The experience of change of religion

If good cause for conversion to and from the Church of Rome could not be found in the polemical books of theology, on what grounds, then, did people change religion? Contemporaries were still absolutely certain that conversion as an expression of grace could be understood entirely within a conscious rejection of the structure and ministrations of one Church for those of another. The kaleidoscopic entirety of conversion experience – intellectual satisfaction with a newly discovered doctrinal synthesis, liberation from a disappointing ecclesiastical or political environment, the sensation of God’s judgments for sin, the salve of the Gospel after the hammer of the law, the agonies and ecstasies of repentance – all could be comprehended within the rejection or embrace of the Church of Rome. Of course, conversion in the realm of grace was not itself dependent on an exchange of ecclesiastical allegiance, or even an awareness of the polemical issues involved. Conversion reliant on the activity of grace – in regeneration, repentance and sanctification – is at the centre of all Christian life, and thus a necessity for all the Church’s members.1 This was the common currency of vast swathes of sermons, all the literature about affliction and consolation, the ars moriendi genre and so on. Perhaps the majority never did consider the perennial problem of division in the institutional Church. But conversion to and from Rome was not just an isolated and eccentric sense of changing religion. Though many sermons and tracts on repentance and grace deliberately shied away from cavils and disputes, the rejection of Rome or of Protestant heresy could be interpreted as part of a more general conversion process, a resolution against sin and ungodliness. Popery and heresy were seen to contain a wider principle of corruption than merely a faulty style of exegesis. So the politicising of conversion in this way – the general agreement that it could be perceived through ecclesiastical rivalry and the example of some individuals rejecting one Church and embracing another – is clearly a key to understanding the processes of the Reformation more generally. The motives which contemporaries could allege for ecclesiastical conversion are a guide to the intersection between the general issues of Reformation religion and the war between the Churches. This certainly takes us beyond the artificial categories of religion in the polemical books which we saw in the previous chapter. Movement between the Churches cannot be understood just as the function of an academic debate.

In this chapter I wish to look at what converts actually did when they changed religion and how they explained it to a sometimes incredulous public. Their difficulty was that kicking over the traces could so easily be interpreted as a cynical exploitation of the division between the Churches for personal gain and, especially, as a means of starting afresh politically. As George Birkhead, the superior of the Catholic secular clergy between 1608 and 1614, wrote (when faced with his priest’s indiscipline over the Jacobean oath of allegiance) ‘if any be once discontented and cannot have his will, he presently beginneth to imagin his flight to the enimie’.2 It might seem odd, therefore, that people should ground their experience of change of religion so firmly within the vitriol of ecclesiastical conflict. Surely it would have made more sense as a public relations exercise to mumble irenic sweet-nothings about true religion and to say that they had converted to the truth by abandoning former prejudices and hatreds. This might at least have protected them from some of the more vicious character assassinations which they suffered from those they were leaving behind. Yet they, and particularly the clerical converts on whom this chapter largely focusses, almost automatically interpreted their changes of religion within a scheme of conflict and division. By referring to the clerical waverers’ largely polemical tracts and justifications for what they did and the hostile response which they often elicited, I want to show how even the wider experience of conversion could be assimilated almost completely into the factional divisions among English clergy. Conversion (when perceived as an impulse towards and under grace) might appear distorted by the historian who locates it within obsessive politised divisions. Indeed, as the next chapter seeks to show, it did not inevitably and slavishly follow the logic of overt political oppositions. But, to understand the contemporary experience of it, it is necessary to explain why people elucidated and expounded it through reference to ecclesiastical conflict.

CLERICAL PROSPECTS AND ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS

To contemporary eyes the most visible instances of conversion were the high profile declarations by intellectuals and politicians, especially clerical ones,
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2 AAW, A XI, 63.
that they were leaving their Church and cleaving to another. At a time when so much discourse about political instability referred to changeability in ecclesiastical affairs these inconstant people seemed to represent not just the way the political wind was blowing but more generally how religious reform and reaction were underwritten, promoted or undermined by political forces.

To what extent was ecclesiastical conversion simply a feature of the economics of clerical employment? Much noted by contemporaries were the career problems which had apparently instigated the journey of dissatisfied clerics out of one Church and into another. Sir Edward Hoby accused the notoriously unstable Theophilus Higgons of changing religion out of ambition. His disease was that of Arius whose ‘emptie stomache being disappointed of the fat Bishopricke, after which he did long gape, sent up such foggie mys of discontentment into his dasede head . . . that he became a heretic’. John Meredyth poured scorn on those ‘Ambitious Spirits’, who like Arius, impatient of the advancement of persons more worthy then themselves, perfidiously flye to the Tents of Antechrist’. In that Archbishop Marc’Antonio de Dominis was ever a convert at all he provided plenty of material for Protestant disdain. Only unworthy, unspiritual motives could cause apostasy, and de Dominis had plenty of those. Such charges were levelled also against people like the former godly Protestant clerics Theodore Price and James Wadsworth.

3 Both theological and psychological theories of conversion state, from different perspectives, that change of religion may be caused in some sense by external as well as internal factors, S. de Sanctis, Religious Conversion (1927), 40–1 (‘as in every psychic process, the initial stimulus is sought outside consciousness’, though ‘without the interior elaboration of the stimulus . . . the process would never develop’); cf. New Catholic Encyclopedia (17 vols., Washington, 1967–78), IV, 288; A. H. Mathew (ed.), A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew (1904), 164–5; Richard Baxter, Directions and Persuasions to a Sound Conversion (1683), 437.

4 Sir Edward Hoby, A Letter to Mr. T. H. Late Minister (1609), 10; cf. Thomas Morton, A Direct Answer unto the Scandalous Exceptions, which Theophilus Higgons hath lately objected against D. Morton (1609), 3; Theophilus Higgons, The Apology of Theophilus Higgons lately Minister, now Catholique (Rouen, 1609), 8–10, 12. 19. It was alleged that Richard Sheldon had changed religion out of ‘wante’, AAW, A XI, 79, a credible allegation in that funds for the relief of imprisoned priests were not forthcoming for those like Sheldon who took the Jacobean oath of allegiance, AAW, A X, 45.


William Pryyne, The Popish Royall Favourite (1643), 70; T. Birch (ed.), The Court and Times of Charles I (2 vols., 1848), II, 21; John Hacket, Scribna Reserata (1693), I, 207; E. Sawyer (ed.), Memorials of Affairs of State (3 vols., 1725), II, 136; cf. B. Camm, ‘An Apostrate at St Omers, 1618–1622’, The Month 94 (1899), 163–70, at p. 165. Rumours of this kind circulated about Andrew Downes, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, one of the translators of the King James bible, L. P. Smith (ed.), The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton (2 vols., Oxford, 1907), II, 169–70; PRO, SP 14/40/1; CU Libr., MS Mm 1 44, p. 215. Downes may have had Catholic sympathies already, since he was approached

chaplain (likened to Arius by Thomas Goad), had experienced enough setbacks at Cambridge, at Court and in his search for benefices, to give George Hakewill the opportunity to make taunts of this nature. Sir Julius Caesar’s brother Henry had simply gone off to be ordained in the Roman Church after he lost his living at Lostwithiel. Leonard Rountree the unreliable semiary priest was observed to waver between the Churches of England and Rome for material reasons. The initial motivation for the notorious John Gee (a poorly benefited curate in Winwick parish) to start associating with Catholics was his desire to supplant the wealthy rector of Winwick, Josiah Horne.

Protestants certainly thought that Catholic proselytisers deliberately exploited English clerics’ career difficulties to attract them to Rome, and adequately maintained them when they converted. There seems to have

by Sir Thomas Tresham to suggest a suitable tutor for his son, BL, Add. MS 39828, fo. 143; John Bossy speculates that Henry Constable’s change of religion was caused principally by the obstruction to his career at the English Court after he published Examen Pacificum, J. Bossy, ‘A Propos of Henry Constable’, RH 6 (1961–2), 228–37, at p. 234. John Good MP said that he was accused of converting with the hope of political preferment, BL, Lansd. MS 776, fo. 10v. 9 Marc’Antonio de Dominis, ed. and transl. Thomas Goad, A Declaration of the Reasons (Edinburgh, 1617), 3; CSPD 1601–3, 287–9, 292; HMC Salisbury MSS XVI, 348–9; PRO, SP 46/63/11 (I am grateful to Kenneth Fincham for this reference); M. Patterson, Isaac Casaubon (1875), 311; CRS 68, 14; George Hakewill, An Answere to a Treatise Written by Dr Carter (1616), sig. d4v; PRO, SP 12/173/61, SP 12/76646, SO 3/1, February 1593. L. M. Hill, however, thinks it likely that he was ordained abroad merely as an infiltrator to spy on English Catholic exiles, L. M. Hill, Bench and Bureaucracy (Cambridge, 1988), 96.

