

Hakryang Seo

Episcopalian or Presbyterian?

Cornelius Burgess (1589?-1665)
on Church Government



Reformed Historical Theology

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

In co-operation with
Andreas J. Beck, Emidio Campi, Irene Dingel, Benyamin F. Intan,
Elsie Anne McKee, Richard A. Muller and Risto Saarinen

Volume 86

Hakryang Seo

Episcopalian or Presbyterian?

Cornelius Burgess (1589?–1665) on Church Government

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <https://dnb.de>.

© 2026 by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Robert-Bosch-Breite 10, D-37079 Göttingen, Germany,
an imprint of the Brill-Group
(Koninklijke Brill BV, Leiden, The Netherlands; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd,
Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Germany, Brill Österreich GmbH, Vienna, Austria)
Koninklijke Brill BV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schönigh, Brill Fink,
Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by
any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information
storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Cover design: SchwabScantechnik, Göttingen
Typesetting: le-tex publishing services, Leipzig
Printed and bound: Elanders Waiblingen, Waiblingen
Printed in the EU

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

E-Mail: info@v-r.de

ISSN 2197-1137

ISBN 978-3-647-50245-8

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	9
Abbreviations	11
1. Introduction	13
1.1 Doctrinal and Ecclesiological Diversity	13
1.2 Church Government	18
1.3 Reformed Episcopalians	20
1.4 English Presbyterianism before the Westminster Assembly	23
1.5 The Westminster Assembly	29
1.6 Cornelius Burgess	35
1.6.1 Studies on Cornelius Burgess on Other Theological Issues	36
1.6.2 Studies on Cornelius Burgess’s Thoughts on Church Government	38
1.7 Primary Sources and Outline of Study	40
1.8 Thesis and Purpose of Study	42
2. Son of the Church of England: The Canons, Reformed Conformists, and Cornelius Burgess’s Thoughts on Church Government	43
2.1 The Canons of the Church of England of 1604 and <i>The Forme and maner</i> of 1607	45
2.1.1 Episcopacy in the Canons of 1604	48
2.1.2 Episcopacy in <i>The Forme and maner</i> of 1607	49
2.2 The Thoughts of Reformed Conformists on Episcopacy	52
2.2.1 Hadrian Saravia	53
2.2.2 George Downham	57
2.2.3 George Carleton	59
2.3 Cornelius Burgess’s <i>The Grounds of Devinity</i>	64
2.3.1 “I beleieve the holy Catholique xch[church]”	65
2.3.2 The Ordination of Church Officers	68
2.3.2.1 The authority to ordain a church officer	68
2.3.2.2 The eligibility for church officers	70
2.3.2.3 The several degrees of church offices	71
2.3.2.4 The ceremony in ordination	72
2.3.3 The Imposition of Ceremonies	72

2.3.3.1	The church's authority to impose ceremonies	72
2.3.3.2	The church's authority to bind people to perform the imposed ceremonies	73
2.3.4	Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction	75
2.3.4.1	The punishment	76
2.3.4.2	The offence and the excommunication	76
2.3.4.3	The church officers who possessed this authority	76
2.3.5	Summary	77
2.4	Conclusion	78
3.	The Laudian Reform and the Need for Reform	83
3.1	Case Study 1: Reading the Book of Common Prayer before Preaching . .	87
3.2	Case Study 2: A Sermon on Mark 9:50, <i>Sal Ecclesiasticus</i>	90
3.2.1	The Contents of the Latin Sermon	91
3.2.2	The Elements That May Have Displeased the Laudians	98
3.3	Case Study 3: Episcopacie by Divine Right	103
3.4	Case Study 4: The Canons of 1640	109
3.5	Conclusion	115
4.	Cornelius Burgess's Public Business and His Thoughts on Church Government	119
4.1	Historical Context: Limiting Episcopal Form	122
4.1.1	Aldermanbury Group and the Concept of Limited Episcopacy . .	122
4.1.2	Suggestions for Limiting Episcopacy	124
4.1.3	Scottish Opposition to (Limited) Episcopacy	126
4.2	Cornelius Burgess and the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance . . .	130
4.2.1	Burgess and the Bishops' Sole Power in Ordination and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction	133
4.2.2	Voting Rights for Bishops in the House of Lords	136
4.2.3	Removal of Deans and Chapters	141
4.3	The "Turbulent Doctor" and the Solemn League and Covenant	143
4.3.1	Cornelius Burgess and the Fast Sermon for the Covenant with God	143
4.3.2	Calling "a free synode of grave ministers of this nation"	147
4.3.3	Cornelius Burgess and the Solemn League and Covenant	151
4.4	Conclusion	155
5.	Cornelius Burgess's Presbyterian Form at the Westminster Assembly	159
5.1	Cornelius Burgess and the Keys	162
5.2	Cornelius Burgess and the Ordinary Offices	166
5.2.1	Cornelius Burgess and the Office of Teacher	168

