

Milton and Catholicism**Ronald Corthell****Publication Date**

15-11-2017

License

This work is made available under a Copyright Controlled by External Host license and should only be used in accordance with that license.

Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Corthell, R. (2017). *Milton and Catholicism* (Version 1). University of Notre Dame.
<https://doi.org/10.7274/24731745.v1>

This work was downloaded from CurateND, the University of Notre Dame's institutional repository.

For more information about this work, to report or an issue, or to preserve and share your original work, please contact the CurateND team for assistance at curate@nd.edu.



Edited by

RONALD CORTHELL and **THOMAS N. CORNS**

*M*ILTON
AND
CATHOLICISM



Milton
and
Catholicism

Milton *and* Catholicism

Edited by

Ronald Corthell
and Thomas N. Corns

*University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana*

University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
undpress.nd.edu
All Rights Reserved

Copyright © 2017 by University of Notre Dame

Published in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Corthell, Ronald, 1949– editor. | Corns, Thomas N., editor.
Title: Milton and Catholicism / edited by Ronald Corthell and
Thomas N. Corns.
Description: Notre Dame, Indiana : University of Notre Dame Press, 2017. |
Includes bibliographical references and index. |
Identifiers: LCCN 2017024326 (print) | LCCN 2017025753 (ebook) |
ISBN 9780268100834 (pdf) | ISBN 9780268100841 (epub) |
ISBN 9780268100810 (hardback) | ISBN 0268100810 (hardcover)
Subjects: LCSH: Milton, John, 1608–1674—Criticism and interpretation. |
Milton, John, 1608–1674—Religion. | Catholic Church—In literature. |
Christianity and literature—England—History—17th century. |
England—Church history—17th century. | BISAC: LITERARY CRITICISM /
European / English, Irish, Scottish, Welsh. | RELIGION / Christianity /
Literature & the Arts. | LITERARY CRITICISM / Poetry. | HISTORY /
Modern / 17th Century.
Classification: LCC PR3592.R4 (ebook) | LCC PR3592.R4 M53 2017
(print) | DDC 821/.4—dc23
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017024326>

*∞ This paper meets the requirements of
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).*

This e-Book was converted from the original source file by a third-party vendor. Readers who notice any formatting, textual, or readability issues are encouraged to contact the publisher at ebooks@nd.edu

Contents

List of Abbreviations and Editions	vii
Introduction	1
RONALD CORTHELL AND THOMAS N. CORNS	
1. Milton and the Protestant Pope	17
ELIZABETH SAUER	
2. John Milton and George Eglisham: The English Revolution and Catholic Disinformation	39
ALASTAIR BELLANY AND THOMAS COGSWELL	
3. Milton, Sir Henry Vane the Younger, and the Toleration of Catholics	65
MARTIN DZELZAINIS	
4. Roman Catholicism, <i>De Doctrina Christiana</i> , and the Paradise of Fools	83
THOMAS N. CORNS	

5. "How Gird the Sphear"? Catholic Spain in Milton's Poetry ANGELICA DURAN	101
6. "Coelum non Animum Muto"?: Milton's Neo-Latin Poetry and Catholic Italy ESTELLE HAAN	131
7. Marian Controversies and Milton's Virgin Mary JOHN FLOOD	169
List of Contributors	195
Index	199

Abbreviations and Editions

- CPW* *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, gen. ed. Don M. Wolfe et al. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953–82)
- CWJM* *The Complete Works of John Milton*, gen. ed. Thomas N. Corns and Gordon Campbell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008–)
- ODNB* *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- OED* *Oxford English Dictionary*, online (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- PL* *Paradise Lost*, in *The Riverside Milton*, ed. Roy Flannagan (London: Longman, 1998)
- PLat* *Patrologia Latina Cursus Completus*
- WJM* *The Works of John Milton*, gen. ed. Frank A. Patterson et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931–38).

Unless otherwise stated, the following editions have been quoted and cited:

- For *Paradise Lost*, *The Riverside Milton*, ed. Roy Flannagan (London: Longman, 1998) (abbreviated as *PL*);
- For *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Regained*, *CWJM*, vol. 2, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers;
- For all other poems by Milton, *CWJM*, vol. 3, ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski and Estelle Haan;

For Milton's vernacular regicide and republican tracts, *CWJM*, vol. 6, ed.

N. H. Keeble and Nicholas McDowell;

For all other vernacular prose, *CPW*;

For *De Doctrina Christiana*, *CWJM*, vol. 8, ed. John Hale and J. Donald
Cullington;

For all other Latin prose, *WJM*.

INTRODUCTION

RONALD CORTHELL AND THOMAS N. CORNS

Milton was a child of a fiercely anti-Catholic society, and manifestations of that tendency permeated his early environment. He was born three years after the Gunpowder Plot, and the fifth of November remained and would remain a persistent reference point in the liturgical calendar of England. “Prayers and thanksgivings to be used by the King’s loyal subjects” continued to be printed, presumably to coincide with the anniversary, and sermons each November 5 commemorated the providential deliverance from a Catholic conspiracy of James I and therewith the Protestant faith in England. The event fitted an explicitly articulated pattern of such providential interventions, initiated by the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. As one rather shadowy author, Matthew Haviland, put it in a broadsheet poem of 1635 (reprinted in 1650):

I, and my house those great things will remember
And in remembrance sanctifie two days.
In *August* [commemorating the Armada] one, the other in *November*;
Both made by GOD for us to give him praise.¹

On such recurrent and to some extent ritualized anti-Catholic events were mapped profound and sometimes violent peaks of popular response.

In May 1618, when Milton was nine, the Defenestration of Prague opened a conflict between the Holy Roman Emperor and his Protestant subjects that reverberated in England. The leader of the Protestant cause, Frederick V, Elector Palatine and son-in-law of James I, found at least moral support among the political nation. The events in continental Europe coincided with and to some extent stimulated the development of English-language news media. As Joseph Frank, in his classic study, puts it, "The English public took a prompt and partisan interest in what was happening in central Europe."² Although the government of the day, like the British government in 1938, may have viewed events in the land of which Prague was capital as "a quarrel in a far away country between two people of whom we know nothing," that was not the view of more militant English Protestants.³ James I excluded national intervention in the interest of his son-in-law, but a volunteer force under Sir Horace Vere attempted to protect his Rhineland territories, though by November 1622 it had capitulated.⁴ Vere's exploits were reported in the emergent news media.⁵ The crown further stimulated anti-Catholic sentiment through the initially clandestine mission of Charles, Prince of Wales, the future Charles I, to Spain in an abortive attempt to secure marriage to the Infanta. It did not play well with public opinion. However, the prince's return empty-handed proved an inadvertent public relations triumph for the house of Stuart as fireworks, bonfires, peals of bells, and much general roistering greeted him.⁶ Milton was fourteen at the time.

Newsbooks and newspapers, both still embryonic, exercised caution through the early Stuart years but nevertheless reflected public concern with events unfolding in continental Europe. In May 1631 the Protestant city of Magdeburg was stormed by the Catholic forces of the Holy Roman Empire, and most of its thirty-six thousand inhabitants were massacred. The court poet Thomas Carew, in a poem not published till the 1640s, congratulated England on its studied neutrality that preserved "Our *Halcyon* dayes" of "Tourneyes, Masques, Theaters," though "the German Drum / Bellow for freedome and revenge"; its noise "Concernes not us."⁷ In the nascent public sphere a different perspective emerged, prompted by reports of "the late Deplorable losse of the famous Citty of *Magdenburgh* . . . the like miserable, bloody and inhumaine Cruelty never committed (since the Seidge of *Ierusalem*) in so short a space."⁸ Milton was twenty-two.

A greater horror and greater stimulus to anti-Catholic sentiment, perceived as the worst atrocity ever perpetrated in the British Isles, emerged shortly after Milton returned from his travels in continental Europe. An uprising by indigenous Irish Catholics against English and Scottish Protestant settlers resulted in wide-scale massacres. The events coincided with the collapse of state control of the press, and in the early 1640s hundreds of pamphlets were published, reporting on Irish affairs, many in lurid terms detailing atrocities, floggings, castration, rape, sexual humiliation, genital mutilation, and even cannibalism. The most influential, and apparently the most authoritative, was Thomas Morley's, the title of which explicitly links the catastrophe in Ireland and the political crisis in England: *A Remonstrance of the Barbarous Cruelties and Bloody Murders Committed By the Irish Rebels Against the Protestants in Ireland . . . Being the examinations of many who were eye-witnesses of the same . . . Presented to the whole kingdome of England, that thereby they may see the Rebels inhumane dealing, prevent their pernicious practises, relieve their poore brethrens necessities, and fight for their Religions, Laws, and Liberties* (London, 1644). A death toll of two hundred thousand was widely accepted.

Milton was sufficiently moved by the plight of Protestants in Ireland to contribute £4 to their relief. Charity was not the only response. Anti-Catholic outrage launched a wave of mob attacks on English Catholics, London embassies of Catholic countries required armed guards, and between 1641 and 1646 twenty-four Catholic priests were killed, often in acts of extreme brutality.⁹ That same savage ferocity characterized the worst atrocities perpetrated by the New Model Army, in the ill-treatment of the allegedly Irish camp followers captured after the battle of Naseby, the sack of Basing House, and the better-known massacres of Drogheda and Wexford. Milton lived in bloody times that inevitably shaped his cultural and political consciousness.