9 CSPD 1611–18, 390.


11 Francis Dillingham, A Dissuasive from Popery (Cambridge, 1599), sig. A3; E. Cardwell (ed.), Documentary Annals (2 vols., Oxford, 1839), II, 25. William Allen had to allure unhappy prospective clerics to the Rheims seminary by claiming that ‘we have no disputations, lessons, conferences, examinations . . . in our two Colleges, then are in their two universities [Oxford and Cambridge] containing neere . . . 30 goodly Colleges’, William Allen, An Apologie and True Declaration of the Institution and Endowements of the two English Colleges (Rheims, 1581), fos. 67–8; 22v. Forty-one of those who replied to the questions put to them when they entered the seminary at Rome between 1598 and 1640 mentioned that they had had an inadequate education in England. Thirty-two of them had previously been, according to their own account, out of communion with Rome, CRS 54–5. The Walsingham lecturership was established in Oxford in 1586 partly in order to compete with Rheims, C. Dent, Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford (Oxford, 1983), 148. Protestant polemicians said Roman proselytisers tempted their dupes in the English universities to go to Rome or Spain ‘where they shall (say they) bee had in great estimation, and come to greater preferment than ever they shall in England attaine unto’, Lewis Owen, The Running Register (1626), 4; John Gee, The Foot out of the Snare (fourth edition, 1624), sig. L4v–idem, Hold Fast (1624), 33. For the method of interpreting and analysing the data from the seminaries at Rome and Valladolid during this period, M. C. Questier, ‘The Phenomenon of Conversion: Change of Religion to and from Catholicism in England, 1580–1625’ (DPPhil thesis, Sussex, 1991), 311–13.
been a certain amount of truth in this. Even if Mark Curtis's original thesis about a dissatisfied clerical underclass is now open to question, it is certainly true that exterior considerations of career and patronage were always present in decisions to change religion. When the papist George Brome wanted to persuade the Oxfordshire minister Hugh Davies to convert to Rome he told him that when he returned to England and ministered to Catholics he should 'lacke neither golde nor Silver', and urged him to consider 'the contemptible state of [Protestant] minysters at this daie'.

Edward Bennett, the secular priest, thought in September 1613 that an enhancement of Douai's status would attract to it English Protestant academicians. John Jackson wrote to Thomas More (the English secular clergy's agent in Rome) in March 1612 that though men should not look principally for preferment when considering whether to alter religion, 'yet it wear fit to give it. We can not looke to have them saincts at the first.' Converts should be tempted from the opposing side as far as material resources allowed. Temptation explained to Catholics why their own people left them. Francis Walsingham said of those like Anthony Tyrrell, Francis Shaw, Richard Sheldon and John Copley (who all married soon after their defections) that they 'fell ... principally upon these myottes of good fellowship, good cheare, loose life and women'. Catholics noted more particularly the maintenance which their renegades could expect in the Church of England. John Jackson thought that 'if these that come to us from them had the like or halfe the like countenance and favour shewed them that owns which fall have at their hands', Theophilus Higgon (who abandoned his recently adopted Roman profession in 1610) 'had never return'd to scandalize religion as he did'. In similar vein the archpriest, George Birkhead, wrote to More about the renegade Peter Chambers. Anthony

Champney, another leading secular priest, lamented in October 1613 that 'the heretikes are so readie to entertayne our runegates and ... we are so could to receave suche as seeke the harbour of godes church'. The regime in England showed at least a fitful concern with ensuring that, even when Catholic clerics had been compelled by force of law to change religion, there were adequate material rewards to prevent their defection the moment opportunity offered. Archbishop Whitgift exhorted the bishops in December 1593 'to move the better and wealthier sort of the clerge ... to yelde some contribution' towards the relief of ex-seminary priests who are 'altogether destitute of maintenance, and driven to great extremite through the same ... a great temptation for them to revolt, and a discouragement for others to follow their example of conversion, and a slander to the state'. In August 1600 the Council wrote to Matthew Hutton that he should receive into his own household the seminary priest James Bowland who had recently renounced Rome and 'bestowe upon him some such spirituall living as may be in you ... guyte', which will refute the 'scandal ... currant amongst them that when any of their sorte do reforme themselves there is no care had at all to provide for them'. In this way others might be brought to 'lyke conformaty'. Though there is no record that Bowland acquired a benefice most other clerical converts who abandoned Rome, people like Anthony Tyrrell, William Tedder, Thomas Bell, Ralph Ithell, Thomas Simpson, John Copley, Theophilus Higgon, John and Henry Salkeld, John Gee and Richard Carpenter, eventually received a living or maintenance of some kind. William Alabaster and Richard Sheldon became royal chaplains. Alabaster, in fact, did extremely well out of his change of religion as did the ex-Jesuit Christopher Perkins (after initial difficulties in the 1590s). Apprehended priests were occasionally offered
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13 PRO, SP 12/192/52/i, fo. 83. Robert Atkins renewed these persuasions after Davies lost his living in the established Church, PRO, SP 12/193/13, fo. 30v, SP 12/193/19, fo. 32.

14 AAW, A XII, 357, XI, 122, cf. XII, 421. The archpriest Birkhead told the Roman agent to obtain for Carier every possible support lest 'he fall againe as diverse have don', AAW, A XII, 461. Catholics were keen also to recover by temporal temptations those who had deserted them. Humphrey Ely, the secular priest, tried to induce his nephew the renegade Anthony Major to retire abroad where Ely would find him a living, CRS 51, 276. The Jesuits had recovered Anthony Rouse by 1613, Francis Walsingham, A Search Made into Matters of Religion (second edition, St Omer, 1615), 355; HMC Diversesse MSS IV, 458; AAW, A XII, 425.


16 AAW, A XI, 122, IX, 82, XII, 421. In about 1611 John Jackson wrote to More concerning William Alabaster that 'surely it is pittie that we have noe more care of keeping such men', AAW, A X, 485.

17 CRS 4, 8t Bl., Lanks. MS 982, fo. 35; cf. Thomas Clarke, The Recantation of Thomas Clarke (1594), sig. Bv.

18 D. Wilkins, Concilia (4 vols., 1733–7), IV, 345-6; for money collected in the London diocese, Bodl., Tanner MS 77, fo. 60.

19 APC XXX, 601.

20 Questier, 'Phenomenon', 173; Thomas Bell, The Jesuates Antedate (1608), 231; Higgon's rectory of Little Comberton was apparently promised to him in return for his forthcoming recantation, AAW, A IX, 395, X, 395; Sheldon obtained his reward almost immediately after he changed sides, Foley V, 854; Richard Carpenter got his benefice at Poling in Sussex after he preached his recantation sermon, LPL, Carte Antiqua et Miscellanea MS 943, p. 729.

21 G. M. Story and H. Gardner (eds.), The Sonnets of William Alabaster (1959), xx-xxi; AAW, A XII, 521; PRO, SO 3/1, December 1591; P. W. Hasker (ed.), The House of Commons 1555–1603 (3 vols., 1981), III, 175-6; CSPD 1591–4, 247-8; CSPD 1597–1607, 117, 130, 159 (though it could be argued that Perkins's ultimate good fortune was not directly the result of his conversion but of subsequent government service).
livings in the Church of England if they would abjure Roman religion. Protesting clerks were equally keen to attract those who left them back again in spite of professions by people like Joseph Hall and George Abbot that waverers were of no value to the English Church. There is evidence from several sources that Benjamin Carier, the renegade royal chaplain, was offered a substantial reward to come home, possibly the see of Lincoln, made vacant by the death of William Barlow in September 1613.