5.2.2	Cornelius Burgess and the Office of Church Governor (Ruling Elder)	170
5.2.3	Cornelius Burgess and the Office of Deacon	174
5.2.4	Subconclusion	176
5.3	Cornelius Burgess and Several Sorts of Assemblies	177
5.3.1	Under One Presbytery	178
5.3.2	Ascending and Descending	180
5.3.3	Subconclusion	184
5.4	Cornelius Burgess and <i>Ius Divinum</i>	185
5.5	Conclusion	187
6.	The Final Stage of Cornelius Burgess's Life and Conclusion	191
6.1	The Final Period of Burgess's Life	191
6.2	<i>Reasons Shewing the Necessity of Reformation and No Sacrilege nor Sinne</i>	194
6.2.1	Not Iure Divino	195
6.2.2	Same Order between Presbyters and Bishops	196
6.2.3	Power of Ordination and of Jurisdiction	198
6.2.4	Preaching the Word of God	199
6.3	Conclusion	201
	Bibliography	203
	Manuscripts	203
	Index	221

Acknowledgements

My sustained interest in Presbyterianism and the Westminster Assembly has led me to this point. While many figures of the Assembly have been the subject of previous scholarship, and others will continue to receive attention, this study has focused on a particular participant whose complex life and work have deepened not only my understanding but also my personal reflection. Engaging with both his strengths and limitations has reminded me of my own frailties, and of the many individuals to whom I am indebted for their support and encouragement along this journey.

Above all, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my primary supervisor, Dr. Randall Pederson, whose patient and generous guidance greatly improved my work—especially as I navigated academic writing in a second language. I am equally thankful to my co-advisor, Dr. Jonathon D. Beeke, for his consistent encouragement and careful feedback, which helped shape this dissertation into a more coherent whole. I also acknowledge with appreciation the support of Dr. Greg A. Salazar and Dr. Stephen G. Myers during the proposal stage and comprehensive examinations.

I am grateful to Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary (PRTS), not only for providing a rigorous and Christ-centered academic environment, but also for the many faculty members who contributed to my growth. Dr. Adriaan C. Neele and Dr. Daniel C. Timmer, as former and current directors of the doctoral program, offered prayerful guidance through various stages of the program. I also thank Dr. William Vandoodewaard, Dr. David Murray, and Dr. Greg Salazar for their teaching on the Scottish Reformation, the Westminster Assembly, and Puritan theology—all of which left a lasting impression on my research. I am likewise indebted to the visiting scholars whose lectures helped me develop a broader and deeper understanding of the field.

My sincere thanks go to the PRTS library staff, especially Laura Ladwig and Namsik Yang, for their resourceful assistance, as well as to Fraser Jones for his careful proofreading. The fellowship of fellow students, often rooted in shared conversations about piety and faith, was a source of ongoing encouragement.

This project involved extensive archival work, and I gratefully acknowledge the support of the staff at the Cambridge University Library (Department of Archives and Modern Manuscripts), the London Metropolitan Archives, and the Bodleian Libraries (Department of Special Collections). I also thank the Folger Shakespeare Library for granting Research Privileges, which enabled access to key resources, including State Papers.

Throughout this journey, the ministry of local churches has been indispensable. Though now dissolved, First Reformed Presbyterian Church of Grand Rapids first

welcomed our family into Presbyterian church life, and Rev. Craig Scott's faithful preaching helped sustain our focus on Christ amid the challenges of living abroad. His wife, Rebekah Scott, offered invaluable practical support during our transition to life in the United States. Likewise, Reformation Orthodox Presbyterian Church received us with warmth and care. I am especially thankful to Dr. David and Mrs. Tara Noe for their exceptional kindness and to the many church members who shared fellowship with our family.

I also thank my family, whose love and support have been my constant strength. I am deeply grateful to my parents, Myung Seo and Jiyoung Lee, and to my parents-in-law, Yongchul Kwak and Kyunghyang Seo, for their unwavering encouragement. To my wife, Minyoung Kwak—my closest companion and truest friend—I owe more than words can express. Her patience and faithfulness have sustained me. To our children, Lynn, Ohnn, and Hyeon, your joy and love have been a daily blessing.

Finally, I give all praise and thanksgiving to God, who calls and preserves His church through Christ. Though she may appear weak and frail on earth, the church will one day stand as the glorious bride of her Savior.

Abbreviations

BL	British Library
Bodl	Bodleian Library
CUL	Cambridge University Library
SP	State Papers

1. Introduction

1.1 Doctrinal and Ecclesiological Diversity

When considering the Reformation or the Post-Reformation eras, historians of late have focused on the doctrinal and ecclesiological diversity within these periods. This is also true when considering the religious reformation in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Previous binary classifications no longer serve as definitive systems of historical-theological analysis.