His prose and poetry constitute a sustained attack on Catholic ecclesiology and forms of authority. From his Gunpowder Plot juvenilia to *Of True Religion*, published the year before his death, his writing represented Catholicism as inimical to liberty, reformation, and reason. Milton's biography is instructive. His father's career and the wealth it produced were premised on his alienation, on explicitly doctrinal grounds, from his own unbendingly Catholic father, Milton's grandfather. Milton grew up in the parish of a leading and singularly militant anti-Catholic minister, his

probable catechist. His earliest known friends included a child of London's community of emigré Italian Protestants and a young poet who wrote to rejoice in a domestic accident, the collapse of a secret chapel, that killed ninety clandestine Catholic worshippers. There is no doubting that, probably from an early age, Milton was, in Arthur Marotti's phrase, an "ideologically impassioned" anti-Catholic.¹⁰ At Cambridge, he followed a familiarly anti-Catholic line in his early neo-Latin poems on the Gunpowder Plot. In the 1640s he showed a particular compassion toward those Protestant settlers attacked and displaced by the rebellion by Irish Catholics. Throughout his prose, he was quick to censure any who could be perceived or represented as compromising with Catholicism. His *Observations* on Irish articles of peace justified Cromwell's implacable Irish campaign that led to Drogheda and Wexford, and his principal arguments against the Restoration included the threat it posed of a restored Catholic queen mother and her entourage. An explicit and partisan anti-Catholicism, in the satirical representation of "eremites and friars" to be exiled to the surface of the moon, jeopardizes the decorum of *Paradise Lost*. His last major prose work attempted to define a broad spectrum of tolerable opinion in terms of its distinction from Catholicism. Recurrently, his concept of the virtuous human life, individual and corporate, was constructed against the Catholic other.

Nonetheless, Milton sufficiently admired from afar the culture of Catholic Italy to master its language, and his Continental travels saw him racing through France to get there. He counted Catholic Italians among his friends and retained correspondence with some after his return home, and he continued to assert, as testimony to his international reputation, that he had been welcomed and celebrated in their academies. He had some social contact with at least two cardinals closely related to the then pope. Anecdotaly, back home he helped the petition of an Irish Catholic deprived of his estates. His brother, a lawyer and royalist activist who was knighted and promoted at the Restoration, possibly reverted to the faith of their paternal grandfather, albeit after the poet's death.

Of course, this "some of his best friends were Catholics" qualification of Milton's anti-Catholicism does not mitigate the severity of his public stance against what he and contemporary Protestants habitually termed "popery." And his position and line of attack align with the propensity of both English Protestants and Catholics to define themselves against each

other. But that is also just what captures our attention. This is *Milton* we are talking about, after all—in all his rich complexity, hardly a Zeitgeist writer (“Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour: / England hath need of thee”). Because it is Milton we are dealing with, it is possible to be conflicted about his inflexibility on the Catholic question, at once taken aback by his peculiar intolerance of Catholics as distinct from Protestant sectarians and understanding of his attacks on the church’s institutional and intellectual authoritarianism. Milton’s mockery of the use and control of imprimaturs in *Areopagitica* brims with his contempt for officious clerics:

Their last invention was to ordain that no Book, pamphlet, or paper should be Printed (as if *S. Peter* had bequeath’d them the keys of the Presse also out of Paradise) unlesse it were approv’d and licens’t under the hands of 2 or 3 glutton Friers. For example:

Let the Chancellor *Cini* be pleas’d to see if in this present work
be contain’d ought that may withstand the Printing,

Vincent Rabbatta Vicar of *Florence*.

I have seen this present work, and finde nothing athwart the
Catholick faith and good manners: In witnesse whereof
I have given, etc.

Nicolo Cini Chancellor of *Florence*.

.

Sometimes 5 *Imprimaturs* are seen together dialogue-wise in the Piazza of one Title page, complementing and ducking each to other with their shav’n reverences, whether the Author, who stands by in perplexity at the foot of his Epistle, shall to the Presse or to the sponge. (*CPW*, 2:503–4)

Over the course of his career Milton’s ire was directed at the clerical class and controlling hierarchical structures; however, one can be forgiven for feeling uneasy with his seeming insensitivity to the trials of conscience experienced by lay English Catholics struggling as members of a religious minority to maintain their faithfulness and navigate the treacherous waters of “dual loyalty.” Why would Milton, champion of conscience, be so unwilling to consider the dilemmas of those caught in the intricate webs woven by religion and politics over the course of a tumultuous

century of confessional conflict in his native land? Did the Continental and Irish atrocities summarized at the opening of this introduction entirely override any possibility of identification with English Catholics? A student of early modern English literature might recall John Donne, who struggled with his attachment to the faith. Donne's autobiographical remarks in the preface to *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), his contribution to the Oath of Allegiance Controversy, famously detail the difficult process of changing religious allegiance:

They who have descended so lowe, as to take knowledge of me, and to admit me into their consideration, know well that I used no inordinate hast, nor precipitation in binding my conscience to any local Religion. I had a longer work to doe then many other men: for I was first to blot out, certaine impressions of the Romane religion, and to wrestle both against the examples and against the reasons, by which some hold was taken; and some anticipations early layde upon my conscience, both by Persons who by nature had a power and superiority over my will, and others who by their learning and good life, seem'd to me justly to claime an interest for the guiding, and rectifying of mine understanding in these matters.¹¹

Of course, Donne's reference to "the Romane religion" is the key to Milton's position—his intolerance of the tyranny of *Rome*. And, as Nigel Smith has put it, "This inability to imagine toleration was very widespread among nearly all religious groups at the time [of the English Revolution]." ¹² Alexandra Walsham, in her book *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700*, reminds us that *toleration* was, through most of the early modern period, a word used pejoratively.¹³ Still, an element of discomfort, or, perhaps more accurately, disappointment lingers.

Of course, the protracted struggle with the legacy of Roman Catholicism has long been recognized as a key influence on the literary production of early modern England. Our understanding of this relationship has been greatly enriched by the new history of early modern English Catholicism and anti-Catholicism that has been created in the voluminous scholarship of the past twenty years. Following upon the foundational work of John Bossy in the 1960s, historians and literary scholars have

since the 1990s been engaged in projects of recovery, revision, and discovery of records of Catholic life and culture during the English Reformation. Beginning with Eamon Duffy's powerful revisionist *Stripping of the Altars*, historians like Alexandra Walsham, Michael Questier, Peter Lake, Christopher Haigh, Anthony Milton, and Thomas McCoog have reshaped and complicated our understanding of Catholicism's place in early modern English religious history, as well as demonstrated the interdependence of Catholicism and Protestantism as ideological mirrors in fashioning religious identities and politics. In concert with this important historical research, literary historians and critics have been reexamining and expanding the early modern English canon by attending to Catholic themes and representations and by recovering Catholic books marginalized or lost over the centuries because of variously motivated forms of omission.¹⁴ Books such as Alison Shell's *Catholicism, Controversy, and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* and *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England*; Raymond Tumbleson's *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660–1745*; Peter Lake and Michael Questier's *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*; and Arthur Marotti's *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy* have complicated and challenged prevailing views of a Protestant framework for English literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. New scholarship on such important Catholic figures as Edmund Campion, Robert Southwell, and Robert Persons is enriching our understanding of the interplay of complex religio-political texts and contexts in early modern English literary culture.¹⁵

What recent scholarship has brought to light is the rich diversity of Catholic and anti-Catholic discourses over the period; the multiple subject positions constructed by and for Catholics as they adapted their religious and political allegiances and practices to changing conditions in Tudor and Stuart England; new understandings of martyrdom and martyrology; writing by and about Catholic women in early modern England; and new appreciation for the role of polemic in early modern English literary culture.¹⁶ In this context, we believe a collection focused on Milton's engagement with Catholicism and anti-Catholicism is timely indeed. While new knowledge of Catholic subcultures and anti-Catholic

ideologies has increased significantly, we are only beginning to understand how early modern confessional conflicts between Catholics and Protestants helped to forge new models and standards of authority, scholarship, and interiority.¹⁷

Seen in the light of recent scholarship on English Catholics, Milton's position against toleration of Catholicism stands out even more brightly than before.¹⁸ Milton could deploy anti-Catholicism as something of a rhetorical device. As a modern editor points out, his hard line against toleration even of private worship to English Catholics in the late treatise *Of True Religion* (1673) is harsher than in the earlier *A Treatise of Civil Power* (1659), which had focused on the "publicke and scandalous use thereof." In *A Treatise* he writes:

Nevertheless if they ought not to be tolerated, it is for just reason of state more then of religion; which they who force, though professing to be protestants, deserve as little to be tolerated themselves, being no less guiltie of poperie in the most popish point. Lastly, for idolatrie, who knows it not to be evidently against all scripture both of the Old and New Testament, and therfore a true heresie, or rather an impietie; wherein a right conscience can have naught to do; and the works therof so manifest, that a magistrate can hardly err in prohibiting and quite removing at least the publick and scandalous use therof. (*CPW*, 7 [rev. ed.]: 254)

Here Milton comes as close as he ever did to allowing there might be a private, inner space where English Catholics could feel free from interference from the English state; his equation of the "forcing" of religion, even for Catholics, as in fact a form of "poperie" is consistent with the thinking of some his radical friends. In the later work Milton wishes to distinguish between toleration of Protestant sects, which he supports, and toleration of Roman Catholicism, which had been extended in limited form under the Declaration of Indulgence.¹⁹ To express his support of Parliament's withdrawal of the Declaration of Indulgence and thereby to align himself and Protestant nonconformists with Parliament against the common enemy, Milton deploys *popery* as a kind of scare-word in *Of True Religion*. Here are the opening phrases of the final three paragraphs of the pamphlet:

The next means to hinder the growth of Popery will be. . . .

