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PREFACE

Arminianism, in its most precise sense as a rejection of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, played a major role in the religious conflicts of Early Stuart England. The term is also applied more broadly to that faction which most strongly supported the ecclesiastical policies of Charles I and Archbishop Laud. Yet, this usage notwithstanding, the debate over the doctrine of predestination was only one among several issues dividing English Protestants, and, by the time they were engaged in a civil war, by no means the most important one.

My purpose in this dissertation is to examine the change in the nature of the religious conflict from approximately the accession of Charles I to his summoning of the Long Parliament. In particular, I propose to explain:

1. The principle concerns of the English Arminians. While other studies explain in detail the origins and rise of English Arminianism, I will attempt to show how the Arminians presented their position when they were at the height of their influence and the common themes in their attacks on the Calvinist doctrine of predestination.

2. When and through what specific issues the doctrinal issue was overshadowed;

3. To what extent the divisions created by these issues
correspond to the earlier ones between Calvinists and Arminians;

4. To what extent the doctrinal conflict over predestination persisted under other guises;

5. What new concerns were reflected in the defense of Laud's policies.

Inasmuch as these problems encompass differences over what members of the Church of England were publicly to profess and practice, I have attempted to answer them primarily on the basis of what was publicly written and said in contemporary books, pamphlets, and sermons. In quoting from these and other primary sources, I have retained the original spelling and punctuation except when the meaning would otherwise be unclear or when a work was available only in an edition with modernized spelling. I also substitute "u" for "j" and "v" and "i," respectively, in accordance with modern usage. All dates are given in old style.
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INTRODUCTION

Both constitutional and religious issues led to the English Civil Wars, and no attempt to explain the conflict can ignore either group of issues. Yet attempts to explain the religious conflicts of Early Stuart England have created considerable confusion in the historiography of the period. All historians agree that the religious conflict involved a group loosely labelled "Puritans" and those favoring the ecclesiastical policies of Charles I and Bishop, later Archbishop, Laud. There is less agreement, though, as to the size and membership of the opposing groups and as to the significance of the issues over which they clashed. One indicator of this confusion is the welter of terms used to denominate - let alone to describe and analyze - the supporters of Charles I and Laud. Historians have, even if with reservations, accepted the term "Puritan," but the Establishment opposing the Puritans has variously been labelled Laudian, Anglican, High Church, even, anachronistically Anglo-Catholic, but more commonly, Arminian.

Arminianism did not originate in England but in Holland. The word describes the theological position of Jakob Hermandzoon (1560-1609, in Latin, Jacobus Arminius) and his followers, a position directly opposed to the Calvinist orthodoxy then prevailing in most of the United Provinces. The Calvinists, or Contra-Remonstrants, charged the Arminians, or Remonstrants, with maintaining five errors, all revolving about a single issue - man's freedom in the process of salvation. In addressing this issue, the Arminians maintained two
points directly contradicting Calvinist orthodoxy:

1) That Christ died for everyone, not only for the elect, and that potentially everyone can benefit from Christ's sacrifice.

2) That in the final analysis man bears the responsibility for his own salvation or damnation.

Salvation, to be sure, is by faith alone, but man can accept or reject the gift of faith offered by God. Also, election is conditional, and sin may cause the Elect to fall from grace.2

The Dutch Arminians suffered a severe defeat at the Synod of Dort in 1618, but Arminianism spread, among other places to England, where its adherents in turn challenged the Calvinists in the Church of England. Though this dispute between Calvinists and Arminians was the most bitterly contested religious issue at the accession of Charles I, historians of the period have remained divided on its significance within the overall religious conflict and thus of its wider significance in the coming of the English Civil Wars. Until recently, the consensus was that while some clerics in Early Stuart England professed Arminian tenets, their Arminianism per se bore little relation to the major controversies which would shake and ultimately topple the regime of Charles I and the established Church. The substantive issues, many historians have argued, concerned ceremonies and church government, and if Laud and his supporters were at times labelled "Arminians," it was, in the words of J. P. Kenyon, "little more than a term of abuse."3 Likewise, H. R. Trevor-Roper, C. V. Wedgwood, Godfrey Davies, E. R. Adair, W. R. Fryer and T. M. Parker have treated Arminianism as a small and relatively unimportant component of the fundamental differences dividing the Caroline Church.4
Other historians have seen the Arminians as part of a much larger group which they term "Anglican." They find among this group, even among those whose views on predestination were clearly Calvinist, a coherent religious outlook opposed to the views of "Puritans." J. F. H. New, for example, has discerned distinctly Anglican and Puritan positions on man, the Church, sacramental faith, and human destiny, with Anglicans in general holding a more optimistic view of human potential, believing in an "easier" path to salvation and a more immanent God, and viewing grace as more contiguous with nature than did the Puritans. J. Sears McGee has also tried this approach with a period later than that studied by New. Like New, McGee argues that "Anglican" and "Puritans" denominate actual religious groupings with discernible differences in outlook, differences which can be reduced to a few underlying themes. According to McGee, the root issue concerns the gap between the potential of "natural" man and the powers accorded him by unearned grace. To the Anglican, the gap was more narrow than that perceived by the Puritan. These differences, says McGee, emerge most graphically in the relative weight each side accorded the "Two Tables" of the Ten Commandments. The Anglicans emphasize the second table or the moral law, primarily duties to man; the Puritans, the first table or laws relating to God's majesty.

Both New and McGee might be criticized for their static views of the religious controversies of Stuart England, for neither of them pay much attention to changes in the specific issues which divided English Protestants over the long spans of time they examine.
Also, their methodology renders their conclusions suspect, for the bulk of their work consists of quotes favorable to their theses from authors they assume to be Anglican or Puritan. New and McGee thus begin by labelling writers as Anglican or Puritan and then cull their works to support their hypotheses in a deductive, ultimately tautological exercise. Furthermore, McGee in particular bases his rather far-reaching conclusions on embarrassingly slender evidence. For example, though he claims to examine the differences between Anglicans and Puritans from 1620 to 1670, most of the "Anglicans" he cites - Henry Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Anthony Farindon, and Robert Sanderson - flourished after 1640, while his case for Puritanism includes no references to William Prynne, only one to Henry Burton, and none to Richard Baxter, except in a footnote.

The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, by Charles and Katherine George, takes exactly the opposite view - that within the Church of England there was substantial accord regarding doctrine, ceremonies, and church government. Thus, the authors downplay the role of religion in the conflict between Crown and Parliament and assert, "The dynamic of what was to come must surely be sought, we feel, somewhere other than here." However, the Georges' book suffers from the same defects in approach as do New's and McGee's. For the most part they ignore the specific issues which rocked the Church of England, instead offering selective quotes on very general topics to produce definitive conclusions. Moreover, as New noted, the Georges' picture of relative religious harmony in Early Stuart England ill accords with an undeniable fact: those whose views
Inclined toward Puritanism tended to side with Parliament; those more in sympathy with the religious policies of Charles I and his bishops sided with the Crown.9

But even though the Georges' glossing over of religious differences may be misleading, they do manage to rescue the Arminians from the vast sea of what New and McGee call "Anglicans." Whatever else their faults, the Georges do demonstrate a rather broad consensus among Elizabethan and Stuart Protestants on the subject of predestination. Nearly all of the major figures of the period felt comfortable with the Calvinist propositions that faith is a true gift of God, that it cannot be earned, and that it generally produces good works.10 However, the Georges acknowledge, Laud and his supporters formed an exception to this rule. During the reign of Charles I, they launched a concerted attack on the public preaching of Calvinist tenets, claiming them to be destructive of morality because of their categorical dismissal of man's role in the scheme of salvation. Laud and the Arminians, they concede, deliberately rejected the religious consensus which united English Protestants. The Georges pass over this finding rather hurriedly, dismissing the Arminian attacks on Calvinism as merely a "stock theme of aggression and defamation" and not a substantive difference over the importance of ethics.11 Yet their conclusion, however cursorily they themselves treat it, challenges a long-accepted view which minimized the importance of Arminian doctrines.