Likewise, scholars of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English Reformation have shifted away from the binary framework. In his *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, Patrick Collinson expressed a refusal “to enter at any depth into the debate over the meaning and the very existence of the concepts of Puritanism and Anglicanism.”¹ This was a paradigm shift in understanding Puritanism. Before the work of Collinson, the predominant views could be divided into two categories: “extrinsic/secular” historians and “intrinsic/denominational” historians and theologians.² Although there were differences between them, they also shared an assumption that Puritanism—those who had independent thoughts not only on theology but also on politics and culture—was contrasted with Anglicanism, which described those who tried to defend and maintain the status quo of the state and the church. However, as Collinson pointed out, the term ‘Anglicanism’ is anachronistic.³ Although it was needed as an antithesis for the explanation of Puritanism’s attempt to oppose and transform the status quo of the state and the church, the term ‘Anglicanism’ “was a term unknown to the sixteenth century, and an indication of a distinct system of divinity, an invention of the nineteenth.”⁴ Collinson described how Puritans were involved in the established Church of England and tried to reform the Church within the established episcopal system. Collinson provided one of the examples, which indicated that Elizabethan presbyterians tried to set up a “presbytery in Episcopacy.”⁵

1 Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967), 13.

2 Peter Lake, “The Historiography of Puritanism,” in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 351; Greg A. Salazar, *Calvinist Conformity in Post-Reformation England: The Theology and Career of Daniel Featley*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 1–16.

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

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

5 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 329.

Although the dichotomist view of Puritanism and Anglicanism collapsed, an alternative binary system was designed to explain conflicts in the Church of England at that time. There has been a trend among historians to reevaluate the role of John Calvin in the development of Reformation and post-Reformation theology, such that many no longer view him solely as a benchmark for judging the ideas of his era but rather analyze him alongside his contemporary Reformers.⁶ In a seminal essay, Nicholas Tyacke offered an alternative to the Puritanism-versus-Anglicanism dichotomy by focusing on “the rise to power of Arminianism in the 1620s.”⁷ Tyacke argued that the royal absolutism and Arminianism in the religious policy of Charles I “became closely identified in the popular mind” so Arminianism had an important role in the bond between Calvinist Puritans and Calvinist bishops of the established Church.⁸ Other scholars attached the nickname “Calvinist consensus” to the bond.⁹ According to Tyacke, the Calvinist consensus played an important role in uniting moderate puritans and Calvinist conformists in the Church of England. However, the Arminian innovations in doctrine and practice severed the bond and even became the driving force of the English Civil War.¹⁰

According to Kenneth Fincham, Tyacke’s dichotomy posing Calvinists against Arminians was helpful in describing the interactions among bishops and the godly in the Church of England. Fincham’s argument was that due to their “rival visions of the episcopal office,” while Calvinist bishops tried to adopt the image of the “preaching pastor,” their Arminian counterparts regarded the bishop as a “custodian of order.”¹¹

However, this binary frame of Calvinism versus Arminianism was attacked by Peter White. White argued that “the model of a theological dichotomy between ‘Calvinism’ and ‘Arminianism’ was simply inadequate for understanding either the overall development of doctrine in the Reformation period, or of personal

6 Cf. Basil Hall, “Calvin Against the Calvinists,” in *John Calvin: A Collection of Distinguished Essays*, ed. Gervase Duffield (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 19–37; R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); Paul Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982); Richard A. Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 11–30.

7 Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” in *The Origins of the English Civil War*, ed. Conrad Russell (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973), 119.

8 Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” 140.

9 Lake, “The Historiography of Puritanism,” 353.

10 Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), xii–xiii.

11 Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 5.

allegiances within it.”¹² White demonstrated this by examining the doctrine of predestination from the Elizabethan period to the beginning of the Civil War in the Church of England. Although White indicated the differences between Reformed theologians’ understanding of the doctrine of predestination, hence questioning the term ‘Calvinists,’ he reused the term Anglicanism to describe William Laud’s theological notions, which were not, according to White, opposed to Calvin nor Beza but followed the traditional Anglican ideas. Kevin Sharpe also agreed that the program of Laud for “the reformation of the church of England” was regarded as a “broader quest for an earlier order.”¹³

Peter Lake in his *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* provided Puritans who “sought to negotiate that choice and still retain both their self-image as ‘Puritan,’ principled members of the most godly and committed section of English protestant opinion, and their active role within the established church.”¹⁴ Puritans now were to be explained not in binary terms but by various degrees in “style of piety, vision of the nature of the godly community and of that community’s relations with both the national church and the wider social order.”¹⁵ Therefore, not all Puritans “were formally nonconformists.”¹⁶

Anthony Milton also argued that in terms of religious matters in the Jacobean and Caroline period, people quarreled with each other not about “single doctrinal issues” but about various doctrinal issues.¹⁷ It is misleading to divide “the church along either simple Anglican/Puritan or Calvinist/Arminian lines.”¹⁸ Therefore, Milton argued for “a broad spectrum of views running from crypto-popish ‘Arminian’ zealots on the one hand, through to die-hard Puritan nonconformists on the other.”¹⁹ There was flexibility among “Calvinists,” “anti-papal divines,” and a “non-Laudian position.”²⁰ Furthermore, Milton also pointed out the process of change or development from 1600 to 1640 in religious thoughts. “All patterns of thought, all groupings within the English Church” had changed and developed.²¹

12 Peter White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 11.

13 Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), xix.

