements they make in their work. In sermons we have an ideal form for analysing the operation of this authority: sermons are rhetorical works which constantly allow analysis of the chosen juxtaposition of speaker with text and audience, they are intently ideological works, and they are inevitably and openly linked with the sources of the authority that they proclaim - be it scripture alone, or scripture abetted by civil and ecclesiastical power.

This thesis shows how, in Laud's sermons, consciousness of, and searching after, authority determine the choice of text or theme, the speaker's tone, the type of imagery, the rhetorical devices and the metaphors employed. Every step of literary composition and presentation has a determinant that is linked to authority. And in this respect, although the circumstances of his life and character make him outstanding, Laud is not unique. As evidence of this I have disclosed the same forces operating in the sermons of his contemporaries, and particularly in the work of the two preachers who have heretofore received the greatest amount of critical and scholarly notice - John Donne and Lancelot Andrewes.
Among the matters this thesis seeks to discuss are the forces of context which influenced Laud’s sermons. After proposing and discussing a definition of both the sermon and of the literary authority of the sermon the first chapter of the thesis concludes with a brief biographical sketch of William Laud. It will be shown that Laud was a man of affairs and that his sermons enunciate a theory of authority which reflects and seeks to validate his own substantial political and ecclesiastical power. Moreover, the style of Laud’s preaching is that of a man of many responsibilities who lacks the opportunities for long meditation; who cannot, as Donne did, construct his whole week around the composition of a sermon, but who must write and speak as urgently and as potently as he is able. One consequence of this is that Laud becomes an ideal subject through which to examine the fount of authority in the sermon, since he often relies heavily on this rather than on developing his personal autonomous authority. When Laud preaches we are clearly able to see him exploiting the authoritative potential of the genre.

The second chapter looks at the larger context of Laud’s preaching: the sermon tradition from its roots in Judaism, to the state of preaching in post-Reformation England, and notes those elements of the tradition preserved in Laud’s sermons. From the early Christian tradition he inherits the distinctive force of
revelation and *kerygma* ("proclamation") which was understood as elevating the preacher's proclamation of the Gospel above all other rhetorical and oratorical forms and making him thereby the heir to a unique type of authority, while from the Patristic period comes Laud's awareness of the particular authority of the Bishop as preacher and pastor. Laud is indebted to the medieval period for his literary landscape where the Bible and the Fathers predominate, for it was in the medieval period that an authoritative canon of these works was developed to which the preacher could turn for support in either his interpretations or his methods. It was also a time when scriptural analysis and preaching methods were systematised providing useful models for both the composition and analysis of sermons.

It was not so much in preaching style or method as in tone and subject that the Reformation and post-Reformation pulpits exerted the greatest influence on Laud. Laud sought to maintain a confluence of the streams of authority mentioned immediately above, while all around him they were being brought into contention. The range of homiletic methods bequeathed by the medieval period along with the liberating power of New Testament proclamation seemed to set preachers free from the Patristic authority of Bishops, Councils or Church Fathers. Given that one of Laud's practical responsibilities was that of safeguarding the
emerging English Church his sermons reflect his concern that the authoritative power of the sermon tradition was, like many other authoritative traditions, under attack.

In Chapter Three the thesis turns to the eight printed sermons of William Laud and examines them as "events" both in the liturgy of the Church and in the Stuart state. The literary analysis of the sermons begins at this point because the culture of Stuart kingship provided a body of agreed meanings and shared views which assured a place and a hearing to a preacher like Laud. Finally, analysis of the context of Laud's preaching shows that his printed sermons, which like most printed sermons are not a pastor's weekly addresses to his flock but rather a churchman's statements upon major occasions, were delivered in settings which encouraged or required the fullest possible exploitation of the authoritative qualities inherent in the sermon genre.

The fourth chapter discusses the central themes of Laud's sermons: obedience and kingship. When Laud argues a point in a sermon he employs a hierarchy of evidential sources which reflects the hierarchy of authority that is thematically central to his sermons. It is obedience to that authority that is Laud's major theme: it characterises God's relations with his people, it is the requisite of civil order, it is the force manifested and
demanded by kingship, and it is certain protection from the misleading and improper interpretation of scripture.

Chapter Five examines the structure of Laud's sermons. Laud's principal structural model is a medieval form known as "the textual sermon". In such a sermon the text of scripture exerts the greatest influence on a preacher's themes and methods. This has the effect, through the influence of the structural authority of the Bible, of preventing the sermon from meandering while at the same time making it rare for there to be sudden twists or turns in its argumentative development. In Laud's opinion a meandering preacher was all the more inclined to find himself straying into doctrinal error, and the avoidance of that was as constant a concern of Laud the preacher as it was of Laud the ecclesiastical administrator.

Chapter Six examines Laud's preaching style. Where structure is concerned with the control of material, style is concerned with the control of the audience. Laud's style is a deliberately practical one. He avoids effects such as paradox and elipsis which leave an opening for the undirected audience to reach a conclusion other than that intended by the preacher. Furthermore he facilitates the preacher's ability to direct the audience through the stylistic creation of an authoritative persona.
Chapter Seven deals with certain stylistic specifics: the imagery and metaphors employed to embody the concepts Laud is examining, and Laud's use of what I have termed "the prophetic voice". The latter allows Laud to enhance his own authority by borrowing the authority of the prophetic speakers of his Old Testament texts.

The final chapter examines in more detail the issues of explication, learning and textuality which were initially raised during Chapter Five's discussion of the structure of the sermons. This chapter shows the complexity of Laud's response to the logocentricity of Puritan religious thinking. He works throughout his sermons simultaneously to acknowledge and exploit the authority of his Biblical text while at the same time asserting his own authority as an explicator of that text.

Laud seeks to restore order to a landscape which he sees as disordered. His literary vision encompasses both the clamour and confusion of the contentious world, and the harmony and order of an organised and uniform society composed under divine will. The signs of danger press in on him in both his private dreams and in his public awareness:

Look therefore, not upon yourselves in peace, but upon a state in blood, upon a church in persecution, ask them which are divided, divided by the sword, which are roasting at the flame, conceive your case theirs, that is the touchstone which deceives not, then tell me whether it be not good counsel to Orate pacem "pray for the peace
This sense of danger accounts for much in Laud's writing: the tense balance between the carefully chosen phrase and the direct, often grating outbursts in his writing. Often the urgency of his message cuts through the scholastic methodology of argument to deploy the force of assertion instead. The language of power combines with confessions of despair and inadequacy from a man often overwhelmed by "the craziness of the times" (2) and yet unhesitating in hunting down and brutally punishing those who disagree with him. Laud is a writer shouting against the storm as he brings the traditions of his form and role to bear on the conditions of his time. What this thesis particularly asks is how (and why) Laud used the sermon to express himself. And what this thesis proposes is that in the sermon, because of the role of authority in it, Laud possessed the ideal form for his theme and personality.
CHAPTER ONE.

The Sermon, Authority, and the Life of William Laud.
In terms of numbers published the sermon is one of the most substantial genres of English literature, yet in terms of study and critical interest it is one of the most neglected (1). One reason for this, as I suggested earlier, is the extent to which it was absorbed into the regular life of its culture, becoming a literary form whose consumption was a matter of weekly routine. A further reason for our forbearance from studying the sermon is that it is so uncompromisingly an ideological form. In a broad sense all literature is ideological, but sermons are ideological in a particularly explicit and imperative way insofar as their reference to, and their identification with an explicit body of doctrine or system of ideas is concerned.

Exactly how does this ideological relation function? What is the generic status of the sermon, and what are its
characteristic features? In particular, what is the nature of
the role played by authority in the themes and the organisation
of sermon literature? These are the principal questions this
thesis sets out to answer. The means of arriving at these answers
is through an analysis of English sermon literature, primarily
from the late medieval period until the Civil War, and with
particular reference to the sermons of William Laud. This thesis
addresses, therefore, both a neglected genre and a neglected
practitioner of that genre in an attempt to clarify and designate
both their places in English literature.

The following lines present a typical image of the sermon:

"And in these restless times, my dear Wooster," he said,
"I fear that brevity in the pulpit is becoming more and
more desiderated by even the bucolic church-goer, who
one might have supposed would be less afflicted with the
spirit of hurry and impatience than his metropolitan
brother. I have had many arguments on this subject with
my nephew, young Bates, who is taking my old friend
Spettigue's cure over at Gandle-by-the-Hill. His view is
that a sermon nowadays should be a bright, brisk,
straight-from-the-shoulder address, never lasting more
than ten or twelve minutes. (2)"

Easily flattered away from the modernist ideas of "young Bates",
the Reverend Mr Heppenstall agrees to Bertie Wooster's request
that he preach his forty-five minute sermon on Brotherly Love,
complete with "the rather exhaustive excursus into the family
life of the early Assyrians", thereby dutifully fitting himself
to the role of the long-winded and stupefying preacher which is
the essential comic device of Wodehouse's story "The Great Sermon Handicap". What has given rise to such attitudes towards the sermon?

As befits a piece of rhetorical writing the sermon is usually carefully and formally constructed. Yet often its construction seems so complex that it becomes both labyrinthine and, worse, irreducible. The painstaking etymological search for the truth and meaning of a Biblical passage demands retentive concentration from an audience. An abstractable preacher such as John Donne, one whose sermons can be easily made to yield up small passages for meditation and appreciation, passages such as:

Every puff of wind within these walls, may blow the father into the son's eyes, or the wife into her husband's. (3)

can gain a measure of acceptance for the literary character of their performance as a preacher that a writer of denser sermons cannot. T.S Elliot, in the title essay of his collection For Lancelot Andrews (1923), concluded that one of the reasons that Andrews' fame lagged unfairly behind that of Donne was that Andrews' sermons could not be broken down but had to be treated as a unit (4). Reforming preachers in both the medieval and the Reformation eras promised their audiences simple and direct sermons that would expose rather than hide the meaning of scripture (5). The sermon has often seemed to be an excluding and
perhaps unnecessarily complicated genre, lacking the imaginative richness for which denseness and cohesion of argument are no substitute.

The seventeenth century, and particularly the years immediately prior to, and immediately following, the Civil Wars are generally accepted as the "Golden Age" of English sermon writing. When one reads any representative sermons from this period one finds oneself reading the overt or disguised presentation of the political and ecclesiastical conflicts which were convulsing the nation at this time; for the pulpit took an active role in these disputes. Queen Elizabeth had marked out this active role for it in her policy of national government. William Laud's biographer Peter Heylyn, writing about the Queen said that she used to:

tune the Pulpits, as her saying was; that is to say, to have some preachers in and about London, and other great Auditories in the kingdom, ready at her command to cry up her design, as well in their publick Sermons as their private Conferences. (6)

Seeing literature so plainly used for polemical purposes, the modern reader might recall W.H.Auden's judgement that:

the principal obstacle to true thinking is our desire for justification, the falser an idea the more obvious its justificatory element. (7)

and dismiss sermons as occasional or ephemeral works.
Finally, disregard for the sermon as a literary form can also be attributed to declining church attendance: sermons, like any other genre, reflect their own popularity; deprived of an interested audience the sermon cannot easily avoid appearing negligible. Up until the end of the eighteenth century the Church, and thus the sermon, were fundamental parts of people's lives. Few things would more surprise the average seventeenth century English man or woman were they transported to the twentieth century than the absence of an obligation to attend church. This social obligation, if it did not create a more pious nation, did give them a greater exposure to preaching, and this in turn, gave them higher expectations of pulpit oratory. Like any writer or performer (and they were both) preachers acknowledged and responded to those expectations. When we reach the nineteenth century we reach a period whose religious life has been characterised by J.A.Froude with the observation that people went to church:

to learn to be good, to hear the commandments repeated to them for the thousandth time, and to see them written in gilt letters above the communion table. (8)

In such circumstances the nineteenth century produced a body of pulpit oratory both vast and intimidating, so much so that John Henry Newman's friend Samuel Wood advised him in 1836 to drop the word "Sermons" from the title of a forthcoming work and call it "Essays" instead if he wished to ensure a wide market. (9)
Even works devoted to the study of sermons display, in a variety of ways the consequences of alienation from the genre. G.W. Owest’s *Preaching and the Pulpit in Medieval England* (1933), like J. Huizinga’s analysis of the French preachers Jean Gerson and Olivier Maillard in *The Vaning of the Middle Ages* (1923), treats sermons as if they were little more than historical documents. This is a view that might seem reasonable in the light of the partisanship of the seventeenth century pulpit noted earlier. But although sermons were a mirror of their age they were limited neither to it nor by it. As a form of persuasion and analysis they were nourished by more than current events and they dealt with themes which were simultaneously of universal and particular importance. William Laud, a committed spokesman for the royalist cause and for the established Church, chose the modes and styles of expression in which he couched his arguments about obedience, authority, order, uniformity, prayer and worship with the particular care of a trained and sophisticated practitioner of an enduring genre of discourse.

Another approach to the study of sermons is that of the literary historian who aims to show, by broad strokes, the apparent completeness of a genre tradition. Such a method is employed in *No uncertain sound: sermons that shaped the pulpit*.
Perry Miller objected that:

the vast array is presented through the introduction as
being a steady and persistent testimony to a simple and
undifferentiated strain of Christian piety. (11)

While on its own it is a simplification, Petry's essentially
biologic conception of generic evolution does nonetheless
alert us to the force of tradition: the sequentiality and
inter-textuality which, along with context, have done so much to
shape the genre.

W. Fraser Mitchell's *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to
Tillotson* (1932) is a work which tries to introduce a structural
pattern into the history of preaching, in this case one which
concentrates on changes rather than continuity within the genre.
Mitchell's search for a discernible pattern forces him to accept
the existence of discrete "schools" of preaching as axiomatic. A
view such as Mitchell's threatens the sermon with an alien
rigidity (12). As a result he locks Laud too securely into the
"School of Andrewes" and overlooks the subtle, personal way in
which Laud transformed his legacy from Andrewes. Identifying the
exact nature of the continuity which Mitchell has perceived but
exaggerated, along with registering the modifications which the
sermon has undergone at the hands of various practitioners, is a
task which validates our attention to the sermon as a literary
It may be helpful to consider the generally agreed definition of what a sermon actually is. The word sermon is derived from the Latin *sermo* meaning "talk" or "discussion". It is the circumstance and the usual mode of delivery that gives the word the more specific and more common meaning of a "discourse delivered from a pulpit...based upon a text of scripture, for the purpose of giving religious instruction and exhortation." (14)
The word "homily" has similar roots, being from the Greek word for conversation, itself derived from the word for crowd. In its early usage *Homilia* was applied to a commentary on the *evangel* of the *mass*. It then became a generic term pertaining to all general utterances of a religious character and was finally, in the thirteenth century, replaced by the term *sermo*. The sermon is thus, by definition, a social encounter and a type of public utterance; it requires a speaker, an audience, and a vocabulary of common terms. This encounter takes place on a variety of levels: the preacher as an individual relates both to the audience as a group and to the individual members of the audience; the preacher and the audience relate within the context of a particular religious structure; finally, the preacher and the audience relate to one another in terms of the theme of the sermon.
The preacher explicates a text or an event and applies the fruits of that explication to the lives and knowledge of his audience. The preacher also instructs the audience in patterns of belief or conduct by means of his explication of the text. To command the attention of the audience, to carry out the process of explication and to propose that his audience will bind themselves to his instructions would all be impossible without the presence and operation of the notion of authority. Sermons are always manifestly authoritarian works, they insist on one correct interpretation, they limit the range of the audience's possible interpretations, and they refer constantly to the authority of their scriptural text. All of these operations cast the preacher into authoritative roles where, for instance, he may confidently promise temporal and spiritual rewards or punishments.
CHAPTER I: PART ii.

Authority In Sermon Literature.

Authoritative literary forms are those which evoke the Adamic myth by displacing the serpentine rhetoric of seduction in favour of an assertion of semi-divine power. An authoritative form thrives upon its power to enforce obedience, threaten or punish, to promise salvation and reject pleading; upon its exercise of delegated power, and upon its association with some powerful body of practice or ideas. It relies upon an immediate capacity for personal influence, and upon the power of the texts and testimonies deployed from its reserves. Authoritative forms characteristically establish particular relations with their readers - they demand to be received in a particular way. They are forms which, like the illocutionary speech acts with which they are filled, manifest the intention of their speaker. Since sermons are monologues we cannot use the text to establish the "prelocutionary act" - the effect that such a discourse has on the audience. (1) However, it will become clear as we examine
the rhetorical form and the style of sermon discourse that the preacher would not be in his pulpit and the audience would not be in their place were there not some level of agreement between them as to the type of preacher - audience relationship that the sermon requires.

The proper relation of preacher and audience as determined by the authority of the sermon genre itself was, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, a close reflection of larger civil and religious concerns. In *Bible Battles* Richard Bernard warned:

Rebellion against lawful authority: this the Lord punished, yea he extraordinarily plagued rebels, making the earth to open and swallow some, and fire to devour others; rebels can look for no good end; see it in Absalom, though he had most of Israel to take his part. Let the end of him, Bichri, and Zimri make men take heed of rebellion. (2)

Such concern with the dangers of disobedience made it a simple matter to link disobedient preaching with social or civil disobedience. Criticism by preachers from the "orthodox party" of the style, methods and themes of Puritan sermons frequently proceeded from the notion that in the zeal of Puritan preaching lay a threat to society, and this idea found a place in other literary forms as well. In *Westward Ho* (1604), Dekker presents Puritan preaching as a display of irresponsible self-indulgence:

Talk and make noise, no matter to what purpose. I learned that from going to Puritan lectures. (3)
and Robert Fletcher exploits the same attitude in his lines:

When subject and religion stir
Like meteors in the metaphor,
When zealous hinting and the yawn
Excise our Miniver and Lawn
When blue digressions fill the troubled air
And the pulpits let
To every set
That will usurp the chair. (4)

Many of the popular ballads of the period, such as those collected by John Wardroper in *Love and Drollery* argue with great violence conjunction of social disorder with "excessive" freedom of expression in the pulpit.

Authors can also exploit the authority that derives from the relation they enjoy with a validating force such as a body of knowledge or practice. Preachers from the established Church in seventeenth-century England enjoyed a share of the broader authority of the Church as a whole and opposed this to those dissenting preachers who cited the authority of their own inspiration. The sermons of the orthodox clergy were part of the apparatus of state and gave tongue to the language of sovereignty. Religious life in England was dominated by the influence of the state. This had long been the case (5) but the Reformation had intensified that influence. There was thus a strong link between religious and civil authority which was, on the whole, typical of post-Reformation Europe as George Sabine notes:
Success tended to go to the religious party that happened to be allied with a strong internal policy. In England and Northern Germany Protestantism was on the side of the Princes. In France and Spain it became allied with the particularist movements of the nobility, the provinces or the cities with the result that the national religion remained Catholic.(6)

In the text of a sermon two principal forms of authority are consolidated. The first is the authoritative text of scripture which emanates from divine power, and to which the audience must be subdued. The second is the power of the form and its performer. The sermon is a genre in which the right of literary expression is placed in particular hands for specific circumstances. The preacher enjoys authority in the form of delegated power: the power to go out, on behalf of the congregation and, armed with the power of knowledge or inspiration, to do battle with the complexities of scripture. Preachers could also display their authority through the skill with which they moulded familiar materials into original forms, creating arresting patterns from a blend of scriptural analysis and observation of the world. However caution was needed here. The traditional Thomist view of scripture invested it with such intricacy that special qualities were required if its explication was not to give rise to doctrinal error (7). The training which the preacher was presumed to have undergone in theology and rhetoric gave force to his explications and value to his
conclusions.

In his *Life of Ronald Knox* (1959), Evelyn Waugh draws our attention to a twentieth-century alternative to the sermon:

Fleet Street had decided that the truth and falsehood of theological assertions was no longer relevant; there remained, however, a vague, residual curiosity in the common man about his ultimate destiny; people who no longer learned catechism or listened to sermons were interested in the opinions of other common men, no better instructed but more articulate than themselves, on topics which had formerly been the concern of philosophers and clergymen. There was a fashion of some years duration for symposia to which all manner of celebrities, but chiefly popular writers, were invited to contribute; many of these were later published as books. (8)

yet John Middleton Murry, himself the author of a collection of "lay sermons", reflected that:

A pulpit, I felt, is a place where a man should utter certainties. I possess no certainties. (9)

What Middleton Murry’s disquiet reflected was his realisation that the certainty which earlier preachers enjoyed and which the authoritative nature of their role and work enforced had gone.

The sermon differs from other authoritative genres such as the roman a these because of the close link between the sermon as a piece of authoritative literature and the sources of much of its authority - the Church and its scriptures. (10) The shadow of these sources overhangs the sermon: defeating some preachers and inspiring others. The genre which results is one which notably
strives for certainty, is averse to self-contradiction and self-questioning, reflects a power which it expects to share, and which requires both its practitioners and its audiences to be particularly responsive to the nature and role of authority.
CHAPTER I: PART III.

William Laud.

Once we accept the sermon as an important literary genre and authority as a crucial and definitive element of it, William Laud's exemplary importance becomes apparent. For more than twenty years Laud wielded immense power in England; he experienced and manipulated authority, in every sense in which the word can be used, at a time when the nation was approaching a civil war fought over that very issue. William Laud, like John Donne, John Fisher, Hugh Latimer, Richard South, and Jeremy Taylor, all the "Golden" preachers of the English church, was a man of affairs. That he was so to a greater extent than any of these just mentioned influences the character of his sermons. At the height of Laud's substantial power memoranda, judgements, directives and inquisitions poured from his pen. All of this commentary and analysis is distilled into his sermons. Yet citing Laud's sermons merely as documents illustrating Stuart policy distorts them insofar as this divorces them from the rich literary tradition of the sermon which Laud brings to bear on the
social, religious, and political culture of his day.

When, on Tuesday, June 19 1621 Laud preached before King James at the Royal Lodge at Wanstead (1) his career stood at a crucial point. If he was to gain advancement his performance in this sermon must overcome his troubled reputation: Laud was already known as a controversial and fractious cleric. Born in Reading in 1573, Laud had matriculated at St John’s College at Oxford in 1589 and come under the influence of theological views quite different from those of the Puritans prevailing elsewhere in the University (2). Of particular importance was the influence of his tutor John Buckridge. Peter Heylyn deals with Buckridge’s career at some length in his biography of Laud Cyprianus Anglicus, believing that:

finding the temper of the Tutor we may better judge of those ingredients that went into the making of the scholar (3).

In the course of his career Buckridge had attacked both Rome’s assertions of authority and the innovations of the Puritans believing that both ran contrary to the principles of "true religion" (4). Buckridge brought to bear a weight of theological and scriptural learning in his writings, being, as Heylyn observed:

one who knew as well as any other of his time how to employ the two-edged sword of Holy Scripture, of which he made good proof in the times succeeding, brandishing it on the one side against the Papists and in the other
against the Puritans and non-conformists. (5)
In style and target Laud followed Buckridge closely in a position
that was antagonistic to many, more Calvinistically inclined
Churchmen at the time.