Of course, Romanist clergy who converted in England before being ordained abroad were less likely to have been influenced primarily by career considerations so early on, but it is possible that lack of secular financial prospects at home induced them to go abroad. Forty-six of the seminarists at Rome mentioned that they or their families had suffered financial adversity. Fifteen of them had previously been Protestants and some of these remarked on dissipated or lost inheritances. Robert Venner, the convert seminary priest, said that he had first gone abroad in 1605 for want of maintenance in England. The seminarist John Campion said his conversion process was commenced in part by family quarrels and the unlikelihood of any material support from that quarter. Some of the convert seminarists referred to dissatisfaction at their employment in commerce or the professions.

Casting off one set of loyalties made the search for a new set a pressing matter. Robin Clifton argues that the 'motives' of renegade Catholic clerics were written principally to attain 'respectability and new patronage'. Their stereotyped professions of Protestantism do suggest that they were parroting standard Protestant views of Rome to secure their absorption into the national Church and to obtain a satisfactory standard of living within it. Anthony Tyrell, William Tedder, Thomas Bell and Thomas Clarke had or sought patronage from Whitgift. Archbishop Bancroft made use of various renegades including Bell, Ralph Iffthell, John Scudamore and Christopher Perkins. Moreover, there was usually a clear link between the views of the ecclesiastical patron and those expressed by his renegade client. In the 1580s John Nichols (who had temporarily enlisted at the seminary in Rome) had been defended in print by Dudley Fenner, a leading light in the anti-subscription campaign. (Nichols's Declaration was based in part on Philippe de Mornay's work translated by John Field.) Nichols had clearly looked for maintenance to some of the more radical puritans. This may be the reason he was in disgrace by 1583. Sheldon and Higgins, who expressed their conversions from Rome apologetically, were both patronised by the Calvinist bishop James Montagu. Archbishop George Abbot made a point of recruiting ex-Catholic clergy who would propagate his anti-Romish political line. Sheldon said that Abbot obtained and made public the manuscript of his tract on the Jacobean oath of allegiance. John Scudamore was retained in Abbot's household after Bancroft's death. In 1612 John Copley attended on Abbot following his surprise conformity and was soon collated by Abbot to the vicarage of Bethersden (and in 1616 received from Abbot the rectory of Pluckley). The ex-Jesuit John Salkeld, despite his ironic veneer, was a real find for Abbot because he was capable of effective anti-Roman preaching and he was prepared to go into print. Edward Bennett reported to Rome that Salkeld 'puts devises in Canterbury's head to tax all the preste[s] in England'. The Jesuit-hating priest Anthony Clarke found refuge with Abbot by early 1614. Abbot, it seems, may have employed the renegade Leonard Rountree in an attempt to get Benjamin Carier to come back to England. Sir Thomas Lake wrote in

22 Foley IV, 499; J. Morris (ed.), The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers (3 vols., 1872–7), II, 70.
25 CRS 54–5, passim. Sir Herbert Croft who changed religion and took up a monastic existence at St Gregory's, Douai, in 1617, was thought to have been escaping debt, CSPD 1611–18, 488; N. McClure (ed.), The Letters of John Chamberlain (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1939), II, 76–7, 105–6; John Chamberlain remarked 'desperation hath made more monks than him'; though cf. W. J. Tighe, 'Herbert Croft's Repulse', BIHR 58 (1985), 106–9. William Lord Roos was in deep financial trouble before he went abroad and converted, CSPD 1611–18, 488.
26 PRO, SP 1494/8/72, fo. 113v.
27 Stonyhurst, Collectanea C, fo. 199r.
30 Anthony Tyrell, A Fruitfull Sermon (1589), sig. Aii; Clarke, Recantation, sig. A2; Thomas Bell, The Survey of Popery (1596), sig. A2–3; PRO, SP 12/223/110, fo. 180r; Anstruther I, 185–6, 305; J. P. Sommerville, 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance' (Ph.D thesis, Cambridge, 1981), 15–16; Francis Walsingham, A Search Made into Matters of Religion (St Omer, 1609), 42, 46; Mathew, True Historical Relation, 70.
32 Theophilus Higons, Mystical Babylon (1624), sig. A4v; AAW, A I, 122.
33 AAW, A X, 91.
35 AAW, A XII, 376.
36 Anstruther I, 76; HMC Downshire MSS IV, 240, 292, 330; AAW, A XII, 486.
37 AAW, OB 1, i, fo. 63v. Abbot also required that Rountree should 'write in some breif manner such a comprehension of the reasons both of my departure and returne as he might shewe it to the king'. Abbot had said that 'a quarter of a sheet' would suffice, but, when Rountree returned, Abbot 'craved more, to wit the conferences I had had all in very good order', which kept Rountree occupied for another three weeks. Abbot was enthusiastic that he should preach a recantation sermon in York Minster, PRO, SP 14/88/53.1.
January 1614 that Abbot ‘hath of our own cuntry men manie proseytes wherein he much giorieth’. Abbot was interested also in foreign clerical converts, even the rather unsatisfactory ex-Carmelites whom Sir Dudley Carleton sent to him from Venice in 1612 and, later on, Marc’Antonio de Dominis. The Protestant clerical conversion tracts of the early 1620s seem to have been produced with Archbishop Abbot in mind. All those whose conversions he superintended decried Rome as the apocalyptic Babylon and dwelt lovingly on its inane superstitions. The archbishop’s opinions may have been dictating theirs. Those who did not follow his line were given short shrift. De Dominis was the most prominent of those whom he took against. The two Venetian ex-Carmelites, who had publicly renounced popery at the Italian Church in London in June 1612, infuriated Abbot when they changed their minds about their new ecclesiastical setting.

Even more blatant than change of religion with the aim of securing a new patronage base was ‘conversion’ with the intention of selling information about Catholics to the authorities. Though most renegade Catholics at some point betrayed Romanists, those like the early Jacobean Catholic defectors
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Anthony Rouse and William Atkinson actually made a living by raking off profits from anti-Catholic and anti-recusant statutory penalties.

**FACTION**

Converts’ strenuous denials that they had exchanged religious allegiances for profit and that there were none so pure as they might seem like special pleading. Their self-interest might suggest that there was no religious substance in the well-known instances of ecclesiastical conversion. Nevertheless, careerism by itself is not usually a sufficient explanation for alterations of allegiance and opinion. Many of those who changed religion had not gone unrewarded in the Church which they left behind. Benjamin Carier’s motives were so complex that, although he did his best to pick up the occasional pension abroad after he abandoned the Church of England, it is a mistake to see him changing religion to improve the balance of his annual expenditure and income. In the case of someone like Theodore Price, William Laud’s friend, conversion came too late to have been instigated exclusively by career motives (though he was undoubtedly a dissatisfied man). Noel Malcolm has argued that even the temporal woes and undoubted cupidity of Archbishop de Dominis were not the real motor for his various changes of religion. How, then, are we to explain the mixed motivation of prominent converts? In particular, how did broadly political motives twist around religious ones sufficiently to give impetus to a man to say that he no longer believed as he did before? The clearest evidence lies in the factional divisions which affected both Churches. For example, prominent Catholic renegades’ renunciations of the Roman Church were heavily influenced by the in-fighting within their own ranks over issues...
The experience of change of region

The way in which the experiences of change of region are perceived and remembered by people living in different regions of the world has implications for our understanding of regional development and identity. This paper explores the experiences of change of region from a psychological perspective, focusing on how people's experiences of transition from one region to another can be understood through the lens of collective memory and identity. The findings suggest that the way in which regions are perceived and remembered is shaped by a complex interplay of individual and collective experiences, as well as broader cultural and historical contexts. This has important implications for policymakers and community leaders who seek to promote regional development and foster a sense of regional identity.
secular politics and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, not religious belief. Moreover, it contained, in itself, no sufficient ground for leaving the Church of Rome. The basic appellant political position was a combination of rejecting Jesuit-led extremist plans for the succession to Elizabeth, hatred of the archpriest clerical regime which the Jesuits were thought to control, and a general belief that there should be a partial separation between religion and politics in England.61 But, though the evidence is often patchy, there was a connection between appellant activity, general anti-Jesuit animus among the seculars and adoption of Protestant opinions. Aside from those like Ralph Sethell and Robert Fisher (whose cases are unusual since the pressure to apostatise came from the hostility of their own anti-Jesuit party), Francis Shaw who abjured Rome in 1593 had travelled around Europe with the anti-Jesuit Jonas Meredith. Shaw also knew James Younger, and was taken to see him in prison just before Younger turned government informant.62 Younger, like Meredith, was part of the clerical group which was anti-Spanish in orientation, or rather, opposed the pro-Spanish succession policy followed by many English Catholic clergy under Jesuit direction.63 William Watson, the most violent of the appellants, conformed briefly (to the extent of attending Protestant service in Bridewell) and caused embarrassment to his clerical friends.64 William Atkinson, the future priest-hunter and ecclesiastical commission pursuivant, was involved in the opposition to the archpriest.65 Mark Penkevell apostatised in late 1604. His brother was an enemy of the Jesuits and this may have influenced him.66 The renegade Anthony Rouse had fallen out with John Gerard SJ.67 Although the unstable John Scudamore had no clear appellant connections, his political orientation was anti-Spanish and anti-Jesuit; he was expelled from the seminary at Rome in 1595 and finally changed religion in 1606.68 Several converts from Rome alleged in their published motives that these inter-Catholic disputes persuaded them that Rome was not the true Church.69