The Georges were not the first to note the broad consensus within the Church of England that Arminianism challenged. Ivronwy
Morgan's excellent study of John Preston uncovered the important, respectable political connections of a leading Puritan divine and recorded the alarm felt not only by those usually labelled Puritans but even by some bishops at the growing influence of Laud and the Arminians under Charles I. Similarly, W. M. Lamont's Marginal Pryne shows how Laud's bitterest enemy opposed the Arminians not in the name of Calvin's Geneva but in the name of the Royal Supremacy and the Elizabethan Church of Foxe and Jewel. In both politics and religion, Lamont argues, "in the period between 1626 and 1640, Pryne was a moderate."

The thesis touched upon by the Georges, Morgan, and Lamont has received a thorough, convincing, and highly suggestive defense in the D. Phil. thesis and forthcoming book by N. R. N. Tyacke. Tyacke presents an impressive array of evidence, especially from the Universities, to support his contention that under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts, Calvinism "was extremely influential, even predominant in England" and that Arminianism represented a revolutionary challenge to the doctrinal status quo. Tyacke also challenges the long accepted view that English Arminianism was mainly an indigenous movement which owed little or nothing to Dutch Arminianism. He shows that though English reactions to Calvinism did predate Arminius, it was only after the spread of continental ideas in the universities that what had hitherto been a very loosely associated group with little in common except a vague antipathy to Calvinism coalesced into a distinct Arminian party. Moreover, the Commons Debates and other sources reveal that when contemporaries denounced Laud
and his supporters as "Arminians," they used the term primarily in a doctrinal sense, not as a catch-all term to include objectionable ceremonies and other ecclesiastical practices.¹⁸

Tyacke's thesis has even broader implications. If he is right about the innovative character of Arminianism, then Puritanism was not necessarily an ever-growing, revolutionary threat to the Established Church.¹⁹ Rather, despite some Puritan dissent in matters of ceremony and church government, the fundamental accord in doctrine enabled most Puritans to conform to the discipline of the Church of England under James I. It was only after Arminians had seized control of the Church and had expanded the definition of nonconformity to include anti-Arminianism and opposition to Laud's ceremonial program that Puritanism really began its rise. The career of William Prynne, for example, illustrates how a moderate's opposition to the Arminian bishops grew into a radical's opposition to episcopacy.²⁰

Tyacke, then, offers strong support of his contentions that:

1) the opponents of Arminianism rightly saw it as a threat to the doctrinal status quo of the late Elizabethan and Jacobean Church,

2) the doctrinal conflict over predestination and grace was of direct, for a time overwhelming, significance in explaining the religious conflicts of Early Stuart England.

His research has far-reaching implications for the historiography of the period, for henceforth the division between Calvinist and Arminian is "a religious split which has to be accommodated in any explanatory model of the English Revolution."²¹ However, two points which augment rather than contradict Tyacke's arguments come to mind.
First, though Tyacke makes abundantly clear the existence of a Calvinist hegemony in the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church, Arminianism was not entirely without precedents of its own. Tyacke himself examines what H. C. Porter has termed "Arminianism avant la lettre" in the Elizabethan Church and describes the repeated if short-lived and isolated challenges to Calvinism even before Arminius took up the banner in Holland. Betsy Amaru, in an unpublished Ph.D. thesis, has examined even more closely these clashes between Calvinists and "proto-Arminians," and while like Tyacke she finds that the outcome of these disputes testify to the strong Calvinist influence in the Elizabethan Church, she also notes how most Elizabethan divines tried wherever possible to avoid prolonged discussion of predestination. And though Tyacke cites James I's support of the Contra-Remonstrants (Calvinists) at the Synod of Dort as evidence of James I's personal commitment to Calvinism and of the Calvinistic tenor of the Jacobean Church, Amaru notes that this Calvinist external policy did not preclude James I's advancement of Arminian clergy within the Church of England. Samuel Harsnett, Richard Neile, and Lancelot Andrewes provide examples of Arminians who held positions of importance in the Church, in the Universities, even in the Court of James I himself, provided, of course, that they kept their views to themselves. Thus, though the open defense of Arminianism and the advancement of strongly Arminian clergy under Charles I was revolutionary, the existence of and the de facto toleration of those holding Arminian or Arminian-like doctrines can be found well before this time and may even have been a logical conse-
sequence of the deliberate doctrinal ambiguity of the Elizabethan Settlement.

Secondly, while Tyacke rightly takes other historians to task for ignoring the doctrinal conflict between Calvinists and Arminians, the religious conflicts of Early Stuart England most definitely included other issues as well. In some cases they were undoubtedly connected with the doctrinal issues. As I mentioned above, the case of William Prynne shows how opposition to episcopacy per se arose only after the episcopacy came under Arminian control. Still, in the 1630's, predestination itself arose infrequently in public debate; instead the conflict shifted especially to ceremonial issues: bowing at the name of Jesus, the position of the Communion Table, the proper observance of the Lord's Day, to name the most important ones. Tyacke claims that overt doctrinal debate disappeared because of its suppression by Charles I in 1629, but that behind many of these ceremonial issues lay the doctrinal issue of how man receives grace. Therefore, he argues, "the Caroline concept of the beauty of holiness . . . can be seen as a peculiarly English manifestation of Arminianism in power."\textsuperscript{26} In some cases, the ritual surrounding Communion, for example, the doctrinal issues definitely emerge in the relative importance each side attached to sacramental grace; in the case of the Sabbatarian controversy, the connection is less apparent. Whatever were the "real" intentions of Laud and his supporters in introducing their ceremonial program, it is interesting that their public statements rarely justified them along doctrinal lines. Rather, as I intend to show, their arguments emphasize far more the
traditions of the Church Universal and obedience to ecclesiastical authority. Also, while by and large Arminians supported Laud on these issues and Calvinists opposed him, the divisions by no means correspond perfectly. Some Calvinists strongly supported, at least in public, conformity to Laud's ecclesiastical policies, while some Arminians gave at best lukewarm support. To this problem I will return. First, however, I will examine the religious issue with which the stormy reign of Charles I began — Arminianism.


Ibid., p. 53.


19. For the most famous defense of this view, see William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism, 1570-1640* (New York: College University Press, 1938).