14 Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 3–4.

15 Lake, “The Historiography of Puritanism,” 355.

16 Lake, “The Historiography of Puritanism,” 355.

17 Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4.

18 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 4.

19 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 5.

20 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 534.

21 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 534.

While various doctrinal disagreements indicate a degree of diversity, such diversity did not break the bond among “the godly,” as the Puritans liked to style themselves. Tom Webster explored clerical networks based on the principle of sociality. Although Webster preferred to use the term “godly” instead of “Calvinists” or “Puritans,” he pointed to aggressive Laudian pressure as antagonistic to those godly networks. While Webster acknowledged “variations” and “disagreements” among “the godly ministers,” he pointed out that the bedrock of the godly networks was not only “puritan spirituality”; as Webster noted, “religion had a primary meaning of attitude of worship or way of being pious,” but also “an extremely tight consensus on the minutiae of soteriological theology.”²² This also indicates that there were groups with different opinions existing outside of the mainstream “godly network” (or mainstream Puritans). This includes not only Roman Catholic recusants but also individuals who originated from the Puritan movement and held even more divergent or extreme opinions, which was explored by David Como.

In his work *Blown by the Spirit*, David Como argued there was an underground Antinomian movement before the English Civil War that emerged out of mainstream Puritanism. “Such godly dissidents,” who came to be known as “antinomians,” “Familists,” or “libertines,” says Como, “objected to what they saw as legalistic and literal-minded tendencies inherent in mainstream Puritanism.”²³ However, the reason why such thoughts were regarded as very dangerous was that “they remained members of the godly community, sharing large portions of the cultural and intellectual heritage that defined puritans as a group within the world.”²⁴

In addition to diversity in doctrinal issues, diversity in liturgical and ecclesiological issues continues to be considered as vital to understanding theological developments in post-Reformation England. Webster revealed that liturgical and ecclesiological issues were foremost in creating fissures within the godly groups. In terms of the liturgy of Laudian style, conformists regarded Laudian ceremonies as “adiaphora” (or “things indifferent”), while nonconformists who suffered from persecution, deprivation, and limited ministry fled England for continental Europe. Webster also highlighted the skillful and ingenious strategies by which the godly ministers in the diocese of Essex evaded trouble and appeared “conformable.” However, they failed because “committed Laudians were looking for conformity without exception.”²⁵ When Webster considered the Puritan diaspora, he stressed

22 Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c. 1620–1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 2, 130, 283.

23 David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004), 3.

24 Como, *Blown by the Spirit*, 8.

25 Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 205.

ecclesiology, which caused further disintegration of the godly networks.²⁶ Thus, Webster showed a spectrum of thought and practice among Puritans in the Caroline period, blurring the binary image too often limited to Calvinists and anti-Calvinists.

Similarly, Polly Ha pointed out that “many puritans would never fit the agenda of any one party; their theology evolved throughout their careers, and cannot be placed consistently in any one ecclesiological camp.”²⁷ When it comes to the ecclesiastical development, Ha also indicated that “the presbyterians contributed to the birth of congregational ‘independency,’ which made new claims to popular sovereignty within the puritan mainstream.”²⁸ The diversity in ecclesiological issues within the networks of the godly stemmed from the nature of the English Reformation. Even Milton rejected the assumption that “Elizabeth’s religious settlement was clear in its content and meaning and that this meaning was universally accepted by contemporaries.”²⁹ He argued not only that “the content and meaning of the basic formularies of the Elizabethan settlement were far from clear,” but also that there existed “fundamental ambiguities and inconsistencies” among the different elements of the religious settlements presented during each ruler’s reign.³⁰ Therefore, Milton adopted the term “*Quasi-Lex*” (semi-official) to describe the situation of the Church of England.³¹

In sum, scholarly analysis of theological perspectives in post-Reformation England has shifted from the paradigm that such theological perspectives form a dichotomous system—such as Puritanism/Anglicanism or Calvinism/anti-Calvinism—to a new paradigm that such theological perspectives formed a multifaceted framework that represents a broad spectrum of opinions among Puritans and their contemporaries. Even Tyacke later acknowledged that his “concentration on the ‘single issue of predestination’ does now seem excessive,” causing him to stress more of “a nexus of associated orthodoxies.”³² However, without denying the importance of diversity among the Puritans, it is necessary to employ certain labels loosely—not strictly or rigidly—because of the existence of principles and fundamental causes that were debated and opposed to each other.

26 Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 253–332.

27 Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 126.

28 Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 3.

29 Anthony Milton, *England’s Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England 1625–1662* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 12.

30 Milton, *England’s Second Reformation*, 13.

31 Milton, *England’s Second Reformation*, 20.

32 Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism. c. 1590–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 10. Tyacke cites sources from Milton and Lake, which can be seen as influenced by his perspective on diversity.