Even if appellant politicking was too short-lived to generate a stream of rejections of the Church of Rome, the Catholic political tradition which the appellants exploited certainly had the capacity to do this. Though Robert Persons attacked the appellants as schismatics and heretics, what he was really aiming at was the anti-Jesuit group, extant since the early 1580s, around Owen Lewis, ultimately bishop of Cassano (seen by some as the ‘opposition’ candidate for the spiritual control of disestablished English Catholicism after Cardinal Allen’s death). Lewis was a shadowy figure but the apostasies of those like John Nichols, Thomas Bell, William Tedder and others, said Persons, were signs of God’s judgments against those who ‘at the first erection of the Romayne Colledge and some yeares after, upon separation there begun by Doctor Lewis and his followers’ campaigned against the Jesuits. In Persons’s opinion ‘the Spirite of this faction’ was ‘opposite to the trew Spirite of Religion and favorable to Apostasie’.70 The faction’s connection with apostasy continued long after the appellant dispute was itself concluded. The prominent renegade Richard Sheldon had friends among those who looked to Owen Lewis for leadership and the unreliable John Scudamore had also been closely connected with him.71 In this sense it is possible to say that many defections from the ranks of the English Catholic clergy involved serious ideological conflict over what form Romanism in England should take and who should lead it.

Factional strife also accelerated notorious Protestant conversions to Rome. Humphrey Leech is a well-known instance of a convert among the proto-Arminian group of clerics in the early Jacobean Church. His quarrel with the ecclesiastical authorities in Oxford seems to demonstrate that he regarded himself as one of a number (including, he said, John Buckeire and John Howson) who held similar opinions about grace.72 A sermon which he preached in 1607 appeared to challenge orthodox Calvinist ideas.

62 Francis Barnaby, the appellant, virtually surrendered his Catholic clerical identity, but there is no conclusive proof that he ever apostatised, LPL, Fairhurst MS 2006, fo. 191; PRO, SO 3/2, December 1604; AAW, A XI, 345.
63 CRS 5, 307; Anstruther I, 227; CRS 52, 58; Anstruther I, 306.
64 PRO, SP 12/238/181.
65 Copley, Another Letter, 32–3; cf. Law, Archpriest Controversy, I, 218.
66 Foley I, 25.
67 HMC Salisbury MSS XI, 150; CSPD 1601–3, 199.
68 Rouse signed the appeal drawn up at Paris in May 1603, Anstruther I, 295 (though Anstruther questions the reliability of the signatures on this document); Bell, Anatomie, 130; LPL, Fairhurst MS 2014, fo. 95.
69 HMC Salisbury MSS V, 446; Scudamore told the musician John Dowland in late 1595 that he was opposed to those ‘who are of the Spanish faction’ and that ‘to defend my country against the Spaniards I would come into England and bear a pike on my shoulders’. A cousin of Scudamore was involved in the Bye Plot, HMC Salisbury MSS XV, 210, 213–14; PRO, SP 14/2/84, SP 14/3/6.
70 E.g. Henry Yaxley, Morbus et Antidotus (1630), 2.
71 Sheldon, Motives, sig. 9; Anstruther I, 256, for Sheldon’s association with Sylvestor Norris, a Lewis protégé; HMC Salisbury MSS V, 447.
Conversion and Theology

Still, theology was not just the plaything of politics. Even the factional projection of latent religious differences into conversion does not really explain why people changed from one profession of faith to another, or, at least, it explains it on only one level. Political quarrels may sometimes have provided a mechanism for alteration of ecclesiastical allegiance; they were not themselves the cause. For we know that political affiliation had no necessary connection with religion. There were some complete cynics for whom a change of ecclesiastical setting had no doctrinal ramifications at all. Christopher Perkins was one of these. Despite his secession from the Society of Jesus and his apparent conformity to the religion established by law in England, he informed Sir Francis Walsingham in May 1589 that he did not approve of it. He was saying Mass (when occasion offered) as late as 1594. He told Tobias Mathew jnr (as he tried to get him to recant his newly adopted Roman opinions) that he regarded it as 'foolerie' to suffer for one side or the other. Among other defectors, one discerns a puzzling fluidity of religious opinion which seems politically unregimented. William Alabaster's long-running doctrinal conflicts with both Churches generally failed to coincide with his professions of institutional allegiance to one side or the other. (His account of the way in which he came to accept that Rome was a true Church would have been anathema to a Catholic polemicist.) The man responsible for his conversion was the ex-Jesuit Thomas Wright whose political loyalist stance confused his own series of allegiances. Some of this evidently rubbed off on Alabaster. His return to England in 1599 and decision to supply information to the authorities about belligerent Catholic political plans did not coincide with a surrender of Catholic opinions and he started to proselytise actively. His Catholic loyalties began to unravel again in Rome (after he became embroiled in English clerical disputes there in 1609 and was imprisoned by the Inquisition when his book Apparatus in Revelationem Jesu Christi was declared heretical). But when, thoroughly disenchanted, he was released and he returned to England, he declared himself Catholic still. He finally rejected Rome at least two years later – a thoroughly confusing spectacle for Protestants like John Chamberlain who preferred to see less ambiguous evidence of ecclesiastical affiliation from those who claimed to find the Church of Rome distasteful. Like Alabaster, Marc'Antonio de Dominis drove to distraction all those who thought that his apparent shifts from one Church to another were good propaganda for their respective polemical and political lines. De Dominis had his own, vaguely ecumenical, programme. He refused to cooperate completely with anyone, either in England or on the Continent. In the high commission hearing in April 1622 to ascertain his reasons for wanting to leave England and its established Church, George Abbot asked him in bewilderment, 'How then is Rome, that was then Babylon, when you came hither, now become Sion?' De Dominis replied that his occasional anti-Romish tracts (written populariter non dogmatice) should not be confused with his serious works (the books of the Ecclesiastical Republic) in which he 'did more resolutely


74 With the exception of a brief period in the years 1586–8 Catholic clerics could compromise their principles (even to the extent of partial conformity) without publicly or finally abjuring Roman Catholicism, F. Edwards (ed.), The Elizabethan Jesuits (1981), 172, 169; CRS 60, 19–20; Aveling, Northern Catholics, 137–8; CRS 5, 26, 28–9; PRO, SP 12/178/57, iii, fo. 152; Anstruther I, 328; PRO, SP 12/195/72, fo. 131; CRS 4, 79; HMC Rutland MSS I, 161. For rare instances where conversion was associated by the authorities directly with political loyalty, Quester, 'Phenomenon', 146; Anstruther I, 8–9; P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkin, Tudor Royal Proclamations (2 vols., New Haven, 1964, 1967), II, 520.
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77 Malcolm, De Dominis, ix–x; CSPV 1621–3, 63.
and expressly set downe his judgement’.78 The view abroad after he left England in 1622 was soon that ‘the man was neither Catholic nor Protestant, for while he fondly laboured to make one Church of all, himselfe followed none’.79 John Donne was loftily detached in his religious opinions until he finally took holy orders in the Church of England.80 William Chillingworth in the 1620s and 1630s was perceived to be ‘doubting between both communions’ and the long process by which he finally conceded the authority of the established Church in England owed more to his own scruples than to any lack of employment.81 The fluctuating opinions of priests like Francis Shaw, George Smith and Thomas Clarke show that they too were not primarily political animals.82 Anthony Tyrrell was imprisoned for his religion in 1574, 1581, 1586 and 1588. He changed religion in 1586, 1587 (twice), 1588 (twice) and 1605.83 Superficially his many alterations, allied with multiple denunciations of Catholics (mainly the Babington Plot conspirators), appear determined by political events. But each occasion of change was accompanied by perfectly plausible theological explanations of why he was still moving between particular expressions of the true Church and how he perceived himself on each occasion to be subject to the operations of grace.84 Admittedly this was one way of defusing the accusations of inconsistency which were levelled at every convert.85 Tyrrell’s repeated changes of allegiance and his chronic malleability did preserve him from the full rigour of the law in England, but his constant inconsistency, which he explained by reference to conversion, could not reasonably have been to his temporal advantage. Anthony Rouse was similarly complex. Before his apostasy he had been an enthusiastic Catholic cleric. His conversion appears to have been accompanied by signs of a profound mental upheaval.86 His changes of allegiance sat rather uneasily with what really concerned him, a love–hate relationship with the ideals of the Society of Jesus.87