The Earl of Leicester, while Chancellor of the University of
Oxford (1564-1587/8) had imposed on members of the University
obligatory subscription to the XXXIX Articles and the Act of
Supremacy. This legislation for uniformity had the effect of
increasing rather than controlling theological dispute, and
obliged the Vice Chancellor and Heads of Houses to be watchful
for unorthodox or inflammatory views. On October 26 1606, during
his exercises for the Bachelor of Divinity degree, Laud preached
a sermon before the current Vice Chancellor, Dr Airay, who was a
leader of the Puritan party in Oxford, and, according to Heylyn,
held:

all things to be a matter of Popery that were not held
forth to him in Calvin's Institutes (6)

Airay felt that Laud's sermon, as one might have expected from a
student of a college so notoriously Romish as St John's was,
contained evidence of papistical leanings and Laud was compelled
to apologise for the offence given. Later another Calvinist Vice
Chancellor, George Abbot (who preceded Laud as Archbishop of
Canterbury) failed to prevail in a similar conflict with Laud
(7). Thus, from his days at Oxford, Laud had made powerful
enemies within the Church. His role as celebrant in the scandalous marriage of the Earl of Devonshire and Lady Penelope Rich in the chapel at Wanstead in 1605 had earned him the Kings distrust (8). When George Abbot was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, in place of the widely favoured Lancelot Andrewes, the resulting distribution of vacant Sees took Richard Nelle, who had become Laud's patron, to Lichfield and Coventry, and John Buckridge went to fill Nelle's place at Rochester. This meant that Buckridge's position as President of St John's College fell vacant and Laud, in the face of strong opposition from within the college and from Abbot (opposition which was finally overcome only by appeals from Laud's supporters to the King), was elected President in 1611. Over the following years Nelle secured Laud's appointment as a chaplain to the King, Prebend of Lincoln and Archdeacon of Huntingdon. In 1616 Laud was made Dean of Gloucester. In this office he set about the reorganisation of worship in Gloucester Cathedral. His actions in this aroused the opposition of Miles Smith the conservative Puritan Bishop of Gloucester who so objected to the innovations which Laud introduced that he refused to set foot in his Cathedral while they remained in place. Since Laud refused to retreat from his position the Bishop remained in exile from his own Cathedral (9). Although Laud declared of his Presidency:

I governed that College in peace, without so much as a show of faction all my time which was near upon eleven
years. (10) he had shown a propensity for making enemies, and his confrontational style may not have recommended him for advancement. Laud, an ambitious cleric, whose patrons now included the King's favourite, George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, came to the pulpit at Wansleat anxious to gain favour. His cautious performance in this sermon suggests that he still feels some uncertainty as to whether sixteen years of Royal suspicion, as well as the enmity of his fellow Churchmen can be overcome. As it was his labours were capped with success for ten days later he records in his Diary:

His Majesty gave me the grant of the Bishopric of St Davids, June 29, being S. Peter's day. The general expectation in Court was, that I should have been made Dean of Westminster...(11))

The next of Laud's sermons to appear in print was delivered at Whitehall on the 21st of March 1621/22 for the anniversary of King James' accession (12). Laud's text is the sixth and seventh verse of Psalm XXI from which he argues the importance of the virtues of unity and obedience. In 1622 Laud stated and defended the doctrine of the English church in a series of conferences with a Jesuit priest known as "Father Fisher". The specific intent of these conferences was to turn the Duke of Buckingham's mother away from her interest in the Church of Rome. But as well as an effort on behalf of Buckingham's mothers' soul Laud's Conference
was also a contribution to the body of intellectual defenses (such as Lancelot Andrewes' dispute with Cardinal Bellarmine) (13) with which the English Church was supplying itself. Initially the work circulated in manuscript. It was sent to the press on February 4, 1623, authorised by Bishop Mountain of London, and appeared on April 16, 1624 as an appendix to White's Reply to Jesuit Fisher's Answer. The first separate publication of the work came ten years later in February, 1634. At the time of publication Laud noted in his Diary: "I have not hitherto appeared in print. I am no controvertist." (14) While it is true that Laud's preference was for the discovery and assertion of the incontestable and authoritative, A Conference clearly works within the tradition of scholastic dispute (wherein Buckridge had trained him). Such skill in dispute provided intellectual status both to the authority of the cause or party in whose service the dispute was undertaken, and to the disputant himself.

With the death of King James in 1625 and the accession of King Charles, Laud (largely due to the influence of Buckingham) came to exert an influence on affairs far out of proportion to the importance of his ill-favoured Welsh diocese. In 1626 Laud was advanced to the See of Bath and Wells and, following the death of Lancelot Andrewes, was made Dean of the Chapel Royal. In 1628 Buckingham, whose notable lack of success as a Protestant
champion had earned damaging criticism both for himself and his supporters was assassinated at Portsmouth. Although Laud wrote to the Dutch theologian Vossius in the language of conventional grief:

But enough - or the fountains of my heart will burst their bounds and pour my life away. He is dead, our benefactor. (15)

It is a measure of the power which Laud had gained that he was not really endangered by the loss of his patron; his concern was primarily personal.

By 1629 Laud and the party he now dominated were the targets of Parliamentary opposition (16). Laud himself was Bishop of London, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford, leading John Evelyn to record that:

Then was the university exceedingly regular under the exact discipline of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Chancellor. (17)

Throughout his life Laud was a generous benefactor both to his own college and to the University as a whole - establishing a chair in Arabic and richly endowing the Bodleian library (18). The latter benefaction was inspired not only by his love of learning but also by the value he attached to learning in the field of the Patristic texts upon which he grounded his claims for the intellectual validity of the Church of England as part of a continuing Catholic tradition.
As Bishop of London Laud oversaw preaching within the diocese. This included ensuring the orthodoxy and discipline of the open-air pulpit at Paul's Cross in the grounds of St Paul's Cathedral (19). It was from this pulpit that Laud preached the seventh of his sermons to appear in print. The occasion was the commemoration of King Charles' "inauguration" and the date March 27, 1631 (20). This sermon praises the succession of the house of Stuart and threatens the audience with divine retribution should they fail to accept and obey God's favour to that dynasty. Two years later, on August 4, 1633 the last impediment to Laud's watchfulness over the whole English Church was removed and those who had followed with unease Laud's rise to power saw the event they had long feared take place. Two days after the death of George Abbott, Laud was named Archbishop of Canterbury. He now directed the Star Chamber, the state licensing machinery, the Council of the North, and the Court of High Commission, and he placed his supporters in vacant dioceses and in state offices: his protege William Juxon, for instance, became Lord Treasurer. Laud organised a vast scheme of metropolitical visitations throughout the country to erase non-conformity and to enforce unity of doctrine and practice. His interest was not confined to the English Church but extended to the Dutch, French and Walloon Protestant communities living in England, whose conformity to the
order and practice of the English Church he required (21). If the 
effects of such visitations were not always lasting they 
nevertheless made the Archbishop’s will felt (and frequently 
resented) for some time (22).

Laud’s inability to compromise, his failure to understand the 
motives of his opponents, and the close links he had established 
with a King who was limited in exactly the same ways, all 
contributed to Laud’s isolation and exposure. He had to contend 
not only with an apparently tireless opposition but with his own 
unease to which he could not afford to give public expression

I have had a heaviness hang upon me ever since I 
nominated to this place, and I can give myself no account 
of it, unless it proceed from the apprehension that there 
is more expected from me than the craziness of these 
times will give me leave to do. (23)

After the Treaty of Ripon Parliament found itself able to act 
against the King but its first targets were his ministers such 
as Laud and the Earl of Strafford. Both were accused of 
"attempting to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom", a 
charge supported by evidence as imprecise as the accusation 
itsl. Despite his defence Strafford was executed on May 10, 
1642, because, in Hugh Trevor-Roper’s words:

Parliament had resolved to make a law for Strafford’s 
death since they could not find one for it. (24)

Laud lay imprisoned in the Tower for two more years until his 
trial began in March 1644. Before an unsympathetic court Laud
sought to defend his policy and his career. His enemy William Prynne (who had supplied the court with a selectively edited version of Laud's diary) remarked that Laud made:

As full, as gallant and as pretty a defense of so bad a case... as was possible for the wit of a man to invent. (25)

However, Strafford's trial had prepared the Parliament for such a situation and again the law of treason was simply adjusted. It was decided that the accumulation of the imputed misdemeanours made a case of treason even if the individual items did not. "I never understood before this time", remarked Laud's counsel, Hearne, "that two hundred couple of black rabbits would make a black horse" (26). However, the House of Lords was convinced to pass the ordinance for execution from the House of Commons on January 4, 1645 and six days later Laud was executed on Tower Hill.

It was upon Tower Hill, on January 10, 1645, that Laud delivered the last of his sermons in an attempt to offer a final defence of his party and his position (27). In his Memoires Sir Philip Warwick said of Laud that:

He appeared to make his own funeral sermon with less passion, than he had in former times made the like for a friend. (28)

This sermon was a comment on the world that he had presented in his earlier sermons and on his role in that world. With the
political and religious system that he had laboured to develop now on the verge of complete collapse and with his own life almost ended, this sermon is a compellingly personal work from a man who generally subsumed himself within his work and the worldly affairs related to it.

Laud sought to order, organise and control the world around him; the "world" of his texts and the "real world" of his administration both testify to this urge. Laud took confidence in his right to enforce obedience from his power to do so; the world of his administration collapsed when his audience denied his right and successfully disputed his power. Clarendon said of him:

He was a man of great parts, and very exemplary virtues, alloyed and discredited by some unpopular natural infirmities; the greatest of which was (besides a hasty, sharp way of expressing himself) that he believed innocence of heart, and integrity of manners, was a guard strong enough to secure any man in his voyage through this world, in what company soever he travelled, and through what ways soever he was to pass: and sure never any man was better supplied with that provision. He had great courage and resolution and being most assured within himself, that he proposed no end in all his actions and designs, but what was pious and just (as sure no man had ever a heart more entire to the King, the Church, or his country), he never studied the easiest ways to those ends; he thought, it may be, that any art or industry that way, would discredit, at least make the integrity of the end suspected, let the cause be what it will .(29)

His enemy, William Prynne, in The Antipathy of the English Lordly Prelacie Both to Regall Monarchy and Civil Unity (1641) wrote of:
Bishop Laud's strange violent acts, and tyrannous proceedings to advance his Archeepiscipall authority, and erect Rome's superstitions, rites and ceremonies in the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and that even by warre, by bloodshed rather than faile in his designes. [sic] (30)

What attracts Laud's supporters and repels his detractors is basically one and the same thing - the authority that is central to Laud's life and writing (31).

Laud was a lonely man who made few friends and many enemies; he was superstitious, fascinated by dreams and portents, and there hangs about him, from the time that he attains the power to assert his will, a quality of doom. What preserves him is his conviction that he has the right to enforce his will and that his beliefs and his offices are the sole necessary justification for his actions. Laud's importance in the history of the sermon is a consequence of this temperamental affinity with the theme and method that is at the very heart of the sermon tradition. (31)
CHAPTER TWO.

The Sermon Tradition of William Laud.
CHAPTER II: PART I.


It is Judaism that introduces public religious discourse into literature for it adds intellectual content to the predominantly ceremonial forms of pagan religion. Moreover, Judaism’s prophetic theory of history presented Israel as a favoured nation, favoured in particular by the great gift of Torah (the Law). Along with study (which was undertaken to an extent unparalleled in Christianity), preaching was the means by which the Torah was taught and explained to the people and made vital in their daily life. Sermons were delivered, whenever possible, each Sabbath as well as on special occasions (1). Generally, although not invariably, sermons were based on the Torah citation of the day—the Sidrah; sometimes preceding the reading and introducing it.

Jewish preachers drew a distinction between what we can call "analytical" and "presentational" preaching. The disquisition on
a text by a master to students in a house of study (the forerunner of what in the Christian tradition will be called the ad clerum sermon), differed from the tarcum which was a type of sermon that translated scripture into Aramaic or some other vernacular and elaborated upon it for those who could not follow Hebrew (this was the forerunner of Christianity's ad populum sermon). Jewish exegesis consists of two distinct forms related to these types: Halachic exegesis and Aggadic exegesis (the latter is sometimes referred to as Midrashic exegesis). Halachic exegesis involved the authoritative exposition of scripture with the aim of declaring the rule (Halacha) of life. (In method and intent this is the form closest to the sermons of William Laud). Aggadic exegesis was a more imaginative form and used the scriptural text as a peg for moral doctrines and edifying tales constructed from allegory, history and speculation. Aggadic exegesis maintained close links with the popular literature and culture of its audience and often borrowed heavily from it for material and methods (2).

The flowering of Jewish philosophy in Europe and the influence on Jewish thought of classical and Christian philosophy during the middle ages enhanced Jewish sermons as the preacher now sought to present connections between Biblical verses and concepts derived from writers such as Plato and Aristotle. During
the Renaissance the style and structure of Jewish sermons reflected reading of classical orators, notably in the way these sermons came to be divided into thesis, development and conclusion according to classical models. Generally, whenever a preacher did not employ Hebrew as the language of preaching his sermons absorbed and reflected a great deal from the sermons of the Christian tradition. By the nineteenth century, despite the antiquity of Jewish practice it was felt that the Christian tradition possessed the most completely developed theory of preaching, and Issac Noah Mannheimer advised Jewish preachers that:

We as pupils and disciples, as novices in the art of preaching which we have been practising only a little while, can learn a great deal from the masters of the art, and we have gracefully to accept every guidance and instruction offered to us in their schools. (3)

It is in Jewish preaching that we first witness the varying levels of analysis and application, the choice between ethical instruction or the explication of sacred text, and the tendency to modify sermons according to their audience. For at least one type of audience, therefore, the sermon promised to be a form of entertainment, and the preacher, faced with the need to make known material appealing and new, became an entertainer. Conservative commentators looked with concern at preachers who took
liberties with Biblical verses not in order to reprove their communities but to prove their own dialectical subtlety and to satisfy the eagerness of their listeners for novel and clever interpretations. (4)

That remark acknowledges the wide influence that the preacher can have. That influence is intensified insofar as the preacher is not dealing with mere words but with verses of the Bible which possess a type of authority of their own. When we come to consider preaching in the Christian tradition we encounter preachers dealing with what is seen as a special, indeed unique type of authority.

The earliest models for Christian preaching are the sermons of Christ, St Paul and the Apostles as they are recorded in the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles and the New Testament Epistles. Throughout the consequent history of Christian preaching these sermons were often cited as representing the ideal state of preaching. To partake of their form and style was to share in the grace of the original Church where generally informal and spontaneous preaching was charged with spiritual and intellectual significance. Erasmus wrote:

The parables of the Gospel: if you take them at face value - who would not think they came from a simple, ignorant man? And yet if you crack the nut, you find inside that profound wisdom, truly divine, a touch of something which is clearly like Christ himself. (5)

Erasmus’ picture of exegesis as a process akin to cracking a nut will recur frequently in Christian homiletical history. The
paradox of the extraordinary within the commonplace, of godhead within human form is the essential paradox of Christ. Erasmus' analogy not only suggests the need to get beneath the surface of the scriptural text, but claims that what will be found there is "... something which is clearly like Christ himself": that something is the authority that raises the parables, in this case, above the tales of "...a simple ignorant man".

St. Luke, in the fourth chapter of his Gospel, describes Christ preaching at the synagogue at Galilee. Christ's method is to read and then interpret a passage of scripture. But it is his authority, as much as the content of his interpretation, that attracts attention:

... they were astonished at his teaching for his word was with authority. (6)

For a case study of Christ's preaching one need go no further than "The Sermon on the Mount" which is the focal point of Christ's preaching ministry; drawing together his ethical teachings into a preaching set piece.

The findings of D.W.Davies (7) suggest that the Sermon on the Mount can be reduced to a set of sayings whose presentation as a whole sermon is solely the consequence of editorial resolution. Even if this theory of the origins of the text is true, a great deal of care has obviously been taken to present the work as a
rhetorical whole. It has a five-part structure beginning with a poetic introduction (that part which we know by the name of "The Beatitudes"), which employs the rhetorical and poetical device of anaphora, in this case the repetition of the word "blessed". This is followed by the assurance, which is similar to the proemium of classical oratory, and which runs from verse 13 to verse 17. Then follows a passage which relates Christ's preaching to Jewish law. This relation is an important one in the sermon since the presentation of Christ at this point aims to show him as a new Moses speaking from a new Sinai. In the Greek New Testament the word for "preach" is kerussein which literally means "to proclaim"; the message is kerygma - the proclamation of the evangelion or "goodnews". Both Moses and Christ have the authority to proclaim a new rule; preachers who see themselves descending in this tradition assume this same authority. After enforcing the relation between Christ and Moses (verses 17 to 48) there is a passage of moral instruction in the form of injunctions about fasting and praying. Christ then concludes the sermon with a climactic epilogue and warning. However, it is really the evangelist who brings the piece to a close when he observes:

And it came to pass when Jesus had ended these sayings the people were astonished at his doctrine, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. (8)

The authority referred to here is two-fold: principally it is the
distinctive authority which Christ enjoys from God, but secondly it is the particularly compelling force of the teaching authority of Christ the man which sets him apart from the scribes.

The early Church was concerned to proclaim the beliefs that made them a separate and unique community. This was a matter of survival: the continued existence of the Church was dependent upon its sense of community which was in turn produced by a peculiar shared belief system. Conviction, therefore, was more important than intellectual apprehension. As St Paul told the Corinthians:

For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom:
But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness. (9)

Preaching as a type of proclamation tends to diminish the persuasive function of sermons. This characteristic, supported by the example of Christ and by contemporary Jewish disapproval of rhetoric, produced the straightforward and unadorned style of preaching found in the Apostolic Church where emphasis was placed on testimony rather than persuasion.

It would, however, be a mistake to believe that the Apostolic Church abandoned all rhetorical awareness. Faced with the need to testify to the faith before such men as Felix (10) and the need to win cultured converts in a period of rhetorical
sophistication, the apostles would need to be able to deliver sophisticated statements of their beliefs. For example, St Paul, as a native of the Greek city of Tarsus, would presumably have absorbed rhetorical theory and skills during his education in that city and would have been able to employ them when the situation demanded. Evidence of his range of styles is found in two of his sermons recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

In the first sermon, the setting is the synagogue at Antioch on the Sabbath. After the Torah has been read Paul is called upon to speak. He reminds his hearers of Jewish history and the prophecy of the coming of the Messiah. He then claims that Christ is that Messiah and supports this claim from prophecies contained in two psalms. Finally, he issues a warning to those who will not believe (11). In the second sermon which was preached at the Athenian areopagus St Paul adapts his sermon to a different cultural setting. Rather than refer to the Old Testament prophecy of the Messiah he refers to the Greek search for a world God. In this case he supports his proclamation with a reference to the culture of his audience:

For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said. (12)

But he follows this appeal with the proclamation of the divine punishment that will ensue if there is no repentence. (13).
The preachers of the New Testament partially modified the intellectual content which Jewish preaching had thrived upon insofar as they stressed the pre-eminent need to proclaim the simple truth underlying the apparent complexity of scripture and revelation. It is among the apostles that we find the origins of the plain style of discourse which runs through the Christian sermon tradition. New Testament preachers forged a method of discourse linked to a particular doctrine and based upon models and exempla which were regarded as uniquely authoritative.
CHAPTER II: PART II.

The Sermon in the Middle Ages.

The multiplication of presbyteral masses in the middle ages, (specifically the liturgically less elaborate "Low Mass"), meant that there were fewer opportunities for a Bishop to fulfill his pre-Nicean role as a preacher. His preaching authority is diffused and more ordained people take up regular preaching. One of the results of this is the ecclesiastical hierarchy's awareness of the need to exert its authority and ensure that what is preached by this growing army of preachers conforms to orthodox views. At the same time these preachers realise that, deprived of the auctoritas of the episcopate, they must enhance their preaching authority by other means; dramatic, rhetorical or scholarly. It is these factors which account for the depth, vitality and social importance of medieval preaching.

It was not only beneficed clergy who posed a threat to the
social and ecclesiastical order from their pulpits but also travelling preachers. These were descendants of the wandering alms sellers and relics traders known as the Quaestuari. Such a preacher appears in what is probably the most widely known sermon from the English middle ages - Chaucer's "The Pardoner's Tale".

In Chaucer and His Poetry, Kitteridge wrote that:

It has long been recognised that the tale owes a great debt to sermon literature. The whole tale as it lies before us is one of the Pardoner's sermons, consisting of text ("the love of money is the root of all evil"), brief introduction, illustrative anecdote (or exemplum), and application. 14

As Chapman (15) has pointed out, the Pardoner follows at every stage of his tale one of the methods outlined in medieval preaching manuals. There the preacher is advised to:

...pronounce the theme in Latin in a low voice, introduce one prayer in the vulgar tongue, resume the theme in the vulgar tongue; draw or elicit one prelection (by similes, proverbs, moralizations or authorities). After the premise of prelection resume the theme division, discuss all members main and subordinate, and recapitulate. 16

Thus the Pardoner begins:

Therefore my theme is yet and ever was, Radix malorum est cupiditas. 17

and then moves on, not to prayer, but to a discussion of his preaching methods:

First I pronounce whenne that I come
And then my bulles show I, alle and somme (ll. 335-336)

And after that thanne telle I forth my tales;
Of patriotickes and bishopes I shewe
And in Latin I speke a wordes fewe,
To saffron my predicacioun,
And for to stire hem to devociun. (ll. 341-346)

He next discusses gluttony, drunkeness and swearing as proof of
mala and then gambling as a proof of cupiditas (ll. 463-471). He
expands his prelocution with a passage from scripture coupled
with a passage from Seneca (ll. 487-495), and proves, by the
method known as "marking the opposites", that the behaviour of
which he has spoken is evil:

But herewith, lordings, a word, I yow preye,
That all the sovreyne actes, dar I saye,
Of victories in th' olde testament
Thurgh verray God, that is omnipotent,
Were doon in abstinence and in preyere.
Looketh the Bible, and ther ye may it leere. (ll. 573-578)

Finally, after the story of the three rioters is finished the
Pardoner offers a recapitulation of his sermon in the passage
beginning:

O cursed sinne, full of cursedness!
O traytorous homicyde, O wickedness. (ll 895ff)

Such preaching, which couched its moralising in such a dramatic
monologue and such arresting phrases and images was a potent
force - entertaining and stirring. To control the influence of
such preachers the ecclesiastical establishment enlisted the aid
of legislation:

Under a constitution published at the Oxford Assembly
from November to December 1407, and republished at St
Pauls in 1409, any preacher other than a priest in his
own parish, was required to obtain a license from the ordinary or the Archbishop in order to preach. Arundel went further and decreed that such preachers were to speak only on the subjects set forth in Peckham's constitution Ignorantia sacerdotorum 18.

The Church's provision of guides to exegesis and sermon construction arose from the same motive as their attempts to control preaching via ecclesiastical legislation. Regular preaching imposed a severe strain on the inventiveness and knowledge of a clergy not possessed of a uniform level of education and skill. Thus guide books, *ars praedidandi*, were developed and circulated to assist and influence the preacher (19).