Another means to abate Popery arises from. . . .

The last means to avoid Popery, is. . . .

Milton concludes: "Let us therefore using this last means, last here spoken of, but first to be done, amend our lives with all speed; least through impenitency we run into that stupidly, which now we seek all means so warily to avoid, the worst of superstitions, and the heaviest of all Gods Judgements, Popery" (*CPW*, 8:433–40).

But more than a rhetorical device, anti-Catholicism does seem to have played the role for Milton that Lake and other scholars have described as a type of Protestant self-fashioning, "a means of labelling and expelling tendencies that seemed to jeopardise their integrity."²⁰ What is particularly interesting about Milton's anti-Catholicism is the way it aligns with his understanding of inwardness and conscience and illuminates one of the central conflicts between Catholics and Protestants in the period. Through most of the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, from Burghley's *Execution of Justice in England* (1583) and William Allen's response in *A True, Sincere, and Modest Defense of English Catholics* (1584), through the Oath of Allegiance controversy (1606), the Royal Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, and its withdrawal in 1673, to the fictitious conspiracy known as the Popish Plot (1678–81), English Protestants and Catholics wrangled over the entanglement of religious belief and political loyalty. In his famous *Humble Supplication to her Majestie* (1600), Robert Southwell sought, problematically, to separate his religious commitment from loyalty to Elizabeth.²¹ In *A Brief Discourse containing certayne Reasons why Catholiques refuse to go to Church* (1580), the prolific Jesuit polemicist Robert Persons had made the case for recusancy to both English Catholics and Protestants "on the grounds that a person who acted in defiance of his inner beliefs committed a greivous sin."²² The particular complications of conscience for English Catholics became especially evident in arguments over the Oath of Allegiance (1606). The key passage in the Oath, one that precipitated debates between Catholics and between Catholics and Protestants in England, and that continues to be debated among historians, can help us gain entry into Milton's thinking on Catholics and conscience: "I do further swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious

and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever.”²³ The chief debating point, in the early seventeenth century and continuing into the present day among historians, is whether the oath was focused on the doctrine of the papal deposing power and therefore functioned as a loyalty test, or whether, as Michael C. Questier argues, it was centered on “the novel ‘impious and heretical’ clause rejecting the ‘damnable doctrine’ that excommunicated or deprived princes ‘may be deposed or murdered by their subjects’” and therefore functioned as a means of branding papal doctrine as heresy and indirectly conceding the king’s supremacy over the church.²⁴ In her recent book *Law and Conscience* Stefania Tutino highlights the change Catholics perceived in the oath:

In other words, in an oath designed to test, according to its author’s [James I] intention, the “civill Obedience” of subjects, there appears the statement that the doctrine of the legitimate deposing of a king excommunicated by the pope is “impious and heretical. . . . If one starts off from an assumption that only political loyalty, and not religious beliefs, was the object of discussion, stating that a founding point in Catholic doctrine regarding the Church of England was to be deemed “impious and heretical” led dangerously into the very forum of conscience that the sovereign himself claimed he wanted to respect.”²⁵

Milton shows little concern in his antipapal writings with issues of Catholic loyalty, but a doctrine, *held in conscience*, of papal supremacy in spiritual matters goes to the heart of his inability to tolerate Catholicism. To put it simply: What is the pope doing in someone’s conscience?

Milton’s intolerance of Catholicism is grounded in this concept of “implicit faith.” An explanation of the term from the Catholic side can be found in another Persons tract, *The Warn-word to Sir Francis Hastings Wast-word* (1602). Following the church father Athanasius of Alexandria, Persons argues that salvation depends on holding to the Catholic faith, which Persons interprets to mean every article of doctrine: “Thus saith that creed [traditionally, if erroneously attributed to Athanasius] shewing us the dreadful daunger of him that erreth, or doubteth of any one article

of the Catholic faith, which infinite people of England must needs do at this day, who have no other guide, direction, or certainty to bring them to resolve in matters of controversy, but eyther their owne reading, or to believe some other as uncertayne as their owne judgment in this behalf.”²⁶ Persons explains the two kinds of faith, “fide explicita” and “fide implicita”: explicit faith is “a cleare, distinct and particular faith or belief of any article, point or parcel of Christian Religion”; implicit faith, on the other hand, comprises “a more darcke, secret or hidden faith, implied as it were or wrapped . . . in the belief of an other more general point” (*Warn-word*, Z6r). The key idea, which Milton, following Calvin, cannot countenance, is that for Persons Catholics unversed in theology “believe the Catholike Church, and all that shee beleeveth, which *implyeth* so much as is necessary to any mannes salvation” (*Warn-word*, L14v–L15r; our emphasis). As Milton writes in *Of True Religion*, “If they say that by removing their Idols we violate their Consciences, we have no warrant to regard Conscience which is not grounded on Scripture” (CPW, 8:432). Or, as he phrased it in *A Treatise of Civil Power* in a passage preceding and canceling his caution regarding “forcing” of religion, “Besides, of an implicit faith, which they profess, the conscience also becoms implicit; and so by voluntarie servitude to mans law, forfeits her Christian libertie. Who then can plead for such a conscience, as being implicitly enthralld to man instead of God, almost becoms no conscience, as the will not free, becoms no will” (CPW, 7 [rev. ed.]: 254). Here is the conundrum from Milton’s point of view: Catholic inwardness is a contradiction, since it includes submission to the pope on spiritual matters; the notion of Catholic “conscience” is unconscionable.

That said, Milton’s intolerance of Catholicism is not joined to any program of persecution of Catholics. Even in the *True Religion*, punishment is reserved only for those who threaten “the security of the State” (CPW, 8:431). He does recommend the destruction of images and prohibition of Masses. However, the pamphlet concludes with positive prescriptions that apply to both Catholics and Protestants: “The next means to hinder the growth of Popery will be to read duly and diligently the Holy Scriptures, which as St. *Paul* saith to *Timothy*, who had known them from a child, *are able to make wise unto salvation*” (CPW, 8:433). Milton tellingly does not limit this exhortation to Catholics: “most men in the course and practice of their lives” place earthly before heavenly things

“and through unwillingness to take pains of understanding their Religion by their own diligent study, would fain be sav’d by a Deputy. Hence comes implicit faith. . . . till want of Fundamental knowledge easily turns to superstition or Popery” (*CPW*, 8:434–35). Thus are Catholics and Protestants both brought under Milton’s censure, as he closes: “The last means to avoid Popery, is to amend our lives” (*CPW*, 8:438). Milton’s intolerance of Catholicism was an active, lifelong campaign against “the popery within.”



This collection of essays investigates a rich variety of approaches to Milton’s career-long engagement with Catholicism and its relationship to reformed religion, picking open latent tensions and contradictions, exploring the nuances of his relationship to the easy commonplaces of Protestant compatriots, and disclosing the polemical strategies and tactics that often shape that engagement. Milton writes so often in dialogue—or debate—with the thought and work of others, and this volume seeks, among other objectives, to make more audible the other parts of those conversations and controversies. This is not, however, a casebook or companion. Broadly speaking, the collection moves from the fine-grained engagement with events and texts to a larger consideration with a wider view, sometimes, indeed, an overview. But it would be misleading to overschematize the structure of a project, the primary aim of which was to give a platform for a diverse and multifaceted investigation into a complex and little-explored field in Milton studies.

NOTES

1. Matthew Haviland, *A Monument of Gods most gracious preservation of England from Spanish Invasion, Aug. 2 1588. and Popish Treason, Novem. 5. 1605* ([London, 1635]).
2. Joseph Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620–1660* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), 4.
3. Neville Chamberlain, radio broadcast on Germany’s annexation of the Sudetenland, September 27, 1938.

4. J. V. Polisensky, *The Thirty Years War*, trans. Robert Evans (London: New English Library, 1971), 167.

5. Frank, *Beginnings*, 9.

6. Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 6–9.

7. Thomas Carew, “In answer of an Elegiacall Letter upon the death of the King of Sweden,” lines 95–98, in *The Poems of Thomas Carew with His Masque “Coelum Britannicum,”* ed. Rhodes Dunlap (1949; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 74–77.

8. *The Continuation of our weekly Avisoes, since the 16. of May to the 4. of June* (London, 1631), title page.

9. Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 172. The following biographical account draws on this study *passim*.

10. Arthur F. Marotti, *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 5.

11. John Donne, *Pseudo-Martyr, Wherein Out of Certaine Propositions and Gradations, This Conclusion Is Evicted, That Those Which Are of the Romane Religion in This Kingdome, May and Ought to Take the Oath of Allegiance*, ed. Anthony Raspa (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1993), 13.

12. Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 121.

13. Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 4.