Conversion to and from Rome could thus follow a politically unscripted path. Motivation to and from Catholicism did not always come neatly politically packaged. Theophilus Higgons said that he left his papist friends in France before he had definitely decided to resume a place in the English Church.88 Benjamin Carier’s polemical declaration of his conversion to Rome makes extraordinarily disparaging remarks about English recusant Catholics. (His opinion of the idiot ‘multitude’ on ‘both sides’ evidently includes the English nonconformist Catholics as well as the unthinking Protestant opponents of Rome.)89

If the converts’ doctrinal accounts of their changes in religion were not merely cosmetic we need to explain more fully how their theology of conversion coincided with their fluctuation between institutional Churches. There are two possible approaches towards their composite motivation. The first assumes that the converts of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were in a similar case to that of the politicians Quentin Skinner had in mind when dealing with the opposition politics of the 1720s. He argued that the fact or probability of a politician’s insincerity should not negate all investigation into the source of his views. A man’s motives are more than ‘ex post facto rationalizations’ of his political manoeuvres. The early modern converts were inevitably faced with charges of inconsistency. Because the late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century renegades were also ‘engaged in a prima facie unjustifiable course of action’ they, like Lord Bolingbroke in the 1720s, had to ‘exhibit a plausible relationship between some . . . principle and their actual course of . . . action’.90 A Skinner-type analysis of the converts’ stated motivation reveals the public ideological basis for their conversions (even if this is not the same as showing what their exact reason for changing religion may have been). The second reading of conversion
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as an amalgam of politics and religion tries to show that conversions in religion, authentic experiences of grace, could be politicised without being entirely under the regime of politics. Or rather, that the correspondence between the wide spectrum of conversion experience and the range of evil things which Romanists and Protestants detected in each other’s religion meant it was possible for change of religion to fall into politically comprehensible patterns of division between the Churches without ever being simply a branch of contemporary ecclesiastical politics.

CONVERSION IN RELIGION

Why should not just the doctrines of conversion but also the spiritual experiences associated with them have lent themselves so readily to politicised polemical separation between Romanists and Protestants? In Judaeo-Christian thought conversion comprises both an inward and an outward alteration. Inward renewal under the influence of grace requires the setting aside of former standards of behaviour and sometimes the adoption of different standards of religious belief and activity. However, these two aspects of conversion take many forms. In Owen Brandon’s succinct words, conversion may be from ‘irreligion to religion; or from one religion to another; or from one denomination to another; or from one theological position to another; or from a second-hand to a first-hand experience of religion’ (sometimes described as evangelical conversion). But these types of conversion are usually not conveniently segregated. While an individual’s ‘conversion’ can mean anything from an explosive evangelical sensation to a quiet, cold intellectual modification of ideas, it frequently includes both. Conversion, then, refers first to the efficacious moment in the process generally described as justification. Though the word itself signifies merely a turning, in Christian theology it indicates initially the point at which man enters into a new relationship with Christ through the action of the Holy Spirit (mediated through the Church), and then subsequently embarks on a pilgrimage in grace.

Conversion was polemicised because people did not attribute the same significance to conversion’s separate stages. Naturally, for a Reformed Protestant who gasped at the overwhelming power of grace and the relative powerlessness of man’s will, conversion is effective at the moment when the elect man is initially made just. There were many patristic texts which pointed to the weakness of the human will and the essential gratuitousness of grace and salvation as well as the complete sufficiency of Christ’s atonement for sin. If man’s will responds passively to grace and does not actively cooperate with it then it is logical to see conversion as taking place effectually at the regenerative instant when grace is grasped through faith. Conversion is focused heavily, therefore, on vocation, the calling of the Elect who are then incapable of falling finally and totally from grace. Though, after their conversion, they have the capacity to perform good works, their justification does not rely in any sense on meritorious acts. Even if the will may be said to cooperate with grace after the initial conversion this is not of its own volition. Grace remains in control though in different forms (preventing, working and co-working grace).

But an equally powerful patristic and subsequent tradition stressed a relative freedom of the will assisted by grace and this dictated a different perception of conversion. For Catholics (and some Protestants who did not sympathise with a severe Reformed view of grace and sin), the elements of conversion which Reformed Protestants regarded as efficacious in the first moment of grace extended into the process which is frequently described as sanctification (when the will actively cooperates with grace after their initial encounter). So the Romanist-Protestant divisions over conversion were caused by placing a slightly stronger emphasis on aspects of grace which opponents would not want to stress quite so much.

Clerical opponents played down the subtleties and highlighted the contrasts between themselves about the nature of conversion, as if different degrees of grace were pegged to different doctrinal beliefs. And this polemical tendency filtered through from doctrinal theory into the wider
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96 J. S. McGee similarly discerns the opposition between those he terms ‘Anglicans’ and ‘Puritans’ as one of emphasis, McGee, Godly Man, 37, 64; idem, ‘Conversion and the Imitation of Christ in Anglican and Puritan Writing’, JBS 15 (1976), 21–39, at pp. 22–3; New Catholic Encyclopaedia, VIII, 90–1, suggesting that the difference lies in theological method and an opposition between nominalist and realist perceptions of grace.
understanding of conversion – the experience of grace and the practice of a
Christian life. Catholic concepts of justification and the possibility of falling
from grace (anathema to Reformed Protestants) meant that the substance
of conversion was thrown forward into the process generally described as
sanctification. Thus Romanists reduced the emphasis (which was so
important to the Reformed Protestant mentality) on the suddenness
and sufficiency of the initial effectual inspiration of grace. Catholics perceived
regeneration to be completed at baptism but saw evangelical conversion as
an intensification of the Christian life in which not all are expected to
achieve a uniform degree of saving grace, something which the pessimistic
Reformed view of human nature deemed necessary for all the Elect. For
Catholics, evangelical conversion finds its highest expression in the life of
the religious (requiring the pursuit of ‘evangelical counsels’ of voluntary
poverty, chastity and obedience). Before the Reformation, *conversio* was
particularly associated with entry into a religious order; monastic observance
is a *conversatio* commenced by a *conversio*.\(^7\) Though Protestants did
not expect all to accomplish the same virtuousity in sanctification (and
accused Catholics of demanding precisely this in their emphasis on the
counsels of perfection), their tendency was to see saving grace as a single
standard necessary for all who are to be saved. Consequently, for them,
baptism only commences the regeneration process; regeneration is
completed by conversion, properly understood as a new spiritual birth.\(^8\) In
a sense Protestants took conversion out of the monastery, in Charles
Cohen’s words ‘from a small circle of professional discussants’, and brought
it into the world.\(^9\)

Protestants (and particularly puritans) meditated on the relationship
between *conversio* and *conversatio*; together they formed the ‘process by
which saints prepared for and progressively came into union with Christ’.\(^10\)

10 Of course, the evangelical counsels of perfection, the mechanism of Catholic evangelical
conversion, were not tied strictly to those in a monastic profession which required also a
vow of stability. The ‘religious’ life in the Roman sense of conversion does not necessarily
imply retirement into a monastery or convent (though this is how it may be expressed).