There still remains room for categorizing individuals into distinct groups based on consensus amid diversity. Nevertheless, ecclesiology (especially disparate Puritan views on church government) more clearly reveals diversity within those groups. Ha's point remains valid in that many people of the time did not neatly fit "in any one ecclesiological camp."³³ This was unlikely to have caused significant discomfort for the English as they had experienced successive rulers slightly altering various elements of the religious settlement. However, considering people's dedication to theological principles at the time, it is worthwhile to examine how they could navigate between different ecclesiological camps. Was church government considered entirely indifferent, or could it be flexibly applied based on certain underlying thoughts? Although the English godly divine Cornelius Burgess (1589?–1665) may not comprehensively represent his contemporaries, his study on church polity shows that it was not entirely indifferent and subject to change freely, but could vary in different circumstances based on certain theologically reasoned principles.³⁴

1.2 Church Government

Among theological doctrines, the topic of church government might be considered more practical than theoretical. As a product of ecclesiological reflection, church government requires a certain visible form, although the visible form is necessary to deal with spiritual, invisible things that happen in the church. Thus, Richard Hooker offered a definition of "church politie, which is a forme of ordering the publike spirituall affaires of the Church of God."³⁵

King Henry VIII severed the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England. With the passing of the Act of Supremacy in 1534, Henry VIII became the supreme head of the Church of England. Although Lutheran and Reformed expressions of Protestant theology from the continent spread throughout England during the reign of Edward VI (1547–1553), the English episcopacy—rooted in Roman Catholic polity—remained untouched. English theologians who favored Reformed theology did not "reform" the episcopal ecclesiology of the

33 Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 126.

34 Many seventeenth-century documents spell his surname as "Burges." Even in Burgess's own published works, the spelling "Burges" can be observed. However, due to orthographic fluidity common at the time, alternative spellings such as "Burgess" began to appear in certain contemporary documents, and even "Burgis" can be found in the ordination register. Despite these variations, most modern scholars prefer the spelling "Burgess," and this study follows the practice to maintain consistency.

35 Richard Hooker, *Of the Lavves of Ecclesiasticall Politie* (London, 1604), 131.

Church of England at that time. For example, under Edward VI, *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*—a draft written by a committee of eight, including Archbishop Thomas Cranmer and Peter Vermigli (a Reformed theologian from the continent), and finalized by a committee of thirty-two—outlines the offices of deacon, presbyter, archpresbyter, archdeacon, dean, bishop, and archbishop.³⁶ Furthermore, the well-known Elizabethan theologian William Perkins acknowledged the power of the Church to “prescribe ordinances rules, or traditions, touching time & place of Gods worshippe, and touching order and comelines to be used in the same,”³⁷ although he argued that “all errors in doctrine”³⁸ should be rejected.

As Anthony Milton noted, Perkins was “prepared to specify that a doctrinal succession alone—without an accompanying institutional succession—was ultimately sufficient for the continuance of the true church”³⁹ with the concept of an invisible church. As such, Perkins “avoided dealing with issues of ecclesiastical polity directly.”⁴⁰ Thus, the concept of “doctrinal succession” played a significant role in the development of the English Reformation. Although the practical aspects of the Church of England may have somewhat resembled those of the Roman Catholic Church, these could be considered *adiaphora* (“things indifferent”), according to Perkins. What was crucial, Perkins insisted, was the preservation of orthodox, apostolic, and catholic doctrine; the form of ecclesiological practices, in the meantime, could be disregarded to a degree.

Despite the concept of doctrinal succession, the episcopacy of the Church of England required a theoretical explanation. During the reign of Elizabeth I from 1558–1603, for instance, there were debates on church government within the Church of England, both internally between Thomas Cartwright and John Whitgift, and externally, between Hadrian Saravia and Theodore Beza.⁴¹ These debates on

36 Commissioners on Revision of the Ecclesiastical Laws, 1550–1552, *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum Ex Autoritate Primum Regis Henrici. 8. Inchoata: Deinde Per Regem Edouardum 6.* (London, 1571), 47–52; Henry Maxwell Lyte, ed. *Calendar of the Patent rolls preserved in the Public record office. Prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy keeper of the records. Edward VI. Pub. by authority of His Majesty's principal secretary of state for the Home department v.4 (1550–1553)* (London: H.M. Stationery off., 1924), 114.

37 William Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike: Or, A Declaration Shewing How Neere We May Come to the Present Church of Rome in sundrie points of Religion.* ([Cambridge], 1598), 137.

38 William Perkins, “The Author to The Christian Reader,” in *A Reformed Catholike: Or, A Declaration Shewing How Neere We May Come to the Present Church of Rome in sundrie points of Religion.* ([Cambridge], 1598).

39 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 280.

40 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 456.