These handbooks, as authoritative guides on sermon writing, played a substantial role in defining the character of sermon literature in the period. The *Speculum sacretale*, to take one example, is a fifteenth-century English collection of *sermones de tempore et de sanctis* which was written at the same time (about 1483), in the same locale, and with a similar structure to the better known *Mirk's Festival* (20). The sources of the narratives, so useful for the preacher in the composition of sermons, were varied, and included (along with the Bible and particularly the New Testament and New Testament Apocrypha) the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, the *Rationale divinorum officiorum* of Joanne
Belethus, the Dialogues of Gregory, the Vitae patrum, the Martyrologium of Ado, Sulpicius Severus on the Vita Beati Martini, and the Sancti Gregorii Magni vita (21). The use of such a manual provides the preacher with exempla, analogies and illustrations and was therefore particularly useful for those preachers still working in the tradition of the informal homiletic sermon.

A second influence on the character of sermons in this period was scholasticism. This influence is evident in sermons where there is minute division of argument accompanied by minute examination of scripture. It was felt that such exhaustive analysis added force to a preacher's discourse, and Hugh of St Cher struck a bellicose note when, commenting on this, he wrote:

First the bow is bent in study then the arrow is released in preaching. 22

In such cases to understand the text was to conquer it and such conquest armed the preacher to combat heresy and to lead the people to God.

The style and method to be applied to the scriptural text were discussed by Jordan of Saxony in the introduction to his commentary on the Grammar of Piscian. Jordan recognises that one of the ways to perceive the intent of the author is to understand
the structure and organisation of their thought, and, moreover, to be able to reduce that organisation to expressible units. He writes that:

The formal cause of this subject is both the *forma tractandi* (the form in which it treats things) and the *forma tractatus* (the form in which it has been treated). The *forma tractandi* is the method of procedure ... The *forma tractatus* consists of the separation into books and chapters and their order. 23

Such a system as Jordan advocates was better suited, and thus more regularly applied, to what may be termed "textual sermons" (24) which linked themselves closely to their text and acknowledged its authority. However, this was not a position designed to clear away disputes about Biblical interpretation and the issue of the authority of scripture and the liberties and responsibilities of preachers towards it became one of the most contentious issues of the Reformation period.

What we witness in the middle ages is preaching breaking away from many of its previously characteristic features. Phyllis Brazillay-Roberts writes that:

By the High Middle Ages the sermon had not only come into its own as an independent genre but it had come more and more to leave the confines of the Mass. 25

At the same time the number and variety of preachers increases - no longer do bishops or their appointees monopolise the pulpits; there is a new vigour in the world of preaching and a growing complexity is perceived in scripture and explicatory methods: the
principle of *multiplex intelligensa* entices the preacher not only to erudition and profundity, but also the speculation which can arouse suspicion and dispute.
In the opinion of C.S. Lewis the Reformation took place on "three planes":

firstly in the thought and conscience of the individual, second in the intertangled realms of ecclesiastical and political authority, and thirdly on the printed page. 25

The literary genre which spans all of these planes is, of course, the sermon, and throughout the period which we label "the Reformation" the sermon stands at the centre of affairs - at once the most sensitive and the most influential of genres of discourse. At his wittiest Bishop Lancelot Andrewes remains conscious of the fact that he is dealing with vital issues of national life and that a Church brought into being by the state cannot abstract religion from political affairs. When Andrewes writes:

Else if all our worship be inward only, with our hearts and not our hats as some fondly imagine... 26

he uses the words "hearts" and "hats" not solely for the effect
of their equivalence of sounds, but because the two words (the latter being a reference to the Puritan habit of worshipping with their hats on), adequately represent a crucial issue of the time: the value of external observances matching inward obedience.

In its early years the Reformation in England was a mere administrative severance from Rome so there was little reason for the character of the sermon to alter. King Edward VI had sought to avoid any interference with private religious practices in favour of giving flesh to the acts of Henry VIII and laying the foundation of a state religion. Apart from obvious doctrinal differences the preachers of the Marian Church generally strike a similar note; obedience is still the key theme of sermons. There is, as Blench writes: "...no attempt at general exegesis of any portion of scripture." (27) Scripture is treated not as a body of knowledge to be elucidated but as a storehouse of texts with which to illustrate and assert the teachings of the faith. The Marian preachers did, however, concentrate on the "Modern" form of sermon construction which they modified with elements of the classical oration: the reading of scripture, followed by invocation and exordium, thence proposition or division, confirmation, confutation and conclusion. In 1549 and 1552 the government sponsored the publication and distribution of The Book of Homilies: a manual to direct preachers in the advocacy of mild
Protestant doctrine and the inculcation of obedience.

On May 8, 1559, Queen Elizabeth gave her assent to the Act of Uniformity to establish legally a uniquely English Church standing between the abuses of Rome and the excesses of continental Protestantism. The Queen refused to let Parliament debate matters of religion and she did as much as possible to stifle such debate in the pulpit as well. (28) A preacher had *The Book of Homilies* to supply him with subjects and manuals such as Louis de Granada’s *Ecclesiasticae rhetoricae* to advise him on style and construction. (29) With such guides the preacher could not go wrong and he would find it the way of wisdom not to stray from these guidelines, as the following anecdote demonstrates:

When Alexander Nowell, Dean of St Pauls, was preaching in her [the Queen’s] presence on Ash Wednesday and was becoming controversial, she screamed at him: "Leave that alone! To your text, Mr Dean! To your text! Leave that: we have heard enough of that! To your subject!" 30

There was, however, a group within the English Church who felt that the Elizabethan settlement had not taken the Church sufficiently far down the road of reformation and had left too many abuses and relics of popery intact. In general terms the Puritans were clergy and laity who believed that nothing was admissible that was not enjoined by scripture. Equally inadmissible was anything which, even though it may have been
enjoined by scripture, had been tainted with papistry.

Richard Hooker suggested that the achievement of a perfect reformation upon such lines would be made difficult by the absence of authoritative guides:

> For in case the rule be certain, hard it cannot be for them to show us where we shall find it so exactly set down that we may say without controversy, 'Thus were the practices of the Apostle's times, these wholly and only, neither fewer or more than these.' 31

Yet in the reigns of James I and Charles I the nation's pulpits resounded to the clamour of those who sought to describe perfect reform, and to establish a "gathered Church" free of the imperfections of the state's religion. This was a challenge not only to a religious settlement but to the intricate patterns and notions of authority that had developed with it.

The Puritan party were disappointed in King James I whose Calvinist background in Scotland had, they hoped, made him sympathetic to their ideals. James, for his part, found the modified Calvinism of the Dutch theologian Arminius, whose influence was widespread among the orthodox clergy, more sympathetic to his conception of kingship. (32) Arminianism was, furthermore, an attractive doctrine to a King who, like James, stressed the resemblance between royal and divine authority. In his treatise On the first sin of the first man Jacob Arminius had said that divine law was symbolical of man under God and thus
commanded man's obedience. For a monarch who regarded himself as a theologian manqué it was an easy step to appropriate such status for royal power. Thus James wrote:

Kings are justly called Gods for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of divine power upon earth: for if you will consider the attributes of God you shall see how they agree in the person of a King. God hath the power to create or destroy, to make or unmake at his pleasure, and to God are both the soul and the body due. And the like power have Kings, they make and unmake their subjects, in all cases yet are accountable to none but God only. They have the power to exalt low things, and make of their subjects like men at chess; a pawn to take a bishop of a knight. (33)

To the orthodox clergy the Puritans were enemies of both the civil and the religious polity of the time. In response to this threat the Church in England laboured from Elizabeth's time to produce a body of apologetical writings which would defend its existence and assert its distinction from Rome on the one hand and Geneva on the other. Thus John Donne, before making his mark as a preacher, achieved notice with his works of controversy aimed principally at Rome. The first, Pseudo-Martyr (1610), contested the claims of persecuted Roman Catholics, while the second, Ignatius his Conclave (1611), attacked the Jesuits. (34) The outstanding, and most influential, apologist of the English Church in these years was Richard Hooker. The Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, the first four parts of which appeared in print in March 1593, was more than a livre de
In this circumstance, it was an attempt to fit the Elizabethan Church into a broadly based theological and philosophical system. (35) Much of the work of William Laud, both in *The Conference with Fisher* and the sermons, was an attempt to simplify and clarify Hooker's monumental and involved defence. To the orthodox clergy, Hooker became the authoritative model disputant as Andrewes was the authoritative model preacher. The urge to codify and defend a theological position gave an added force to preaching at this time and gave the genre an importance the like of which it had never previously known in its long history.
CHAPTER II: PART iv.

Conclusion.

Depending on their intention, sermons may be divided into the following types: appeals, exhortations, warnings, demonstrations, and affirmations. All of these intentions serve the genre's purpose of convincing the reader or audience as to the validity of a doctrine. We can cut to the heart of a sermon by considering the illocutionary speech acts upon which it depends: that is the promising of salvation or punishment, the exhortation to prayer or repentence, the affirmation of doctrine, or the praising of God. The preacher who wishes to persuade his hearers that God is a just and righteous God who rewards obedience and punishes disobedience will demonstrate his proposition by citations from scripture and by instances from scripture and history where the proposition has been demonstrated in action. The conclusion to which the sermon is directed is the injunction to follow those commandments.
Such a definition of sermons tells us something about their intentions but apparently little or nothing about thematic content, or style, or organisation of discourse. In reality, however, this intention determines and describes absolutely those features which, in other genres, frequently enjoy a potential for unpredictability and limited autonomy. Sermons are an example of what Karlheinze Stierle has called "systematic texts": those which present a series of arguments in a logically organised way. (36) As well as linking "arguments" together in this manner sermons link their allusions, exempla and references together in the same way. Such exempla become minimal narratives which the sermon joins by focusing its analysis and the audiences attention on what it perceives as the univocal quality which the preacher is able to disclose. In the course of delivering parables Christ regularly calls upon his audience to "hear" him. Clearly it is not the sensory act of hearing that he is enjoining but rather interpretative hearing or understanding. In what Christ says, as in scripture generally, there are two meanings. The preacher performs the task which Christ asks of his hearers - unveils the concealed meaning and makes it explicit. In order to minimise the danger of misunderstanding, the sermon proposes its own interpretation, controls narrative, interpretative and pragmatic types of discourse, fixes meaning, links themes and images and introduces a unity which supports the stylistic unity
of the discourse. The achievement of this is brought about by the authority with which the genre invests the preacher and empowers him to act upon the text.

The medieval trend by which the sermon broke away from the limits of liturgy, coupled with the use made of preaching as a medium for propaganda during the Reformation, broadened its spheres of performance and influence. Audience expectations, preacher's performances, and the conventions of the genre, all adapted to these complex and demanding contexts of utterance.
CHAPTER THREE.

The Settings and Contexts of Laud’s sermons.
CHAPTER III: PART 1.

The Sermon as Event in the Liturgy and the State.

What we have talked about so far is, principally, the forces involved in the development of the sermon genre, and William Laud the preacher. It is now time to consider the particular forces that shaped Laud's sermons, and these were forces that derived from the setting and the contexts of the sermons. The range of venues at which Laud preached the eight sermons that have survived in print tells us at once of the ubiquity of sermons. Laud's printed sermons were not preached in conventional church situations but in Parliament, at country houses, in the royal palace, at one of the two public outdoor pulpits in London and on the scaffold at Tower Hill. Moreover, the venues suggest the sermon's status in public, political and courtly ceremony as well as in the practice of religion.

In the context of the medieval liturgy the sermon represented
one of the congregation’s few points of direct contact with the service. Throughout the middle ages the laity was physically excluded from most of the service of the liturgy since the architecture of the typical medieval church with its long chancel to accommodate clergy, divided from the nave by a rood screen, effectively isolated the congregation from all proceedings except for the elevation of the Host which took place at the High Altar (1). The exception to this isolation was the sermon which, even when it was a formula homily, was at least a direct address to the people.

There was much contemporary discussion during the Reformation (as well as variation in practice) as to where to locate the sermon within the liturgy. When the reformer Theobald Schwarz drew up the Revision of the Order of Service in 1524 he placed the sermon after the Gospel but advised that the sermon should invariably end with an explanation of the Lord’s Supper (the early reformers, conservative as they were preserved the eucharistic focus of the Mass) (2). In England, Cranmer’s 1549 Prayer Book offered a similar view of the sermon’s function:

After the Crede ended, shall follow the sermon or Homely, or some portion of one of the Homeleys as ther shalbe herafter decided. Wherein if the people bee not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament of the body and blood of our saviour Christ then shall the curate give this exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same. 3
In England, as the Orthodox church took control of the Reformation this came to be the standard view of the role of the parochial sermon. There was little liberty offered to the preacher and what little there was was curtailed still further by the appearance of *The Book of Homilies* (1547 and 1563) which had the effect of circumscribing the ambitious preacher and indulging the lazy one. Laud himself, in principle, followed this line of thought. At the censure of Prynne and Bastwick in the Star Chamber he said:

...it [reverence] is *versus altare*, 'towards his altar,' as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth. (I say the greatest, yea, greater than the pulpit; for there 'tis *Hoc est corpus meum*, 'This is My body,' but in the pulpit 'tis at most *Hoc est verbum meum*, 'This is My word,', and a greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the Body than to the word of our Lord. And so, in relation answerable to the Throne, where His body is usually present, than to the seat whence His word useth to be proclaimed 4

declaring himself to be one who saw the sacerdotal function of the ministry to be more important than the preaching function which the Puritans emphasised. To Laud, the sermon was to be preached in the service of some further purpose: its independence was to be curtailed.

Unless otherwise specified, "sermons", as they are discussed in the following pages, mean court sermons - part of the day to day life and expression of a court whose ruler was the supreme governor not only of the state but of the national church. When
the King summoned Parliament, for example, a preacher was appointed to remind the members of their duty to God and the nation. Such a preacher did not preach within the structure of liturgy, but within the pattern of civil life. Court sermons enhanced the monarch's authority through making it a subject fit for sermons: they did not simply regard that authority they found a place for it in the system the sermon created: they established a pattern of collocation between God and the King, divine law and civil law, religious faith and political obedience. There grew up a symbiotic relationship wherein the monarch benefited from such associations while the preachers enhanced the authority of their sermons by reference to the tangible authority of the crown. So Laud was able to defend himself when necessary against the charge of Erastianism (strictly the subordination of ecclesiastical to secular power, but by extension the subordination of religious to political considerations generally), by reference to the belief that divine ordinance decreed a place for royal authority. To Laud the "divine right" of Kings meant not only that God approved of a King but that the King's power came in a necessary and active fashion from God. This made obedience a religious as well as political issue. As the epigraph to A Breife and Moderate Answer to the Seditious and Scandalous Challenges of Henry Burton (1637), Laud's chaplain and propagandist Peter Heylyn affixed the
following lines from I Peter 2:13-14:

Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as supreme or unto governors, as unto them which are sent by him, for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. 5

and this message of obedience was constantly found in sermons such as Laud's which were generated around and for the court.

In Erasmus' dialogue *Ciceronianus* Bulephorus reports a sermon preached before Pope Julius II:

The exordium and peroration, together almost longer than the body of the sermon itself, were filled with elaborate praise of the Pope as *Jovis optimus maximus*, whose power was unlimited and whose omnipotent right hand brandished a thunder bolt. 6

The sermons preached in the Papal court during the Renaissance, were intended for the Pope's ears even if the Pope was not present. The Pope and the Pope's interests were evoked for the hearers to remind them that it was in his court that they were hearing the sermon and that its liturgical function was matched by a role in what Stephen Orgel has elsewhere called "the theatre of power" (7).

In post-Reformation England sermons and court masques raised the status of the ruler above that which mere servility could have achieved. Although John Foxe did not create the notion of the King as a saviour (it grew, originally, from ancient notions
of the sanctity and priestly functions of the monarch, his Book of Martyrs established the uniqueness of the English monarch's role. Foxe had originally intended to write an account of five years of persecution but his work swelled into a history of the sufferings of God's people from Babylon to Marian England, a history over which a vast net could be drawn. The implicit and explicit correspondences between England and Israel appealed to post-Reformation English monarchs and they enforced the ideas, and Foxe's book, beyond the scope they might otherwise have enjoyed. In the light of Foxe's book Queen Elizabeth, who had rescued England from the power of Catholic Spain, embodied the Protestant settlement in England. For the sake of the preservation of that settlement preachers cried up and embroidered the Foxe's view of the monarch's special grace. To the Puritans the monarch's role as divine intermediary carried quasi-legal responsibilities to push forward reformation, as well as penalties for neglect of these responsibilities. In contradistinction to this the orthodox pulpit discouraged criticism of a monarchy that had been blessed with such responsibilities and signs of favour.

How do the specific sermons of William Laud fit into these general patterns of politics and culture? The Stuart conception of culture, which emerges from the writings of people like Ben
Jonson was of a force whereby the human spirit could be re-shaped in accordance with the demands of a new age of peace and harmony. Laud's regulation of worship; his advocacy of the principles of "the beauty of holiness", and the propagation of splendid ceremonies are all cognate with the work Inigo Jones performed with court masques - the representation of ideas of power and authority through sight and sound, and through the centrality of the monarch and his attendant secular and sacred symbols.

The culture of Stuart kingship produced an audience of relative theological sophistication. This meant that a shared body of conventional knowledge and presuppositions existed to supply that precondition of group understanding in which there was a place for the preacher's authority.
CHAPTER III: PART ii.

The Settings of Laud's Sermons.

A crucial difference between a sermon and most other types of literary work is that in a sermon the preacher addresses a real audience, not the imagined or constructed audience of the novel or the poem. Critical analysis of sermons must offer a guide to the motives as well as to the mechanics of the text's production. It is the knowledge of contexts which can be adduced from the text that gives us the actual significance of linguistic and literary features.

One manifestation of context which is important in all types of literature but especially in the case of sermons, is the so-called "context of utterance": "the immediate situation within which discourse is conducted" (1). Among the elements understood by "context of utterance" are the physical surroundings and locations of participants within those surroundings. John Wesley
preaching from a hay rick will construct (for this reason among others), a quite different sermon from that which Laud, speaking before Parliament, would have composed. Likewise, a preacher taking full advantage of the so-called "auditory churches" (designed by such architects as Sir Christopher Wren), with their multiple-deck pulpits in the front centre of the church overwhelming and often obscuring the altar, preached sermons quite different from those produced by preachers in churches that still retained a sacramental focus.

Context of utterance takes place on multiple levels. On the one hand it is the immediate and unique relation of a specific preacher to a particular audience in a certain place, on a certain occasion. At the same time, to both parties, the particular sermon takes place within, and belongs to, a "type" of discourse with recurrent features that each can identify. This is the "sermon tradition" and the preacher's awareness of this goes some way towards influencing both sermon composition and the relation that is established between preacher and audience. Unlike speakers using other rhetorical forms such as forensic oratory, the preacher, so far as he evokes some of these recurrent features of the tradition, prepares his hearers' minds with categories of speaker, setting and relation. These categories and the expectations they give rise to, provide the
foundations of audience acceptance upon which the preacher can call.

What then was the context of utterance for each of the eight published sermons of William Laud? When and where were they preached and to what sort of audience were they delivered?

Sermon I was preached in the chapel of the hunting lodge at Wanstead on June 19, 1621. Wanstead had been one of the estates of the Earl of Devonshire whose chaplain Laud had been. It had been in this same chapel where he now preached that Laud had celebrated the controversial Devonshire/Rich marriage in 1605. Laud, preaching to aid his preferment, is being judged upon the scene of his former error. The occasion of the sermon was the King's birthday which fell in the course of one of James' progresses through the country. On this occasion he was being entertained at Wanstead by Sir Humphrey Mildmay, the Master of the Jewel Office, to whom King James had granted the estate. The chapel at Wanstead was an intimate one like that of so many country houses, and on this occasion the audience would have been an intimate one: the Wanstead household and the King's retinue (2).

Sermons III and VI were preached at the opening of the
Parliaments of February 6 1625 and March 17 1628 in the chamber of the Parliament itself. Laud preached what were, to him, political and religious truths, to a Parliament that grew more and more inclined to question them.

Sermons II, IV and V were preached at the Royal palace of Whitehall on March 24, 1621, June 19, 1625, and July 5, 1626. At the time of Sermon II Parliament was agitating an unwilling King to go to war with Spain and Laud's sermon states the royal position (3). Sermon IV was preached at the opening of the first Parliament of King Charles' reign. Originally it had been intended to be preached at Westminster Abbey but the outbreak of plague caused the King to omit "the pomp usual upon that day lest the great conflux of people should be ill of consequence." (4), and Laud preached before a smaller audience at the court. At the time of Sermon V (which Laud preached a little over a fortnight after having been appointed Bishop of Bath and Wells), King Charles had recently dissolved the second Parliament of his reign, and England felt itself threatened with invasion from Spain. The fleet was on stand-by at Portsmouth; Lord Lieutenants in several counties were mustering troops; and plague had broken out in parts of England. On all three occasions Laud's audience would have been courtiers; so we can interpret the King's command that the sermons be printed as a way of gaining a wider
audience for the arguments Laud advances for unity and obedience.

The chapel of Whitehall stood between the Great Hall and the river, but it is more likely that the sermons were delivered outside in a place known as "Sermon Court"; the preacher and the courtiers occupied the courtyard while the Royal Family listened from the windows of the Council Chamber (5). The setting is, therefore, similar in many respects to that found in Sermon VII preached at the open-air pulpit of St. Paul's Cross on Sunday March 27, 1631 on the commemoration of King Charles' inauguration. The character and setting of the Paul's Cross pulpit is described at length by Millar Maclure in *The Paul's Cross Sermons*. (6). It is sufficient to note here that the open-air pulpit (one of two such public pulpits in London, the other being at Spitalfields), was a wooden structure on a stone base with the preacher standing between the two pillars that supported the roof. The bulk of the audience stood or sat in rings, while the privileged members of the audience sat either within a low wall of brick which enclosed the cross or in covered galleries made up in the walls of the cathedral facing the pulpit.

The open air pulpit at Whitehall placed the audience within the shadow of the palace (both physically and semiotically), and elevated the Royal Family above them while at the same time
Insulating them from the world outside the palace walls. In such a setting Laud preaches a sermon which re-enforces the court's world view. At Paul's Cross the setting is traditionally one of confrontation. As Millar MacIure explains, the setting of Paul's Cross was associated with a traditional preaching tone:

They [the preachers] felt engaged to maintain a tradition older than most of them would openly acknowledge, the tradition of the warning voice hallowed by generations of Dominicans, and hallowed for them by the generations of reformers upon whom that sometimes dangerous mantle fell.

7

Laud, speaking within the shadow of the visible Church, (the Cathedral rising around him), preaches a sermon that challenges his audience, threatens them, and reminds them of their obligations to authority.