CHAPTER I

ARMINIANISM AND ITS DEFENDERS

Whatever importance one assigns the doctrinal issues in explaining the coming of the English Civil Wars, there can be no doubt that the religious conflicts which rocked the English Church and State in the 1620's concerned above all the doctrinal issue of predestination. With the publication of two books openly voicing Arminian opinions, Richard Montagu launched the most direct attack on Calvinist orthodoxy since the late 16th century.\(^1\) Of course, there had been opposition to Calvinism in the intervening years, and some of this predated any possible Arminian influence. For example, Lancelot Andrewes, while he was chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, probably wrote the anonymous "Judgement of the Lambeth Articles."\(^2\) The treatise sharply criticized public discussion of predestination, whose exact nature was a mystery to man. Though Andrewes, like the later Arminians, tied reprobation to man's sins rather than to God's arbitrary decree and linked predestination to God's foresight of human behavior, he avoided dogmatic statements. Instead he urged harmony and obedience to ecclesiastical authority.\(^3\) Andrewes enjoyed cordial relations with the later leaders of the Arminians - Bishops Laud, Neile, and Buckeridge - and appeared in virtually all matters to be in close agreement with them, but until his death in 1626, he shunned doctrinal controversy.\(^4\)

In contrast, Richard Montagu represented the culmination of a
movement which had been nurtured by and openly espoused the ideas of Dutch Arminianism. Thus, T. M. Parker is wrong when he argues that "English 'Arminianism' was parallel to Arminianism proper, not its product..."

On the contrary, Arminius and Dutch Arminianism were intimately linked with developments in England. Arminius had after all written a major attack on the scholarly Elizabethan Puritan, William Perkins. James I later became deeply involved in the disputes in the Netherlands and even sent delegates to the Synod of Dort, where in 1618 the Arminians were roundly condemned. Furthermore, as Carl Bangs has noted, James I's politically motivated defense of Calvinist orthodoxy in the Netherlands ironically stimulated English interest in Dutch Arminianism. There was a reissue of Arminius' works in 1612/13, and the future bishops William Laud and John Howson were among those becoming interested in Arminianism at this time.

Richard Neile, bishop of Durham, provided key leadership to the nascent Arminian movement through his patronage and protection. The Durham House Group, taking its name from Neile's London residence where they met, included those who would be the most prominent supporters of Arminianism in the 1620's. Not only did Neile advance Arminians to important positions in the see of Durham; he also helped advance like-minded men elsewhere in the Church - William Laud, for example. And in 1624, while the other Arminian bishops Laud, Buckeridge, and Andrewes were keeping a judicious silence, Neile was the only bishop to lend Richard Montagu public support. Though later Neile would mysteriously fade into obscurity as Archbishop of York, his Durham House Group "had provided a nucleus for the clerical
leaders who were to come into their own during the Personal Rule, and to apply on a national scale ideas which had given the Durham House Group its original coherence."

For some time, James I was able to combine favors to some members of this group with a strong defense of Calvinist orthodoxy at home and abroad. His intervention in Dutch matters has already been mentioned. In addition, James I resolutely opposed domestic challenges to Calvinism, as Edward Simpson learned when he maintained an Arminian proposition in a sermon preached before the king in 1617. Meanwhile, as I showed in the last chapter, James I continued his promotion of the more discreet Arminian clergy.

In 1624, however, Richard Montagu forced the issue with the appearance of his Gagg for an Old Goose. Montagu (1577-1644), then prebendary of Windsor and successively bishop of Chichester (1628) and of Norwich (1638), had written the book to counteract Roman Catholic proselytizing of the parishioners of his living in Essex. As part of his defense of the Church of England, Montagu had denied that the Calvinist view of predestination constituted one of its doctrines. Naturally, Montagu's assertions angered many of those holding Calvinist views, including George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury. But though Abbot and other prominent clergy condemned Montagu's heterodoxy, James I supported the beleaguered cleric. As both Tyacke and Amaru note, there is no evidence to support the assertions of later Arminians that James I's defense of Montagu signalled a departure from his life-long Calvinist views. Possibly James I stood by Montagu because of his earlier defense of
the Church's privileges, privileges so intimately connected in the mind of James I with those of the Crown. The most obvious explanation, though, is the increasing control of affairs of State assumed by the Duke of Buckingham and the future Charles I, both Arminian sympathizers, as James's physical and mental condition deteriorated.\(^{14}\)

Montagu was preparing a defense of his Gagg against two of his detractors, the moderate Puritans, Samuel Ward and John Yates when his royal protector James I died. Thus, it was Charles I who took up the defense of Montagu, and it was to him that Montagu's even more explicitly Arminian Appello Caesarem was dedicated. Although Montagu's Gagg does indeed seem to have been written primarily to refute the charges of Roman Catholic missionaries and only incidentally to challenge Calvinist orthodoxy, his Appello included a full-blown defense of Arminian doctrines and vicious attacks on those whom he labelled Puritans. Moreover, while Montagu seems to have produced his Gagg on his own, he wrote Appello Caesarem in conjunction with John Cosin, who along with Montagu had been associated with the Durham House Group. Cosin (1594-1672) assisted Montagu throughout his tribulations and later earned many enemies in the House of Commons and in Durham, where he was a canon of the cathedral, for his energetic efforts to revive pre-Reformation ceremonies and liturgies. It was Cosin who introduced Montagu to the writings of Arminius, after Montagu had completed his Appello.\(^{15}\)

The political implications of Montagu's case and its intrusion into other issues between King and Parliament have already been examined in detail.\(^{16}\) Several important consequences emerged from
this struggle. The estrangement between King and Parliament grew as Charles I at first hesitantly, then decisively intervened on Montagu's behalf, naming him a royal chaplain and eventually a bishop in order to protect him from the House of Commons. Furthermore, the Duke of Buckingham supported Montagu and the Arminians in a conference called at his London residence of York House. Though the conference had been called for the purpose of easing religious tensions, Buckingham's actions shattered one of the Crown's tenuous links with moderate Puritan clerical and lay leaders. And, not least, in the course of the struggle, for reasons still not understood, leadership of the Arminian faction shifted from Neile to Laud.

My concern here, though, is less with these points than with the basis of the assault on the Calvinist hegemony in England led by Montagu and taken up by other Arminians. In his Gagg and Appello, Montagu presented the major points of the Arminian case, points which would recur in the works of other Arminians. In A New Gagg for an Old Goose, Montagu charged that Roman Catholic propagandists and missionaries were attempting to discredit the Church of England and thus win converts by presenting "mere opinions, private fancies, peculiar propositions of private men . . . some raked together out of the lay-stals of deepest Puritanisme," as the official doctrines of the Church of England. Among these "private fancies," argued Montagu, were Calvinist doctrines. Montagu began by denying the impossibility of the Elect falling from grace finally and irreversibly. Certainly, he acknowledged, some members of the Church of England maintain the reverse, and they are free to do so, so long
as they do not thereby disrupt the unity of the Church or attempt to impose this private judgement on others as a fundamental doctrine. Such points, contended Montagu, "For the major part are fitter for schooles than popular discourses: and may be held or not held, without heresie either way." Nevertheless, Montagu made clear his own belief that the "Elec" could and did fall from grace, bolstering his argument with references to the Scriptures and the Church Fathers.

Montagu dealt similarly deal with the Calvinist doctrines of predestination. He disclaimed any intent to define doctrinally the exact manner in which God elects or reprobates. Debate throughout the history of the Church, between and within the Catholic and Protestant camps, had failed to resolve this issue. Regarding the Church of England, Montagu once again maintained that belief in an absolute, irrespective predestination was a private matter, a belief which could safely be either held or doubted. Yet, as before, Montagu did not hide his own Arminian sympathies. He argued from Scriptural and Patristic evidence and from homilies of the Church of England that God had intended Christ's sacrifice to redeem all mankind, not merely the Elect, and that Reprobates were damned on account of their own sins, not by an inevitable decree.