41 John Whitgift, *An Ansvvere to a certain Libel intituled, An admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1572); Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an ansvvere made of M. Doctor VVhitgifte Againste the Admonition to the Parliament* (Hemel Hempstead, 1573); John Whitgift, *The Defense of the Aunsvvere to the Admonition against the Replie of T.C. by Iohn VVhitgift Doctor of Diuinitie* (London, 1574);

ecclesiological issues were crucial not only within the Church of England and with neighboring Reformed churches, but also with the Roman Catholic Church because it was necessary for the Church of England to argue that the episcopal form of the Roman Catholic Church was flawed, even though the two churches shared a similar form of church government.⁴² However, this theoretical development eventually produced a *iure divino* episcopacy. The essential and logical outcomes of the *ius divinum* concept triggered various reactions among the godly, particularly when there were growing doubts about the episcopalian doctrinal position (i. e., their doctrine of apostolic succession).

1.3 Reformed Episcopalians

Looking through a binary lens, Nicholas Tyacke explained that the Arminian religious innovations of Charles I and William Laud stimulated reactions from Calvinists such as “‘root and branch’ remedies,” such as “the Root and Branch Petition of December, which called for the abolition of bishops.”⁴³ Tyacke put some bishops, such as John Preston and John Davenant, in the “mainstream of Calvinist Episcopalianism.”⁴⁴ Although “the hallmark of opposition to the Arminian policy of the government was still Calvinist Episcopalianism” in the 1620s, the failure of the Reformed episcopate resulted in it “being discredited as a viable church system.”⁴⁵ Tyacke identified a certain group of bishops who were in favor of the Reformed doctrine in particular (such as predestination) as well as the episcopal form of church government.

Thomas Cartwright, *The second replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes second answer, touching the Churche discipline* ([Heidelberg], 1575); Thomas Cartwright, *The rest of the second replie of Thomas Cartvuriht: agaynst Master Doctor Vuhitgifts second ansvuer, touching the Church discipline* (Basel, 1577); Hadrian Saravia, *D. Sarauia. 1. Of the diuerse degrees of the Ministers of the Gospell. 2. Of the Honor vvhich is due vnto the Priestes and Prelates of the Church. 3. Of Sacrilege, and the punishment thereof.* (London, 1591); Theodore Beza, *Ad Tractationem de Ministrorum Evangelii Gradibus ab Hadriano Saravia editam, Theodori Bezae responsio* (Genevae, 1592).

42 Robert Bellarmine, *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei, Adversus Huius Temporalis Haereticos, Tribus Tomis comprehensae* (Ingolstadt, 1586); George Carleton, *Consensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra tridentinos Demonstrans vnam ac perpetuam doctrinam è sacris scripturis excerptam, & in Ecclesia Catholica conseruatam vsque ad concilium tridentinum, in grauissimis sidei controuersas, quæ sunt de scripturis, siue regula fidei. ecclesia. fide iustificante. gratia* (Frankfurt, 1613).

43 Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” 142–143.

44 Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” 128–129.

45 Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” 137.

Kenneth Fincham also indicated that based on the indulgent “Calvinism” in early Stuart England, Reformed conformists and nonconformists alike “shared a common opposition to the Church of Rome.” However, the conformists still maintained “the formularies and government of the Church, and the supreme governor’s authority to determine rites and discipline,” and even “the *ius divinum* status of episcopacy,” taking the advantage of “the descent of the episcopal office from apostolic times.”⁴⁶ Fincham also pointed out that although there was a movement for the abolition of the episcopal order in the 1640s, “much contemporary opinion was not hostile to bishops” between 1603 and 1642.⁴⁷

Anthony Milton illustrated the Laudian anxiety and strategy to reinterpret “the writings and actions of Calvinist conformists such as Morton, Davenant, Hall or Prideaux in order to present them as supporters of Laudian ideas and policies, and as opponents of Puritanism.”⁴⁸ This indicated not only that Laudians did not belong to the Reformed conformist group but also that they kept their distance from moderate or reformed figures, even including Episcopalians, in the previous generation.⁴⁹ Likewise, Milton argued “it was precisely the more rigid Calvinists, the most dedicated anti-papal writers, who were the strongest and most consistent early supporters of *iure divino* episcopacy,” while “avant-garde conformist divines” did not regard episcopacy as “an immutable system” of church polity.⁵⁰ Although there were various understandings of the term *iure divino*, the Laudian driving force to remove the ambiguities of the term resulted in “a polarization of opinion and allegiance.”⁵¹

Marcus Harmes also examined reformed bishops during the Reformation and post-Reformation era. Harmes described their interaction not only with “a broader landscape of political demands,” including their advisory role in the House of Lords, but also with “a much broader world of continental reforms, where non-episcopal and episcopal reformed churches provided the substance of both attack against and defence of bishops.”⁵² Although Harmes offered the image of bishops as agents of reform, he explored a comparatively small numbers of cases.

46 Kenneth Fincham, “Introduction,” in *The Early Stuart church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993), 9.

47 Kenneth Fincham, “Episcopal Government 1603–1640,” in *The Early Stuart church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993), 88.