14. John Bossy’s influential works include “The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism,” *Past and Present* 21 (1962): 39–59, and *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1975). See also Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), “The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation,” *Past and Present* 93 (1981): 37–69, and “From Monopoly to Minority: Catholicism in Early Modern England,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 31 (1981): 129–47; J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984); Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992); Peter Lake, “Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice,” in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*, ed. Richard Crust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), 72–106; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1995); Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society and Boydell Press, 1993) and *Charitable Hatred*; Thomas McCoog, ed., *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1996).

15. Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy, and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Raymond Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660–1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Peter Lake and Michael C. Questier, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002); Arthur F. Marotti, ed., *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (London: Macmillan, 1999), and *Religious Ideology*. Other recent literary and cultural studies include Frances E. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (1999; repr., Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2005); Ronald Corthell, Frances E. Dolan, Christopher Highley, and Arthur F. Marotti, eds., *Catholic Culture in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007); Scott R. Pilarz, *Robert Southwell and the Mission of Literature, 1561–1595: Writing Reconciliation* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004); Anne Sweeney, *Robert Southwell: Snow in Arcadia, Redrawing the English Lyric Landscape, 1586–95* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006); Victor Houlston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons's Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007); Raymond Tumbleson, *Catholicism*; Dennis Flynn, *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Ceri Sullivan, *Dismembered Rhetoric: English Recusant Writing, 1580–1603* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1995).

16. On the diversity of Catholic and anti-Catholic discourses, see especially Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and Oral Culture*; Sullivan, *Dismembered Rhetoric*; Tumbleson, *Catholicism*; and Marotti, *Religious Ideology*. On Catholic subject positions, see Bossy, "Character of English Catholicism" and *English Catholic Community*; Haigh, *English Reformations*, "Continuity of Catholicism," and "From Monopoly to Minority"; Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*; and Walsham, *Church Papists*. On martyrdom, see Anne Dillon, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535–1603* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); Susannah Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); John R. Knott, *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563–1694* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Eliza-

beth Hanson, *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). On writing by and about Catholic women, see Dolan, *Whores of Babylon*; Heather Wolfe, *The Literary Career and Legacy of Elizabeth Cary, 1613–1680* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). On the role of polemic, see Tumbleson, *Catholicism*; Sullivan, *Dismembered Rhetoric*; Lake, “Anti-Popery”; Houliston, *Catholic Resistance*; and Marotti, *Religious Ideology*.

17. On models of authority, see, for example, Robert Weimann, *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse*, ed. David Hillman (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996); on models of scholarship, see Anthony Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (1997; rev. ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); on models of interiority, see Katherine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

18. For a concise overview of the features of Catholicism that underlay Milton’s intolerance, see Andrew Hadfield, “Milton and Catholicism,” in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 186–99.

19. Keith Staveland in *CPW*, 8:431–32. Milton wishes to express his support of Parliament’s withdrawal of the Declaration in order to persuade Parliament to see him and nonconformists as allies against popery and, therefore, worthy of toleration. Staveland also claims that Milton’s convictions about Catholicism were consistent throughout his career, somewhat undermining his rhetorical argument in *Of True Religion*.

20. Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 27; Lake, “Anti-Popery”; Anthony Milton, “A Qualified Intolerance: the Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism,” in Marotti, *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism*, 85–115.

21. See Ronald Corthell, “‘The Secrecy of Man’: Recusant Discourse and the Elizabethan Subject,” *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (Autumn 1989): 272–90.

22. Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, 242.

23. Quoted in Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570–1625* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 133.

24. Michael C. Questier, “Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance,” *Historical Journal* 40 (1997): 318–19. The debate is summarized by Johann P. Sommerville, who argues for the oath as a loyalty test in “Papalist Political Thought and the Controversy over the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance,” in *Catholics and the “Protestant Nation”: Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), esp. 172–78.

25. Tutino, *Law and Conscience*, 133. Tutino argues that the inclusion in the oath of a renunciation of the doctrine of papal primacy “offered a new

formulation of the separation between inner beliefs and outer conduct, shifting in a fundamental way . . . the ‘boundary between the internal and external forum’” (321–22).

26. Robert Persons, *The Warn-word to Sir Francis Hastinges Wast-word; conteyning the issue of the three former Treatises, the Watch-word, the Ward-word and the Wast-word (1602)*, in *English Recusant Literature, 1558–1640*, ed. D. M. Rogers, vol. 302 (Ilkley: Scholar Press, 1976), L14v. Subsequent citations are to this edition and are given parenthetically in the text.

CHAPTER 1

MILTON AND THE PROTESTANT POPE

ELIZABETH SAUER

[The bishops] brought in many *Popish Innovations*, and in their Surplices, Copes, and Hoods, had well nigh ushered the Pope into *England*.

—Mercurius Britanicus, *Communicating the affaires of great Britaine: For the better Information of the People* (1644)

In early modern England, Catholics disputed the nature and terms of their relationship to the international church, their allegiances to the state, and their subjection to Catholic bishops appointed by Rome. English Catholic clerics themselves protested against the Jesuits and their missionizing in England and abroad, and thereby contributed to the anti-Jesuit rhetoric of the day, at the same time that they added their voices to the prevailing anti-Puritan sentiment. That the discontents and divided

loyalties of Catholics, who conformed to varying degrees to the Church of England, continued in later decades is evidenced in the distinction between lay English Catholics and what the anonymous author of the seventeenth-century *Letter from a Gentleman of the Romish Religion* calls “Missionary Priests in this Kingdom.” By virtue of their ordination and oath of obedience to the pope, the foreign priests subscribe to “the mad Doctrine of Popes having power to depose Princes,” the letter’s author complains. Resistance to kingship was a known principle of the Jesuit tradition. The professor of the “Romish Religion” explicitly distances himself from this Jesuitical position and assures his brother, the ostensible addressee, that no renunciation of one’s allegiance to the king is demanded on the part of Catholic laity, who are subject to and will be protected by England’s laws.¹

Neither English Protestant conformists nor Puritans were prepared to entertain the possibility of a loyal Catholic citizen. As “an ideal polemical tool” and “a free-floating term of opprobrium . . . defined by its place in a longstanding ideological code,” antipopery was a rallying cry for a Protestant nation that defined itself in opposition to Catholic Rome—the origin of all ills.² A term of derision, *popery* was a universal charge, and *papist* “a magic epithet” that offered an effective means of immediately vilifying those designated as undesirable or different.³ In Stuart England, popery would have had to be invented if it didn’t exist, points out Peter Lake in his study of anti-Catholic prejudice.⁴ Antipapist sentiment was prevalent in many circles in England, but largely as an invention of the historical and literary imagination at a time when the emerging nation had a strong religious orientation. The identification of “an other” or a common adversary and the rhetorical, ideological, and cultural existence of antipopery were necessary for the coalescence of disparate Protestant groups and consolidation of an English identity. Milton buys into prejudices of the time and deploys and supplements the popular anti-Catholic rhetoric in establishing his role as architect and champion of Protestant nationhood. He does so in relation first to Laudianism, on which this chapter concentrates, and later in relation to monarchism, which he reviles as popish. When he justifies the regicide at the end of the decade, Milton also seizes the opportunity to assault the English pope, the archbishop of Canterbury, and his “late Breviary” (a Catholic prayer book for clerics) (*CWJM*, 6:291). Laud remains a target long after his sen-

tencing and the demise of the episcopacy because he represents for Milton an English counterpart of an ever-threatening papal power and a malignant popish influence on a justly executed king, who, like his father, “shiver[ed] between Protestant and Papist all his life” (*CWJM*, 6:357).

I

Throughout his writing career Milton rehearses a series of errant practices and erroneous beliefs that he associates with popery. He condemns the doctrine of purgatory (*CPW*, 1:702). In *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (1643) he derides the papists’ designation of marriage as sacramental rather than as an arrangement intended for “human Society” (*CPW*, 2:275). In *The Judgement of Martin Bucer Concerning Divorce* (1644), Milton contrasts literal (usually Catholic) approaches to scriptures with “the direct analogy of sense, reason, law, and Gospel” (*CPW*, 2:431) in order to refute the English church’s papistical interpretation of Matthew 5 and its subscription to canon laws on marriage. Also, like his Puritan contemporaries, Milton rejects the designation of sacredness with specific institutions or individuals. He expresses contempt for the idolatrous accouterments of ceremonial and sacramental worship, represented by the Mass, clerical vestments, religious art and images, and “easy Confession, easy Absolution, Pardons, Indulgences” (*CPW*, 8:439). But there were also menacing aspects to Catholicism: in a 1641 speech addressed to Parliament, John Pym, who brought the Grand Remonstrance before the House of Commons, warned, “The Religion of the Papists is a Religion incomputable to any other Religion, destructive to all others, and doth not endure any thing that doth oppose it; and whosoever doth withstand their Religion, (if it lie in their power) they bring them to ruine.”⁵ When it is cited in religious nationalist discourses and when it is politicized, Catholicism becomes especially detestable and dangerous. Romish intolerance and tyranny in turn justify Protestant intolerance of Catholicism, if not outright persecution of Catholics. When political and religious interests meet, as they regularly do in Milton’s imaginative and polemical works, “political intolerance will not allow condoning the religious component.”⁶ Collapsing the differences between a politicized popery and the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church became central to

Milton's polemical strategy. "Their religion the more considered, the less can be acknowledged a religion; but a Roman principalitie rather," as he writes in *A Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes: Shewing that it is not lawfull for any power on earth to compel in matters of Religion* (1659), which warns the new parliament of the injustices and dangers of politico-ecclesiastical institutions and doctrines that repress liberty of conscience (CPW, 7:254). Popery is a twofold menace, "Ecclesiastical, and Political, both usurpt, and the one supporting the other," Milton declares in *Of True Religion*, in which he takes parting shots at popery (CPW, 8:429).