Montagu's defense of Arminianism in his New Gagg for and Old Goose, then, was brief, and, though not evasive, tentative in its assertions. The furor which his breach with Calvinist orthodoxy aroused served to strengthen rather than diminish his Arminian convictions. Within the same year that his Gagg appeared, he was
already contemplating a defense of the positions he had advanced there­in, and this time he told his friend and associate, John Cosin, he would present an even stronger case for the consistency of his position with official and unofficial pronouncements within the Church of England. He would garner evidence from the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, from the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, at which James I dealt a severe setback to English Puritanism, from the homilies, and even from the writings of the Calvinist Bishop Morton of Coventry and Lichfield.22

At this point Montagu still refused to label his opinions "Arminian," even in private. As he was preparing sermons for the lectureship to which he had been appointed, he told Cosin that he would "neither favour Arm [inanism]: nor patronize Calv [inism] ..." He would preach "not only the plaine letter of the Church of England, but the Puritans' owne interpretation of it that way at Hampton Court, by the mouth of Dr. Reynolds."23 Though there is no reason to doubt Montagu's sincerity, his thought was in fact coming under strong Arminian influences. From the very beginning, he wrote his Appello Caesarem in close co-operation with Cosin, and when he had completed his first draft, he left the revision of it entirely to Cosin and Bishop Neile. "Add, alter, do what you will," Montagu told them.24 Moreover, after Appello Caesarem was completed, it was Cosin who introduced Montagu to the writings of Arminius. Until then, Montagu claimed publicly and privately that he had never before read Arminius.25 As might have been expected, Montagu read Arminius with strong approval. "The man had more in him than all the
Netherlands," he wrote to Cosin. 26

How, then, did these stronger Arminian influences emerge in Montagu's second book? He certainly discussed predestination at greater length than before, but even more noticeable was his more aggressive stance in defense of essentially the same positions he had previously maintained. He insisted that he had affirmed nothing contrary to the accepted doctrines of the Church of England, that the true threat to the Church came from his opponents who labelled his opinions "Popish" and "Arminian" but were themselves "Classical Puritaines" seeking to foist their own doctrine and discipline on the Church of England. 27 Montagu himself claimed to be not "Arminian, Calvinist, or Lutheran (names of division) but a Christian" and considered it absurd and degrading that members of the Church of England, "a Church every way so transcendent unto that [sic] van Leyden and of Geneva" should denominate themselves by the names of leaders of those Churches. 28 The touchstone of true doctrine, he claimed, was neither Calvin nor Arminius nor any other contemporary but the authority of the Scripture and the verdict of the Church through the ages. Hence, he agreed with Arminius insofar as Arminius interpreted these sources correctly, and he dissented from Calvin (who, he said, was "Farre in account and estimation before Arminius") insofar as Calvin "dissenteth from Antiquity and the universall auncient Church." 29

Montagu also emphasized to a greater extent than before the compatibility of his views on grace with the doctrines of the Church of England. Specifically, he denied that Articles 16 and 17 of the
39 Articles of Religion taught the impossibility of falling from grace or that man was saved or damned by an irrespective, irreversible decree. According to Montagu, Article 16 maintained only that a regenerate person who fell into sin and thus from grace might be, not necessarily would, be restored to grace. Likewise, Article 17, though it affirmed God to be the ultimate source of man's election or reprobation, said nothing as to the manner in which either process was affected. Montagu personally believed that all those who voluntarily accepted Christ were saved, while those who of their own free will rejected Christ were damned. "If this be Arminianism," he stated, "esto. I must profess it." In both cases, however, he claimed to assert dogmatically no "more than I am urged to doe by the plaine and expresse words of our Articles and Doctrine publickly professed and established in our Church."

But though Montagu thus professed to take a moderate, tolerant stance on these matters, the terms in which he denounced those opposing his views were anything but moderate and tolerant. He accused his Calvinist accusers of secretly harboring Puritan sympathies, of seeking to overthrow the established doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, the same doctrines which they now treacherously claimed to be upholding. He even managed to inject a note of xenophobia and political hysteria, when he charged that his opponents' true design was to impose their Calvinist doctrines on the Church of England

that so through Forraine Doctrine being infused secretly and installed cunningly, and pretended craftily to bee the Churches, at length you may
winde-in with Forraine Discipline also, and so fill Christendome with a Pope in every Parish for the Church, and with popular Democraties and Democraticall Anarchies in the State.

The response to Montagu was swift, impassioned, and nearly universally censorious. John Yates, one of the "informers" mentioned in the subtitle of Montagu's *Appello Caesarem*, wrote an even-tempered, rigorously logical response. Though he refused to label himself a Calvinist (like Montagu he rejected any label other than "Christian"), he vigorously upheld the predestinarian position as the authentic doctrine of Scripture, the Reformation and the Church of England. He assembled his own array of evidence from Scripture, the Fathers (especially Augustine, of course), and Continental and English Reformers to prove that the Elect cannot fall finally and totally from grace and that God chooses his Elect by an absolute, irrespective decree, over which man's actions have no control. To say otherwise, said Yates, would be to impugn God's sovereignty, to imagine a scheme wherein

Gods will is resisted, and the lumpe hath gotten power over the Potter, to make himselfe to honour or dishonour ... nothing is reserved to God in secret to make his Word effectual; no will, no counsell, no decree to establish, that is any whit better knowne to himselfe, then to us ...

Joining in the chorus were the English delegates to the Synod of Dort, led by George Carleton, bishop of Chichester, who maintained that their subscription to the Articles of the synod condemning Arminianism in no way conflicted with their loyalty to the Church of England and that the articles were in perfect accord with the doctrines of their native church. William Prynne, in the first
of his many books, warned against Arminian inroads into the Church and tried to rally the moderate Calvinist forces within the Church under the leadership of Archbishop Abbot to crush the assault on orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{35} Other famous or soon-to-be famous figures among the anti-Arminian writers were Francis Rous, prominent among the Parliamentary opponents to Charles I's policies; Henry Burton, the Puritan preacher whose outspokenness would lead to the loss first of his position as court preacher, and then of his ears; and Daniel Featley, a former chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, and a prolific author, who anonymously penned three attacks on Montagu.\textsuperscript{36}

Those publicly defending Arminianism in published books and sermons were less numerous. Among the more prominent ones were Thomas Jackson (1579-1640), a renowned Oxford scholar, president of Corpus Christi College, author of a twelve volume commentary on the Apostles' Creed, and perhaps the only Arminian who had support in the House of Commons; Christopher Potter (1591-1646), Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, who diligently implemented the Laudian reforms in Oxford but who also vigorously asserted the privileges of his college against Laud; and Samuel Hoard (1599-1658), yet another Oxford scholar (All Souls) and (surprisingly) chaplain to Robert Rich, the Puritan Earl of Warwick.\textsuperscript{37}

Though all of these men had once held Calvinist views, none of them explains very fully his "conversion" to Arminianism. As early as 1615 Thomas Jackson maintained that "men regenerate may sin so grievously as to fall both totally and finally from grace . . ."\textsuperscript{38} Jackson claimed that he became aware of his apparent breach with
Calvinist orthodoxy after he was appointed minister of St. Nicholas, Newcastle (1623). There he learned of the writings of "a great rabbi in some private conventicles in and about that town" who maintained that "whosoever was elected from eternity was never the child of wrath, save only in the esteem of men." When Jackson took it upon himself to refute this assertion, he found himself accused of denying "the doctrine of all reformed churches concerning election and reprobation." Christopher Potter abandoned Calvinism in much the same way as had Arminius himself - in the course of attempting to defend it. Samuel Hoard has left no direct testimony of the process by which "a zealous Calvinist in the beginning" became "a greater Arminian afterward." However, he probably was assisted in preparing his most famous book, Gods Love to Mankind (1633) by Henry Mason (1573?–1645), an associate of Thomas Jackson and to whose prebend of Willesden in St. Paul's Cathedral Hoard succeeded in 1637. Mason and perhaps even Jackson himself might have had some influence in leading Hoard away from Calvinism.