The last stanza of the popular ballad A Prognostication on Will Laud prophesies:

Dumb dogs that wallow in such store,
That would suffice above a score,
Pastors of upright will:
Now they'll make all the Bishops teach,
And you must in the pulpit preach,
That stands on Tower Hill. 8

Laud's final sermon is that which he delivered from the scaffold on Tower Hill on January 10 1644/45. The broadest meaning of the word pulpit is "a raised platform" and Laud transforms his scaffold into a preacher's pulpit in order to deliver a defence of his party, life and conscience. Heylyn's Cyprianus Anglicus
and The History of the Troubles and Trvall of the Most Reverend Father in God, and Blessed Martyr William Laud recount the circumstances of Laud's execution: the crowd gathered around him, and beneath the scaffold (from where he asked that they be moved to prevent his blood falling on them); the clergy commissioned by Parliament to accompany him and who importuned him in theological arguments; and the cold wind which so ruddied his cheeks that some claimed he had painted them to conceal his paleness at the face of death. Laud came to the scaffold carrying a piece of paper from which he read to the crowd. The History goes on to print

the speech itself, which followeth here according to the best and most perfect copy, delivered by his own Hands unto one of his chaplains, and in his name presented to the King by Lord John Belasis at the court in Oxford. 9

In the hour of his death Laud sought to communicate not only with the crowd around him but with his King who, as Laud had exchanged the influential pulpits of Court and Parliament for the isolation of the scaffold, had exchanged the Royal authority of Court in London for the emasculation of exile in Oxford.
Conclusion

Rhetoric is not language as it is generally understood and employed; it is language created for a special place, and for a special audience, be it the court, clergy, judiciary or the people, and a special purpose. Consider the title page of the 1657 edition of the sermons of Robert Sanderson:


all tailored so precisely to their audience that the four types of sermons can be announced as virtual sub-genres (1). Preachers such as Sanderson recognise that pulpit oratory is more than merely persuasion. A preacher seeks to direct and control private religious thought. The preacher motivates and organises the reflections of individuals in his congregation into a communal pattern of thought, objectifying individual responses and adjusting them to the demands of dogma.
How does Laud achieve a relation with his audience and attain that force which Donne identified as a vital aspect of preaching when he wrote:

It is not the depth, nor the wit, nor the eloquence of the preacher which pierces us, but his nearness, that he speaks to my conscience as though he had been behind the hangings when I sinned, as though he had read the book of the day of judgement already. (2)

Most importantly Laud relies on the bond between himself and the audience forged out of a community of values. Preaching to the court he was an "insider", simultaneously preacher and courtier, administrator and priest. At the beginning of Sermon IV Laud expresses his relation with his audience by alternating the use of "we" and "one", blending them until "one" refers not to the individual but to the singular Church composed of individuals:

... for here we find there is but "one Lord," whom we serve; but "one God and Father," whom we worship and obey; but "one spirit," whom we receive while He sanctifies us; "one Lord," "one God and Father," "one Spirit," three in one, all three but one God, blessed for ever; but "one Baptism," by which we are cleansed; but "one faith," by which we believe; but "one hope," upon which we rely; but "one knowledge," by which we are enlightened; but "one body," of which we are members: different graces but all tending to "one edification;" divers offices, but all joint overseers of the same "work" till the building be "one," and "we "one in it." (p.155)

By building safely upon a basic assumption of community in discourse Laud avoids the need, experienced by preachers who approach pulpit oratory as a genre that calls exclusively for
persuasion: predicting whether the central idea of his sermon will fall within the audience's latitude of acceptance.

All communication depends on assumptions, and these assumptions can provide regularity in formal communication. Perhaps the most important assumption is agreed meaning. This agreed meaning provides the perimeters of the frame in which public discourse is presented. The frame contains audience expectations and associations. In the case of Laud's sermons the frame is as follows: it is expected that in the setting of the Parliament or Court Laud will preach a sermon which deals with an issue of national significance, and that he will highlight that significance by means of the application of the Biblical text used for the sermon. It would be expected that the sermon would attack Rome and the Puritan party, if not directly then obliquely. Each part of what is expected to be a controversial sermon will be linked with certain themes and figures in the text and all will be related in some way to the acknowledged principles of the Laudian/Orthodox party of the English Church. These expectations also help to set a standard for the preacher's performance.

George Herbert advocated a simple approach to achieving a
preacher's aims when, in *The Country Parson*, he advised that a sermon should consist of:

a plain and evident declaration of the meaning of the text coupled with observations drawn out of the text... as it lies entire and unbroken in scripture itself.

With, perhaps, some reservations about relying on scripture alone for support, most preachers would concede Herbert's point. But Herbert also opposed breaking up the text, "since the words apart are not scripture but a dictionary." (5) This might have been the voice of common sense, but Herbert's claim carried with it not only a required denial of the scholastic proposition that grace resided in each word of scripture, but also a denial of the court preacher's opportunity to test his skill and impress an audience. A "plain and evident declaration" in "plain and evident language" may serve the turn at Bemerton but a preacher preaching to a more sophisticated audience wanted themes and prothemes, repetitions and divisions, appeals both to the ear and to the understanding. The division into points and the correlative hierarchy of style are a consequence of exposure to the *Ars praedicandi* tradition. Formalised practice imparts authority to a preacher and to his sermons. With works such as Hemminge's *The Preacher, or Methode of Preaching*, (1574), Wilson's *The Art of Rhetorique* (1555) and continental works such as Polanus's *De conconium sociorum methodico* (Basle, 1574) and Louis De Grenada's *Ecclesiasticae rhetoricae, sive de ratione conconandi* (Cologne, 1582) to refer
to, a preacher could acquire expertise which would, hopefully, please his audience as much as it would his own vanity. Authority derived from the use of authoritative models would enhance that authority which the preacher derived from his status as an acknowledged mediator of power within a community whose deep and unique principles he shared and expounded.
CHAPTER FOUR

Evidence and Obedience in Laud's Sermons.
CHAPTER IV: PART i.

Evidence in Laud's Sermons.

Evidence in sermons consists of sources advanced by the preacher and subjected to his rhetorical organisation which tend to prove or disprove a theological contention which has been advanced. The most important elements of this definition are first that sermonic evidence consists of sources, and second that these sources are subject to rhetorical organisation by the preacher. A sermon's evidential sources are of three types: documentary, oral, and "worldly". Of the first type the most important is scripture, but the class also includes patristic writings, theological works, works belonging to the cultural tradition of the audience and the preacher, and civil or ecclesiastical documents (Acts, Injunctions, Bulls, and Encyclicals). Oral evidence is principally the testimony of the preacher himself, his own recollections and responses; while "worldly" evidence can be understood as evidence from the audience's own knowledge, experience, or daily life.
All of these types of evidence rely for their effectiveness on the handling they receive from the preacher. Adduced facts in a sermon have no identity or status which is truly independent of the argumentative structure in which they figure. To present any of the forms of evidence for a contention does not prove it or even establish it. This merely advances it, and only the operation of rhetoric can secure its acceptance. So we find with Laud that despite his tendency to assert facts and positions within the sermon he couches these in a rhetorical structure. In the course of sermons some contentions are supported, some are undermined, and some are excluded altogether. Ultimately a hierarchy of evidence is created. A certain order of reference is developed: some sources are intentionally mentioned before others. This mechanism allows us to clearly identify the preacher's attitude towards authority in its general and specific senses.

Laud's Sermon I unhesitatingly accepts the Psalm which is its text as an authoritative piece of documentary evidence. In doing so it establishes, and early in its pages enunciates, an authoritative hierarchy:

And this is in my text too: for the word in the Septuagint is ξηριοτοριεζημονον and enquire after the good
of Jerusalem; labour it." And yet it is often read in scripture for orate, "pray for it." Both then. And the Fathers bear witness to both in their place. (Sermon I: p.7)

Scripture is the principal authority, even when its reading is open to ambiguity, and the Fathers stand as support to it. Later Laud tells us more of his hierarchy of theologians when he says of a certain point that:

[It] is confirmed by St. Hierome, and some modern divines.(I:17)

Here the more specific Geneva Annotations on Isaiah. xxv:2 is subordinated to St. Jerome's mere translation of the passage in the Vulgate. Likewise, when Seneca is cited on the same page as evidence in the "secular thrust" of Laud's argument (the relation of Commonwealth and Church), it is only to this aspect of the argument that a pagan philosopher's evidence may be applied: it is not the sort of evidence which, like scripture, extends over both the Commonwealth and the Church. Finally, Laud places his own evidence as a preacher in its place when he confesses to a limitation in his own treatemnt of the work by contrast with the Psalmist's:

And I do it ill to call it barely "peace:" our prophet calls it the "blessing of peace." (I:10)

thereby concluding the section of the sermon dealing with blessing by the Intensifying deployment of a superior type of evidence. Laud has structured his types of evidence in such a way as to bring about the maximum impact: accumulating them like
weights of diminishing size on a scale. Laud favours, throughout all of his printed sermons, such evidential chains moving generally from the most authoritative: scripture, to the less immediately authoritative, such as personal experience. However, such chains also run in the opposite direction. A rising scale of evidential authority is to be found in Lancelot Andrewes' sermon at the opening of Parliament in 1621. First, having employed the evidence of inherited practice and the writings of contemporary authors to support the appositeness of his text he goes on, in the discussion of the theme of his sermon, to deploy both prophetic and divine sources of evidence:

The Prophet speaketh here, God himself there: Ego dixi, dili estis. This saith our Saviour, in sermo Dei. The other two may seem to drop out of the prophet's pen, but this came from God's own mouth: the more, say I, to be regarded. (1)

In Andrewes' sermons such chains of evidence are part of the background or the preliminaries to the sermon proper, in Laud's sermons they exercise a far more constant shaping force and they, therefore, are less inclined to vary their form.

In Sermon I, while asserting the vital role of prayer in civil affairs Laud reminds his hearers of "that ancient Christian custom" whereby Parliaments and councils "began both the first day's work and every day's work, with 'prayer'", and he cites Appian's testimony that such was also the habit of the Romans: "the heathen which knew not the true God." (p. 9). However, the
evidential hierarchy is reasserted at this point when Laud says:

But I leave them. My text is more ancient and more full than their practice: (p. 9)

Elsewhere Laud responds to the Puritan objection that the prayer in the church litany which asks for deliverance from affliction may be presumptuous if such affliction is God’s wish with a citation from the Old Testament (from the text of the sermon), a supplementary citation from St. Paul leading to the Epiplectic conclusion:

And hath the Church of England such ill luck, that it cannot do as David and St. Paul bids it, but it must anger the Puritan? (p. 12).

And when on page 18 he confutes the arguments of the Chillists Laud does so solely on the authority of scripture rather than by citing any of the specific theological attacks on the Chilliast doctrines.

So it is that though he calls on his hearers to consider a state in disarray and wracked by civil conflict (p. 10), to consider the evidence of "the eye of nature" (p. 11), and the evidence of "received judgement" (p. 18) it is to scriptural evidence that he turns at the most important moments in the text.

The antisagoge passage on page 21 of Sermon I brings together the various forms of evidence into a persuasive appeal:

But shall men prosper that do so indeed? Yes, you have no
probable cause to distrust it: the words are, "they shall prosper." And if you take them for an earthly promise, you have the King's word for it: if for a spiritual, you have the Prophet's word for it. Would you have any man testify that hath had experience? You have David's word for it; and he had often trial in himself, that God made him prosper for his prayers' sake, and his love to that State and Church. And since you cannot distrust a King, a Prophet, a man of experience, be sure to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem:" if it be but that yourselves may prosper (p. 21).

Although Sermon II is primarily an exhaustive exegesis of that text, the occasion - the celebration at Court of King James' accession - encourages Laud to focus on the King as a source of "worldly" evidence and it is from this source that he supports the textual thrust of his presentation. He writes of the explanation for God's blessing:

And here it were sacrilege for me, and no less, to pass by His Majesty, without thanks both to God and him. To him, for quia sperat, because he trusteth: for no prince hath ever kept more firm to religion ... And to God for quia dedit, because in mercy he hath given him this "blessing" so to trust, and by this trust in Him, to be this and many other blessings to us. (p. 51)

Elsewhere, evidence of God's favour is derived from God's protection of the King: his deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605 and from drowning in January, 1620 (p. 59). Finally evidence is provided from Laud's own testimony:

Prophet I am none, but my heart is full, that "the mercy of the Highest," which hath preserved him in great sickness, and from great dangers, hath more work for him yet to do; the peace of Christendom is yet to settle. (p. 55)
Sermons III and IV can be treated as a pair: both are sermons to Parliament and both approach this setting armed with "worldly" evidence.

But if you take the "earth," for the State at home, then it is high time to magnify God — first, for the renowned, religious, and peacable Reign of our late dead sovereign of blessed memory, who for so many yeeres together, kept this kingdom in peace, and from "melting:" and secondly, that now in the change of princes, which is not the least occasion for a State to melt, we live to see a miracle, Change without alteration:— another King, but the same life expression of all the royall and religious virtues of his father; and no sinewes shrinking, or dissolving in the state. (p. 98)

The type of evidence which Laud refutes is also evidence from the "real world":

Nor may the wisdom of the world think that to "pray," and to "give thanks" to God, are void actions: for whatever worldlings think the Church doth great service to the state while it prays.(p 74)

Sermon V contains an appeal to a specific kind of "worldly" evidence: the appeal to common experience:

For when did any man see a Kingdom, or a great city, wasted, and the Mother church left standing in beauty? sure I think never. (p. 121)

The audience is asked to use its experience as an analytical tool: "Look around you — observe", counsels Laud on page 142, for when they have done so they will conclude:

And herein, above other nations, we are blessed this day;
I say again, above other nations, if we can see our blessings, and be thankful. (p. 139)

In Sermon VI Laud returns to documentary evidence, drawing not only upon scripture but also upon a secondary source of documentary evidence that derived from the Church Fathers. In the course of this sermon he cites, among other Fathers, Anselm, Augustine, Basil, Bernard, John Chrysostom, Hilary, Isidore, and Jerome (as well as Calvin). So pervasive is recourse to the patristic writers that it replaces the evidence of experience. Here Laud determines the relative merits of sources of evidence. The power of experience as an evidential force in a sermon does not necessarily earn it the right to supplant scripture or the Fathers as the principal feature in the hierarchy of evidence (2).

Finally, Sermon VII operates by assembling evidence from biblical history with which to prompt comparisons with contemporary kingship. The Jesuit Lorinus is again confuted by Laud, this time with the aid of citations from Jerome and Tertullian, (pp. 185-187), but these citations support a conclusion arrived at earlier by consulting the meaning of scripture:

There are many things in this psalm that are not applicable to Solomon; but some are, and none more than
the words of the text. For these words can as hardly be applied to Christ, as that after to Solomon. Now that that agreed to types before Christ's coming, agrees to all that are like Christ after His coming. Therefore this is appliable to all godly, religious kings; for all have directions from, and share in, the prayer of Solomon. (p. 186)

The subjects of godly and religious Kings and the obedience due to them was an important one for both Laud and his audience. As such they represented issues to which Laud dedicated much of the evidence he mobilised throughout his sermons.
CHAPTER IV: PART II.

Obedience and the Icon of Kingship in Laud’s Sermons.

Religion and politics had enjoyed a symbiotic relation in England since the Reformation. In his speech delivered in the Star Chamber in June 1637 Laud outlined his position in respect of the Church’s relation with the Crown:

our being Bishops Jure Divino, by Divine Right, takes nothing from the King’s right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet may we not exercise that power, either of order or jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us, that is, not in His Majesty’s or any Christian King’s Kingdoms but by and under the power of the King given us to do. 1

During the reign of King Edward VI a letter was sent "to all preachers which the King’s majesty hath licensed to preach", and it began:

After our right hearty commendations: as well for the conservation of the quietness and good order of the King’s subjects as that they should not by evil or unlearned preachers be brought into superstition, error, or evil doctrine, or otherwise be made stubborn or disobedient to the King’s majesty’s godly proceedings, his highness by our advice hath thought good to inhibit all manner of preachers who have not such license as in
the same proclamation is allowed, to preach, or stir the people in open and common preaching of sermons, by any means: that the devout and godly homilies might the better in the meanwhile sink into his subject's hearts, and be learned the sooner, the people not being tossed to and from with seditious and contentious preaching, while every man according to his zeal, some better, some worse, goeth about to set out his own fantasy, and draw the people to his opinion. 2

"Superstition, error or evil doctrine" are all signs of disobedience to "the King's majesty's godly proceedings". As such they are prorogued by this policy which seeks to prevent the gap left by the break from de jure submission to Rome being filled with an excess of religious liberty in which the people are "tossed to and from with seditious and contentious preaching". Uniformity, policed by the licensing of preachers, is a way to help secure obedience to orthodoxy. (2) Uniformity means obedience: this relation passes down through the Reformation from party to party. When Laud, warns his audience:

For if every man may preach as he list though he pretend the law and gospel too, Jerusalem will be quickly out of unity in itself (p. 75)

he is echoing Bishop Wren of Norwich who, on Laud's favourite topic of unity, found the base of unity in obedience and wrote:

The Holy Church subsists not without the communion of saints. No communion with them without union among ourselves. That union is impossible unless we preserve a uniformity for doctrine and a uniformity for discipline. 3

When Laud preached for the opening of Parliament in 1625 and set forth the need to recognise the blessing of God in the provision
of councils and judges that part of his sermon recalled the Accession Day sermon of 1583 in which Archbishop Whitgift drew particular attention to St Paul's commendation of obedience to magistrates in his letter to Titus. (4) And Laud's efforts through the licensing of texts and preachers, through the control he exercised over his dioceses and archdiocese, as well as over the University of Oxford during his Chancellorship, perpetuate Queen Elizabeth's advice, given to Oxford during her visit in 1592, to "seek to obey the law rather than to be ahead of it." (5)

Obedience is not only a principal theme throughout Laud's sermons - the key to the history of God's relations with his people, the requisite of civil order, the force manifested and demanded by kingship - it is a directing force in their style and structure. Laud works, as we saw in the preceding section, within a circumscribed literary landscape: the Bible, the Fathers, occasionally a pagan writer or a contemporary theologian. His use of all of these serves the larger cause of Laud's obedience to the constraints of the scriptural text. Later we will look more closely at the significance of this "textuality" in Laud, but for the present we can notice how, in Sermon IV for example, the nature of the text as Laud sees it:

The psalm is accounted a kind of dialogue between God and the prophet. (p. 93)
determines the two-part division of the sermon. This division also abets the sermon's structure of problem/remedy. The formal divisions are always a consequence of Laud's obedience to the inherent demands of his text: in Sermon VII he tells his audience:

My text is a prayer; and there are two petitions, and these two petitions divide my text into two parts. (p. 186)

Obedience to the text restrains Laud from rhetorical flights. His use of sermonatio (the answering of feigned questions), involves questions and answers so perfunctory as to show that Laud has no wish to have the feigned question seriously considered. Another preacher might have embroidered on such questions or pursued them through authorities: here, for example, is Donne in a Lenten sermon of 1626/27:

But shall we receive good from God and not evil too? shall I shed upon you lumen visionis, the light of that vision, which God hath afforded me in this Prophecy, the light of his countenance and his gracious blessings upon you, and not lay upon you onus visionis 6

To Laud such exploration represents a potentially dangerous diversion and he cuts it off with a swift answer to his question, the rejection of the appropriateness of a question, or a raw appeal to his authority to override the question. Laud's dictum seems to be that the employment of a rhetorical device, although it may be called for, must never tempt the preacher to compromise
Sermon II is a sermon which deals exhaustively with the King as a blessing from God and therefore a figure compelling obedience. A king is a blessing to his people:

when he turns the graces which God hath given him to the benefit of them which are committed to him. (p. 36)

Laud's text:

For Thou hast set him as blessings for ever: Thou hast made him glad with the joy of thy countenance. Because the King trusteth in the Lord: and the mercy of the most High he shall not miscarry. (Ps. xxI. 6,7)

is a declaration of praise and dedication which Laud presents as the charter of a divine order and, by extension, a guide to the methods by which that order might be fully realised. Thus the traditional exhortative, reforming purpose of the sermon is fulfilled through the analysis of divine favour. David is the particular blessing referred to in the psalm and his status as a blessing is based on the fact that he trusts the Lord:

And indeed, the words are a reciprocal proof either to other: - for because God gives, David hopes: and because David hopes, God gives more abundantly, honour, blessing and joy. It is in the text quia sperat even because he trusts. (pp. 48-49)

David, as Donne remarked in the Second Prebend sermon:

was not onely a cleare Prophet of Christ himselfe, but a Prophet of every particular Christian: He forteills what I what any shall doe, and suffer, and say. 7
Specifically, David as a king who has put his faith in God is an exemplar to King James who, for the same reason, is an exemplar to his people. Laud praises the King for meriting the mercy and blessing of God. Plato, in *The Protagoras*, says that the efficacy of the poetry of praise depends on its ability to arouse emulation, and Laud reminds his hearers that they should emulate the King's relation with God in their relations with the King: cultivating a similar trust and obedience. Trust is necessary for the people because the provision of a good king is a blessing and the reasons for such a blessing are not always immediately appreciated:

And you cannot, no not even with a curious eye, search all the reasons how he is set for blessings, because God, in disposing it, hath hid, *lumen intra umbram*, and thickened the veil that is drawn over it. (pp. 40-41)

Laud argues that obedience is due to the King because the King is blessed by God:

here God places the King; this is His ordinance, to season his cares; therefore, if any attempt to displace him, to plunge him into grief, to make him struggle with difficulties, it is a kind of deposing him. The care of government should be eased not discomfited; else, doubtless, God would never have placed David between *laetificasti* and *gaudiam*, joy and joy. p. 47

So, although throughout Sermon II Laud emphasises that obedience through trust is the force which determines civil liberty, obedience being more than a political obligation raises the relation between the interests of the King and the interests of
the people above the Hobbesean grounds Donne advanced during the dedicatory epistle to Pseudomartyr:

For since in providing for your Majesty's security the oath defends us, it is reason that we defend it. 9

The King according to Sermon II, brings three specific blessings. The first is "the true worship of the true God", whereby the King is an exemplar of orthodoxy and obedience to the will of God, and an opponent of schismatics. The second specific blessing is "preservation from foreign enemies" whereby the King is a defender of a favoured nation such as England conceived itself to be. The final specific blessing is "Life and vigour of Justice and judgement among the people" by which the King exercises God's judgement on earth and fulfils God's ordinances. All of these blessings, because they represent obedience to God, ensure the continuation of divine favour, and therefore ought to be a cause for joy among the people.

King David is the principal kingly exemplar in Sermon II:

when I read David rex sperat, "the King trusts in the Lord," and hear him speak in the third person, as of another King, methinks the prophecy is worth bringing home to our most gracious sovereign. p. 54

Identification with biblical kings was a common form of praise at the time. Andrew Willett's sermon Ecclesia triumphans, preached in 1604 to welcome King James to the throne, cited no fewer than
twenty points of comparison between King James and King David, while at the other end of the king's reign, and mining the other identification which James encouraged, John Williams, preaching at his funeral, called King James "a lively statue of Solomon". (10).