From the outset of his career, Milton maps binary oppositions between good and evil onto his literary representations of Protestantism and Catholicism. In "In quintum Novembris"—likely designed to observe the anniversary of Guy Fawkes Day and deliverance from the popish plot to overthrow the king—Milton hails James as a restorer of peace and order, while describing the punishment of the conspirators.⁷ Though he initially eulogized James, Milton later faults the king for his indulgence of Roman Catholics.⁸ This chapter reviews some of Milton's early writings on church government and his 1644 anticensorship tract, in which he elides differences between Laudianism and Catholicism and politicizes both as popery. In a recent study of *Areopagitica: A Speech of Mr. John Milton For the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing*, Stephen Dobranski points out that the censure of Catholicism in the tract is also a denunciation of the Laudian church.⁹ Earlier attacks on pseudo-Catholic Laudianism appear in "Lycidas," which captures the collusion of political and ecclesiastical affairs in the line about papistical prelates "Creep[ing] and intrud[ing], and climb[ing] into the fold" (115). Whether detecting radical elements in Milton's early works or aligning the young Milton with Laudian conservatism, Miltonists have generally interpreted "Lycidas" as the poet-polemicist's first decisive antiepiscopal statement.¹⁰ The poem exerts pressure on the conventions of the pastoral mode through its incursion and digression into church polity and its detection and excommunication of an internal foe.

Indeed, beginning in the 1630s, Milton's antipopery rhetoric, while designed to expose the threat of an anti-Christian outsider, was also deployed to designate as foreign and corrosive the internal "tyranny [that] invaded the Church" (CPW, 1:822–23). Laud and Charles viewed the divinely ordained office of the prelacy as a corollary of *jure divino* mon-

archism. Milton in contrast focused on discrediting the former, in part by implicating the archbishop and popish prelates in a plot to destabilize just kingship. What Protestants saw as the Catholic Church's claims over conscience were interpreted as a compromise of national allegiances and sovereignty, including disobedience to kings. Milton thus deploys the rhetoric of popery to designate as alien and subversive the contagion that exists *within*—"the Pope, with his appertinences the Prelats" (*Areopagitica*, CPW, 2:549). By relying on the language of the other—the stranger, the intruder, the malefactor—antipopery allowed for the labeling and externalizing of internal conflicts.

II

In the early modern era, English Protestants accused the papacy of spreading superstition and sedition and dictating the observance of false rituals, which transformed an active and engaged congregation into blind followers. Catholicism was perceived as contaminating court politics and church government, in part through the conspiracy of the king's counselors and an Episcopalian Church subject to non-English influences. Through its association with foreign allegiances and menacing foreign powers, popery was judged to be "a solvent of the ties of political loyalty" as well as of Protestant unity.¹¹ Alleged associations with Roman Catholicism shook the Caroline government and accounted in part for its downfall. In the late 1620s, John Cosin prepared, presumably at the behest of Charles I, the *Collection of Private Devotions*, an Anglican manual for use by court ladies and specifically for Susan Fielding (née Villiers), Countess of Denbigh, who was leaning toward Rome.¹² Cosin's prayer anthology, modeled on books of hours, was intended to counter the Counter-Reformation liturgy that encouraged conversions to popery. At the same time, Cosin was heavily involved in the defense of high church practices that resembled Catholicism, and in that regard he was engaged in the same exercise as his friend and correspondent William Laud, the archbishop of Canterbury and chief ecclesiastical administrator. In 1628 Cosin participated in the prosecution of Peter Smart, who vilified popery from the pulpit of the Cathedral of Durham, where the subject was frequently broadcast. Smart was held in custody for over a

decade by the Court of High Commission for what William Prynne described as the “popish *Innovations* [he and his confederates] brought into that Church . . . , as Images, Copes, Tapers, Crucifixes, bowing to the Altar, praying towards the East, turning the Cōmunion Table of wood . . . into an Altar of stone.”¹³ Like Laud, Cosin would be accused of undermining the king’s authority over the church and of attempting to divert the king’s subjects from the true religion by “seducing” them to popery.¹⁴

Not only did Prynne and Henry Burton vehemently attack Cosin’s book, they implicated it in a plot to subject England to Roman authority. Prynne designates the book as “*Popish*, both in the forme, and matter of it,” and declares its intent to “Vsher *Poperie* into our Church.” Establishing parallels between Cosin’s prescriptions and popish discipline, Prynne judges that the book is leading the English Church back to the Romish origins it renounced when the Reformation took hold.¹⁵ Burton likewise maintains that the one unified church, which Cosins defends, enslaves England to Rome once again. Since this “Popish booke,” declares Burton, renders the English church “no otherwise distinct from the Church of Rome,” the pope will usurp kingly power and “with his foote strike[] off his crowne.”¹⁶

The threat posed by a foreign adversary was thus overshadowed by internal court and church affairs. According to the Venetian ambassador in England, Anzolo Correr, Roman Catholics after 1636 were tolerated to a greater degree than before, and Mass attendance in the queen’s chapel increased.¹⁷ “Catholics are no longer hated or persecuted with the old severity,” he reports. Worse yet, they are permitted, if not welcomed, at the court: “The public services in the queen’s chapel are most freely frequented by very great numbers, while those of the ambassadors are crowded,” Correr continues. Queen Henrietta Maria would be linked to popish plots in the late 1630s. As for Laud, he is now lording over the national church “*so that they commonly call him the pope of England.*” Those who feared the infestation of Catholicism in their country also drew upon examples of proselytization at court. In October 1637, the conversion (known as the perversion) of Lady Newport, one of the queen’s ladies and wife of Mountjoy (Earl of Newport)—confirmed suspicions about the influence of Catholicism on those close to the monarchy.¹⁸ George Con, who served at the queen’s court until 1639, was accused of attempting to bring England in line with Rome. As Ambassador Correr

informed the Doge and Senate, the king of England, had he not doted so much on the queen, would surely have enacted "some resentful measure" against the papal agent, whose removal from the court was urged, lest England "be brought to obedience to the Roman pontiff."¹⁹ The joining of England with Rome was a regular refrain at the time, and the king's failure to resist the sway of Rome and its agents was increasingly troubling and ultimately treacherous.

Laud's actions and his theology supported the authoritarianism of the king and privileged royal prerogative over the liberties of the subject. Laudian reforms were seen as supporting a counter-reformation and as imposing a contrived and repressive conformity on the national church. Among the more popular works of the day that identified Laudianism as a vanguard for popery was John Bastwick's *Letany of John Bastwick . . . Also a full Demonstration, that the Bishops are . . . Enemies of Christ . . .* (1637). The book, which John Lilburne helped bring out at his own peril, exposes the collusion of prelacy and popery. In 1637, the *Letany* would bring Bastwick to the Court of the Star Chamber and then to pillory, where he would be joined by Prynne and Burton for their paper-contestations against the prelates.²⁰ Lilburne would be punished in the following year. The dangers inherent in Laudianism and Catholicism were powerfully conflated in the popular imagination and enabled the antiepiscopal and antipopish movement to gain momentum.

Laud and his clerics, who supported his ecclesiastical policies, gradually became disinclined to condemn popery or popish innovations, a strategy that had in fact proven futile in encouraging recusants to join the English church.²¹ In an effort to lure conformists inclined toward Catholicism back to the Church of England, pro-Laudian clergy sought to depict Rome as a true, if flawed, church and to downplay the differences between the doctrine and discipline of the English Protestant and Catholic churches. Bringing recusants into the fold was "infinitely more urgent" than attempting to reconcile with Puritans whom they despised.²² When Correr reported that Laud had assumed the title of the "pope of England," he explained that Laud condoned Catholicism in the court and at the same time set his sights on destroying "the party of the Puritans, which has grown so much as to cause apprehension to the government."²³ Laudians ascribed the rise of dissent and discontent with the English government to unauthorized preaching, which in his mind had

upset the balance between church and state and had poisoned vulnerable minds. Reckoning Laud receptive to their religion, Catholics decided that Catholicism could be tolerated within a monarchically governed English church.²⁴ There was a danger in the refusal to denounce the Church of Rome, which the Reformers generally detested and feared: the Laudians themselves became implicated in popery. Charges of crypto-Catholicism were directed particularly at Laud himself. Laud ardently sought to demonstrate his opposition to Catholicism, though hardly with the same intensity or commitment that he exhibited in the fight against Puritanism.²⁵