But whatever had led these authors to abandon their former Calvinist views, they now defended their new Arminian convictions skillfully and wholeheartedly. Their writings offer an impressive case for Arminianism on Scriptural, historical, moral, and practical grounds.

As had Montagu, these other writers denied that their doctrines were specifically Arminian. Their opposition of Calvinism, they argued, represented no innovation and was in complete accord with the pronouncements of Scripture, the Early Church, and the Church of Eng-
land. Such, indeed, had always been the claim of English Arminians. On August 2, 1625, when Arminianism was just beginning to disturb English religion and politics, the Arminian Bishops Buckeridge, Howson, and Laud wrote to the Duke of Buckingham to protest that Montagu's books had maintained nothing contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{43} Nearly 20 years later, when the fortunes of Arminianism and the Arminians were quite different, Archbishop Laud would still maintain at his trial that the doctrines he had sanctioned were not Arminian but fully orthodox: "For that Christ died for all men is the true and constant doctrine of the Catholic Church in all ages, and no error of Arminius . . . .\textsuperscript{44}

Thus, a major part of most Arminian writings consisted of quote after quote from Scripture, the Church Fathers, and the official doctrines and liturgy of the Church of England. In fact, Christopher Potter became an Arminian when, as he was reading Arminian authors with a view toward refuting them, he encountered disturbing arguments backed by Scriptural references, arguments which he was unable to refute. He also examined the writings of the Fathers and found the verdict of the Early Church more favorable to Arminianism than to Calvinism.\textsuperscript{45} Nearly all of the Arminian writers at one time or another cited the Scriptural examples of David and Peter, to show that those who had received saving grace could for a time fall into mortal sin, and of Saul and Judas, to show that those who had once enjoyed saving grace could even fall finally and totally from salvation.\textsuperscript{46} Another favorite citation was Ezekiel 18:32 ("For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord
God . . ."), which they believed proved that God intended the application of Christ's sacrifice to be universal, that only man's own sinfulness and obstinacy prevent his salvation. Unless man has a true freedom to accept grace, then God must indeed will the death of those who reject him and his promise in Ezekiel must be a lie.47

Hence, they argued, those Scriptural verses dealing with election and reprobation must be understood in light of God's general promise to save all who had faith. For example, Jackson tried to disassociate the reference in Jude 4 to "men who were of old ordained to this condemnation" from belief in an immutable, irrespective decree of reprobation. The men spoken of, he said, could not logically and morally have been compelled to sin and be condemned. Only the condemnation of their sins, not of their persons, was eternal:

Taking them as now they are, there was a necessity from eternity that they should perish; but there was no necessity from eternity that they should be such ungodly men as now they are. This necessity did accrue in time, they wilfully and freely brought it upon themselves.48

Similarly, Samuel Hoard argued that a Calvinistic interpretation of such verses would make the Bible and therefore God self-contradictory.49

These arguments illustrate a major theme of the English Arminians, especially Jackson and Hoard - a belief in the logical and moral superiority as well as the Scriptural validity of their doctrines. Of course, logic led their Calvinist opponents in a very different direction. For them, God's sovereignty logically required that no
one be saved except those whom God has freely chosen. Any human
action that could influence or alter God's choice would make God less
sovereign. As Montagu's opposite, John Yates phrased it:

What God wils to be, that he foreknowes to be: but
if he will it not, but leave it to be willed as
man shall give him cause, then shall his pre-
sience be subject to error, as his wil is to
change.50

This still leaves man squarely with the responsibility for his own
sins, said Yates. God in his mercy and for reasons he alone knows
has chosen to save a few people, his Elect. All others are justly
condemned for the sins their own corrupted natures have led them
to commit.51 Thus, the reprobate can blame only themselves for their
damnation, but the Elect owe their salvation to God alone. To
attribute their election to any other source would be blasphemous and
presumptuous. As William Twisse, Jackson's opponent argued, "God
forbid that we should so maintaine God to be no Author of evill, as
withal to deny him to be the author of good."52

Just as Calvinists believed their doctrines to be necessarily
derived from God's majesty, so the Arminians believed theirs to follow
from God's justice. They endeavored to prove that, no less than
their opponents, they fully acknowledged God's sovereignty but not at
the expense of his justice nor to the detriment of morality. Thomas
Jackson, for example, in his Treatise of Divine Essence and Attributes,
argued that to say salvation was contingent on man's voluntary accep-
tance of grace in no way implied that God's will could be frustrated.
Just as God's sovereignty included the power to decree certain events
necessary, so too it encompassed the power to decree other events contingent. Indeed, this latter power formed an essential part of God's sovereignty:

So far is freedom of choice or contingency from being incompatible with immutability of God's will, that without this infinite variety of choice or freedom of thought in man and angels, we cannot rightly conceive him to be as infinitely wise as his decree is immutable.53

God had made salvation contingent on man's acceptance or rejection of grace, and predestination was nothing more or less than God's foreknowledge of man's decision. In no way did this subject God to man's will, for God had freely chosen this scheme of salvation, from among many possibilities. John Plaifere, the least known of the Arminian writers, phrased this most succinctly:

For he predestined to life those particular men, to whom out of his own good pleasure he decreed to give those happy means, whereby he foreknew they would be vessels fit for honour, being given unto them: He rejected those, letting them to perish, to whom he decreed to give no other means than such under which he foreknew that through their own ingratitude they would be fit for wrath.54

Salvation, then, comes from God alone, but in such a way that the reprobate bears full and direct responsibility for his fate. The Arminians denied any affinity with Pelagianism here. Thomas Jackson stressed that the natural man, unaided by grace, can of his own power do nothing pleasing to God, that he cannot even, "dispose his heart for the better receiving of grace."55 Yet though man can do no particular thing to assure his salvation, he still hath a true possibility or freedom of will to do or not do something required by God, which thing
being done by man God will dispose his heart, and make it fit for grace; the same thing not being done, or neglected, the neglecter's heart shall every day than other be more indisposed and more incapable of grace than heretofore.  

Jackson explained this apparent contradiction with an analogy, in which he compared God to a Prince and man to his rebellious subjects. Accordingly, God's offer of grace is a general pardon, contingent only on the rebels' submission. But though the act of submission is absolutely essential to benefit from the pardon, the Prince alone can be said to have saved the rebels. Likewise, though man must make some efforts to make his soul acceptable for God's offer of grace, such efforts are not really the "cause" of his salvation. They may be "the instrumental cause or means subordinate to the principal cause why Christ's sheep are suffered or admitted to enjoy the benefit of the same free pardon," but they are "no cause at all why the pardon was proclaimed, or why the kingdom of heaven was prepared for them ..."  