The majority of texts chosen by Laud for his sermons come from the Book of Psalms. This was seen as a royal book: the outpourings of a King who had been favoured by God. Although James favoured identifications with Solomon, his pretensions as a poet seemed to him to bond him to David. In the image of the psalmist, especially as it is developed in the passage which Laud chooses as the text for Sermon I, lies the full force of Davidic identification. Laud's sermons, unlike some of the secular literature which grew up in the court, did not overtly pursue this identification to its limits, which are that David the Psalmist is figura Christi (11). Rather, in Laud's sermons the image of the King is not only a point of concentration but an aid in the interpretation of the metaphoric and symbolic dimensions of reality. To ponder the nature and practice of Stuart Kingship is, in Laud's view, a religious exercise because so much of the biblical dispensation is reflected in this institution. The blessings of God, the covenantal relation, are all the more easily apprehended for being expressed in the living
form of the Stuart kings who do not merely represent power, the power of civil authority, but partake of the power of scripture insofar as they are referred to and partly explained by figures such as David and Solomon. Sermon VII, like the prayer of the King in the psalm that is its text, allows the hearers to "pierce through to the antitype and body of the promise which is Christ" (p. 185).

Sermon V stresses the importance of obedience by dwelling on the context of the sermon - the outbreak of pestilence and the efforts of the church and state to combat it. A concerned state:

partly on account of the pestilence yet raging in many parts of the kingdom, partly on account of the danger of enemies threatening us. 12

has imposed the fast, the prayers, and the sermon:

And as it ought to be, so authority in a most religious hand commands it. And a powerful edict hath made the duty public, which else perhaps would have been as much neglected in the private, as the time itself and the danger both have been. p. 124

To Laud's eyes both the plague and the external threat are signs of God's displeasure directed at England because it has failed to be sufficiently vigorous in supporting the King against his foreign and domestic enemies. Laud challenges his hearers that they have failed in this matter of obedience:

He has placed over us in the throne, a wise, a stout, a vigilant, and a most prudent King. Well; but can you
always have these second helps at hand? Can you always by them effect your ends? Have you them ready at this time? Have you the sinews that move them? It is well if you have. But I doubt it is a great part of the sorrow and trouble of the time, that you have not. p. 124

Laud suggests that if they are unreformed these threats will point forward to further dangers, and he exhorts his hearers to action, and the principal action that he calls for is prayer:

To God and to God by prayer. That is the Church way. And the Church way is via regia, the King’s way, as Epiphanius calls it. pp. 122-123

In Sermon Seven Laud argues that if the nation fails to support the King in his prayers the only possible conclusion is that they are plotting against him. Public witness of loyalty is particularly important at a time when there is a conflict within the state:

for the first thing that makes prayer necessary, absolutely necessary, for a King is himself: that a superior hand, even God’s hand, would set, and keep him right, when so many inferior hands labour to set awry. (p. 190)

The King is thus a force for balance and demands support rather than disturbance. In his sermon preached before King James at Whitehall for the commemoration of his deliverance from the Gunpowder Treason, Lancelot Andrewes, illustrating the close links between God and the King’s destiny, preached upon the text:

My son, fear thou the Lord, and the King, and meddle not
with them that are given to change.

For their destruction shall rise suddenly; and who knoweth the destruction of them both?

These things also belong to the wise. (13)

In Sermon VII Laud reminds his hearers what the alternative is to supporting the King:

For the person that keeps close to this duty, among many others, he shall be sure of this one great blessing, he cannot fall into the opposite sin of murmuring against the King. David, the King in the text, he had faithful and religious people; yet there was a Shimei among them, that instead of praying for the King, cursed and reviled him. David was very patient; but I pray remember what Solomon the King's son did to Shimei; and if the memory of his punishment would affright other men from running into this blasphemous iniquity, all would soon be well. (p. 191)

Part of the character of power that Laud draws attention to in this sermon is power's capacity to act. Laud impresses far more forcibly than Andrewes the belief that fear enforces obedience and unity. A failure of unity will undermine every area of life. The position of power that Laud attained in the state both allowed and obliged him to exercise authority. He acknowledges in such passages as the one quoted above that the concordia discors, while it may be acceptable as a vision, is, in reality, supported by active power. Laud fused civil authority with the visible church and its authority, and he reminds his hearers that the visible church has power over their bodies as well as their souls.
In Laud's view the admission of power and acquiescence to hierarchy are not so much matters for the individual as they are collective concerns. Laud's assertion of the authority of the king and church will have no effect—indeed it will, strictly speaking, have no meaning—if his own authority is not conveyed to his hearers. When Laud creates a community in his sermons he makes an object of it—a fixed quantity possessing no natural propensity for radical change. Laud depends upon shared values and a sense of community in his public sermons as much as in his sermons to the court. Richard Flatham has described this presumed community of viewpoint in the following way:

In short, as with any attempt to give an agent reasons for thinking and activity in a certain manner, the experience of power presupposes the shared values, beliefs, conventions that give such notions as "thought", "action" and "reason" a foothold and yield criteria by which individuals may judge any reasons for thought and action that are in fact given. 14

In Laud's seven sermons the simple notion of a sermon delivered by a figure of authority is the source of much of the impact of their message, as well as a significant rhetorical determinant.
CHAPTER FIVE.

The Structure of Laud's Sermons.
In Laud's sermons theme and style are intimately bound up with structure. Structurally, Laud's sermons extend horizontally and vertically. The horizontal dimension runs from the text to the context, encompassing the scope and coherence of the text; this is the "narrative" of the sermon. Sermon VI illustrates this well since it is a sermon with a strong "historical" orientation - drawing on a number of historical instances to supply lessons to the present: in this case the lesson is:

For corruption at the heart of man breeds pride even out of God's graces. p. 156

The coherence of the text is provided by the relation of the historical exempla which Laud cites. Likewise, in Sermon III Laud's first step is to set the text in context, not to say what it means but, rather, to display its history and circumstances. Like Laud, John Donne is keen to look at the manner and matter of a text when he divides it. Donne moves from the location of the text to the division of it in his Second Prebendal sermon:
The key of the Psalme (as St Hierome calls the Titles of the psalmes) tells us that David uttered this psalme when he was in the wildernesse of Judah; There we see the present occasion that moved him; and we see what was passed between God and him before, in the first clause of our text; (Because thou hast been my helpe.) And then we see what was to come, by the rest, (Therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoyce.) So that we have here the whole compasse of Time, Past, Present and Future; and these three parts of Time shall be at this time the three parts of this Exercise.(1)

In Sermon III Laud moves from the specific city of the text to all cities, and the concepts that he uses shift from the concrete of walls and towers to abstractions such as "wise ordering". Having followed this pattern of diffusion and talked of the relation of the temple to the seats of Justice Laud is able, having laid out the ground, to focus the rest of his address on Parliament itself.

The vertical dimension of the sermon runs from God to the audience, through the text and the preacher. Laud regularly constructs his sermons so that they end with a prayer. Sermon V, for example, closes with the passage:

As we have therefore now begun, so let us pray as the prophet did. (pp. 146-147)

This method is an important one to note in our study of the vertical dimension of Laud's preaching because the language of prayer is composed of the act of self-location and the symbols of submission; placing the suppliants in relation to God, and, in this case, setting Laud as their intermediary who prompts them to
to pray and advises them how to turn the text into practice: "My text begins where every good man should end..." (p. 33). Laud uses another form from the language of prayer in his employment of intercessionary phrases. Evelyn Underhill described the function of the intercessionary prayers of the liturgy as being: "...to check, as it were, the forward rush of the soul towards God." (2) Laud uses them in the same way, to interpose himself between the people and God and to direct and determine their approach.

A dialectical sermon such as John Donne frequently preached is not simply one whose ideas develop by the contrasting of opposed statements, it is one with a particular formal structure that directs the organisation and development of these ideas. Preachers make no more important or revealing choice than their choice of what structure they will employ in their sermon. Laud favours the medieval model of the textual sermon where sermon structure is directed by the structure of the text. There are two reasons for this preference. The first is Laud's obedience to the authority of the text. The second reason is that this method provides a safeguard for the preacher by limiting the scope of a sermon's development: a safeguard not provided in looser forms of sermon construction. In Sermon VI, for example, Laud chooses to deal solely with the theme of the text - unity,
and the method of the text—exhortation. The six particulars on which the text is divided and upon which the sermon is developed (p. 158) are only additions and qualifications made to the keyword "unity" by the other principal words of the text. These additions advance by a series of orderly qualifications foreshadowing the stages of the sermon’s development:

But what then? Will any kind of "unity" serve the turn? Surely, any will do much good: but the best is safest; and that is the "unity of the spirit." pp. 161

Likewise the nature of the text of Sermon IV:

This psalm is accounted a kind of dialogue between God and the Prophet. (p. 93) determines the two part division of the sermon, a dialogue, containing also on the one hand the problem and on the other its remedy. Likewise in the case of Sermon VII:

My text is a prayer; and there are two petitions, and these two petitions divide my text into two parts. (p. 187)

Laud’s sermons contain in their opening paragraphs the four foci of textual explication for sermons: the outline of the theme; the outline of structure; the relation between the passage itself and the Bible as a whole; and finally its relation to the world at large, and in particular the significance of the text for the specific audience or occasion on which it is preached. Laud is not so limited a preacher as to try and prescribe an order of importance for these elements which would require formal
heads and divisions. Rather he treats these elements as inter-related and arranges them as the text and the occasion suggest would be most effective. Laud announces the construction of the sermon by telling his hearers:

I begin at the state in which David, when he came to the crown, found the "earth," the world in general: the kingdom of Judah in particular, and the Church of God. (p 95)

What Laud is promising is *euteprismus*, the process whereby points dealt with are enumerated and then undergo *prosapadosis*. Because Laud recognises the Bible as a composition with a framework he constructs his sermons accordingly: deploying definite steps whose logic will be clear to his hearers. This is the force that prevents his sermons from meandering. It was not merely Laud's preference for organisation and precision that made this important. A meandering preacher was all the more inclined to find himself straying into doctrinal error, and the avoidance of such was a constant concern of Laud the preacher as it was of Laud the ecclesiastical administrator. As well as observing the general structural characteristics and motives of Laud's sermons the following pages will focus briefly on two interesting structural particularities: cohesion and collocation.

So far as the theory of preaching could be said to present a uniform view on any matter it held that structure was determined by intention. Jeremy Taylor, for example, intending to show the
unity of apparent contraries, designs his sermons on the Platonic/Ramist pattern of analogy whereby approaches to matters come in twos, such as means and ends, past and present, revelation and experience, or the thing as universal and the thing as particular. If the aim of a sermon was primarily instructional then its character would be analytical and it would move from the particular to the general, focusing on key words of the text and aiming to remove obscurities. However, should the text be seen as a motto for a more abstract type of exhortation, or a commentary on doctrine, then the move would tend to be in the opposite direction: from the general to the particular, discussing illustrative instances of some larger issues.

Laud is a descendant of the practice of Lancelot Andrewes not only because he chooses to be learned rather than popular; to use short sentences in general preference to more complex sentences; and in his use of classical and patristic citation, but also because of his rigorous text development and his careful sense of structure. Laud’s debt to Andrewes is most apparent in Sermon I (3). Andrewes divides his sermons into three schematic sections: Exordium, Tractatio intermedia and Epilogus seu peroratio (4). This was but one way of achieving the traditional aim of showing the means and reason for the text, but each of these categories supported other corollaries. In Sermon II, for
example, Laud subdivides his text and announces his subdivisions:

So three parts will divide the text, and give us order in proceeding. (p. 35)

But even this division admits of further subdivision:

I begin at the first. The "means" by which God adds honour even to the majesty of princes. And because that doubles in the text, I will take the first in order, which is *dando*. Thou layest great honour upon the king, "by giving him or setting him as a blessing for ever." In which means of laying honour the circumstances are three. (p. 35)

Every division contains the seeds of another division. Laud is, however, more particular than many preachers as to how far he will pursue opportunities for division.

The history of sermon construction from the medieval period resolves itself into a choice between two types of construction. The "Ancient" form was descended from the Patristic homilies and concerned itself with either explication and elaboration or with the topical treatment of a subject according to reason and scripture. The "Modern" form was a product of the Universities, it showed a heavy Aristotelian influence and relied more on logic than on oratory. Laud avoided the latter form, largely, I suspect, because its apparently infinite divisions and its often confusing logic-chopping could mislead both preachers and audience. Laud favoured the "Ancient" form with its long history, its reliance on reason and scripture and its manageability. Yet
he borrowed many preaching devices from the more "intellectual" tradition of the modern form. Among these was the practice of declaring and confirming the divisions into which the sermon was divided. This was done both to justify the division and to prove that it was well grounded in logic and scripture. Laud's division throughout his sermons is intrinsic, usually following the order of the words as they appear and then the order of grammatical structures or the logical order of the idiom.

Sermon III, (1621), displays Laud's cohesive control of his material as well as his fondness for the three-part structure. The text of the sermon is:

For Thou hast set him as blessings for ever: Thou hast made him glad with the joy of Thy countenance.
Because the King trusteth in the Lord: and in the mercy of the most High he shall not miscarry. (Ps. xxI, 6,7.)

and the theme of the sermon is that of the text - blessing, while the protheme of the sermon is God's role as the author of the blessing. Linked to this is an analysis of the King's role as a conduit for blessing, and his particular fitness for blessing. The King is the particular object of the text and so although God is first in importance the King will be the initial focus:

God is first in the work, wherever a gracious King is a blessing to his people. (p.42)

The theme is introduced to the body of the sermon by noting the identification of all Kings with David:
for in this the learned agree, that the letter of the psalm reads David: that the spirit of the psalm eyes Christ: that the analogy in the psalm is for every good King that makes David his example, and Christ his God. (pp. 33-34)

In this same way each division is supported by the citation of scriptural authority.

The subdivision of the text is announced: the means (which are themselves two-fold), the reason, and the success which the blessed King will enjoy. The subdivision first deals with the means of blessing and the first of these is the King. The nature of Kings and their parallels with Christ are discussed, as is the pattern of blessing which links God with the King and with the People. The subdivision next deals with the joy brought by blessing. This allows Laud to carry over from the earlier part of the sermon the notion of blessing as a gift from God and to remind his hearers that while they may be ungrateful for the blessing they have received they must recall that their happiness depends on the quality of relations between God and the King, and that this quality is secured by the King. The relation is shaped by the "reasons" for the blessings which are the subject of the next subdivision and these are the King's virtues of hope, trust and charity. The final part of the subdivision deals with reward: again Laud stresses that God is the origin of this and that it is given for virtue and not for policy. The amplification of the
text occurs from page 54 onwards and following from the emphasis in the earlier passages Laud applies the amplification directly to the King:

Next, methinks, I have a *non commovebitur*, he shall not miscarry, for, or in, his "public affairs." Prophet I am none, but my heart is full, that the "mercy of the Highest," which hath preserved him in great sickness, and from great dangers, hath more work for him yet to do; the peace of Christendom is yet to settle. Will God honour this island in him, and by his wisdom, to order the peace, and settle the distracted state of Christendom, and edge the sword upon the common enemy of Christ? Why should there not be trust in God, that in the "mercy of the Highest he shall not miscarry?" (p.55)

This focus upon the King is indicative of Laud's predilection for the concrete over the abstract; the particular over the general: he prefers to reveal a virtue through its embodiment in the King, just as the virtue of unity is best illustrated through the example of Jerusalem.

Laud is fond of constructing his sermons around the operations of typology: the study and comparison of types. Typology differs from allegory and symbolism in that the analogy is literally and historically true. For example, the deluge in Genesis is a type of baptism and it is also a real deluge: only the link between them is abstract. Laud, like many writers who dealt with sacred themes, saw a host of reflections between their world and the world of the Bible. Typology, when engrained in a writer's thinking as it is engrained in Laud's, produces a
fondness for binary arrangement. This tendency survives within the dominant ternary organisation of the sermons. The theme of Sermon I is Church and State: paragraphs and arguments divide throughout the sermon to correspond to this division. Jerusalem is the house of God and the house of the King (p.1: para.3). The euteprismus (1:4) consists of two figures, the words of the text are an exhortation and a prayer; the first the mode most appropriate for the State, the second the mode most appropriate for the Church. The peristasis of 1:6 describes two types of fault in the matter of obligations: there are two qualifications to the obligation to pray for peace (1:13): si possible (if it be possible) and quantum vobis (as much as lieth in you).

Readers may find this pattern of reflection ultimately unsatisfying, done sparingly it is clever, pervading an entire sermon it could rapidly stale. But Laud is deliberately a limited preacher. His structures may be open but they are nonetheless complete. He is apt to construct edifices, particularly those which embody the authority of the Church and State and place them at such points where they will command attention by blocking the vista over which, otherwise, the audience’s eyes may roam without restraint. Throughout the seventeenth century literature had shown an interest in practical methods of discovery: by meditation, by representation, by gradual and tentative
enlightenment. Pre-eminent in this tradition are Bacon's *Essays*, Donne's *Sermons* and *Essays in Divinity*, and Browne's *Hydriotaphia*. Laud, who is not a speculative natural scientist, nor a convert engaged in a life-long search for certainty, nor an "irregular Platonist", is guided in his thinking and his writing by steady certainty and constructs his sermons with appropriate consideration and care.

Among the areas where Laud shows this care is in the matter of collocation. Collocation is the linguistic characteristic by which members of the same lexical set appear close together in texts because texts tend to be cohesive, in other words they stay on the same topic. Laudian collocation is the result of ideological fashioning: "King", "blessing", "Jerusalem", "Temple", these are examples of words which collocate on ideological rather than lexical grounds in Laud's sermons. Laud is not so experimental a writer as to collocate unalike and uncommon words such as Andrewes might have done but he does fit his collocations into the larger rhetorical pattern of his sermons, to make them effective not as isolated moments but as complements to a total pattern. In Sermon I, for example, Jerusalem, when it constitutes the key element in a passage, is usually supported by the word "temple", which, when it itself is the key word, is supported by "solemnity" all of this continues.
the theme of the opening line of the sermon where where the Ark is brought with solemnity to Jerusalem:

But now the presence of it made the City of David, domicellum religionis, the house of religion, as well as regni, of the kingdom. (p. 3)

Moreover, when we compare Sermon II and Sermon VII we can see how the collocation of King and Prayer in the first is expanded to provide the major structural image of the second.

Cohesion is a distinguishing feature of a well-formed text. Focus on an integrated topic and the presence of well-signalled internal transitions indicate its presence. The presence of cohesion, while it marks the texts of Laud's sermons as well formed works, is used by him in a particular fashion. Laud favours two principal types of cohesive link in his sermons: reference and reiteration. He avoids a third important alternative; ellipsis. Laud is wary of the empty space that ellipsis leaves in an argument. It is this wariness that is behind such typically Laudian constructions as "Which one? - why 'tis...", where nothing delays the resolution of a question.

The nature of communication and persuasion in circumstances such as sermons has been studied by Irving L. Janis in his paper "Motivational effects of different sequential arrangements of conflicting arguments: a theoretical analysis." Janis discussed a
class of communication situations

in which a prestigeful source transmits an intelligible, persuasive message to recipients whose favourable attitude towards the source predisposes them to be relatively uncritical with respect to accepting the truth value and cogency of the main argument. This class is referred to as "authoritative communications" (5)

From the outset of his sermons Laud presents a clear-cut position on the issue being discussed. He waits until he has fully stated his interpretation of the text and explicated its form and direction before he sets out to refute any opposing arguments which his audience may be entertaining. For instance, it is eight pages into Sermon V before he refutes the Calvinist position on God's operation in human affairs:

Well, we are safe enough at sea, and at land, if we can but get God to "arise" on our part. But how shall we be able to do it? How? why, never dream, for it is a dream indeed, and a fond one too, that you can ever be able, without God's grace, to make God yours. But know that He hath grace for you, and gives it, and He is half yours already: He will "arise" and be all yours, if you pray in grace. But here two things are especially to be taken heed of, if we will have our "fasting" and our "prayers" prevail. And I doubt that we are guilty of both, and have taken heed of neither. (p. 128)

Janis suggests that:

When a source with high prestige is communicating with an audience generally inclined to be uncritically receptive rather than disputatious, relatively few recipients will become strongly motivated to recall unmentioned arguments which would refute or counteract what the communicator is saying. (6)

In Sermon VII where he is addressing the potentially less sympathetic audience of Paul's Cross we witness Laud structuring
his sermon to take advantage of the rhetorical benefit derived from withholding contrary arguments until positive arguments have been presented and the chances of generating a sustained conflict have been minimised.

Sermon IV illustrates a simple cohesive text based on the predominance of two words which Laud employs in a variety of aspects and relations throughout the sermon. The text is:

When I shall receive the congregation, or, when I shall take a convenient time, I will judge according unto right. The earth is dissolved, or melted, and all the inhabitants thereof: I bear up the pillars of it. (Psa. LXXV, 2,3)

This text, as Laud tells us, is a dialogue, and this validates the focus on, and recurrence of, specific terms, and in a larger pattern justifies Laud's breaking the text, according to its two points, the state of the earth, and the remedy and time of remedy. The dialogue quality is displayed to dramatic effect in the exchange on pp. 94-95. The first division treats of the state of the earth and the key term here is "melting". The text "talks", according to Laud, simultaneously about the earth/world/state/Judah/Church. David coming to the throne of one localises but does not exclude the remainder. As there are a variety of locales involved so there are a variety of connected causes of melting: heat, sin, God's punishment. With these connections made it is a simple matter for Laud to say that no part of society is safe
from the effects of melting. However the present King can impede such a threat. The major remedy against melting is "justice": a term which Laud emphatically mentions nine times within the very first paragraph of the sermon.

Laud constructs his sermons in such a way as to achieve the maximum potency for his message, the maximum cohesion for his address, and the maximum incontestability for his argument. The structure of his sermons is, therefore, carefully directed towards control: he has no wish to leave loose ends for either himself or his audience to become tangled in.
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The Style of Laud's Sermons.

A preacher preached with three possible intentions: to explicate, to confirm or to apply doctrine. The chosen intention contributed to the style employed in the sermon. In the previous chapter we looked at some of the ways in which Laud designs his sermons to achieve the maximum control of his material. When we turn to the stylistic traits of Laud's sermons we will observe that their style is directed towards the control of the audience. This control is achieved through the stylistic creation of an authoritative persona (1).

The court of King Charles I was one where prose style was deeply appreciated. Dr Fell, the Dean of Christ Church, in a tribute that must combine some truth with its hyperbole, described King Charles as:

the most accurate judge and greatest master of English rhetoric which this age hath given. 2

It also appears that the King did not confuse style and content:

"I carry my ears to hear other preachers, but I carry my
In such circumstances Laud had to meet a high standard and to locate a style both personal and suitable. Varying stylistic registers are among the signs of a rich genre, and a rich text in such a genre displays the successful modulation of one stylistic register to another. The preacher who seeks clarity and force of discourse had three main styles at his disposal: the plain and uncolloquial, the colloquial and the ornate. Of these all but the colloquial, with its racy style and homely exempla, possessed the capacity to express the preacher’s authority over his audience. It may be the authority of the plain-spoken Jeremiad, bare in style and enhanced only by quotations from scripture and the Fathers, or that of the intricate, daunting and impressive marshalling of a wide variety of evidences within a rich rhetorical structure. Among the Puritans there were many who were committed to the bare and austere plain style and felt compelled to declaim against rhetorical devices, and even patristic citation, on the authority of evangelical simplicity. A largely unvarying stylistic register would seem to have been the ideal of the tradition of plain-spoken testimony in religious discourse.