The “fear of popery” connects the religious controversies of the Laudian era with the wars of religion that raged during and following the archbishop’s demise.²⁶ Again, popery continued to serve an imaginative, ideological, and polemical function more than it posed an actual threat. Until the early 1640s, there was a reluctance to see the king as complicit in popery, though he was seen as surrounding himself with counselors and ecclesiasts with papist leanings and aspirations.²⁷ The December 11, 1640, “Root and Branch” Petition challenged the legislation introduced by Laud’s 1640 *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall*, which reinforced the relationship between monarchical and episcopal authority.²⁸ Milton would shortly thereafter refute the notion that “no forme of Church government is agreeable to monarchy, but that of Bishops” (CPW, 1:573). “The First and Large Petition . . . For a Reformation in Church-government”—the formal title of the Root and Branch Petition—demanded the abolition of the prelacy, given its approximation to and support of Catholic polity and authority. Listed here are grievances occasioned by the practices of the prelates that include “the publishing and venting of Popish, Arminian, and other dangerous Bookes and Tenets, as namely, that the Church of Rome is a true Church” (Art. 10); “the Liturgie for the most parts framed out of the *Romish Breviarie Ritualium* Masse-book, also the Book of Ordination, for Archbishops and Ministers, framed out of the roman Pontificall” (Art. 18); and the “expectation of the *Romish* part, *that their superstitious Religion will ere long be fully planted in this Kingdom again*” (Art. 28.1). The tenets of the petition are invoked in Milton’s antiprelatical works, including *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence*, which presents a defense of what was known as the “City Petition.” *Animadversions* mentions its favorable reception by Parliament, which not only judged it worthy of support but

secured the MPs' commitment to its principles. Opposition to the petition represents an affront to parliamentary authority, Milton points out (*CPW*, 1:677). The petitioners had campaigned against future incursions of the episcopacy in state affairs, and Milton takes up the same cause in his polemical writings. In doing so, he, like his Puritan contemporaries, availed himself of anti-Laudian, antiprelatical, and anti-Romanist propaganda in the war of religion that preceded and accompanied the civil wars.

III

It is noteworthy that Milton's humanism and his participation in a republic of letters could trump his anti-Catholicism or, perhaps more accurately, modulate his staunch English Protestant nationalism. One might turn to Milton's early remarks on his sojourn to Italy for confirmation of this. "I knew beforehand that Italy was not, as you think, a refuge or asylum for criminals, but rather the lodging-place of *humanitas* and of all the arts of civilization, and so I found it" (*CPW*, 4:609).²⁹ While still at Naples he learned from merchants "of plots laid against me by the English Jesuits, should I return to Rome, because of the freedom with which I had spoken about religion" (*CPW*, 4:619). But Rome beckoned again. Later, when he recalled his trip to Rome, Milton portrayed himself as an embattled but resolute protector of the faith, that is, as a "Protestant soldier,"³⁰ who championed national interests (and thereby his own), though encompassed round with dangers: "What I was, if any man inquired, I concealed from no one. For almost two more months [January–February 1639], in the very stronghold of the Pope, if anyone attacked the orthodox religion, I openly, as before, defended it" (*CPW*, 4:619). Nicolaas Heinsius, Dutch scholar, philologist, and poet, whose correspondence sheds light on the reception of Milton's Latin writings on the international stage, mentions that the antipopish Englishman had incensed his hosts during his tour of their country, which Heinsius regularly visited:³¹ "Imo invisus est Italis Anglus iste [Miltonus] inter quos multo vixit tempore, ob mores nimis severos, cum & de religion libenter disputaret, ac multa in Pontificem Romanum acerbe effutiret quavis occasione" (In fact, that Englishman was hated by the Italians, among

whom he lived a long time, on account of his over-strict morals, because he both disputed freely about religion, and on any occasion whatever prated very bitterly against the Roman Pontiff).³²

Milton's Puritan sympathies and disillusionment with the prospect of a church career resulted in a dedication to the Presbyterian cause probably not long after his return to England in the late summer of 1639. By the time of the issuing of the aforementioned Laudian *Canons* in 1640, Milton had decided against a formal religious vocation.³³ He committed himself instead to taking up arms for Protestant cause in an alternative arena: while the conflict between Charles and Parliament was heating up, Milton set out to defend the interests of religion and liberty of conscience against the incursions of the episcopate. In doing so, he does not rebel against civil authority. In fact in the antiprelatical tracts of 1641–42 he registers his continued support of monarchical government, answerable to the law and the interests of the people as represented by Parliament. Monarchy, he insists, is defined in terms of "the Liberty of the subject, and the supremacie of the King" (*CPW*, 1:592).

Church tyranny is Milton's enemy, which he brands as papistical. Popery is for him an external invader but also, as repeatedly observed in the present chapter, an internal adversary, manifested in the ungodly prelates and the archbishop of Canterbury, who conspire to usurp the authority of the English subjects and monarch. In a discussion of Milton's antiepiscopal prose, Thomas N. Corns refers to the polemicist's strategy of "cheerfully lump[ing] the errors of Protestant bishops with those of their Catholic predecessors" in an "exuberant disregard for church history."³⁴ The compressed history of the Postscript to the Smectymnuan *An Answer to a Booke* offers an illustration of this.³⁵ "A Postscript" traces England's church government since the establishment of the See of Canterbury, with its founder "Austin the Monk" (*CPW*, 1:966). Thereafter, Dunstan (the Anglo-Saxon archbishop of Canterbury), Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, and Archbishop Anselm, followed by a long line of English prelates through to the Elizabethan era, are indiscriminately accused of imposing Roman ceremonies on the church and subjecting kings and the state to the papal authority.

Roughly concurrent with his Postscript, *Of Reformation* traces the history of a church whose reforms are constantly intercepted and overturned by Romish intruders and imitators. At the outset of the tract, John

Wycliffe is credited with sparking reform through his opposition to papal authority and doctrine, but, explains Milton, his blaze was quenched by the pope and popish English dynasties, extending from Henry VIII (CPW, 1:525, 526). Designed to expose the connections between England and Rome, the pamphlet *The English Pope* declares that “*Roman Prelates*” seeking to erect an “*Ecclesiasticall Empire*” were discovered in England over a century ago and that Henry VIII made no attempt to deliver his “subjects liberty from popish thraldome.”³⁶ England, as Milton laments, was reduced to a schism and a scandal to the Reformation when the prelates restricted the ordination of ministers and introduced ceremonies into the liturgy, thus supporting “the *pompe* of *Prelatisme*” and sending the country “sliding back to *Rome*” (CPW, 1:527). The “*See of Canterbury*,” the seat of the archbishop’s authority, became a satellite for the papacy (CPW, 1:529). The elevation of the prelate will prove to be his tragic downfall, Milton predicts, as he divests the position and Laud himself of authority: “When hee steps up into the Chayre of *Pontificall Pride*, and changes a moderate and exemplary House, for a mis-govern’d and haughty *Palace*, *spirituall Dignity* for carnall *Precedence*, . . . then he *degrades*, then hee *un-Bishops* himselfe; hee that makes him *Bishop* makes him no *Bishop*” (CPW, 1:537–38).

Milton recounts that in the course of church history, and especially beginning with the rule of Constantine, the office of the ecclesiast became increasingly undemocratic in contrast to the communal arrangement of the primitive church. The “Canon-wise Prelate” was exalted at the expense of the people of God, the laity, whose status was diminished to that of “impure ethnicks, and lay dogs” (CPW, 1:547). Further, the prelates themselves, far from demonstrating their allegiance to king and country, became guilty of undermining both: “What good upholders of Royalty were the Bishops, when by their rebellious opposition against King John, Normandy was lost, he himself depos’d, and this Kingdom made over to the Pope” (CPW, 1:581). Since then, the episcopate had assumed the same tyrannical powers in England as the papists had on the Continent. Thus “wise and famous men” would support Milton’s verdict that “the Protestant *Episcopacie* in *England*” was as much to be feared as the papacy (CPW, 1:581). Had not English ecclesiasts disputed the supremacy of the monarchy? Certainly the chief ecclesiast was guilty of exactly that and thereby incriminated himself. Laud, Milton testifies, shortly after the

archbishop was impeached for treason, is “accus’d out of his owne Booke, and his *late Canons* to affect a certaine unquestionable *Patriarchat*, independent and unsubordinate to the Crowne” (CPW, 1:594). The aforementioned Laudian Canons rendered the church immune to Parliament’s authority. Underscoring the dangers posed by the bishops, Milton develops parallels between the episcopacy and the papacy: “If *Episcopacie* be taken for *Prelacie*, all the Ages they can deduce it through, will make it no more venerable then *Papacie*.” Juxtaposed in order to convey identification, “Episcopacie,” “Prelacie,” and “Papacie,” which converge in the “See of Canterbury,” constitute a “dolefull succession of illiterate and blind guides” (CPW, 1:602–3). As the See of Canterbury, Laud is a whole institution, which Milton seeks to dismantle. As he draws near to a conclusion in *Of Reformation*, Milton, still endorsing kingship, imagines the prospect of Charles governing without Laud: “The King shall sit without an old disturber, a dayly incroacher, and intruder” (CPW, 1:599).