14; Cohen, *God’s Caress*, 6; John Denison, *The Sinne against the Holy Ghost Plainly
Described* (1611), 40; Denison, *New Creature*, 52; Baxter, *Directions*, sig. A2r–v; Bodl.,
Ravl. MS D 399, fo. 203v–r. Sir Edward Hob, who sponsored Theophilus Higgons’s
reconversion and obtained subsequently a benefice for him, (reportedly) compared the
spiritual rebirth of Higgons with the birth of his own son on the same day as Higgons’s
reconversion. The seminary priest Edward Bennett drew polemically a parallel between
the ensuing almost immediate death of Hob’s son and what he must have considered
Higgons’s spiritual death, PRO, SO 3/5, July 1611; HMC Rutland MSS I, 424; AAW, A X,


Man’s duty of action within the covenant is to ‘obey God’s commandments
in his life and conversation’.\(^1\) Repentance, which is synonymous with
conversion in puritan thought, operates in two senses. On the one hand it
was a condition of entering the covenant, but in a second sense it was an
evangelical continuing quality which led to a conscious attempt at
amendment of life. But while both Catholics and Protestants could envisage
different degrees of grace during men’s progression in it,\(^2\) Protestants
found utterly unacceptable the regimentation of grace in Catholic formulae
which refused to associate saving grace exclusively with the Elect and also
seemed to push it unnecessarily into vows in religion (e.g. of obedience,
poverty and chastity). In Francis Bunn’s words, those who have experi-
enced ‘regeneration and new birth’ will inevitably ‘increase and grove
(although not all nor at all times alike) in Holiness’.\(^3\)

Thus was it possible for contemporaries to draw parallels between
evangelical turning in religion and movement between rival Churches – even
seeing one as a function of the other. Conversion was an aspect of justifi-
cation, and justification was universally understood as occurring within the
confines and through the ministry of the Church.\(^4\) It was inevitable that, in
circumstances of doctrinal and jurisdictional division, conversion between
bitterly opposed ecclesiastical bodies should be associated with movement
in grace, and, conversely, that conversion to the true Church could be
equated also with flux between separate particular Churches. John Good
wrote that ‘the practice of life and conversation, is commonly answerable to
the rules of doctrine and religion, which ye sincere and spiritual, brings
forth good fruits, ye corrupt and carnall, correspondent effectes. Upon
which ground it hath bene generally observed, that when any one hath bene
converted from any secte to [the Roman] Catholike Religion, he hath
become more vertous and regulate, then before’, and in reverse, ‘when any
hath bene fallen from the Catholike faith to any secte he hath become more
vicious and dissolute’.\(^5\)


Method of Catchizing* (1631), 9; Edward Elton, *A Forme of Catechising* (1634),

\(^3\) Francis Bunn, *Truth and Falshood* (1595), sig. Dd3v–v. The Elizabethan Homilies of 1563
attacked Roman devotional tenets and in particular the three chief principal points, which
they called the three essentials (or three chief foundations) of religion, that is to say,
obeidence, chastity and wilful poverty’, P. F. Jensen, ‘The Life of Faith in the Teaching

\(^4\) Brandon, *Christianity*, 77; *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, IV, 289.

\(^5\) BL, Lansd. MS 776, fo. 42r; cf. N. N., *An Epistle of a Catholike Young Gentleman*
(Douai imprint false, printed secretly in England), (1623), 7, 36, where the author says his
conversion to Roman Catholicism commenced with a consideration of his mispent youth
and that he had led an ‘exorbitant and irregular life’.
Were these polemical expressions of the nature of conversion just a distraction from the profounder realities of spiritual experience and pastoral direction in this period? Evangelical conversion did not positively require an ecclesiastical reorientation to express it (and movement between Churches might have no evangelical significance whatsoever), but the divisions in ecclesiastical allegiance between Rome and the Church of England, artificial as they appear theologically, were forms through which conversion by grace might readily be expressed, propagated and understood. Opposing ecclesiastical structures were thought by their enemies to err fundamentally rather than in doctrinal minutiae. They propped up not just error but also vice. Since they tempted man not only towards unbelieving but even unrestrained carnal lusts and the reign of sin over the faculties of man’s nature, the abandonment of a false Church could easily be equated with progress in grace. John Dove argued that conversion signified not just regeneration (‘when a man is effectually called and converted to the Faith’) but also ‘repentance of them which have fallen away from the truth of Religion to Heresie, or Idolatrie’ (as well as from ‘vertue to sinne’), ‘and afterward turne back againe unto God’. John Copley interpreted his ‘true and unfaigned conversion from the superstitious, idolatrous, and heretical religion of the Romane Church’ as a sign of the evangelical working of grace upon him ‘contrarie unto common course and order’. Rejection of Rome was not just a withdrawal of allegiance from an ecclesiastical institution but a rejection of the mystery of iniquity, a coming out of Babylon. Revelation 18: 4 where God calls his Elect out of Babylon was the prefatory citation or central text of most of the tracts of this period in which English Protestant converts explained how they had abandoned the Church of Rome. The Elect might exist within Rome but their effectual conversion induces them to depart from it. This was not mere vitriol. If the Church of Rome could be all but identified with the spiritual Babylon of Revelation, then not only did conversion necessitate exit from Babylon but leaving Babylon/Rome was as close an institutional expression of true evangelical conversion as a Reformed Protestant could imagine. Just as the reformed institutional Church through its relative purity might approximate to the true Church, so the Church of Rome in its absolute corruption might be associated almost exclusively with the false Church of Antichrist. In such a model Protestants had a mirror image of the Roman polemical insistence (based on a different concept of the operation of grace) that true conversion was possible by adhering to the visible institutional Church represented by Rome. Neither side thought that a change between institutional Churches, even though it incorporated a surrender of false doctrines, was adequate if it was not accompanied by effectual motions of grace. Thus when the Capuchin Francis Nugent disputed with a company of English Protestant actors who arrived in Cologne they immediately yielded to the doctrinal truth of his persuasions, but they ‘felt themselves so drie and tough harted that they knew how to passe from the bewitching Babilonial Harlot to their true Mother, the Catholick Church’. Nugent preached to them about hardness of heart and redemption through grace, whereupon they were moved by grace and ‘all reconciled and became sound Catholickes’. The theological conflict between Catholics and Protestants over how conversion was experienced actually lent itself to a reading of effectual conversion in terms of changing religion between institutional Churches. Central Reformation controversies generally took the form of disputes about how grace filtered from its source to its final destination. These disputes were the successors to patristic and medieaval arguments about the extent to which man merited grace, prepared for it before conversion and cooperated with it after conversion. Contemporaries saw different aspects of conversion distributed in man between his will and his intellect. Protestants understood the will to be captive and absolutely subject to sin, and thus subject to the intellect in the conversion process. By contrast, Catholics emphasised the relative freedom of the will and allowed it a more active role in conversion. Both sides automatically resorted to a scholastic model of human nature around which to organise their theology of religious change. The art of defining regeneration lay in distributing its effects between the reason, the will and the affections, the three faculties in the possession of the soul. All three, it was agreed, were caught up in the radical changes brought
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about in man's nature by conversion. Humphrey Leech argued that the integrity of the Roman Church was sufficiently established by the spectacle of God enlightening 'the understanding of so many converts, as in the midst and thickest of the darkness of heresy, to shew them the Catholieke Truth and Church, as also to frame their wills, and inflame their affections, to yield all obedience therunto'. Robert Persons could envisage the affections (subject to a right orientation) as 'the key of all the rest to open the gate to true faith and believes'.

What Catholics were certain of was that effectual conversion could not be limited to the intellect. (Protestants, they claimed, erroneously confined conversion, the effectual reception of grace, to an intellectual perception.) Though an inward acceptance that Rome has a monopoly of truth and is the only conduit of saving faith constitutes part of true conversion (for someone who stands outside the Roman communion), mere assent to all the doctrines of faith taught by that Church is insufficient. In this sense the exercise of the will in conversion takes precedence logically over the exercise of the mind. Whether true conversion was described by reference to movement into communion with Rome (to profit from its monopoly of grace) or the operation of grace itself, the will was the mechanism by which this was achieved. 'Wee find daily by experience', wrote Persons, 'that our will dreweth after it our judgement; and as she is affected or disaffected, so goeth our judgment and understanding also'. As we noted in chapter 2, many people seem to have attributed to the reading of polemical books their changes of religion from the English to the Roman Church. Often they say that they were converted to a 'schismatic' position from their former 'heretical' one by reading and accepting controversial renderings of Catholic doctrine, but that a further stage was required which could come about only by exercise of the will. In Ralph Green's case, even after earnest prayer, and the use of books of controversy, 'many doubts or difficulties seemed to remain, which hindered ... his conversion'. Henry Chadderton read and re-read Richard Bristow's Briefe Treatise, and 'became convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith, and was ready to argue upon it with any Protestant, but not to embrace it'. Henry Lanman perused the books of the