But though man's role in his own salvation is thus essentially passive, it is nevertheless essential. Those who deny man this modest role thereby remove the onus of sin from the sinner to God, for if the reprobate are always under the compulsion to sin, then God is "not the necessary only, but the only cause of all and every obliquity, of all and every sin, of all that hath been, is, or can be blameworthy in men or devils, from their creation to everlasting."  

Similarly, Samuel Hoard argued syllogistically that if (a) God's decree of reprobation is absolute, and (b) reprobation is supposed to be a punishment for
sins, then it logically follows that (c) God's decree places on reprobates the necessity of sinning. The conclusion, said Hoard, is inescapable from the premises. Any action by God which in any way predisposes man toward sin makes God *ipso facto* the author of sin.59

For this reason, Thomas Jackson believed that the Arminian position, far from impugning God's omnipotence, affirmed God's immutability; that is, his unswerving adherence to eternal standards of goodness and justice. By virtue of his goodness, God would have all men saved and extends to each one of them the means to salvation. That all do not respond implies no frustration of God's will, for God's infinite justice also requires that the means to salvation be offered with no element of compulsion.60 Accordingly, God directs his will not toward this or that individual but toward the qualities of goodness and evil, and he realizes his will by rewarding those who choose good and punishing those who choose evil. In this sense his will is eternal and may never be frustrated. Those who choose good, God has from his foresight of their choice always determined to reward; those who choose evil have been foreordained to punishment "from all eternities," even though God has never willed their choice of evil.61

This insistence on God's adherence to eternal standards of goodness is one of the strongest and perhaps most original themes in Jackson's defense of Arminianism. It stands diametrically opposed to the views propounded by the Calvinist John Preston at the York House Conference (see above): "God delights in nothing but himself; His joy & comfort is terminated in Himselpe."62 It also reveals Jackson as "a hitherto unknown Platonist" of Early Stuart England.63 Sarah
Hutton finds evidence of Jackson's Platonism in his belief in the 
prisca theologica or the knowledge of God handed down from Pythagoras,
Hermes Trismegistus, Plato, and others, and in his critical stance 
toward Aristotelian philosophy, especially as it was adapted by the 
Schoolmen. She also notes that Jackson's opponent, William Twisse,
criticized him precisely on these grounds. However, she overlooks 
another manifestation of Jackson's Platonism: his insistence on the 
real, objective existence of goodness, an existence no less real than 
that of God. Jackson denied charges that he hereby postulated the 
existence of any goodness in man prior to that infused by God. He 
did, though, insist that good and evil exist in nature even apart from 
"the act or exercise of God's will," such that things are good 
not because God wills them but rather are willed by God because they 
are in and of themselves good. Thus, Cain's murder of Abel was 
immediately recognized as evil, even though God had not yet propagated 
any law against murder. Likewise, in the controversy over pre­
destination, Jackson argued that an absolute, irrespective decree of 
election or reprobation was logically impossible, inasmuch as God, the 
source of all goodness, would thereby contradict eternal, recognizable 
standards of goodness.

Samuel Hoard presented basically the same objections to the 
Calvinist doctrine of predestination. (Perhaps he reflected Jackson's 
influence here, see above). Certainly God's power, taken by itself, 
enables him to reprobate and elect men at will, to require them to 
have faith yet to withhold faith from all but a few. Yet though it is 
certainly within God's power to do so, such a plan could hardly consist
with God's "Mercy, Justice, Truth and Holinesse." In fact, these virtues glorify God far more than his power does, for "acts of power are not morally good in themselves, but are made good or evil by their concomitants. If they be accompanied with Justice, Mercy & c., they are good; if otherwise, they are naught." Nor is God's exercise of these virtues as far removed from human experience as Calvinists maintain. Except, of course, for a vast difference in degree, that which is just, upright and mercifull in men, is so in God too: and by these virtues in our selves with acts conformable to them, we may safely measure what are so in God.

Besides defending their views as logically and morally superior to those of the Calvinists, the Arminians also offered a more practical defense of their doctrines. In various ways they tried to prove that Arminianism would promote greater public morality and devotion than would Calvinism. At the York House Conference, Francis White (1564?-1638), then bishop of Carlisle and later of Norwich (1629) and Ely (1631), warned of the likely consequences of public preaching of Calvinist views:

... what good will you get by this doctrine, to persuade men that if once, in all their lifetime, they have been in a state of grace and justification, they should presently assure themselves of their salvation by a grace of predestination conceived to remain in them? What will follow, but that always after, they remain justified and sanctified men in God's sight, although they walk in the meanwhile after flesh, and continue in foul and willful sins.

Likewise, Thomas Jackson warned that tying salvation to an uncon-
ditional, absolute predestination dooms to despair those who are unsure of their election, while it leaves vulnerable to presumption those who believe their election irreversible, no matter what they do. In fact, the doctrine posed a dilemma for any charitable person, inasmuch as

> It is not possible for that man not to love God which truly believes that he hath mercy in store for all, or for that man not to hate him, which is persuaded that he hath reserved judgement without mercy to some men as they are men, or that he hath destined them to an inevitable destruction before he gave them life or preservation.

Samuel Hoard argued that not only did Calvinist doctrines portray God as a liar, who publicly promises salvation to all who have faith but who secretly withholds faith from all but a few; it also makes the ministry superfluous, really a farce, because its purpose is to exhort men to seek and accept that which they cannot. Reprobates are left without the slightest responsibility for their wretched estate, for they could never have been other than what they are. Conversely, the proposition that the regenerate can no longer commit mortal sins in this life is truly diabolical, for just as the devil tempted Christ to test his infallibility (Matthew 4:6),

> so doe the members of Satan now set upon the members of Christ; pretending to comfort them, they intend onely to corrupt them.

Even if this is not the intent of those who preach absolute election and reprobation, it is the logical consequence.

Perhaps the most eloquent Arminian argument against the practical consequences of Calvinist preaching came from Peter Heylyn, a writer
who at least before the Civil Wars did not much concern himself with
the doctrinal controversy. (See below, Chapters III and IV.) However,
when Henry Burton claimed that the essence of the Gospel lay in "the
doctrine of Grace and Salvation," Heylyn became enraged. "Cannot
Christ profit us, and you and your disciples?" he protested,

unlesse we must be taught that the greatest part
of mankind, is cast off forever, without any re-
gard had to their sinnes, and all the promises of
the Gospel made unto them of none effect. Or do
you think that faith, and an honest life will be-
come unprofitable, unlesse wee vex poore people
with the noise of doubtfull disputation . . ."75

All of the Arminians, then, may have believed their opponents to
be doctrinally and logically in error, but this alone did not disturb
them. Much like their Dutch predecessors, they would have allowed
their opponents to believe whatever they wished, so long as they did
not divide the Church or expose the laity to damaging doubts because
of a basically speculative matter. This tendency emerged clearly in
a sermon delivered by William Laud in 1626, in which he found Calvinist
doctrines not so much wrong as irrelevant. He did not deny that God
predestined men to election or reprobation; he only maintained that the
process is and ought to remain, a mystery:

It is very dangerous breaking up of 'seals',
especially God's. The indorsement is enough
for us, and very plain to be read. It follows:
'and let every man that calls on the name of
Christ depart from iniquity.' If he do not that,
he is not Christ's; let he talk of predestination
while he will.76