The theme of the danger that popish English bishops pose to monarchs runs through Milton’s antiprelatical tracts, including not only *Of Reformation* and *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, produced about a month later (June or July 1641), but also *Animadversions* (July 1641), a response to the April 12, 1641, *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*, by Bishop Joseph Hall. Hall had been asked by Archbishop Laud to produce a defense of episcopacy, which was titled “Episcopacie by Divine Right Asserted” (February 10, 1640). The *Defence* sparked a print war over the subject of church government, about which Hall combated with the Smectymnuus authors. Milton entered the arena with his first two antiepiscopal tracts, while reserving his direct assaults on Hall for *Animadversions*, in which the Remonstrant is cast as a backer of Romish doctrines and practices. *Animadversions* aligns the Remonstrant or protester’s position on *jure divino* episcopacy with the pope’s own defiance about “his ungainsaid authority” (CPW, 1:674), the opponents of which are condemned as heretics. Milton hails the liberation of the nation by virtue of the distinctly Protestant protest against Romish superstition: “*Brittains* God hath reform’d his Church after many hundred yeers of *Popish* corruption,” releasing the people from the “intolerable yoke of *Prelats*, and *Papall* Discipline”—once again deemed as interchangeable (CPW, 1:704). “Every true protested *Brittaine*” must now render thanks that the night

of popish thralldom is giving way to “the morning beam of Reformation” (CPW, 1:704, 705).

The fourth antiprelatical pamphlet, *The Reason of Church-government Urg'd Against Prelaty*, again utilizes the genre of animadversion tract and countertract, as Milton opposes church tyranny, partly represented by bishops' return to the House of Commons on December 29, 1641. He excises them from history by cross-examining their defenders and by exposing their popish roots. Written in response to *Certain Briefe Treatises . . . Concerning the Ancient and Moderne Government of the Church* (1641), *Church-government* (CPW, 1:783) exposes the historical connection between the bishopric and the papacy.³⁷ Under the pretense of securing order, the office of the bishopric gave rise to the pope and papacy (CPW, 1:783). If all churches joined together under the prelacy in the name of quelling dissent, an “Arch-primat, or Protestant Pope” would emerge and issue a “finall pronounce or canon” (CPW, 1:783). The consequence thereof, Milton warns, would be the subjection of the people to servility, a betrayal of the liberation or deliverance promised by the Gospel. He also describes the corresponding social, material, and legal violations committed by the prelates who deprive citizens of their civic rights and estates: when “they have stufft their Idolish temples with the wastefull pillage of your estates,” they will, like the merchants of Babylon—identified with Rome—sell your souls, “your bodies, your wives, your children, your liberties, your Parlements,” and, “by their corrupt and servile doctrines,” permanently enslave you (CPW, 1:851).

IV

In the same year as *Church-government* was produced, the aforementioned John Pym, the unofficial head of Parliament, appealed for the indulgence of supplicants, especially those pleading for free speech. “This great Councell . . . is the soul of the Common-wealth, wherein one may hear and see, all the grievances of the Subjects . . . amongst whom, the greatest priviledge is liberty of Speech.”³⁸ The “company of Seminary Priests” that exists as long as papal agents continue to infest England, explains Pym, endangers the church from without, but as great a danger lies

within, from those who serve the church for the sake of worldly preferences.³⁹ Milton's speech "For the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing," begins as Pym's did by flattering Parliament for its willingness to hear its citizens' appeals: after rehearsing the epigraph from Euripides appearing on the title page to *Areopagitica*, in which he states, "This is true Liberty when free born men / Having to advise the public may speak free," Milton in his exordium declares, "When complaints are freely heard, deeply consider'd, and speedily reform'd, then is the utmost bound of civill liberty attain'd, that wise men looke for" (*CPW*, 2:487). Liberation from Rome is hailed thereafter as an act of God and secondarily as the work of the Lords and Commons of England. As noted above, the assault on Catholicism prevalent throughout *Areopagitica* is partly a recrimination against the Laudian church, but it is also aimed at the very Parliament whose "laudable deeds" and "indefatigable vertues" Milton otherwise celebrates (*CPW*, 2:487). *Areopagitica* was in preparation during Laud's trial (which ended August 31), and the Areopagus serves for Milton as the site of the inquisition of the Laudian institution and the corresponding policies of the Roman Church. At the same time Milton urges Parliament, which adopted those policies by reintroducing licensing, to repeal its own oppressive quasi-popish practices.

In July 1641, Star Chamber and the High Commission were abolished, and with that the jurisdiction that the bishops held over licensing ended. But in 1643, the Stationers Company was invested with the power to regulate the printing trade by searching printing houses, seizing presses, and apprehending authors, printers, bookbinders, and distributors of "scandalous or unlicensed" materials.⁴⁰ Milton's defense of critical reading involves a rebuke of governmental authorities who, in imitation of the church prelates, enforce censorship, prohibit book publication, and discourage active interpretation, thus thwarting the progress of the Reformation. Laud may be on trial and "the Prelats" may have "expir'd" (*CPW*, 2:491) on February 13, 1642 (insofar as they were removed from the House of Lords and deprived of their authority over licensing),⁴¹ but various vestiges of Laudianism remained intact. "The ghost of a linen decency yet haunts us" (*CPW*, 2:564), Milton complains. The ghost lingered after the scaffold took care of the rest.

In *Areopagitica*, Milton's most optimistic statement on England's Reformation, the nation is figured as chosen and privileged by virtue of

the “great measure of truth which [it] enjoy[s], especially in those main points between us and the pope, with his appertinences the Prelats” (CPW, 2:549). The political institution of the papacy stands in the way of true liberty, the cherished value and defining feature of the Reformation. “The Popes of *Rome*” were the first censors, Milton, reminds his audience; “Engrossing what they pleas’d of Politicall rule into their owne hands, [the papists] extended their dominion over mens eyes, as they had before over their judgements, burning and prohibiting to be read, what they fansied not” (CPW, 2:501–2). Having historicized the connection between Rome and licensing in his oration, Milton challenges Parliament to reaffirm the difference between the liberty-embracing English nation and intolerant foreign papists. In *Areopagitica*, censorship is represented as Romish, as well as Spanish, but this originally popish practice threatens England from within: the English press is “gag[ed]” by its own ecclesiasts (CPW, 2:519). The situation is thus all the more complicated when the tyranny Milton exposes and rails against prevails even after the “Bishops [were] abrogated and voided out of the Church” (CPW, 2:541). Maintained by a system in which “Episcopall arts begin to bud again” (CPW, 2:541), the restraint of press freedoms is upheld by parliamentary issued licensing policies whose associations with Romish censorial and Inquisitorial operations Milton was determined to publish and censure.

Areopagitica outlines strategies for combating popish influences and effects on various fronts, including at the level of the individual, whose spiritual inertia, Milton warns, leads to errancy: “There is not any burden that som would gladlier post off to another, then the charge and care of their Religion. There be, who knows not that there be of Protestants and professors who live and dye in as arrant an implicit faith, as any lay Papist of Loretto” (CPW, 2:543–44). Errant faith is untried and untested and, in its stagnation, breeds superstition even among Protestants, Milton is keen to emphasize. *Areopagitica* thus sets up comparisons between “the dignity of labour, manual and intellectual, and . . . the lazy, loitering easy life readily imaged in the beneficed clergy or Roman church,” as Michael Wilding observes.⁴² When Milton translates the obligations and rights of the people as God’s chosen into civil rights and individual liberties, he further distances Protestant expressions of faith from an “implicit faith” and from the blunting and numbing doctrine and discipline of the

Roman Catholic Church. To resist popery is to promote “reason, scripture, and conscience,” which is Milton’s rallying cry throughout his anti-episcopal tracts.⁴³ The exercise of the faculty of reason and the active engagement with scripture ward off superstition and its custodians.

Does the antipopery of *Areopagitica* compromise the defense of liberty of speech? Not at all, Milton protests. An intolerant religion invalidates itself: while toleration should be broadly extended to embrace as many Christians as possible, “Popery,” that is, “open superstition,” is intolerable: “As it extirpats all religions and civill supremacies, so it self should be extirpat” (*CPW*, 2:565). Though a papist practice, censorship can justly be used to rein in papists, and thus what may appear to qualify or even subvert his argument for freedom of the press is turned into a principle assured of achieving consensus and broad support. Resistance to Catholic and Episcopalian authoritarianism brings Protestants into agreement with each other. By establishing common ground through the opposition to popish conformity, Milton takes the first step toward confronting Parliament about a licensing act that he codes as Romish.

