as chapter epigrams. Of special interest is Sawyer’s use of Ephelia’s exercise in alchemical verse, “To Phylocles, inviting him to Friendship” (Female Poems, 1679, 85-86, 28 lines), which opens with a fine salutation: “Best of thy Sex!” This charming poem on the melding of genders (“We’ll mix our souls”) certainly sounds like chaste, pre-emptive writing from Mary Villiers to her ‘Phylocles’ (lover of fame), Prince Rupert, during the first stirrings of their romance. Finally, being a novel, there are a few predictable fictions in Sawyer’s reconstruction—e.g., Richard Gibson painting Mary Villiers, Anne Shepherd Gibson secreting away Mary’s poems in a glove-case, Mary’s tragic souvenir, being the knife which killed her father—but these indulgences ‘work’ so very well we fancy they could be true. Scholars of the seventeenth century will find this book enchanting, and they will see familiar and new personalities through a creative but accurate lens.


Nicholas Tyacke is well known to literary and church historians—and to all students of early modern England—for his highly influential Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). His research was among the first to chart a distinctive new course in our understanding of post-Reformation England, but it is only the most familiar of the numerous works by this distinguished historian. In his honor, a number of friends and colleagues have now brought together fourteen essays that variously address many of the issues that have concerned Tyacke over the years.

These essays are of uniformly high quality. Some are very specialized, and examine little known archival and manuscript documents, such as Kenneth Fincham’s study of “The Religious Legacy of the Interregnum at St. George Trombland, Norwich,” which appears last in the collection. Yet this local controversy over the removal of a gallery across the east end of the chancel, built in 1652 to provide more seating for the godly auditory, is shown to have significant
implications for our better understanding of the interaction of opposing groups—dissenters and conformists—during the turbulent years of change from Commonwealth to Restoration. Fincham suggests that we consider the case of the troublesome gallery as symbolic of a more general and widely dispersed cultural movement.

The thirteen essays that precede Fincham’s share with his study a similar design. Each one moves from a particular investigation to a broad and interpretive theme. Apart from this general ambition, there are few obvious links or connections between most of these essays; they do portray, of course, broad concern for early modern England, and they all exemplify thorough and impressive scholarship. Each of the authors offers an essay according to personal inclination, and so the volume is an agreeable miscellany with no obvious overarching theme, plan, or organization—features common to many a Festschrift.

The volume begins with an introductory essay by Peter Lake who describes Nicholas Tyacke’s special contribution to controversies about “Puritanism and Arminianism.” Tyacke expounded a thesis as early as 1973 on the rise of Arminianism that “was integrated almost immediately into what emerged over the next ten or fifteen years as the distinctively revisionist account of the period: an account in which the English civil war emerged not as the ‘first modern revolution’ but rather as the ‘last of the wars of religion,’ in causing which the rise of Arminianism, rather than of a revolutionary or proto-revolutionary puritanism, played a crucial role” (3). Lake describes in some detail the historiographical situation in which Tyacke presented, and continues to offer his work.

Each of the essays in this rich volume offers an important insight or observation, yet several of them are especially noteworthy. Keith Thomas, in writing on “Art and Iconoclasm in Early Modern England,” describes and reviews the wholesale destruction by protestant reformers of sacred images depicted in windows, sculptures, and paintings; and he asks whether we may fairly condemn these reformers as haters and trivializers of art and beauty. Perhaps some were, but their main intention was not “the total rejection of art” (38). What they achieved, in fact, was a splitting off of art from faith by setting up “a lasting conflict” between them (39).
Diarmaid MacCulloch, in “The Latitude of the Church of England,” cogently sketches the generous theological room extended by the English church from pre-Restoration times up to the late seventeenth century. He very correctly invokes the importance of Strassburg and above all of Bullinger’s Zürich—not Calvin’s Geneva. Heinrich Bullinger’s *Decades* (translated into English in 1577) was to have a huge influence on “conformist” Elizabethan bishops; on Archbishop Whitgift himself; on Richard Hooker, the greatest philosophic theologian of the age; and on Lancelot Andrewes, whose lectures in the 1590s at St. Giles Cripplegate expounded views in sympathy with these “advanced” reformers. Andrewes preached conformism by criticizing strict predestination, by emphasizing the liturgical year, by regularly celebrating the eucharist, and by indicating that consubstantiation embodies the Real Presence. The St.Giles lectures, published as *Apostasmatia Sacra* (1657), which MacCulloch cites, are indeed central in showing Andrewes’s beliefs, as a recently discovered manuscript of the lectures confirms (probably appearing too late for mention here, but which I described in *English Manuscript Studies* 13 2007).

One other essay deserves special mention. Anthony Milton’s perceptive essay about Bishop John Overall sharply expands our knowledge of this little discussed and inadequately understood churchman. “‘Anglicanism’ by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall” nicely corroborates MacCulloch’s essay by extending the ecclesiastical significance of the generation of Hooker and Andrewes to the emergence of mainstream “Anglican” methodology of the 1620s and later. Overall preached vehemently against predestinarianism; but he also keenly defended and emphasized ceremonialism and ritualism—whatever, indeed, he felt would stir up suitable devotion. His influence certainly affected Richard Mountagu’s *Appello Caesarem* (1625) and John Cosin’s *A Collection of Private Devotions* (1627), as well as other controversial works, and undoubtedly helped to form the thought of many Laudian divines. Milton argues convincingly for Overall’s significance on many fronts; he was above all “one of the first divines to create for the Church of England a coherent theological identity” (171), for the Church’s “doctrine was to be read not just in its confessional articles, but in its liturgy” (172).
One may take into account only a little of this fascinating collection of historical essays, so filled with ingenious and trenchant arguments: Thomas S. Freeman on Pope Joan and Reformation England; Brett Usher on the many ways in which Elizabethans regarded Puritanism; Patrick Collinson on Puritan nomenclature; Paul Seaver on the variety of patronage of Puritan preachers; Susan Harman Moore on the fate of New England’s “Reformation”; Thomas Cogswell on the family history of the notorious John Felton; Richard Cust’s sympathetic portrait of Charles I and his belief in divine providence; William Sheils on the fortunes in peace and war of two remarkable civic preachers in Yorkshire.

There is a brief preface, a list of commonly appearing abbreviations, and an index of names; but no biographical notices are given for any of the contributors, nor, oddly, for such a volume as this, a biography of the honoree, or a general list of his publications. The editors seem not to have taken sufficient care for stylistic consistency. For example, some essayists modernize quotations, others do not. Notes, fortunately at the bottom of each page where citations appear, are usually careful and informative, but might have been more scrupulously checked. For one example, Diarmaid MacCulloch miscites the Folger Library Edition of Hooker in note 59 of his essay: W. Speed Hill (not ‘W. R. Speed Hill’) is the general editor of the edition, and only 5, not 7 volumes were published at Cambridge (by Harvard UP). Occasionally, some authors fall into rather casual and informal diction, others maintain a more formal and academic mode; and often one feels that an author is still working on an early draft, as in Peter Lake’s “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” which seems repetitive and confusing. But both he and his co-editor Kenneth Fincham, together with their other contributors, have produced a splendid and highly rewarding volume.