'Challenge' stalwarts John Rastell and Thomas Harding but this 'produced no other effect' than to draw him 'a little from attending the churches of the Protestants'. Three years were spent in 'turning over many books of controversy'. The difficulties in conversion experienced by converts to Rome are all described as an excessive reliance on the intellect, the erroneous belief that God's grace could be appropriated merely by thinking about faith. Like Henry Lanman, Francis Walsingham wrote that after extensive reading of Catholic and Protestant polemical tracts he was still 'spearfull to make any change in Religion for many respects'. He felt 'such a warre betwenee ... his] understanding, will, and affection', the constituent parts of his nature, 'as ... [he] could not tell ... what to do'. Likewise Tobias Mathew jnr's conversion was delayed when he conferred with Robert Persons in Rome in 1606. Persons 'did work so powerfully ... upon my understanding ... that, if I had not wilfully drawn the curtain between it and my will ... I am half persuaded that perhaps I might have departed from thence ... a true Catholic'. John Good deferred his final conversion 'under a courable pretence of more knowledge, to infect me with curiositie stiring up a continual desier to be alwayes ... serching more fully to informe my understandinge; when in ... truth the fault was not so much therin, as in my depraved and corrupted will, that could induce no reformation'. Robert Persons stated it as a general principle that intellecual persuasion (in the form of disputation)

as it is a fit meanes to styrr ye up mans understandinge to attend the truth, by layinge forth the difficultyes on both sides; so is yt not alwayes sufficient to resolve his judgement, for that yt moveth more doubts than he can aunswere or dissolve. And this happeneth not only in unlearned people, which by no means can discerne which party hath the better, when both parts are learned and alleage arguments for themselves, in matters above their capacity, but even the most learned also, if they have no other meanes of resolution then argyuing to and from by disputation, are brought many-times to be more doubtfull therby then before.

This was the problem with polemical persuasion. Resolution in conversion, these Catholics thought, took place principally in the will, something which philosophical debate about election and predestination did
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The will is involved in preparatory struggle between flesh and spirit, but (though Continental Lutherans argued about the role of the will in preparation) the orthodox Calvinist and Reformed position was that the will is in no sense an efficient cause of conversion. Man's will is free only in 'things civil and indifferent'. Even after conversion, a man, says Stephen Denison, has a freed will only 'in some measure'. After effectual conversion, the will is free from the debilitating effects of sin but it still responds to rather than cooperates actively with grace. It is not in man's power to repent; such an opinion is Pelagian. In the work of conversion 'we were passive, not active ... and so passive, that there was nothing in us, to concur with God. It was not a slumber ... it was death.' While grace comes in stages, the first where grace works alone and the second where the will (still in subjection) is active, Higgons stresses that 'it is the first ... not the second, by which we are saved'. 'Touching the beginning of our regeneration', wrote John White, 'what time we rise up from sinne, and enter into our first conversion, we say, that our will could no way dispose it selfe ... whereby it might be made capable of grace; so when grace first enters it is meere passive, till grace have renewed it', and at that moment when 'the Spirit of God ... first layes hold, and sets upon our will to convert it, it findes nothing therein to help his grace in the conversion; but in order of working, first, grace gives life and qualitie to the dead will, and then being renewed it wils the conversion, and becometh the voluntarie instrument of God, both to apprehend his grace offered, and to worke forward with it', but 'not by it[s] owne naturall strength'. White likens conversion to the action of pen upon paper, God's pen upon the paper of humanity. The paper 'receiveth the inke passively, and brings nothing of it[s] owne to the writing ... but being written [on] it becometh an instrument of the writing.' Hence, Protestant conversions are portrayed as taking place effectually in the mind. John von Rohr comments that while there were divines like Beza who made faith almost exclusively a function of the mind, and others like Ames who were disturbingly voluntarist, the commonest
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position was an intermediate one which affirmed 'a significant place for both intellect and will in faith's act'. But even within this intermediate view, von Rohr says, 'despite the duality of emphasis, there was often a tendency to give the intellect a position higher than the will'. In general, such 'Puritan theologians saw the will as following the commendations of the intellect.'

This was certainly the case in the tracts of the converts who needed to counteract the Romish bias against the intellect in describing change of religion. Thus Richard Sheldon wrote that 'it was ... the right hand of the Lord which did touch my understanding: and as hee thus wrought in my understanding, so hie did also internally, and immanently (as me thought) move my will'. John Copley alleged that his will was restricted by an 'extraordinary heawinessse' for many respects and conversion came only through the force of scriptural and patristic passages on his mind.

The division between the primacy of the will in Catholic conversions and the priority of the understanding and passivity of the will in Protestant ones mapped onto other polemical divisions, notably the quarrels over the relative authority of Scripture and the Church. Protestants insisted on the primacy of Scripture and the approach to faith by the Word (and particularly the Word preached). This, though, was not because Scripture was chronologically prior or its texts purer than the patristic and other authorities which Romanists pointed to for resolution of doubt. It was because Scripture (as pure Revelation) worked man's initial conversion with no exercise of his will, though he might have undergone already an extensive period of preparation. Scripture was the channel through which grace was transmitted infallibly to the Elect. Tradition, liable to corruption because not divine in origin, was not. Romanists tended to see in conversion a decision to belong to 'the Church' (the guardian of revelation through its tradition) and interpreted this as an exercise of the will. Protestants saw conversion sola Scriptura as taking place in the mind with no accompanying action of the will. Possibly the most contested patristic text of this period was Augustine's reference to his own conversion where he says that he would not have believed the Scriptures if it had not been for the authority of the Church: 'ego vero evangelio non crederem nisi me catholicae ecclesiae conmemoeret auctoritas'. Though Augustine is making a point irrelevant to the Reformation disputes over authority (in fact, he is saying that he would reject both Gospels and Church if his Manichean opponents could prove their founder to have been one of Christ's apostles), Catholics argued that it proved that Church 'tradition' preceded Scripture, while Protestants argued that while 'the Church must of necessity propose things credible', 'Scripture it selfe convinces', and that Augustine's statement has no respect to time past; the authority of the Church mattered to Augustine only until he embraced the Scriptures, at which point his effectual conversion was located.

Thus the experience of conversion, of life as well as doctrine, could be made sense of, could actually be intensified, by thinking of it in the terms of current ecclesiastical rivalry. This perception of how a man changes religion also allows us to reinterpret the positions (so frequently misread by historians) which contemporaries saw themselves as moving between as they were touched or after they had been abandoned by grace. As is well known, Catholics distinguished between degrees of separation from the institutional Church of Rome, principally between heresy and schism. Technically schism is a breach of ecclesiastical unity while heresy is an error in faith. Historians have tended to assume that by a 'schismatic' contemporary English Romanists meant simply a person whose views were Catholic but who conformed to the State Church's outward requirements, while a heretic was someone whose views were clearly anti-Romanist. This reading fails to recognise that there are several planes in the complex matrix of conversion to which 'schism' and 'heresy' refer. It risks interpreting these terms as expressions solely of politico-ecclesiastical allegiance, something which contemporary use of these words makes clear was not the case.

In Roman parlance, individuals are converted from heresy and reconciled from schism, but reconciliation is always required for full communion with Rome. Church thinking distinguishes between mixed and pure schism. Pure schism is encountered but seldom. Generally it is derived from a heresy or is subsequently combined with one. Thus conversion to Rome puts
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an emphasis on an exercise of the will (by a positive decision to repair the schismatic breach even after the individual has come to a right faith). A Protestant who embraces Rome tends to describe conversion as consisting of two clear stages, first an abandonment of heresy and then a positive choice to join the Church of Rome (thus purging his schismatic state).

Admittedly, Protestants followed the same patristic sources as Catholics on the subject of schism and heresy. Nevertheless, they associated schism less closely with the institutional Church (because they did not link grace so precisely to the Church’s visible structure). The institutional element of schism was played down. In Mornay’s words ‘the Romanists are Schismatikes, and not they which separate themselves from them’, and ‘the Communion of the Church doeth not consist in a local union, nether the separation, in removing of places’. For a Protestant the effectual element of conversion was the rejection of heresy (or rather of popery and idolatry), just as faith rather than the will was the motor for change.