The authority for this was St Paul who, in I Cor. 11, 1,4 said:

And I brethren when I came to you, came not with the excellency of speech or wisdom declaring with you the testimony of God... And my speech and my preaching was not with exciting words or man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit of power.
John Bunyan echoes this message in *Grace Abounding*, strengthening it with the Puritan's awareness of the mortal importance of testimony:

I could have stepped into a style much higher than this which I have here discoursed, and could have adorned all things more than here I have seemed to, but I dare not. God did not play in convincing me: the Devil did not play in tempting me; neither did I play when I sunk into the bottomless pit, when the pangs of hell caught me: wherefore I may not now play in my relating of them, but be plain and simple and lay down the thing as it was.4

Other Puritans, influenced perhaps by the Ramist *Rhetorica* of Talon (1554) favoured a style with tropes but without schemata.

(5)

Laud's style in general has more in common with the plain and uncolloquial: terse and pointed, its structure guided by strict rhetorical progression. Laud avoids the excesses of Ramism with its range of dichotomies, distinctions and collocations. Rhetorical *schema*, when employed, are used not for display but for cogency. As noted previously, Laud's doctrine is a modification and simplification of Hooker's work in *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*; in the same way his sermon style is a modification of that used by Hooker (6). The imperative of strict and controlled development of argument has led Laud to the Ciceronian tradition whose periodic structure allowed the clear expression of complex thoughts. Further, the combination of subordinate clauses within the unit of the sentence allowed for
the balancing of conflicting or complementary thoughts. As an
example we can consider the following passage from Sermon V

Why, but why should God "plead," "judge," and "maintain
His own cause?" Is the prayer of the prophet just? Yes,
no question. For, the "cause of God" is ever just, and
therefore ought ever to be "maintained." Nor is it any
partiality in God to "His own cause", the He comes
to "judge" it. But He is forced, as it were, to the
"maintainence" of it Himself, partly, because some men
will not, and some men cannot, "defend His cause;" and
partly because it must be judged at some tribunal. Now
there lie many appeals in the cause of God. And all
appeal Is to a superior Court: the highest is God's.
(p.135)

Laud favours the weak coordinating conjunctions such as "and",
"not", "or" which preserve the independence of the clauses,
rather than the constructive conjunctions such as "Therefore",
"so", and "it follows". All of this gave a sense of deeper and
more dextrous construction and presentation of thought than did
the monotonous subdivisions of many preachers. Laud's bare style
enhances the strictness of the logic which unifies his sermons
and which relates ideas and figures within a text to other ideas
and figures in the same text, other texts, history and present
reality.

One of Laud's most notable rhetorical methods is the device
of repetition and accumulation. The following passage from Sermon
II shows Laud's balanced employment of accumulation:

"Not in armles, nor in riches, nor in any strength of
man" is Euthymius. "Not in sword, nor spear, nor shield,
but in the name of the Lord of Hosts," is David himself.
The use of repetition is a simple way of enforcing association. Moreover, the choice of such a style of writing suggests the influence on an audience whose ears were accustomed to the language of the Book of Common Prayer of the incantational rhythm of prayer in sermon rhetoric. Where a passage recalls the style of prayer the subject is elevated and intensified by its reflection of prayer and that elevation is shared by the writer.

Rhetoric is a force to be controlled and used correctly. In Laud's case its use is characterised by both frugal argument and an economical language of argument, as in the following passage:

Upon that mercy she grounds her confidence, that upon the same repentance, she shall have the like deliverance. And upon that faith and hope she repents and prays. (p. 123)

Here the key words of the Christian faith are woven together—mercy, confidence, repentance, deliverance, faith, hope and prayer; the style and meaning joined and controlled in the balanced phrase and the balanced narration. Whereas Donne explored the idea and method of paradox in his prose works, including his sermons, Laud seems to have had neither time for it nor trust in it. His caution is shown in his use of the rhetorical device of sermonatio: the answering of a feigned question:
For is there conquest over enemies, or rest from them? why that is Tua gratia God's favour: so Saint Basil. Is a King, or a state, famous for the ordering of it? Why there is auxilium a te, all help from God: so Theodor[et]. (p. 41)

Laud's answer to such "rhetorical questions" is usually so perfunctory as to show that the notion of questioning was quite outside Laud's plan: the questions occur not to foster a query but to enforce the certainty of the answer. Another preacher might have embroidered such questions as Laud presents and provided further explorations of the theme; to Laud such explorations would be a dangerous diversion from the purpose of the sermon. Laud's deep sense of certainty, along with the need to offer confident and authoritative exposition and argument makes "rhetorical" questions the only possible ones.

Laud has chosen a practical style. His effects are grounded in tone and emphasis, not merely in the content of language. As he suggested in Sermon IV his language is a limited thing when compared with his prayer. His intellectual energies are devoted to explaining rather than discovering: his language is a reflection of its objects rather than an object in itself. Episodes are used to prove an assertion rather than to explore it so, throughout the sermons inventitio is rigorously controlled by dispositio. Laud is fighting yet another engagement of the orthodox Church's battle with the Puritans: the battle of
earnestness against zeal. It is a conflict with deep historical and theological roots. We can trace some of the principles of Laud's style to the practice of the Dominican preachers of the middle ages. While Laud was suspicious of employing paradox he nonetheless aimed at generating intellectual apprehension in his audience. Franciscans expressed a simple Christian truth in order to gain a simple emotional reaction: the Franciscan aesthetic was equally simple, involving the soul in a linear movement towards God and affirming the Bonaventuran view of the primacy of the will. The Dominican view, arising from the Aristotelian notion of man as an intensely capable intellect (a notion which Thomism had incorporated into Christian philosophy), called for the preaching of the Christian paradox in order to gain intellectual assent.

While the moderates in the English church under Elizabeth had called for caution in religious reform, the "Root and Branch" faction had called for a speedy and "zealous" reformation that would cleans England of its national sins. Zeal meant the search for God's sanctions and the abandonment and persecution of whatever did not have these sanctions (7). For many Puritan preachers zeal became both the dominant theme and the dominant tone of their sermons. In the place of zealous preaching the orthodox Anglican clergy advocated, what George Herbert termed
"earnestness of speech springing from reason":

And herein is the greatest ability of a parson, to lead his people exactly in the ways of truth, so that they neither decline to the right hand or the left. (8)

To the orthodox clergy the frenzy of Puritan preaching and worship seemed to threaten them with the consequences of not only religious frenzy but of political and social frenzy as well:

A HUE AND CRY AFTER THE REFORMATION

When temples lye like batter'd Quarrs, 
Rich in their ruin'd Sepulchers, 
When Saints forsake their painted glass 
To meet their worship as they pass, 
When Altars grow luxurious with the dye 
Of humane bloud, 
Is this the floud 
Of Christianity ?

When Kings are cup-boarded like cheese, 
Sights to be seen for pence a piece, 
When Dyadems like brokers tyre 
Are custom'd relique set to hire, 
When Soverainty and Scepters loose their names 
Stream'd into words 
Carved out by swords 
Are these refining flames ?

When subjects and Religion stir 
Like Meteors in the Metaphor, 
When zealous hinting and the yawn 
Excize our Miniver and Lawn, 
When blue digressions fill the troubled ayre 
And the Pulpit's let 
Top every Set 
That will usurp the chair ?

Call yee me this the night's farewell 
When our noon day's as darke as Hell ? 
How can we less than term such lights 
Ecclesiastick Heteroclites ? 
Bold sons of Adam when in fire you crawle
Thus hight to bee
Perch'd on the tree
Remember but the fall.

Was it the glory of a King
To make him great by suffering?
Was there no way to build God's House
But rendering of it infamous?
If this be then the merry ghostly trade?
To work in gall?
Pray take it all
Good brother of the blade.

Call it no more the Reformation
According to the new translation,
Why will you wrack the common brain
With words of an unwonted strain?
As plunder? or a phrase in sense cleft?
When things more nigh
May well supply
And call it downright theft.

Here all the School-men and Divines
Consent, and swear the naked line
Want no expounding or contest,
Or Bellarmine to breeake a jest.
Since then the Heroes of the pen with mee
Nere scrue the sense
With difference,
We all agree agree. (9)

An account of the career of Hugh Peters (one of the Puritan ministers who accompanied Laud to the scaffold), provides a typical portrait of the unruly preacher. A popular Puritan preacher "finding great encouragement among the female devotees", Peters aided the rebel Parliament, enveighed against The Book of Common Prayer and Episcopacy, and was reported to have said that "he would rather be supplanting in Old England than planting in New England." (10) His very coming to the Ministry is presented as the outcome of civil as well as moral laxity.
...it was an usual practice for him to frequent places of worship to catch the manner of popular preachers, and to turn them into ridicule on the stage. Going on a Sunday to hear Dr. Dee preach at St Faith's church, in order that he might have a new subject of sport with, he was so much struck with his discourse, that he determined to quit his theatrical life and companions and employ himself in more serious pursuits... he played his part so well that they cry up his name till it doth echo all over the city, and his friends grow numerous, in so much that one of the greatest parishes, St Sepulchre's, elect him their lecturer, in which capacity he continued many years, but being much addicted to women, and intriguing with a vintner's and butcher's wife, he was detected by both husbands, and prosecuted with club law by the one, and common law by the other. (11)

Those who wrote such accounts shared with the author of 'Hue and Cry After Reformation', and with weightier writers such as Hooker, Jewel and Laud, the aim of exposing the dangers of non-conformity. Sermons, like ballads (though unlike apologias, could be broadly polemical.

Laud is quite prepared, in the interests of polemic, to lower the style and imagery of his sermons. Donne's greater fluidity of style makes similar lowering less noticeable. Donne moves over a wider range of stylistic levels than Laud is prepared to cover. Laud, although a vigorous preacher, does not actively seek out, as Donne does, those points where vigour could be exercised. When opportunities present themselves, however, he avails himself of them to strike what blows he can:

the very worst men pretend best when they break it [unity]. It is so in the Church: never heretic yet rent her bowels, but he pretended that he raked them for
In the same vein is his attack on the Chillasts in Sermon I: "Good God what a fine people have we here. Men in the moon." and "I cannot tell here whether it be Balaam that propheslieth, or the beast he rode on." (p. 19).

On the one hand these epithets and derogations are the obverse of the coin of royal flattery, on the other hand they are rhetorical weapons for use against Laud's opponents. The Puritans were by no means the sole enemy, old adversaries such as the Church of Rome were dealt with in a similar fashion:

But they must not think to choke us with the wool that grows upon pastures, which as the Fathers have diversely spun out, so no one of them comes home to the clothing of Rome, with such a large robe of state as she challengeth. (p. 78)

The style of Sermon V proves that even without the motive of polemic Laud is capable of vigorous writing. This is a spare and vivid sermon, at times as racy as Latimer. Laud's comments on spiritual nourishment in this sermon are an example of his vigorous conception and writing:

It is to fast from sustenance while we are in the Church; and to fall greedily, like hungry men, upon all our old sins, as soon as we are out of the Church door. God Himself cries out against "this fast," and will have none of it. (p. 125)

There are no redundant passages in this sermon every point, every sub-division to which he returns is a telling one. Vigour was
something every preacher needed to aspire to in a time when the frequency of preaching could jade an audience.

Still within the tradition of Latimer is Laud’s occasional employment of exempla, such as the following:

indeed: put but a little salt upon a snail, and he will drop out of his house presently. (p. 96)

In Sermon III he offers his hearers a medieval exemplum (medieval both in subject and spirit) asking them to picture a dragon persecuting the Church (p. 64). Such an image has the further value of allowing the King to be presented in the role of a champion who battles with the dragon on behalf of the Church. Laud employs, in Sermon II, exempla from the King’s life to show the operation of blessedness in the King’s life (his preservation from the Gunpowder Plot, from the Gowrie conspiracy, and from drowning), but he also draws upon the world of commerce for metaphors and exempla. In Sermon IV, for instance, he says:

And it is hard, very hard, for a man that breaks "unity" to give either God or man a good account of so doing. (p. 159)

In Sermon II political relations are shown as a type of commerce between the King and the people. When Laud speaks of the people’s changeableness he plays upon the two meanings of the word "moveable":

And this is a great "success" — to have to do with the greatest "moveables" in the world, the people, and not "miscarry." (p. 52)
and his hearers can accept the word "moveables" both as referring to moveable property, but also as something liable to be swayed. The relationship between God and the people is portrayed as one of bounty rather than commerce:

And God sells neither His help nor His favour. It is all Tu dedisti, His gift, His free gift. Wherever it is (p.41)

Donne is a witty preacher because he perceives God as a witty, "metaphorical", God. However Laud sees recondity as a consequence of human vanity and wilfulness. The slumbering God of Sermon II only appears to veil himself - in reality he is testing not only the wit but the faith and obedience of his people.

Although he relies as usual upon scripture to provide the bulk of the ardentia verba he heightens the style by his use of personal appeals: "... that my thoughts could speak that to you that they do to God." (p. 160) and:

For my part, death were easier to me than it is to see and consider the face of the Church of Christ scratched and torn, till it bleeds in every part as it doth this day; (p. 165)

Laud's style never becomes loose; if it has a fault it is that which is attributable to tension rather than to neglect of concentration, but occasionally he includes wit and even banter to enliven and enforce a point. In Sermon VII he deals in a little critical irony:
The age is so bad, they will not endure a good King to be commended, for danger of flattery; I hope I shall offend none by praying for the King. (p 188)

Another way by which he intensifies his sermons is by the strategy of speaking in a self-reflective way, as when he gives voice to what he imagines to be the thoughts of his audience:

If you think I have staid too long in this circumstance, I hope you will pardon me. You should be as loth as I to go from amidst the "blessings:" but I must proceed (p. 39)

The passage contains a most effective switch of tone by Laud from the self-deprecating first sentence to the rebuke contained in the remark "You should be as loth as I to go from amidst the "blessings". Laud, in this public sermon, never lowers his style, and thus his presentation, to the point where the audience might be at ease. His authority provides him with an opportunity to criticise. He ridicules the position of those who are ungrateful to the King by the bathetic description of their fault on page 44. At first it is "gross ingratitude", then it becomes "dangerous slumber" - moving from wilful obstinancy to neglect, finally being described as "a sullen pet", making it, thereby, childish and foolish.

Finally, it is possible to discern in Laud's preaching a discourse-based attempt to mould audience interpretations. Gillian Alexander, believing, along with Halliday, Sapir and Whorf, that reality is linguistically constructed, has postulated
the development of an oppositional discourse in the mid-seventeenth century designed to counter the traditional aristocratic discourse. One manifestation of this is to be found in the simple use of pronoun relations, particularly "I" and "You". We may generalise and observe that in what Alexander calls conservative texts the pronoun "I" occurs most frequently in the subject and object position (12). Alexander's comparison of the opening 2,000 words of Donne's *Devotions* with Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* shows that Bunyan, in a way which she argues is typical of radical or Puritan writers, uses "you" or "thou" far more regularly than Donne. She concludes that for Donne the first person/third person relation represents the separation between Divine God and Fallen Humanity. Thus the pronouns "he" and "I", "we" are always in syntactic opposition and never at the same level of the clause structure:

We are all prodigal sons, and not disinherited; we have received our portion and misspent it, not been denied it. We are God's tenant here, and yet here he our landlord pays us our rents; not yearly not quarterly; every minute he renews his mercy, but wee will not understand.(13)

Laud refers to the text of Sermon I as an exhortative text but in the first two thousand words of the sermon he uses variations of "we" ("our" or "us") forty-seven times but words from the "I" group ("I","my" and "me") forty six times. Despite being an exhortative text the pronoun "you" is the least used
group. The first person pronoun group dominates in Sermon II as well, followed in frequency by the pronoun "you" and then the "we" group: ("we", "our" and "us"). The "I" and "they" group are used equally in Sermon III. In Sermon VII, his public sermon at Paul's Cross, the "I" group predominate by 61 to 40 over the "you" group. What is the significance of this predominance by the first person pronoun? What is the significance of Alexander's model for the study of Laud's sermons? The focus on "I" is the focus on the authoritative as well as the exemplary speaker, the speaker who places "you" in a role of submission and instruction.

To analyse a spoken form such as sermons we need to consider features unique to such forms particularly the types of address and types of language that the speaker employs to shape the responses of an audience. In Laud's case this means looking at his use of imagery and metaphor and also his interesting employment of what can be termed the "prophetic voice."
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Imagery, Metaphor and The Prophetic Voice.

In his sermons Laud enhances his personal authority by appropriating the authority of many of his texts via the persona of the prophet and the characteristics of the prophetic voice found in his Old Testament texts. The most vigorous passage in Laud's sermon at Wanstead (Sermon I) comes when he draws upon the Foxean store and asks his audience to consider a state in disorder:

Look, therefore, not upon yourselves in peace, but upon a State in blood, upon a church in persecution, ask them which are divided by the sword, which are roasting at the flame, conceive your case theirs, - that is the touch-stone which deceives not, then tell me whether it be not good counsel rogare pacem, to "pray for the peace" of both (p. 10)

And often throughout the sermons he draws attention to a point with an appeal in the very cadence of such a prophet: as when, on page 36, he cries: "For the heavens and the earth shall learn...". The pre-Renaissance pulpit with its denunciation of sin in the manner of Jeremiah or Ezekiel had accustomed hearers...
to the prophetic and oracular voice from the pulpit. Prophecy is a different order of discourse from argument. In prophetic discourse the force of the whole is derived from the self-contained force of the separate units which are often no more than loosely arranged aphorisms. In prophecy it is terseness that carries conviction, for terseness implies that the thing being said needs no defence or substantial elucidation and that it rises above debate. Laud’s style, like that of the prophets, is aphoristic and imperative.

As well as valuing the prophetic voice for its rhetorical utility Laud favoured the prophetic voice because of his vision of God’s relation to England. The prophetic mode of speech recalls the Covenant speeches of the Old Testament. The covenant speech is based on the covenant between God and Israel. Its purpose is to strengthen the authority of the Lord by reminding the hearers of what the Lord has done, to add new commandments, and to warn the hearers of what can happen if such commandments are ignored: like the Biblical prophets Laud recounts God’s punishment of his people:

The “pestilence”, as if it were angry that God had driven it out of this “great city of the Kingdom,” wastes and destroys far and near in other places of it. The “sword” of a foreign enemy threatens to make way for itself. And if it enter, it is worse than “famine” and the pestilence. (p. 124)

A large part of a preacher’s power derives from the ability to
summon up such images for his audience. In his sermons Laud attempts to develop patterns of meaning and frames of perception that go some way towards displaying a cohesive interpretation of the world and the divine influences upon it. He employs images in a manner described by L.C. Knights, where their function:

is not to intensify the meaning, to make it deeper or richer, but simply to make more effective a meaning that was already fully formed before the application of the illustrative device. (1)

Imagery found in the Bible offered a rich and obvious field for preachers but, despite his general reliance on the Bible, Laud favoured secular sources for most of the images he used to express spiritual concepts. One such image was the fortress. Throughout the medieval period the image of the fortress had been used in many literary forms, including sermons: either as the fortress of faith, or as the defiant city of evil composed of the bricks of hardened sinners. Laud chose the former meaning and portrayed the fortress as standing against the onslaught of internal and external danger and relying on the unity of its members to prevent it being breached:

Now, neither the walls of the State, nor the walls of the Church, can keep or defend themselves, or that which they compass: there must be men, and they must keep both the walls and the palace, and "the peace;" viri muri, men-walls. (p. 24)

The notion of a "visible church" was one amenable to Laud's
frequent use of architectural images. In Sermon I the Temple built by the King to house the Ark of the Lord creates a bond between Church and State which overcomes the conflicts that had previously marred relations between Saul and Samuel. Laud tells his hearers that, to ensure God's blessing, they must preserve the buttress of the state, which is justice, and the buttress of the temple which is religion. These two buttresses support the pillars upon which God has raised the twin structures of Church and State. The people meet together, on occasions such as Parliament, to provide strength to the buttresses of prayer and judgement, as Laud tells his audience throughout Sermon IV.

Like the fortress, the body must retain its unity if it is to survive. The "bounds" of the body are its skin and sinews, they must be kept free from external damage and internal corruption (Sermon VI). In discussing the circumstances of the Psalm which is the text for Sermon III Laud tells his hearers that it was sung for the Feast of the Circumcision. He tells them this not in order that they might treat it as a text for the day:

Why the Church appointed it for that day is not my question now (p. 72)

but by focusing on the referential quality of the text and the images to which its setting refers he examines the significance of the feast. Unity requires
a paring off, round about, of heated and unruly affections in the handling of differences. And there must be a "circumcision" and a paring off of foolish and unlearned questions, yea and of many modal too that are fitter "to engender strife" than godliness, or no peace. (p 73)

Circumcision, along with immersion and sacrifice, was one of the ways in which Israel entered into its distinctive covenant with God. The ceremony of circumcision was thus a binding of the individual, by the community, to the rules of the covenant. Among the Ashkenazim for instance, to this day, a binder for the Torah scroll is made from cloth used in the circumcision ceremony: thereby linking the Torah with the covenant enforcing act. Laud maintains that a surgical process akin to circumcision will eliminate the sources of disunity that endanger England.

Sermon IV is a sermon built upon a close treatment of images from the text. Once more proper order is shown as beneficial for both Church and State:

The third and last circumstance of the text is, the time that is chosen for both these, both for the execution of "justice," and establishing the "pillars;" and that is a set and a "convenient" time," even when He shall receive the congregation:" "for that time will I take," saith God, "and I," saith the King. (p. 112)

The Temple, which is central to Laud's argument for authority and uniformity represents, among other things, a divine ordinance:

And the Law says not simply, they shall assemble and meet and serve the Lord, but that precisely, they shall do it "in the same place which the Lord shall choose." (p. 77)
The temple is also the seat of the symbols of the Law which exercise authority and control:

Now I may not omit the place whither they were to ascend. It was Jerusalem. There the Temple. In that the Ark. In that the Law. (p 77)

The design of Laud's sermons involves the authoritative ordering of ideas, the foregrounding and enshrining of key symbols in just the same way that worship and civil affairs were ordered in Jerusalem. Laud's seven printed sermons frequently disclose his interest in the role and status of the city of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was a city both royal and holy, symbolising the union of Church and State. Laud makes Jerusalem the principal structural metaphor of Sermon I:

First, then, here is the body, for which, and all the members of it, he would have them pray, and that is, Jerusalem. (p. 5)

Jerusalem occupies this role because it is the place where Church and State come together. Each is transformed by the presence of the Ark of the Law and the ritual and order which that evokes:

But now the presence of it [the Ark] made the City of David, domicellum religionis, the house of religion, as well as regni, of the kingdom. (p. 3)

Jerusalem, as a blessed place, was a goal for the Jews, and, Laud suggests, it should be a goal for his hearers as well. He sets out to inspire them to this with a picture of an anabasis, focusing on a political and religious journey rather than a
personal spiritual quest. In Sermon III Laud writes of the Jews:

And you may observe, too, that this coming to the Temple to pray and to worship is called here by the prophet an "ascent", or going up, ascenderunt: and an "ascent" it is. (p. 75)

Obedient to order and with the goal of a unified Church and State before them the journey to Jerusalem becomes a spiritual ascent:

And as St Augustine speaks, Si non descendisset, In latrones non incidisset, if he had not been sinking and going downwards "from God and from His Church," he had not fallen into the hands of thieves. (p. 76)

The nature of Jerusalem makes it a powerful illustration of divine blessing. One of the most important ways, according to Laud, by which blessing is obtained, is through the prayers of the King and his people.