The scene of the Court of the Areopagus gives way only a short while later to a site of judgment on Tower Hill: “This is a very uncomfortable place to preach in,” confessed Laud in his final performance—on the scaffold. At the same time that he defends his work as archbishop in his last dying speech, Laud laments the rise of dissenters who destabilize the true Protestant religion and nation: “The Pope never had such an harvest since the Reformation as he hath now by these sects that are among us.”⁴⁴ In his last breath, Laud again identifies as his primary target the sectaries who impede the progress of the Reformation and thereby inadvertently aid the pope’s cause. When Laud was executed, Samuel Pecke printed a transcript of the archbishop’s speech in his *Perfect Diurnall*. Although clearly a Puritan partisan, Pecke gave his adversaries space to air their views, but not without his own animadversions, which he describes as “observations.” All the interpolations in the transcription of Laud’s speech implicate the archbishop in popery.⁴⁵ “If the Pope heard you,” states Pecke, in response to Laud’s declaration that the pope is reaping the benefits of internal divisions in England, “heed [he would] *scarce believe you in this; what? a better Harvest than when Jesuites, Priests and Fryers, and a world of Popish trumperie were tollerated.*”⁴⁶ Pecke is determined to pen the last words for Laud, whose reputation as an apologist for Rome would

follow him to the grave and beyond. When William Prynne in 1646, for example, retried his late persecutor, he again highlighted the archbishop's indulgence of the pope and Romish priests and decried his hostility to the Reformed churches and the Reformation movement.⁴⁷

This chapter has sought to unsettle the binary between English Protestantism and Roman Catholicism in a review of Milton's early condemnation of Laud. The antiepiscopal tracts in particular exhibit Milton's elision of differences between Laudianism and popery and his politicization of both. For Milton, for whom a key polemical strategy in the works on church government is the repeated reinforcement of the prelacy-papacy connection, the Reformation remains a protestation; and given that the shadow of Rome still hangs over the state and church, the English religion is defined in terms of opposition or negation as Protestantism (after the Lutheran *protestatio*). *Areopagitica* builds on the antiprelatical writings by identifying licensing with a Romish Laudian era (CPW, 2:555). But Milton has another objective in mind in *Areopagitica*: the anti-Catholic directive and imperative designed to unite Protestants gives way to affirmations of liberty and prepares the way for the accommodation of those "cry'd out against for schismaticks and sectaries," whom Laud especially despised (CPW, 2:555). "Many moderat varieties and brotherly dissimilitudes" make up the new "Temple of the Lord" Milton envisions, soon to be reconceived as an invisible church (CPW, 2:555). The erection of the heterodox Reformed church in the place of Laud's "mis-govern'd and haughty *Palace*" (CPW, 1:537) would represent the ultimate victory in the disciplinary controversy, the debate over church government, and the "wars of Truth" (CPW, 2:562) that constituted Milton's civil war.

NOTES

1. Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), 64; *A Letter from a Gentleman of the Romish Religion, To his Brother a Person of Quality of the same Religion* (London, 1674), 27, 26. William Castell notes the Jesuits' argument that princes should be subordinate to the pope, who has the power to depose kings (*The Jesuits undermining of parliaments and Protestants with their foolish phancy of a toleration, discovered, and censured* [London, 1642], 2).

2. Peter Lake, "Anti-popery: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), 91, 96. On early modern anti-Catholic rhetoric, see Martin J. Havran, *The Catholics in Caroline England* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1962); Arthur Marotti, ed., *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1999); Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Ethan H. Shagan, ed., *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005); Raymond Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660–1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

3. Don M. Wolfe, introduction to *CPW*, 1:70–72.

4. Lake, "Anti-popery," 83.

5. John Pym, *March 17. Master Pym's Speech in Parliament* (London, 1641/2), 6.

6. John T. Shawcross, "'Connivers and the Worst of Superstitions': Milton on Popery and Toleration," *Literature and History*, 3rd ser., 7, no. 2 (1998): 57.

7. John Milton, "In Quintum Novembris," in *The Shorter Poems*, ed. Barbara K. Lewalski and Estelle Hann, *CWJM*, 3:166. Quotations of Milton's shorter poems are taken from this edition.

8. Thomas N. Corns, "James I," in *The Milton Encyclopedia*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), 190. See, for example, *CWJM*, 6:357–58.

9. Stephen B. Dobranski, "Principle and Politics in *Areopagitica*," in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 195.

10. Elizabeth Sauer, "Milton and Caroline Church Government," *Yearbook of English Studies* 44 (2014): 199–200; John Spencer Hill, *John Milton: Poet, Priest and Prophet: A Study of Divine Vocation in Milton's Poetry and Prose* (London: Macmillan, 1979), 39–40; Thomas N. Corns, "Milton before 'Lycidas,'" in *Milton and the Terms of Liberty*, ed. Graham Parry and Joad Raymond (Cambridge: Brewer, 2002), 23–36; Edward Jones, "Milton's Life, 1608–1640," in *Oxford Handbook of Milton*, ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 13; Edward Jones, ed. *Young Milton: The Emerging Author, 1620–1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Nicholas McDowell, "The Caroline Court," in *Milton in Context*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 237–47; Neil Forsyth, "The English Church," in Dobranski, *Milton in Context*, 296,

298. On Milton's "disengagement" from Laudianism, see also Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 95.

11. Lake, "Anti-popery," 79.

12. John Cosin, *Collection of Private Devotions: In the Practise of the Ancient Church, Called the Houres of Prayer* (London, 1627).

13. William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome. or The First Part of a Compleat History of The Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of WILLIAM LAUD Late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* (London 1646), 93 (misnumbered in original source).

14. *Diurnall Occurrences* (1641), quoted in *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes: From the Beginning of the Long Parliament to the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford*, ed. Wallace Notestein (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1923), 57n20.

15. William Prynne, *A Briefe Suruay and Censure of Mr Cozens his Couzening Deuotions Prouing both the Forme and Matter of Mr Cozens his Booke . . . to be Meerely Popish* (London 1628), 3, 82.

16. H. B. (Henry Burton), *A Tryall of Private Devotions: or, a Diall for the Houres of Prayer* (London 1628), A4r, Hr.

17. Venice: May 16–31, 1637, in *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, vol. 24, 1636–1639, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: HMSO, 1923), 210–18. See also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 61–62.

18. William Prynne, *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud . . . Collected and Published . . . as a Necessary Prologue to the History of His Tryall* (London, 1644), 21.

19. Venice: November 13, 1637, in Hinds, *Calendar*, 24: 312–28.

20. Bastwick identifies Laud as pope in his account of the Puritans' pilorying in *A Breife Relation of Certain Speciall and Most Materiall Passages . . . June the 14th. 1637. At the censure of those three worthy Gentlemen, Dr. Bastwicke, Mr. Burton and Mr. Prynne* (Amsterdam, 1638), 16.

21. A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 64, 77. As Laud declared at his trial, no "understanding Papist" could be persuaded and converted by the denunciation of the Pope as Anti-Christ (William Laud, *The History of the Troubles and Tryal of . . . Laud, The Works of . . . William Laud*, ed. W. Scott and J. Bliss, 7 vols. [Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847–60], 4:309).

22. Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49, no. 4 (1998): 639.

23. Venice: May 16–31, 1637, in Hinds, *Calendar*, 24:217.

24. Michael C. Questier, ed., *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1621–1638: Catholicism and the Politics of the Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 19.

25. Ibid., 21n62. That Laud rejected Catholicism as he rejected Puritanism is discussed in Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642*, 10 vols. (1884; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1965), 7:301–2.

26. Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 938–39.

27. See, for example, *Sir Francis Seymour his honourable, and worthy speech, spoken in the high court of Parliament . . . And how the splendor of His Majestyes glory is eclipsed with toleration of Iesuits, seminary priests, and bad ministers* (London 1641).

28. *The First and Large Petition of the City of London and of Other Inhabitants Thereabouts: For a Reformation in Church-government, as also for the Abolishment of Episcopacy* (London, 1641), in CPW, 1:976–84; *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (London, May 17, 1640), E203 (2), sig. B6.

29. See Catherine Gimelli Martin, “Italy,” in Dobranski, *Milton in Context*, 319–22.

30. Diana Trevino Benet, “The Escape from Rome,” in *Milton in Italy: Contexts, Images, Contradictions*, ed. Mario A. Di Cesare (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1991), 47.

31. Barbara K. Lewalski, *Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 98–99.

32. Nicolaas Heinsius, “Letter to Isaac Vossius” (1653), quoted in *The Life Records of John Milton*, ed. J. Milton French, 5 vols. (1949–58; repr., New York: Gordian Press, 1966), 3:321; trans. David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, 6 vols. (1877; repr., Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1965), 4:475.

33. Hill, *John Milton*, 49. This was in part an expression of his opposition to the prelatical system (John T. Shawcross, *The Arms of the Family: The Significance of John Milton's Relatives and Associates* [Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004], 179).

34. Thomas N. Corns, “Milton's Antiprelatical Tracts and the Marginality of Doctrine,” in *Milton and Heresy*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski and John P. Rumrich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 43.

35. See Don Wolfe, preface and notes to “A Postscript,” in CPW, 1:961–65.

36. *The English Pope, or a Discourse Wherein the Late Mystickall Intelligence betwixt the Court of England, and the Court of Rome is in Part Discovered* (1643), 3–4.

37. *Certain Briefe Treatises, Written by Diverse Learned Men, Concerning the Ancient and Moderne Government of the Church. Wherein . . . the Primitive Institution of EPISCOPACIE is Maintained* (Oxford, 1641).

38. Pym, "March 17. Master Pym's Speech," 3.
39. *Ibid.*, 4.
40. "The Licensing Order of 1643," ed. Ernest Sirluck (1959), in *CPW*, 2:798.
41. Episcopacy itself, however, was not abolished until October 9, 1646.
42. Michael Wilding, "Milton's *Areopagitica*: Liberty for the Sects," in *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategies from Milton to Junius*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (London: Routledge, 1987), 17.
43. Corns, "Milton's Antiprelatical Tracts," 47.
44. *A Perfect Diurnall of Some Passages in Parliament*, no. 76 (January 6–13, 1645), 603, 604; see also William Laud, "The Speech of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, spoken at his Death, upon the Scaffold on the Tower-hill, Jan. 10, 1644," in Laud, *History of the Troubles*, 4:430–40.
45. *Perfect Diurnall*, January 10, 1645, 603.
46. *Ibid.*, 604.
47. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, e.g., 391.