48 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 539.

49 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 539.

50 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 455.

51 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 461.

52 Marcus K. Harmes, *Bishops and Power in Early Modern England* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 119.

More recently, Stephen Hampton focused on the tradition of “Calvinist Conformists” as a whole.⁵³ Hampton regarded the Reformed conformists as “neither puritan nor Laudian.”⁵⁴ Hampton described the conviction of Reformed bishops as those who were preoccupied with opposing Roman Catholics and Arminianism. They included the British delegates at the Synod of Dort, and were the defenders of the Reformed faith in the doctrine of predestination and of grace.⁵⁵ However, Hampton also pointed out their conviction that the “episcopacy reflected the intention of Christ and the practice of the Apostles, and had been maintained in the Catholic Church ever since.”⁵⁶ Moreover, Hampton offered the reasons why the Reformed conformists adhered to the episcopacy. The episcopal form was not only guaranteed by divine right but also connected with “the working of grace.”⁵⁷ The Reformed conformists were convinced that the established Church of England “sustained and promoted the spiritual life of the elect, a spiritual life that they conceived in the terms of orthodox Reformed soteriology.”⁵⁸ Therefore, the Reformed conformists were distinguished not only from nonconformist puritans but also from the Laudian conformists. Greg Salazar examined the theology and life of the Calvinist conformist Daniel Featley (1582–1645), showing how Featley defended episcopacy by using church history and looking to other continental Reformed churches that had hierarchical church polity.⁵⁹ Featley rejected signing the Solemn League and Covenant, arguing that, while he was “not persuaded that any platforme of Government in each particular circumstance is *iure divino*,” episcopacy was “an Apostolicall Institution” and “the Church never so flourished, as within 500 years after Christ, when it was governed by Bishops.”⁶⁰ He referenced historical precedent, mentioning episcopacy’s roots as an apostolic institution and emphasizing its foundational role in the early church’s structure and flourishing. Moreover, Salazar pointed out that “Featley left room for the possibility that episcopacy could be abolished” by the permission of Parliament and royal assent.⁶¹ Featley is thus seen as an example of those who supported episcopacy not in terms of *iure divino*, but of *apostolica institutione*.

53 Stephen Hampton, *Grace and Conformity: The Reformed Conformist Tradition and the Early Stuart Church of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

54 Hampton, *Grace and Conformity*, 8.

55 Hampton, *Grace and Conformity*, 68–148.

56 Hampton, *Grace and Conformity*, 304.

57 Hampton, *Grace and Conformity*, 305.

58 Hampton, *Grace and Conformity*, 23.

59 Salazar, *Calvinist Conformity in Post-Reformation England*, 171–208.

60 Daniel Featley, “Post-script to the Reader,” in *Sacra nemesi, the Levites scourge, or, Mercurius Britan.* (Oxford, 1644).

61 Salazar, *Calvinist Conformity in Post-Reformation England*, 195–196.

Historians have increasingly focused on the bishops who were inclined to one branch or another of the Reformed tradition. Although there were bishops who regarded church polity as an indifferent thing, Reformed conformists, as Milton points out, understood the episcopal form of church government in terms of *iure divino*, which was distinguished from Reformed nonconformists.

The rediscovery and reemphasis on Reformed episcopalians had an impact on how individuals of the time were understood. First, it demonstrates the difficulty of uniformly applying a simplistic binary classification to individuals of that period. Differences in understanding various doctrines, especially the doctrine of predestination triggered by the Synod of Dort, existed even among Episcopalians. This variation in understanding also reflects that resistance to Laudianism was present not only among those termed “nonconformists” but also within the Episcopalian camp. Secondly, it shows the necessity of considering Reformed episcopalians who defended the episcopal form of church government as a concept of *ius divinum*, despite such doctrinal differences. Finally, it demonstrates that beliefs about church government and beliefs about other doctrines, especially predestination, are distinct. Thus, a simple binary classification cannot serve as a comprehensive framework of understanding, and a thorough consideration of an individual’s beliefs in both doctrine and church government is required to fully reveal their overall Christian identity.

1.4 English Presbyterianism before the Westminster Assembly

The Church of England retained episcopal government throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As the episcopal form of church government was tangible and visible, it could easily be a target of attack and resistance by nonconforming figures to the church government. However, no concrete presbyterian form of church government had been practiced in England before the Long Parliament replaced episcopacy with presbyterian church government in 1646. Thus, it is necessary to define the term “Presbyterian” before dealing with Presbyterianism before and even during the English Civil War (1642–1651) and the period of the Westminster Assembly (1643–1653).

As Patrick Collinson observed, “the first presbyterians” during the Elizabethan era insisted that “there must be a strict parity of pastors.”⁶² They also claimed the introduction of lay elders, although the ecclesiastical office was not allowed to preach.⁶³ In terms of practice, they designed several meetings consisting of minis-

62 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 103.