As Chancellor of Oxford, Laud tried to prevent both Calvinists and
Arminians from publicly debating issues relating to predestination.77
In his private as well as public pronouncements, Laud preferred to
avoid discussion of the issue. For example, when in December 1630 he wrote to Samuel Brooke, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, warning him not to publish any books on the predestinarian controversy, he did not discourage Brooke from continuing his private study of the issues. "Nevertheless," he added,

I am yet where I was, that something about these controversies is unmasterable in this life. Neither can I think any expression so happy as to settle all these difficulties.76

Despite Richard Montagu's pivotal role in the doctrinal controversy, he too claimed to approach the issue reluctantly. In his New Gagg For an Old Goose, Montagu acknowledged that man cannot of his own effort turn to God, that he must be drawn by grace. But Montagu professed uncertainty as to the exact workings of this process, noting that the Church had traditionally contained a variety of views, and he urged "moderate spirits" not to contend over this matter.79 In his Appello Caesarem, Montagu repeated this plea:

The Question of free-will, so canvassed and discoursed of up and downe, is indeed a point, and so ever hath beene held, of very great obscurity: fitting rather Schooles, than popular eares or auditories.80

Thomas Jackson also believed that most of the discord over predestination could be avoided, that the strife over a speculative matter concealed broad areas of agreement. He professed a willingness to concede almost every other point to any Calvinist who would grant God's freedom to do good and man's freedom to do evil:

In all other particulars, save only so far as they are reducible to these two, I have not yet the the learning or understanding to conceive what contradiction there is or can be between men not
willing to contend about words.  

For Christopher Potter, too, the debate over predestination concerned not fundamental religious truths but rather minor, non-essential points, on which the verdict of the Early Church, of the Protestant Churches, and even of the Church of England was ambiguous. Surely, then, it was not too much to ask members of the Church of England to put aside their differences "and let God alone with his secrets. . . .", to let "our hearts be united, though our heads differ." Like Montagu, he believed that one could hold either the Calvinist or Arminian position without danger to one's soul. He even speculated that Calvin and Arminius themselves were

now where they agree well, in the kingdom of Heaven; whilst some of their Passionate Disciples
are so eagerly brawling here on Earth.  

It is quite clear, then, that the doctrinal debate formed an important part of the religious disputes of Early Stuart England and that furthermore, while those defending Arminianism may have been few, they presented an impressive case for the Scriptural and historical legitimacy of their views and even more ingenious arguments for the logical and moral superiority of Arminianism. Yet they also believed much of the debate over predestination to be sterile and irrelevant to the practical religious needs of the community, and they professed a willingness to tolerate the views of all those who would be equally circumspect. At least two Calvinists, Joseph Hall, bishop of Exeter, and Robert Sanderson, future bishop of Lincoln, made similar pleas and called for moderation from both sides. However, John Yates saw Montagu's profession of toleration as merely a ruse for admitting
heterodoxy through the back door.\textsuperscript{85}

Whether or not the Arminians were sincere soon became irrelevant, for in 1629 Charles I issued a proclamation forbidding further public debate on predestination. To be sure, both sides occasionally violated the royal directive in sermons, in clandestinely published books, and surreptitiously in licensed books.\textsuperscript{86} Still, the number of sermons and books dealing explicitly with predestination declined rapidly after 1629. However, though the doctrinal debate thus receded somewhat, religious disputes most certainly did not. To what issues the arena of conflict shifted and what relation these issues bore to the earlier doctrinal differences will be the subject of the next chapter.
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CHAPTER II

THE CONFLICT SHIFTS FOCUS

On June 14, 1626, on the eve of the dissolution of Parliament, Charles I issued "A Proclamation for the Establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England."\(^1\) Apparently, this proclamation had been suggested by Bishops Mountain, Neile, Andrewes, Buckeridge, and Laud in a letter to the Duke of Buckingham on January 16, 1625/6. Though, on the one hand, these bishops revealed their Arminian sympathies by attesting to the orthodoxy of Montagu's \textit{Appello Caesarem}, on the other hand, they recommended that the king pursue a neutral course by prohibiting

\begin{quote}
  all parties, members of the Church of England, any further controverting of those questions by public preaching or writing, or any other way, for the disturbance of the peace of this Church for the time to come.\(^2\)
\end{quote}

This course Charles I attempted to follow. He began by assuring his subjects

\begin{quote}
  that neither in matter of Doctrine, or Discipline of the Church, nor in the government of the State, he will admit of the least innovation . . .
\end{quote}

Pursuant to this end, he enjoined both clergy and laity to refrain from all written or spoken pronouncements on religion except "such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England..." Furthermore, he authorized bishops, judges, and justices of the peace to restrain such expressions as necessary.\(^3\)

As a measure designed to reassure the King's subjects of the sound-
ness of his Protestantism and of his respect for traditional constitutional arrangements, this proclamation perhaps served its purpose. As an attempt to quell the doctrinal conflict, it proved a miserable failure. As I have shown in the preceding chapter, both Calvinists and Arminians continued after this date to preach and publish defenses of their doctrines, each apparently convinced that his pronouncements were as "clearly grounded and warranted" as the proclamation required. About the only person silenced was the one with whom the controversy had begun, Richard Montagu. In due time, Charles I would protect Montagu with a bishopric and a pardon, but in June 1626 Montagu felt alone, frightened, and betrayed. Two weeks after the proclamation had been issued, he complained to his friend John Cosin:

While are not the opponent writers questioned?  
While write they still ... impune, and I must hold  
my peace, sit downe, possesse my soule in  
patience ...?

The Calvinist Bishop Davenant, on the other hand, thought that the enforcement of the proclamation favored the Arminians, for evidence of which he pointed to the publication of Thomas Jackson's Treatise of Divine Essence and Attributes. When Parliament assembled in 1628, it undertook a thorough investigation of Montagu and other Arminians, an action which further testifies to the ineffectiveness of the proclamation.

Charles I tacitly admitted the failure of his 1626 proclamation when in November 1628 he reissued the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. As he explained in the accompanying declaration, both sides in the dispute, despite their seemingly irreconcilable differences, readily upheld the truth of these articles. Hence, in the interests of restoring
peace, he forbade any doctrinal pronouncements in print, from the pul­
pit, or in the universities based on anything but the "literal and
grammatical sense" of the Articles of Religion. Less than two months
thereafter, the king tried to erase any remaining trace of doctrinal
conflict by issuing a royal pardon to Montagu (and to John Cosin,
Robert Sythorpe, and Roger Maynwarling, see below) and a royal proclama­
tion suppressing Appello Caesarem. This proclamation required that
all copies of the proscribed book be surrendered to one's bishop or
bishop's chancellor and prohibited all further discussion of the pre­
destinarian controversy "by reading, preaching, or making Bookes, either
pro or contra these differences." The king's intentions were unmis­
takable - he would end the controversy simply by refusing to recognize,
and by forbidding his subjects to recognize, that there was one.