And it is an excellent thing, full of honour to God and themselves, when Rex et Propheta, the King and the Prophet, go first in prayer for the State's and the Church's peace. (p. 22)

Prayer, for both the nation and the King, is part of the business of government and not to pray for the King is, implicitly, to plot against him:

And some, for they are but some are so waspishly set to sting, that nothing can please their ears, unless it sharpen their edge against authority. (p. 202)

Laud seeks to encourage prayer for the King by reminding his hearers of what happens to those who plot against the King:

I pray remember what Solomon the King's son did to
Shimei: remember that, and if the memory of his punishment would affright other men from running into this blasphemous iniquity, all would soon be well. (p 191)

The image of the praying King which Laud presents in Sermon IV intensifies the link between God, the King, the Church and the State. Two major emphases predominate in Laud's representation of the King: the public aspect: the King as the head of the body of the Commonwealth; and the private aspect: the development of the spiritual life of the Prince and the development of the spiritual life of the people as they emulate him. The praying King is an indice of a signified: the praying King conveys obedience to God's commands, the King as petitioner takes his place within the divine order and testifies, by his role, to its hierarchy. Likewise his action is presented as one which is constant throughout the history of Kings from the first, David and Solomon, whom God blessed, to the present.

The whole style of Laud's address from the scaffold, which I have designated as Sermon VIII, is remarkably different from that of the previous seven. Laud's language here is, at times, that of the Puritan mystics, full of personal witness, trial and tribulation, deliverance and revivalism. The single largest stylistic determinant in the case of this sermon is, naturally, the situation in which Laud finds himself: tried (unjustly in his
opinion), convicted (likewise), and on the verge of execution, seeing the imminent collapse of the political and religious system that he had laboured to develop. Into this sermon Laud fits the defence of his party and position which had been denied to him at his trial, and the defense of his life and conscience. The shift between these two oratorical aims intensifies the power of Laud's meditations on his own impending death and the circumstances that have brought him to it.

The sermon treats four particulars: the King; the people; the Church; and Laud himself. The defence of the King against the charge of Popery contains an important qualification:

I hold him to be as sound a Protestant (according to the Religion by Law established) as any man in this Kingdom; (p. 433)

The King's (and Laud's) religion is that established by law. Many times Laud had warned of the danger from those:

that give their ways and bend their wits to nothing but ever to devise best how to fit through the laws so soon as they be made, as it were in scorn of this congregation and all the Gods in it. (I, 210)

This law, Laud charges, and cites his own case as proof, is being broken down by the Parliament and the people. The doctrines by which he has been charged and tried he equates with the images set up by the wandering Israelites in defiance of God's commands and in proof of their wilful delusion. Laud states his refusal to "forsake the Temple" which, as we have seen, has been throughout
throughout the sermons the dominant image of the relation of Church and State and worship and law.

The Laudian idiolect is based on the capacity to formulate in language actual embodiments of social, cultural, religious and political facts: ultimately it reflects the bases of the linguistic practices and awarenesses of a specific group or community. If we acknowledge that in the face of changing experiences people attempt to give expression to their awareness of that change through linguistic novelty it should come as no surprise to discern little linguistic novelty in Laud. Laud's world is a world of fixed institutions and relatively fixed experiences.

The preacher's authority endowed him with an insight into his text which in turn allowed him to discern references, connections and illuminations concealed from the laity. Because they were concealed these facets of the text were often best expressed in metaphor: that is, by the understanding and experiencing of one thing in terms of another. In such circumstances a preacher could lose his way in a world of immanence and transcendence, but Laud protected himself from this danger by rationalising the metaphoric qualities of religious language. So far as Laud was concerned the act of "sight", the vision of faith, was never
liberating independently of the reality of faith and worship through which it was focused. It was this condition of his thought that led Laud to favour the use of the structural rather than the decorative metaphor. The structural metaphor was more than an embellishment, it was an essential part of the intellectual as well as linguistic character of the text.

The role of the decorative metaphor in highlighting or intensifying some factor within the sermon means that of itself it is less precise, less clearly defined in the mass of the sermon argument than is the structural metaphor upon whose frame so much of the sermon argument might depend. Nonetheless, Laud shows in Sermon II that the poetic and dramatic qualities associated with the decorative metaphor can be carried by a metaphor whose purpose is primarily structural. The sermon opens with a potent and arresting metaphor of abandonment and despair: "Not an Esau but he "cries" when the "blessing" is gone." (p33) Esau's lamentation (Genesis 27:34) was two-fold: for the loss of his father's blessing in itself, and for the interruption to the proper line of succession that has occurred through Jacob's theft. The principal theme of this sermon is blessing, and by employing this reference to Esau Laud forges a link between royal succession and blessing while at the same time emphasising the cost of the loss of blessing. Later in the same sermon he pursues
this theme of blessing with the crown and its meaning:

But He begins at that which crowns the crown itself. He is *benedictio*, a "blessing," and no less to the people. (p. 35)

There lies the pattern of structural metaphor in this sermon: a system based in essences derived from objects, derived by Laud through the process of abstraction as opposed to the method of Andrewes who derived the essences through a process of refinement. Throughout his sermons Laud tries to direct the attention of his audience to the active power of virtues: the relation between concepts such as "blessing" and day-to-day government. The metaphorical link between "crown" and "blessing" is that which defines both the crown's functional and referential qualities.

The subordination of suggestion and immanence to structural metaphors allows Laud to achieve a clearer meaning. In Sermon VII for example, his metaphorical figures are instruments: the disobedience of the people is a "scourge" to themselves (p. 194), the King is "an instrument of justice" (*loc. cit*), justice is a light (p. 207) carried by the King in a "Lanthorn given by God," (*loc. cit*). Such metaphors like the light of justice are designed to be "clear and unmistakable" (*loc. cit*).

One of Laud's favourite architectural metaphors is that of
the foundation stone. This metaphor reaches back within the Christian tradition to the description of Christ: "the stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone" (Luke 20:17), and Laud takes up this metaphor in a typical fashion in Sermon III:

But when the House of the King is built upon God, as David's was, then it is to the people, et domus et fundamentum both a house and a foundation of all their houses. (p. 84)

In Sermon IV where Laud refers to the "pillars of judgement" he fits these pillars into a cosmology where they are an ordering force:

The earth itself, that hath but one "pillar," and that is the poise and equilibre of the centre (p 104)

and then moves on to consider the major and minor pillars of the Church and State. Here his message is, once more, that to attack the pillars is to attack the whole building and ultimately to attack God who caused it to be built:

they which weaken the government; nay, which do but offer to impair the honour and reputation of the governors are dangerous and unworthy members of any commonwealth...There must be one to bear them [the pillars] or else they can never bear the earth. One and it can be none under God: Ego confirmavi, it is I that in all times have borne up the pillars of it. (p. 107)

This metaphorical use of the pillars provides Laud with an answer to the images of civil disorder and collapse that occur in Sermon IV:

But when it is once terra liquefacta, "molten" and "dissolved," there is no footing, no foundation then, "I
stick fast in the [deep] [mire] where no ground is," and mire is but terra liquefacta "molten" and "dissolved" earth. (p. 97).

Danger to a state, which is represented by its walls and towers, allows Laud to use the language of spiritual warfare, particularly as he envisages defence against "the devil and all his batteries" (p. 70). Unlike the non-conformist notion of the individual soul in battle, Laud's picture is one of a besieged community.

The metaphors which Laud uses when he flatters the King are in general the common stock of flattery:

The King is the Sun. He draws up some vapours, some support, some supply from us. (p. 101)

Likewise the King is the helmsman of the ship of state, but here he operates in the close reflection of Christ:

We have been in one "tempest", and we have cause to fear another; let us in any case get Christ to sea, and aboard our ships, that no tempest may untackle them, or rent their keels, or hew down their masts. (p. 127)

The reflection of Christ is also strong in the metaphors used in Sermon VIII. The text of Sermon Eight (the speech from the scaffold), is from Hebrews 12:2:

Let us run with Patience the Race which is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our Faith; who for the Joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the Shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

Taking the metaphors of the race and of the cross as a death of
shame Laud applies each to his own case. He places himself in a position to be modelled on Christ as a martyr. He is, thereby, able to set himself apart from his accusers and the circumstances of his execution. Throughout the account of his trial the sense of his isolation has been intensified, now he emphasises it by taking the power over his life out of the hands of those who have brought him to the scaffold:

For men can have "no more power over me, than what is given them from above." (p. 430; citing John 19:11)

As he has threatened people in the past for their behaviour towards the Church now he threatens them for what they have done to him:

I know my God "whom I serve," is as able to deliver me from the sea of blood, as He was to deliver the three children from the furnace: (p. 447)

Throughout this sermon Laud uses such references to link his personal consolation with the larger issues raised by his case. His final confession of faith:

What clamours and slanders I have endured for labouring to keep an uniformity in the external service of God, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church, all men know, and I have abundantly felt. (p. 434)

continues this merging of the personal and the public.

What characterises the forms that we have identified in this chapter? In what sense does a phrase identified as metaphorical, or as a referential figure, deviate in terms of its usage from
the primary or normal way in which the word or phrase is used? In the case of Laud's sermons there is, first, the influence of the religious significance of the language used. Second, the general propensity of "poetic" metaphors to give free play to the imagination of the reader is controlled and circumscribed by the various operations of Laud's preaching authority.
CHAPTER EIGHT.
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Explication, Learning and Textuality,

One further type of authority exercised by Laud remains to be discussed: this is the authority that comes from learning. The principal field in which Laud exercises this authority is in explication de texte. In his sermons we see an interesting struggle waged (and won), by Laud to place his authority as explicator on an almost equal footing with the authority that the Bible itself enjoyed.

Rhetorical writing is grounded in orality (1) but Laud, in the role of the preserver and defender of authoritative doctrine expresses himself in his sermons as one ever conscious of the language and demands of written texts (2). A phrase such as "My text answers..." fits every reading and becomes Laud's signal for the end of any argument. At one point in Sermon IV Laud pictures the text as bearing up the world:

The earth itself, that hath but one "pillar," and that is the poise and equilibre of the centre. And that is borne up by the Word and ordinance of God. (p104)
Elsewhere, Donne has pictured the text as enjoying the complexity of the body:

We consider the dignity of the Book of Psalmes, either in the whole body together, or in the particular limmes and distribution thereof.3

Such complexity requires great skill on the part of the explicator who sets out to deal with these texts. Moreover, a text with prophetic qualities such as the text of Sermon II, poses, because of its various levels of meaning further difficulties in interpretation. In such circumstances a preacher must work confidently. Laud writes of the text of Sermon II:

And it should not be passed over neither, for whose mouth David fits the passage. And, first, there is no question but that David speaks it for himself: - and there is the King's acknowledging Tu dedisti, God's gift in making him all the "blessings" he is to his people. Next, I find, pil loquuntur: they are the faithful that speak it: not a religious and good subject, but he is Tu dabis, that God would bless his King, and make him a blessing for ever. (p44)

The manifestations can be seen, the text can be analysed to show its scope but its "reason" may remain concealed:

And you cannot, no not with a curious eye, search all the reasons how he is set for blessings: because God, in disposing it, hath hid lumen intra umbram and thickened the veil that is drawn over it. (pp. 40-41)

It is by authority that the suggestive qualities of scripture are controlled:

the learned agree that the letter of the psalm reads David: that the spirit of the psalm eyes Christ; that the analogy of the psalm is for every good King that makes David his example, and Christ his God. (p. 34)
Here Laud establishes the "proper" relation of "letter" and "spirit" under the aegis of "authority" (in this case the authority of the "learned").

Attitudes towards the text reflected conflicting views about authority in the seventeenth century. Hooker saw the chief error of the Puritans as lying in the belief that scripture was God's only given law (4). In contrast, he subscribed to the Augustinian position that some authority outside scripture has to convince us that scripture is "a sacred rule of well-doing". Hooker declined to believe that scripture was self-validating, and he favoured a three-part process whereby scripture contains the truth: reason interprets its meaning; and the church teaches the application of that meaning. The Puritan position took advantage of the revisions which the Bible had undergone since the Reformation. The appearance of the vernacular Bible did more than simply take the Bible out of the hands of the clergy and put it into the hands of the people; it created a Bible that was no longer merely an inspired volume of revelation, doctrine and rules of conduct but was now a work upon which states rested and social identities were established and distinguished. The reformers took the view that authority, in the final analysis, had shifted from the visible Church to "The Book". Yet the Puritan party in England embraced many varieties of practice and many variations
of doctrine — from the traditions of Zurich and Geneva to the teachings of Luther (as well as extremist groups such as the Brownists and Anabaptists). Although this diversity of viewpoints weakened the reformers it required more than polemical skills for orthodox clerics to mount a defence against these views, it required a sound grasp of theology and church history: the clash between Puritans and orthodox parties becomes a clash of scholarship, and thereby, ultimately, a clash of authorities. The early Church insisted that the Bishop could and should teach authoritatively: the teaching role of the Bishop was, for instance, the cornerstone of Irenaeus' defence of orthodoxy against the Gnostic heresy. In common with the early church, post-Reformation England was concerned to distinguish itself by its doctrine from its neighbours. This need gave the orthodox clergy a particularly important role: to be not innovators but expositors and maintainers of doctrine. For Laud, as a descendant of a Catholic tradition, it was necessary to bear witness to that culture and draw evidence and support from it. When Bishop Young of Rochester ordained Laud in 1601 and

found his study raised above the system and opinions of the age upon the noble foundation of the Fathers, councils and ecclesiastical historians; and presaged that, if he lived, he would be an instrument of restoring the church from the narrow and private principles of the time. 5

he recognised him as one who would avoid the temptation to use learning for display's sake and who would use it instead for a
clear, premeditated purpose.

The intention of the sermon helped determine the scope of interpretation that a preacher might give to a particular text. We have already noted, for instance, Laud's freedom to sidestep controversies when it suited him:

both may stand, and I will not make my text narrower than it is (p.21)

Laud often appears, deceptively, to be bound by the text:

Do you ask "What enemies?" I will tell you; perhaps I shall not be able to tell you all: but what my text tells me, I will show you. (p. 137)

but this submission to the text becomes less and less evident as he advances in civil and ecclesiastical authority and approaches his text with greater power. His bishopric, his attainment of the rights and responsibilities of institutional authority encourages him to overlook conflicting points of view and niceties of interpretation. We see this most notably in Sermon IV when, discussing the meaning of the phrase "the unity of the spirit", Laud writes:

But others take "the unity of the spirit" to be that spiritual concord which none doth, none can, work in the hearts of men but the Holy Ghost. And I am apter to follow this sense. (pp. 161-162)

What Laud is doing is choosing not the interpretation that is manifestly right, but the one that is most appropriate: a little later on the same page he says:
the "unity," then, "of the Spirit," to which the apostle exhorts, includes both: (p. 162)

In Sermon VII we see a sermon whose organisation and structure are clearly dictated by considerations of textuality:

My text is a prayer; and there are two petitions; and these two petitions, divide my text into two parts. (p. 187)

The choice of a "praying text" suggests from the very beginning the attitude that he will adopt towards the preaching role: the "age", he suggests, is more in need of prayer, with its unity and hierarchy, than instructional preaching. Therefore he will not spend his time in unwanted speculations:

I will not enter upon the question quando, when David made this prayer and penned this Psalm. First because the quando, the time here is not in the text, nor in any part else in scripture: therefore I may safely be ignorant. (189)

When he retreats from this laissez faire attitude a little later:

Therefore I shall take liberty to dissent from this opinion, with all submission to better judgements, but especially to the Church. (p. 190)

It is in a passage that clearly locates for his hearers the point to which they ought to look for guiding authority - the Church which he represents.

Classical rhetorical practice held that since the root of the word "etymology" meant "true" the further back the meaning of a
word was pursued the truer it became. Within the tradition of Christian preaching this view was enhanced to read that the further a passage could be warrantably broken down into its component parts the more convincingly its truth would emerge. To Laud, however, the exact word is less worthy of consideration than is its capacity to contribute to a desired explication:

For be the word "thank," or "confess," it stands here expressive of the whole liturgy, of all the public external service of God: all which, if it be not accompanied with inward service of the heart, is worth nothing. (p. 73)

In the course of this sort of explication Laud acknowledges the importance of making discriminations within the available material:

And:- "hope" is not here a naked expectation of somewhat to come; but it is "hope," and the ground of hope, "faith," as some later divines think not amiss (p. 49)

Being a practical man of a practical mind, "the slave of action and not words", as he wrote to Vossius (6), Laud had little inclination towards controversy, quite apart from the disquiet it caused in the Church. Considerations of authority mean that Laud was unwilling to stimulate a popular audience with too much speculation:

I will not fill your ears with curiosities, nor trouble you with disputes, wherein this "judgement" desired for the King, and this "justice and righteousness" for the King's son differ from one another. (p. 193)

and we may contrast this with Lancelot Andrewes whose analytical divisions were designed to disclose as much as possible of what
was comprised in a text. Writing to Vossius in Holland after the 1628 Parliament Laud announced that:

I have left no stone unturned in my efforts to prevent the public discussion of these intricate and thorny problems, lest, while pretending zeal for truth we should offend against religion and charity. I have ever counselled moderation, lest turbulent spirits with no real care for religion should set the world at odds. 7

Among his printed sermons it is only in the one preached at Paul's Cross that we see Laud imposing so obvious a censorship on his audience; yet he gave evidence elsewhere of this propensity when, writing to the Duke of Buckingham about Richard Montague's controversial works *A Gagg for the New Gospel*? No; *A New Gagg for an Old Goose* (1624) and *Apello Caesarem* (1625), he said:

Now may it please your Grace; the opinions which at this time trouble many men in the late work of Mr Montague, are, some of them, such as are expressly the resolved doctrine of the Church of England, and these he is bound to maintain. Some of them, such as are fit only for schools, and to be left at more liberty for learned men to abound in their own sense, so they keep themselves peacable and distract not the Church. 8

We will not find in Laud any sense of learning displayed for its own sake, none of the
tasteless crowding of citation which destroys any sense of argument and defaces so much of English preaching in the time of the Commonwealth. (9)

Yet at times there is a donnish quality in Laud's use of his learning, as when, with the qualifying phrase "If I mistake not...", he presents his knowledge of archaeology:
The Temple, if I mistake not, upon the east and the palace of Solomon upon the south side of the same mountain, to shew that their servants and service must go together too. (p. 79)

and, in Sermon II, Laud not only draws typological connections between Jerusalem and his theme but makes a point of showing that he understands them by thoroughly explaining them to his hearers.

Finally, Laud employs the authority of the Church Fathers and what, at one point, he calls, "ancient Christian customs" (p. 9). Laud saw that this was a particularly potent source of authority at a time when the Puritans were calling for a general reversion to apostolicity within the Church, and he would have agreed with the sentiments of the great Erastian lawyer John Selden who said:

> Popish books teach and inform, what we know, we know much out of them. The Fathers, Church story, Schoolmen, all may pass for Popish books, and if you take them away what learning will you leave? Besides, who must be judge? The Customer or the Waiter? If he disallows a book it must not be brought into the Kingdom, then Lord have mercy upon all Scholars. These Puritan Preachers, if they have any things good, they have it out of Popish Books, tho' they will not acknowledge it, for fear of displeasing the People; he is a poor Divine that cannot sever the good from the bad. (10)

Such learning was also a way to counteract zeal, as Laud and Buckridge had suggested in their introduction to the sermons of Lancelot Andrewes:

> he that is zealous according to knowledge is not less
zealous for his knowledge's sake. And true wisdom, which is not true if it be not Christian, carries not water about it to quench zeal, but only to sprinkle it, that it may burn within compass and not fire the house which it intended but to warm. (11)

William Forbes in Considerationes moderate et pacificae controversiarum de justificatione purgatio, invocationum sanctorum, christo mediatore, et eucharista (published posthumously in 1658) illustrates his familiarity with a range of authorities by citing 29 Roman Catholics, 20 Anglicans and 37 other Protestants to refute the position of rigid Protestants and rigid Roman Catholics. In Laud's tradition it is clearly not regarded as unsound for a preacher to quote from a variety of opinions: as we find Laud quoting both Cardinal Bellarmine and Calvin.

Reconciling differences of opinion among his authorities is not something that inhibits Laud: such differences are not allowed to impede the progress of the sermon:

The learned, both the Fathers and the latter divines, differ much about my text. For some will read it "time:" and some "the congregation." (p. 93)

It is in these circumstances that Laud brings to bear his own authority as a manipulator of the texts, often disregarding controversy and asserting that in some issues it is immaterial which side one takes. In Sermon VII he sets out the criteria of an acceptable interpretation:
And since this opinion [Laud's, on the circumstance of the composition of the text] maintains nothing contrary to the analogy of faith, nothing that hinders the context, nothing that crosses any determination of the Church; nay since there is in it more piety to God, more duty to himself, more instruction to his Son, and more good example to other Kings, that the prayer begins at himself, I will take the prayer as I find it in the very words of the psalm, to be a prayer, first for David, and then for his Son, and so proceed. (p. 190)

Laud brings to bear the related authority of Bishop and scholar to give shape and meaning to his Biblical text. He portrays the explicatory process as one in which laymen could easily become lost and where only the authoritative explicator is equipped with the scholarly expertise to move safely. By the assertion of this authority he sets himself as the moderator of his audience's understanding of scripture.
CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

In sermons explication and application of texts, as well as direction of conduct and belief each require for their rhetorical and pastoral effectiveness a realisation on the part of the preacher and the audience of the preacher's authority. No matter what their aim - demonstrative, didactic or exhortatory, sermons are always manifestly authoritarian works, just as the effective preacher is always an authoritative figure. As a result the sermon is a genre averse to self contradiction and self examination and one which requires of both its audience and its practitioners a particular responsiveness to the operations and issues of authority.