63 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 106.

ters and elders, depending on their scale from congregational to universal.⁶⁴ Thus, there were three marks of Presbyterianism: parity of ministers, lay elders, and aristocratic meetings. However, “presbyterianism,” Polly Ha argued, “was not simply an abstract and static concept without variation.”⁶⁵ Upon examining its historical development, Ha concluded of Presbyterianism that it “is a system of government adhered to and supported by a collection of individuals.”⁶⁶ Furthermore, English Presbyterians were not “inherently antimonarchical” in its relation to political authority.⁶⁷ Rather, English Presbyterians “made concerted efforts to accommodate royal supremacy.”⁶⁸

According to Ann Hughes, the term “Presbyterian” can be used in two different ways. First, the term “Presbyterian” could indicate “those who decided preference was for a national church organized on strictly Presbyterian lines, with parochial elderships, classes, and synods.”⁶⁹ Hughes regarded them as those who “believed a Presbyterian church was the only scripturally sanctioned, *iure divino* visible church.”⁷⁰ Second, the term could be used in a broader sense: “Presbyterian is shorthand for those puritans who worked tirelessly in the 1640s and 1650s to reform the national church, mostly opposing ‘toleration’ or liberty of conscience.”⁷¹ This definition enables historians to deal with differences among Presbyterians positively. The latter definition of Presbyterians is roughly equivalent to that of “moderate puritans,” whose thoughts on church government were “open-minded” and ministries were carried out under the episcopal form of the Church of England.⁷²

In addition to Hughes’s explanation, Elliot Vernon defined the term in three different ways. Although Vernon’s first and second definitions are similar to Hughes’s, Vernon’s third definition offered something different; it accounted for “the politics of religion around late 1644 and early 1645.”⁷³ There was “the political alliance” that sought to control the political situation in relation to religion within the Parlia-

64 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 106.

65 Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 4.

66 Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 4.

67 Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 15.

68 Ha, *English Presbyterianism*, 181.

69 Ann Hughes, “Print and Pastoral Identity: Presbyterian Pastors Negotiate the Restoration,” in *Church Life: Pastors, Congregations, and the Experience of Dissent in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Michael Davies, Anne Dunan-Page, and Joel A. Halcomb (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 153.

70 Hughes, “Print and Pastoral Identity,” 153.

71 Hughes, “Print and Pastoral Identity,” 153.

72 Hughes, “Print and Pastoral Identity,” 153.

73 Elliot Vernon, *London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638–64, London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638–64* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2021), 4.

ments in the 1640s and the 1650s. However, those who participated in the political association were not Presbyterians in the first nor the second sense.⁷⁴

Considering the use of the term Presbyterian, it entails differences between self-recognition as a presbyterian and contemporaries labeling someone as such. Historians defining a historical person as a Presbyterian according to their own criteria is another source of confusion. A historical figure in the pre-English Civil War era might erroneously be judged as a Presbyterian according to the presbyterian form of church government of the Westminster Assembly.

To situate modern debates on the continuity of Presbyterianism from the Elizabethan era to the Westminster Assembly, it is essential to examine the principal positions in existing scholarship. This analysis will proceed in chronological order, beginning with an assessment of William Shaw's foundational work.

When Shaw outlined the history of English Presbyterianism, he argued that "there are no traces of any inheritance of the ideas or influence of this Elizabethan Presbyterianism by the English Puritans of the days of James I. and Charles I."⁷⁵ Because Presbyterianism in the Elizabethan era was not "a clerical movement" on a nationwide scale but "an academic movement principally," there was no "actual organisation" of Presbyterianism.⁷⁶ Thus, on this matter, Shaw's central thesis is as follows: after the decline of Presbyterianism under Elizabethan rule, no continuity existed between Presbyterianism during Elizabeth I's reign and that of the English Civil War. In the same vein, Roland Usher insisted that there was "no connection between the two movements; there was even no continuity reaching from one to the other, from the 'presbyterians' of Elizabeth to the 'presbyterians' of the Civil War."⁷⁷ Usher regarded the Presbyterian movement under the Elizabethan reign as "a clerical movement" that did not include the laity, while the later Presbyterian movement in the Civil War was "a movement inside the Church to stay in it."⁷⁸

However, scholars began to pay attention to "non-separating nonconformists" who were active in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This category, as proposed by Perry Miller, included William Ames, John Ball, Paul Baynes, William Bradshaw, and Robert Parker. Despite their differences, Miller assessed these individuals as having agreed on "congregational polity" in opposition to Presbyterianism.⁷⁹ However, this classification has been criticized for its oversimplification. It

74 Vernon, *London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638–64*, 4.

75 William Arthur Shaw, *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640–1660* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1900), 1:6.

76 Shaw, *A History of the English Church*, 1:5–6.

77 Roland G. Usher, ed. *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth as Illustrated by the Minute Book of the Dedham Classis, 1582–1589* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1905), xxiv.

78 Usher, *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, xxiv.

79 Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630–1650* (Gloucester, MA: P. Smith, 1965), 73–101.