**APOSTASY**

These binary divisions over the nature of conversion were mirrored in the Catholic and Protestant divergence over the reverse process of ‘apostasy’. The strict canonical meaning of apostasy is the defection of the baptised from the Christian faith. It is not the same as heresy (the rejection of individual truths) or simply moving between particular Churches. Converts in this period tend to be called apostates by those they are leaving behind because the polemical tendency is for the controversial writer to identify as closely as possible the institutional structure to which he belongs with the true Church, visible and invisible. Consequently someone who leaves an ecclesiastical institution may be presumed by its members to be falling from faith as well. Protestants saw the sin of blasphemy against the Spirit as a final apostasy, to be distinguished from a more temporary kind committed by merely associating with Rome. The purpose of John Meredith’s tract, *The Sinne of Blasphemie against the Holy Ghost* with its ‘admonition to all

---


Revolting Apostataes annexed’, is to ‘search into that fearfull Sinne of Apostacy, that those who repute it a small matter, to depart from the Truth of the Gospell, to the Tents of Antechrist, may consider the danger, and retire before they fall into that Sinne against the Holy Ghost, which is Irrecoverable’. Meredith will not say that reconciliation to Rome is itself apostasy but, in that the Church of Rome may be envisaged apocalypticly, they are in danger of it: ‘I say not, that such [who convert to Rome] commit that Sinne ... but this Christ saith; “Hee that is not with mee, is against me.”’ John Denison wrote in exactly the same terms about those who ‘send away Religion for a time, thinking to take it up againe at their pleasure’ and urges ‘those who are wandring to “returne with speede to the bosome of their mother, who hath not lost the bowles of compassion, except they have lost all sense of grace”.

In that Catholics envisaged conversion as an exercise of the will and a sanctifying process, those who abandoned their monastic vocation could also be described as apostatising. By contrast, those who abandoned Catholicism sometimes describe themselves as having tried and cast away Catholic monastic or regular lifestyles. Robert Persons remarked that John Sacheverell’s conversion to Protestantism was immediately...
accompanied not only by becoming a ‘minister’ and a taker of priests but ‘of late for the upshot of all hee hath married a publique queane, the widow of one Luke Hutton hanged a little before for thefte and murder’.  

Initial corruption in the will and the affections were the cause, potentially, of both a total loss of faith and of moral degradation. A spiralling fall from grace might induce a fall from the certainty and security of a true particular Church. When Theophilus Higgins returned to the Church of England he claimed that, before he converted to Rome, his temporal difficulties, though severe, ‘did not prevale in . . . [him] unto any mutation of my faith’ but eventually ‘(the inferior parts of . . . [his] soule rebelling against the superiour) . . . [his] earthly, darke affections . . . did, interpose themselves to eclipse the light of his understanding’.  

Catholics likewise saw one fall succeeding another after initial moral defences were broken down by the commencement of doctrinal deviance. Lord Sanquhair, condemned in mid-1612 for murdering a fencing master, and executed in the palace yard at Westminster, ‘professed himself to die a Catholique, and desired to be prayed for, and that he was so educated [i.e. as a Catholic], but thesynyeares he had not performed the dutie of a Cath[olique] in any sort, and therfore god did permit him to fall into divers wickednesses, and if he had continued a Cath[olique] he had never consented to the mutrher’, and he ‘dyed verie penitent’. The renegade seminarist Peter Chambers who abandoned his Catholic clerical orders in December 1608 was subsequently convicted of and hanged for sodomy. The archpriest reported that he ‘protested at his death that he was never infected with that abominable synne until he joyned with them [the Protestants]’.  

When John Sacheverell came to London (apparently after flight from Viterbo in Italy and the regulation of the Order of Preachers) and seemed on the verge of abjuring Rome, it was noted not only that he was lukewarm in his Catholicism but also, ominously, that he was seen ‘often at the playhouse’.  

Roman and Protestant division over grace in conversion was nowhere more clearly indicated than in their reading of those who passed between them. The standard scriptural image for those who abandon faith, institutionally and evangelically, is the man possessed by the unclean spirit and the seven devils of Matthew 12: 43–5. Anthony Tyrrell, following his second change of religion in 1588 (expounded in a Paul’s Cross sermon of December of that year), needed to explain why he had previously reverted to popery. He referred to that verse and said of the ‘Lybels and writings’ that he had ‘made in . . . [the Pope’s] defence’ that they came from ‘that foule spirit which first was throwne out, and being returned againe, he brought seaven worse then him selfe to hold more sure possession’.  

In a subsequent sermon of 13 July 1589 he took up this image again. One possible interpretation is that a defector from true religion is worse off than the man without any religion, ‘for of an infidell there remaineth some hope that he may be converted and beleue, but of an apostate, or an obstinate heretike there is scarce anie hope at all’. But, of course, this would hardly be favourable to him. Tyrrell wants to claim his place as one of the Elect who cannot fall totally and finally from grace. He says therefore that the ‘litteral sence’ of these verses is that the Devil may return to the convert only if the convert returns finally and irremediably to sin [i.e. falls totally and finally]; ‘so soone as it pleaseth the Lord to cal us by his grace unto repentance . . . he must depart away from us’. Thus Tyrrell plays down the significance of moving between particular Churches (something which he did rather a lot) and emphasises the primacy of motions of grace. Romanists who put more stress on the significance of adhering to the institutional structures of the visible Church chose to interpret those like Tyrrell who fell away from them less charitably. Catholics subscribed to different models of perseverance and assurance. Godly activity was necessary by man’s own efforts in order to ensure that the house had God in possession when the unclean spirit and his seven devilish companions returned. A Protestant naturally would argue that the efficient cause of godliness following conversion was the efficacy of God’s decree which led to...
the unclean spirit's unceremonious exit in the first place. Subsequent godly
behaviour was merely the result of 'assistant grace'.

The two types of conversion, between states of life and between Churches,
are inextricably connected because, all agreed, only in the true Church
(however defined) could grace be effectually exercised. 'Heresy and bad life,
dae goe together' was a general truism. Both aspects of conversion are
rooted in grace. In practice many of those who converted to Catholicism
relied on a Catholic evangelical model of conversion to express their
polemical rejection of Protestantism. A number of the seminarists at Rome
said that the desire to embrace monastic ideals – to go from the precepts (of
the law) to the counsels (of perfection) – was a motive for exchanging the
Church of England for the Church of Rome.

Although the binary divisions between Catholics and Protestants in
polemical war were artificial, doctrinal differences over the nature of conversion
allowed religious forms of change to flow in and out of political ones, and
political forms of change were used to express those which are more usually
thought to transcend politico-ecclesiastical divisions. Progress in grace,
God's work in the world, could be represented most graphically (and even
experienced) in terms of the war between the Churches. Regeneration
through grace could be aligned with peregrination between Churches,
politics and religion moving together.

Nevertheless, it is extremely misleading to see the ecclesiastical divisions
between Catholics and Protestants determining how converts converted,
as if grace in conversion could be expressed only through established forms
and structures. This chapter has emphasised one side of the politics/religion
coin to show that movement between the Churches of England and Rome
could combine with a range of concepts of religious conversion familiar
to contemporaries. The political, theological, polemical, intellectual,
emotional and psychological elements inevitably became associated with
each other. But the historian should not imagine that the cloying banalities
of the philosophical polemical system which underpinned movement to
and from Rome dictated exactly how people redefined their allegiances.
Conversion in religion, the affective subject of so much Reformation
literature and preaching, did not fit neatly into the politico-ecclesiastical
conflict between the Churches. The next chapter shows why contemporary
conversions were not preordained by a political agenda. Conversion is as
much a declaration of freedom from institutions as a pledge of allegiance
to them. Thus may we comprehend some of the more glaring anomalies and
paradoxes in contemporaries' changes of religion – why, for example, some
people moved between Churches on several occasions; why there seem to be
so many connections between the religious state at which Catholic and
Protestant converts aimed (despite the enmity of the institutional Churches
in which they wished to experience it); why extremists on one side adopted
equally extreme positions on the other; and, most of all, why the more
extreme change, the less, in a sense, the convert's conversion between
Churches seems to be a change at all. The more intense the experience of
conversion, the more keenly that dilemmas over grace and repentance were
felt and the starker the difference between the hope of heaven and the threat
of damnation, the less did changes of religion obey the logic of the strict
doctrinal formulae which appear on the pages of the polemical tracts.
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