In this thesis I have tried to answer two questions. The first is: why take William Laud out of his role as a historical figure and study him as a literary craftsman? The second is: why study sermons at all? While medieval sermon literature is well covered from a variety of approaches, most work concerning
English sermon literature in the seventeenth-century rarely progresses beyond consideration of the nexus of literature and religious sentiment and belief. This thesis has analysed the sermon as a means by which the individual voice (in this case William Laud), is able to communicate within a community.

This thesis has been an examination of the public mode of discourse: a mode which has been subject in the past to neglect and misinterpretation. In *La Poesia*, Croce wrote:

> In the old aesthetics and philosophies of art there was the category of the "non-free arts" which were really serving other than artistic ends. Among these arts, alongside those curiously termed "non-free arts of perception" (that is, objects and utensils such as a house, a garden, a cup, a necklace - all good for practical usage and aesthetic enjoyment as well), were placed the "non-free arts of the imagination", those of speech or oratory, which were thought to bend the sequence of poetic images to practical use. (1)

The sermon is a genre which has unfairly suffered relegation in literature because of the tendency to exclude these "non-free arts" from literary consideration. However this exclusion should be at an end now, for critics have become more aware of the determining power of institutions in the creation, communication and circulation of literature. Literary criticism is witnessing a return to a concern with the 'historical embeddedness' of literary production: with this new awareness should come new attention for the genres of public discourse.
One principle to which Laud's sermons draw our attention is the utility expected of seventeenth-century prose. Arguments over whether prose should be "plain" or "decorated" revolved around the fixed point that it must always be potent. The style and technique of William Laud's sermons highlight this concern for potency. His touches of decoration and his variations in intensity of utterance are not designed to balance the functional with the decorative, but to further enforce the sermon's purpose.

Many aspects of the sermon, less crucial than authority, have only been treated quite briefly in this thesis and would repay further work. Among these is the status of the sermon as a literary indicator: the extent to which it absorbs the developments or fashions of literature generally. In approaching such a question one would need to bear in mind that in consequence of the authority created and confirmed by their role and their genre preachers perceived the sermon as having a special integrity. More work remains to be done on the sermon's view of the world. We have analyses of contemporary drama which show us how the pulpit was viewed, but little on the view from the other side. The role of the pulpit in popular culture is reasonably well documented for the middle ages but less so for the period from 1500 to date. Why, for example, in the eighteenth
century was sermon-going such a popular pastime? Or, to pose but one specific, minor problem, what was the influence of the practice of copying sermons on the development of shorthand? What mutation in the authority of the sermon was perceived which permitted it to become an entertainment? The sermon's usurpation by the essay form is another matter requiring attention. Why, to consider a specific case, do sermons hardly feature in the abolitionist literature of England even though much of it was written by clergymen? What influence did the Royal Society with its attack on rhetoric and its assertion of reason have on the eighteenth-century pulpit? Is the legendary sloth of the Augustan church an adequate explanation for the decline of the sermon form? And why, amid this decline, did the publication and printing of sermons barely draw breath?

"What did our Fathers of the nineteenth century do," asked Virginia Woolf to deserve such a scolding? That is the question which we find ourselves asking as we dip here and there into the long row of volumes which bear the names of Carlyle and Ruskin. (2)

Although she asked her question about the works of two secular prophets, could she have posed the same question about the divines of the nineteenth century? Or was it because they did not scold that they sat silently, for all their number, upon the shelves?
Finally, a vast bibliographic lacuna exists whereby we are generally ignorant of the sermon printing and publishing industry at almost every level. Why, to take a specific question, do more of John Donne's sermons survive from 1626 than from any other year? We do not have any knowledge, except for certain individual preachers, whether sermons were printed from notes or from preacher's prepared texts; we do not know the size and character of the market for sermons. The work of Frederic Barbier of the Institut d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine in Paris on the distribution of incunables as a guide to their production and consumption provides many suggestions for ways and areas in which the sermon might also be analysed (3).

By focusing on a crucial characteristic of sermons and an influential practitioner in the genre this thesis has gone some way towards offering an explanation of the profusion of sermons, their typical tone, their rationale, and their distinguishing qualities.
ENDNOTES.
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Chapter I, Part i.

(1) Although the works of individual preachers have been touched upon there are only three substantial scholarly studies of English preaching: W. Fraser Mitchell's English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1932; G.W. Owst's Preaching and the Pulpit in Mediaeval England, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933.; and J.W. Blench's Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: a Study of English Sermon Literature 1450-1600, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964.


(3) John Donne, "A Sermon Preached at St Dunstan's, January 15, 1625/26". Cited in Logan Pearsall Smith, Donne's Sermons: Selected Passages, with an Essay by Logan Pearsall Smith. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920, p. 61. A volume of selections such as Smith's illustrates the ease with which Donne may be abstracted and anthologized.


(5) Donne told his audience on Christmas Day 1626:
He that brings any collateral respect to prayers, loses the benefit of the prayers of the Congregation; and he
that brings that to a Sermon; he heares but the Logique, or the Rhetorique, or the Ethiques, or the Poetry of the sermon, but the Sermon of the Sermon he heares not...

John Donne. "A Sermon Preached at St Paul's Upon Christmas Day, 1626." Smith op. cit., p 121. Donne's remarks reflect his own consciousness of the need to avoid concentrating on the "external" qualities of sermons; a need for the preacher as well as the audience.

For an instance of this policy in operation see G.E. Gorman, "A Laudian Attempt to "Tune the Pulpit": Peter Heylyn and his Sermon Against the Feoffees for the Purchase of Improprations," Journal of Religious History VIII (4), 1975, pp. 333-350.


(9) Unless you thought of giving us a whole volume of such sermons I do think the two [University sermons] would appear much better in the form of essays. They would only want a new beginning and end each; and you have no idea how the very name of sermons restricts a book's circulation, while essays are eagerly caught at, and many are suprised into the consideration of subjects which would otherwise never be presented to them.


(12) Mitchell's book is also limited by his stated purpose of clarifying Donne's place as a prose writer through analysis of contemporary works, Mitchell writes that:

It was felt that a comprehensive study of the representative seventeenth century divines was as likely to prove profitable in determining the place of Donne as a pulpit orator as a study of the lesser seventeenth
century dramatists has proved in throwing into relief the
greatness of Shakespeare. (p.3)

(13) Suffering from a limitation similar to that experienced by
Mitchell is a work such as Etienne Gilson's *Michel Menot et la
technique du sermon medieval* (1925) which subdues its material to
a pattern it purports to find.

1976, p. 1838

Chapter I, Part i.

(1) Although, in *Donne at Sermons: a Christian Existentialist
World.* Albany, New York: State University of New York Press,
1972, Gale H. Carrithers has based her argument on what she
perceives as the dialogue qualities of the sermon.

(2) Richard Bernard, *Bible Battells: or the sacred art military,
for the waging of warfare according to Holy Writte.* London: for E
Blackmore, 1629, cited in Robert Malcolm Smuts, *The Culture of
Absolutism at the Court of Charles I.* Ann Arbor, University
Microfilms International, 1976, (Princeton University, Ph.D.,

Works of Thomas Dekker.* Edited by Fredson Bowers. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1955, Volume II.

(4) Robert Fletcher, *The Poems and Translations of Robert
Fletcher.* Edited by D.H. Woodward. Gainesville: University of

(5) Norman F Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in

(6) George H. Sabine. *A History of Political Theory* London:
Harrap, 1941, p. 435.

(7) The "orthodox" Thomist view of the interpretation of
scripture held that

The author of Holy Writ is God, in whose power it is to
signify His meaning not by words only (as men can also
do), but also by things themselves. So whereas in every
other science things are signified by words, this science
has the property that the thing signified by the words
have themselves also a signification; therefore that
first signification whereby words signify things belongs
to the first sense, the historical or literal. That
signification whereby things signified by words have
themselves a signification is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal and presupposes it. Now this spiritual sense has a threefold division... so far as things of the Old law signify the things of the New Law, there is the allegorical sense; so far as the things done in Christ, or so far as the things which signify Christ, are types of what we ought to do, there is the moral sense. But so far as they signify what relates to eternal glory there is the anagogical sense. (From The Summa Theologica translated by the Dominican Friars. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1920, ques.1; art. 18, reply to objection 3.)


Chapter I: Part iii.


(2) Founded in 1555 by Sir Thomas White, Lord Mayor of London and a supporter of Queen Mary, St. John's college escaped censure during the "mild and gentle, not rigorous reformation" which Queen Elizabeth ordered at Oxford in January 1557, (G.C. Broderick: A History of the University of Oxford London: Longmans Green and Co., 1886, p. 87), but four years later the second President of the college, William Ellye, was removed from office on account of his Romish tendencies (he died in Hereford gaol where the High Sheriff described him as a "vigorous worker for the Jesuit cause" (D.N.B.). Later during the term of President Robinson (1564-157) several Romanist fellows of the college faced exile or imprisonment on account of their opinions (a'Wood names seven, Ann.II, p. 145, and Gee's Elizabethan Clergy confirms this figure but suggests that it may not be complete. See also Anthony a'Wood, Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Famous and Antient University of Oxford. London: R Knaplock, D. Midwinter and J Tonson, 1721, pp. 55-70.)
(3) Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 49.

(4) Buckridge’s principal anti-Romanist work is *De Potestate Papae in Rebus Temporalibus Sive in Regibus Deponentibus Usurpata* (1614). Also worth noting for indications of Buckridge’s views are *A Sermon Preached Before His Majesty, 22 March, 1617* (1618) and *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Lancelot (Andrewes)* (1634). The latter work was included with Laud and Buckridge’s edition of the sermons of Andrewes.


(6) *ibid.*, p. 54.

(7) *ibid.*, p. 61.

(8) In 1605 Laud, who was Chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire, officiated at his marriage to Lady Penelope Rich the daughter of the Earl of Essex. She was recently divorced from Robert, Lord Rich to whom her family had married her despite her preference for Devonshire. She held to this preference during her marriage to Rich by continuing to bear affection for Devonshire and going so far as to bear him children as well “before she was separated from the bed of Rich” (Heylyn, *op. cit.*, p. 57). Convinced that they had promised themselves to one another before her “eding Laud went ahead and married the two. The marriage, given the adulterous circumstances, was greeted with outrage by, among others, the King himself. Heylyn puts as good a light as possible on Laud’s role:

> if any other consideration of Profit, Preferment, or Compliance, did prevail upon him (as perhaps they might), they may with charity be looked on as the common incidencies of human frailty, from which the holiest and most learned men cannot plead exemption.

Heylyn, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

Yet Laud himself kept the day as a fast for the rest of his life, and commemorated the event with an annual prayer:

> O merciful God Thou hast showed me much mercy, and done great things for me; and as I was returning, instead of thankfulness, I wandered out of my way from Thee, into a foul and strange path. There thou madest me see both my folly and my weakness: Lord, make me ever see them, ever sorry for them. O Lord, for my Saviour’s sake forgive me the folly, and strengthen me against the weakness for ever.

Laud “Devotions”, *Works III*, p. 81.


(9) Laud wrote to Richard Neile:

> I beseech your Lordship let me have your lawful
assistance, that so long as I do nothing, but that which is established and practised in our Church, I may not be brought into contempt at my first entrance upon that place by any turbulent spirits, and so disenabled to do that good service which I owe to the Church of God. And if it stand in your Lordship's liking, I will humbly desire that his gracious Majesty might know, what success I have in beginning to reform what I found amiss in that place. (Works VI, p. 241.)

(10) ibid., p. 89.


(12) A Sermon preached at White Hall, on the 24th of March, 1621, Seeing the Day of the Beginning of his Majesties most gracious Reign. By the Bishop of S. Davids. London: Printed by Bonham Norton, and John Bull, Printers to the King's Most Excellent Malestie, 1622.


(16) We learn from The Dictionary of National Biography that Oliver Cromwell's maiden speech in the Parliament of 1629 was an attack on Bishop Neile for encouraging the clergy of his diocese to preach Popery:

> The Bishop of Winchester, he complained, had sent for Dr Beard, prohibited him from controverting the popish tenets preached by Dr Alabaster at St Paul's Cross, and reprehended him for disobeying the prohibition.


(19) There had been numerous instances in the past of this pulpit being used to incite civil disobedience among the large crowds that attended the sermons there as a form of out-of-doors


Preceding these were

Sermon III: *A Sermon preached on Monday, the Sixth of February, At Westminster; at the Opening of the Parliament. By the Bishop of St. Davids. London: for Bonham Norton and John Bull. Printers to the King’s Most Excellent Majestie, 1625.*

Sermon IV: *A Sermon Preached Before his Majesty, On Sunday the XIX of June, At White Hall, Appointed to be Preached at the Opening of the Parliament. By the Bishop of St Davids. London: Printed by Bonham Norton and John Bull, 1625.*

Sermon V: *A Sermon Preached Before His Majestie, On Wednesday the Fifth of July, At White Hall, At the Soleme Feast Then Held. By the Bishop of St Davids. London: Printed for Richard Badger, 1626.*

Sermon VI: *A Sermon Preached on Monday, the Seventeenth of March, At Westminster; At the Opening of Parliament. By the Bishop of Bath and Welles. London: Printed for Richard Badger, 1628.*


(22) Among the results of Laud’s activities was that he became the butt of popular ballads criticising his power and charging him with being a secret Papist: typical of the genre is a late work (dating from around 1641-1642), *A Prognostication on Will Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury* which begins:

*My little lord, methinks 'tis strange,*  
*That you should suffer such a change,*  
*In such a little space.*  
*You, that so proudly t'other day,*  
*Did rule the king, and country sway,*  
*Must budge to 'nother place.*


(26) *loc. cit.*

(27) Laud’s speech from the scaffold was reprinted in *The Harleian Miscellany: or, a Collection of Scarce, Curious, and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts... in the late Earl of Oxford’s Library*. London: For T. Osborne, 1746, Vol VII, pp. 575-580.


(31) The principal hagiographic life of Laud is Heylin’s *Cyprianus Anglicus: or the History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (1668). The evidential value of much that Heylin tells us is open to doubt because he made use of Prynne’s unreliable *Breviate* as a necessary substitute for Laud’s Diary. William Holden Hutton’s *William Laud, Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury*, (1895) is similarly both adulative and un-critical. A.C. Benson’s *William Laud: Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, A Study*, (1887) is dilettante, and concerned primarily with personal details and speculative psychology. What has emerged as the sole and standard scholarly life of Laud is *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645*, by H.R. Trevor-Roper (1940). Where Hutton lets his attraction with Laud run away with his judgement, Trevor-Roper’s work, while infinitely more rigorous than its predecessors, ultimately fails to satisfy because of its author’s complete lack of sympathy for the Church. As an erstwhile eighteenth century rationalist Trevor-Roper believes it is a mistaken assumption that people really care much about religious doctrine. (p. 264)

Perhaps in 1940 people did not, but in 1640 they undoubtedly did, and William Laud cared more than most.
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(3) ibid. p. 1003.

(4) ibid. p. 1001.


(9) I Cor. 1: 22-23.


(13) Acts XVII: 22-31. St Paul also expresses himself in a "sermon substitute" genre - that of the epistle sent to the early Church communities and read aloud to the assembled members. What is, for our purposes, particularly important about this form is the way it comes to express and share in the authority of ecclesiastical office by becoming the preserve of the patriarch or the Bishop who, in turn, validate their power through the production of such works.

Chapter II, Part ii.

(14) G. L. Kittridge. Chaucer and His Poetry. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1915, p 72. It has been suggested by
Ian Robertson in Chaucer and the English Tradition Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp. 205-206, that not only was Chaucer criticising the Pardoner's piety but also, more generally, the contemporary language of the pulpit.


(19) Foremost among the *ars praedicandi* available in the middle ages were Adam of Lille's *Ars praedicandi*; Humbert of Romans' *De eruditione praedicatorum*; the *Speculum sacerdotale*, and the *Manipulus flororum* of Thomas of Ireland.

(20) F. Pelster. The *Speculum Sacerdotale* as it exists in Ms Bodl. Laud 571." Bodleian Library Quarterly Record VI,1930, 170-173.


(23) ibid. p. 66, n. 1.

(24) The terms for the "textual sermon" are as numerous as its variations: the Rouses, for example, adopt what they concede to be the ungainly term "school sermon" in preference to the misleading one of "scholastic sermon" and the limited one of "university sermon". "Textual sermon" seems preferable because it draws our attention to both the material and the technique of the
sermon.

Chapter II: Part iii.


(32) If James did not always openly support the Arminians by word he regularly did so by deed, appointing them to many Sees and senior ecclesiastical appointments during his reign.


Chapter II: Conclusion.

(35) See Peter Munz. The Place of Hooker in the History of


Chapter III: Part i


(5) Peter Heylyn, Briefe and Moderate Answer to the Seditious and Scandalous Challenges of Henry Burton late of Friday Streete, in Two Sermons by Him Preached on the Fifth of November 1636. And in the Apology Prefixt before them. London: Richard Hodgkinsonne, 1637, p. 36. .


Chapter III: Part ii


(3) Note the discrepancy of date here, Sermon II was actually
preached before the sermon printed in all editions as Sermon I.

(4) Laud Diary June 18, 1625, Works II, p. 165.


(7) ibid. p. 87.

(8) "Prognostication on Will Laud." in Lamont and Oldfield, op. cit., p. 55.

(9) Peter Heylyn. Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 446.

Chapter III: Conclusion.


(4) ibid. loc. cit.

Chapter IV: Part i.


(2) See p 129 et seq in Sermon V and p. 171 et seq in Sermon VI.

Chapter IV: Part ii.

J.P. Somerville summed up the situation in the following words:

The King's laws define the limits within which clergymen could legitimately exercise their spiritual powers.


(2) "A Letter Sent to All those Preachers which The King's Majesty Hath Licensed to Preach, from The Lord Protector's Grace, and others of The King's Majesty's Most Honourable Council, the 13th Day of May, in the Second Year of the Reigne of our Sovereign Lord, King Edward Vith." Item XXXII, in Appendix to Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556. Edited by John Edmund Cox, for the Parker Society, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846.


(5) Broderick, Op Cit p. 98.


(11) The Book of Chronicles describes how David danced before the Ark in praise of the Lord. But Michal, daughter of Saul, despised him for what she regarded as his debasement in this. In punishment for her attitude Michal remains barren. What she has failed to see is that David is figura Christi; though he is at that moment less of a king in Michal's eyes he has, in fact, by humilitas and sublimitas summed up and prefigured the Christ-like state (as Dante suggests in Purgatorio X 55-69).


Chapter V.


(3) A letter from Mr Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, preserved in Nichols' Progresses of King James (III, 167), records:

Herewithal I send you a sermon of Dr Laud's on the King's Birthday, because it is after the manner of the Bishop of Winchester's preaching, and because it somewhat touches the idle conceit of Serjeant Finch's book of The Calling of the Jews (cited in Laud, Works I:2)

(4) Early editions of the sermons of Andrewes, such as that by Laud and BucKridge, mark with typographical devices and bands of ornaments the divisions between the components of the sermon.

(6) ibid p. 179.

Chapter VI.

(1) An important work in this area which is of interest in the subject and period of this thesis is Joan Webber's, The Eloquent "I": Style and Self in Seventeenth Century Prose, Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin, 1968. Webber identifies two categories of prose. Her categories are conservative Anglican and radical Puritan. The first is meditative, anti-historical, obscure and ambiguous. It is the style of contemplatives like Donne and Browne who use their writing for exploration, Webber's Puritan style is active, timebound, simple and visible: its presentation is also less sophisticated and mannered than the Anglican style.


(3) ibid, loc. cit.


(6) W. Fraser Mitchell wrote:
A specimen of his [Hooker's] style from the famous sermon "Of the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect" - which occasioned Travers' "Supplication" - goes to prove that the characteristics of what he delivered in the pulpit were identical with those of his written work in the study;"
Mitchell, op. cit. p. 64.


(9) Fletcher. op. cit. pp. 137-139.
(10) The Tales and Jests of Mr Hugh Peter, Collected into One Volume. Published by one that has Formerly Been Conversant with the Author in his Life Time. And Dedicated to Mr John Goodwin and Mr Philip Nye, Together with his Sentence and the Manner of his Execution, to which is Prefaced a Short Account of His Life. London: Printed for S.D. and are to be sold by most of the booksellers in London, 1660, p. vi.

(11) ibid. p. vii.


Chapter VII.


Chapter VIII.


(2) The appearance of a body of ars praedicandi coincided with the development of canons of the works of theological writers. Laud brings these to bear to support his interpretations of Biblical texts. By the middle of the Third century the teaching authority of the Bishop's was so well established that Cyprian would not separate right teaching from sacramental validity. see William Countran. "The intellectual role of the Early Catholic Episcopate" Church History 48 (3) Sept. 1979, 261-268.


(6) Cited in Trevor-Roper, op. cit., p. 81


(8) Laud. Works VI, pp. 244-245

(9) Mitchell op. cit p. 97.


(11) XCVI Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, Late Lord Bishop of Winchester. London: George Miller for Richard Badger, 1629, A3.

CONCLUSION.


BIBLIOGRAPHY.


ANDREWES, Lancelot XCVI sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes, Late Lord Bishop of Winchester. London: Richard Badger, 1635.


St. Augustine the preacher. Being fifty short sermon notes founded upon select passages from his writings by John M. Ashley. London: J.T.Hayes, 1877.


BATESON, Mary. "A Worcester Cathedral book of ecclesiastical collections made about 1000 AD" English Historical Review, X, 1895 pp.716-731


BRIDGET, T.E "The Bristol Pulpit in the days of Henry VIII. Dublin Review Third Series, 1879, pp.73-95.


BROCKWELL, Charles W. "Answering the Known Men: Bishop Reginald Peacock and Mr Richard Hooker." Church History. 49:2, 1980, 133-146.


Philology, Vol. III


ERASMUS, Desiderus. Ciceronianus; or, A Dialogue on the Best Style of Speaking. Translated by Izora Scott. Albany, New York: Brandon Printing Co., 1908. (Columbia University Contributions to Education, Number 21.)


GORMAN, G.E. A Laudian attempt to "Tune the Pulpit": Peter Heylin and his Sermon Against the Feoffees for the Purchase of


The Harleian Miscellany: or, A Collection of Scarce, Curious and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts, as well in Manuscript as in print, Found in the Late Earl of Oxford's Library. London: For T. Osborne, 1746.


*Cyprianus Anglicus: or the History of the Life and*


The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, begun in the Year 1641... and the Happy End and Conclusion Thereof By the King's Blessed Restoration and Return Upon the 29th of May in the Year 1660. Oxford: Printed at the Theatre, 1702-1704.


JANIS, Irving. "Motivational Effects of Different Sequential


PELSTER, F. "The Speculum Sacerdotale as it Exists in MS. Bodl. Laud 571." Booleian Library Quarterly Record, VI, 1930, 170-173.


ROBERTSON, Ian. Chaucer and the English Tradition. Cambridge:


Speculum Sacerdotale. Edited from MS. BM. Add. 36791 by Edward H.


TREVOR-ROPER, H.R. Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645. Hamden Conn.:


WARWICK, Sir Philip. Memoires of the Reigne of King Charles I. London: Richard Chiswell, 1702.