At first, the attempt to calm troubled waters by fiat met with
results more like Canute's than Christ's. Even Peter Heylyn, who was
Laud's chief propagandist during the 1630's and the most zealous apolo­
gist for Laudianism and royalism under the Commonwealth and Protectorate,
would later castigate Charles I for suppressing a doctrinally sound
book, ostensibly to appease Parliament. But no contemporary Arminian
source, certainly not Montagu himself, who had now been made a bishop,
voices displeasure with the proclamation. Rather, it was the Calvinists
who felt directly under attack, and they struck back when Parliament
resembled on January 20, 1629. In their view, the king had not produced
an impartial solution or imposed a "cooling off" period but had in­
stead been misled by a clique of Arminian clergy seeking to suppress
doctrines long affirmed by the Church of England. Thus, on January 29,
the House of Commons passed a resolution which, like the king's declaration, affirmed the truth of the 39 Articles but which also, unlike anything Charles I had countenanced, explicitly disassociated the articles from "the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians wherein they do differ from us." Neither did the royal pardon deter the House Committee for Religion from continuing its investigation of Montagu, Cosin, and other Arminians, including Richard Neile, who had allegedly been instrumental in obtaining the pardons. This same committee drew up a set of resolutions denouncing "the subtle and pernicious spreading of the Arminian faction" as evidenced in the publication of openly Arminian books and the advancement of Arminian clergy. Though these resolutions were never placed before the House, the Commons, at the very point of their dissolution and over the objections of their own speaker, did resolve that

\[
\text{whoever shall bring in innovation of religion, or by favor or countenance seek to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinion disagreeing from the true and orthodox church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this Kingdom and Commonwealth.}
\]

Despite the decidedly inauspicious start to the recently enunciated royal policy, Charles I was fairly successful in suppressing at least the outward manifestations of doctrinal controversy. True, both sides on occasion breached the enforced silence. In 1630, for example, William Prynne had published his book entitled Anti-Arminianisme, excusing himself on the grounds that the king could hardly have intended to suppress "the ancient, established, and resolved Doctrines of the Church of England." Samuel Hoard did not even attempt to excuse his anonymously written, openly Arminian book, Gods Love to Mankind, but
even Henry Burton had to admit that the book had appeared without official approval and was unlicensed. In Newcastle, Calvinists and Arminians waged a prolonged and bitter struggle for control of the pulpit. Robert Jenison, a Calvinist lecturer, and Yeldard Alvey, Thomas Jackson's successor to the parish of St. Nicholas, regularly denounced each other, in the process involving municipal and ecclesiastical officials in their dispute. Skirmishing continued until 1632, when Charles I intervened by supporting Alvey and the Arminian faction.

However, these examples seem to form the exception, not the rule. Apart from the two books mentioned above, few if any books concerned directly with predestination were published between 1629 and 1641. Would-be offenders either decided to respect the king's proclamation or else were deterred by Laud's revival of an Elizabethan decree. This decree required the licensing of all books by either one of the archbishops or by the bishop of London. Likewise, though religious issues could and did polarize communities after 1629, nowhere but in Newcastle, it seems, was that issue Arminianism versus Calvinism per se.

Perhaps most impressive was the success achieved in suppressing doctrinal debate in the Universities. As Dr. Tyacke had demonstrated convincingly, royal policy toward the universities clearly favored the Arminians, almost from the beginning of Charles I's reign. Calvinist theses, which had routinely been defended at commencement exercises, were now forbidden to aspiring scholars. Known Arminians were appointed to influential university posts and college presidencies. Furthermore, whereas Calvinists who violated the ban on predestinarian preaching generally had to recant in public, Arminian offenders could do so in
private to the vice-chancellor. However, if, as Dr. Tyacke claims, the new policy "opened the way for the discreet propagation of Arminianism," it did not do much more. The universities did not replace a Calvinist with an Arminian orthodoxy. True, when he was forced to take sides, Laud would invariably favor the Arminians, but he did not actively seek such occasions. For example, one of Laud's first acts as chancellor of Oxford was to write a letter to John Tolson, president of Oriel College, regarding a sermon preached by one John Tucker. Laud was incensed that Tucker had flagrantly violated the king's command by openly advancing Arminian opinions and casting aspersions on the Synod of Dort, and he enjoined Tolson to avoid any further incidents, "that so those unhappy differences, likely to rend this Church as well as others, might sleep first and die after." On September 23, 1631, he reaffirmed his stance in a letter to the vice-chancellor, admonishing him to avoid even the appearance of partiality in enforcing the ban on public discussion of predestination.

But if open manifestations of doctrinal controversy subsided somewhat after 1629, religious controversy in general did not. Though Arminianism per se became a less visible issue, the Arminian clergy and by extension "Arminianism" had become entangled in other equally inflammatory controversies, controversies which led opponents of the Arminians to identify them first of all with a royalism so extreme as to deny all rights and liberties to the king's subjects and secondly with an alleged conspiracy to subvert the Protestant Church of England through the introduction of "Popish" ceremonies and practices.
1. Arminianism and Royalism

I have already shown how attacks by Parliament and protection by the king and the Duke of Buckingham turned Arminianism into a political issue. Besides being a political issue in its own right, Arminianism also became identified with a specific political position - ultra-royalism. To be sure, there was no necessary connection between the two. In the United Provinces, the home of Arminius himself, Arminians favored provincial autonomy (especially of Holland, where they were strongest) and were portrayed as political subversives by their enemies, including James I of England. Historians have also quite rightly emphasized the impressive consensus among Jacobean clergy and laity concerning obedience to royal authority and the mutual dependence of Crown and Parliament. Nevertheless, the Calvinism which so strongly appealed to English Protestants contained potential ammunition against monarchy. It imbued those who believed themselves "elected" with a determination to do God's will and to eradicate those who they believed opposed it. John Calvin himself had explicitly sanctioned resistance to the magistrate under certain circumstances, and his position had been widely publicized in the Geneva Bible, for a long time the authoritative text for English Protestants. Finally, practice as well as theory had shaped the political stance of Calvinists, for wherever it had spread - Geneva, France, the Netherlands, and Scotland - its proponents became involved in armed conflict with established authority.

Even during the reign of James I, Calvinists and Arminians fore-shadowed their future political differences. In 1622, James I was rudely reminded of the potential antipathy between Calvinism and monarchy.
In a sermon preached by William Knight, a young Oxford divine. Knight attempted to justify resistance to tyrannical kings, an idea he had acquired in a book by the prominent German Calvinist, David Pareus. Not only did James order the unfortunate Knight imprisoned, but in addition the works of Pareus were condemned and publicly burned, and the universities were advised to emphasize the Scriptures, Fathers, and Schoolmen in the training of divinity students and to exclude the more recent, potentially dangerous works of Reformed theologians. If the pulpit and press alone did not make James I wary of Calvinism, then both he and his son could hardly have failed to notice the strong support they received in foreign and domestic matters from the Arminian bishops Andrewes, Overall, and Neile, in sharp contrast to the more independent views of the Calvinist Archbishop Abbot. As opposition to Arminianism intensified in the House of Commons, so too did the dependence of the Arminians on their royal protector, a dependence which could only have magnified their predisposition toward royalism.

This royalism found expression in well-known works of prominent Arminian clergy. For example, in a sermon intended for but apparently never delivered to Charles I's first parliament, William Laud, then bishop of Bath and Wells, portrayed the king as "God's immediate lieutenant upon earth," the exercise of royal power as "God's by ordinance, and the King's by execution," and the source of that power as neither the king himself nor his subjects but God. An outbreak of the plague may have prevented Laud from delivering this sermon, but he conveyed its sentiments perfectly to the second parliament of the reign, when he reminded it members that
The King's power is God's ordinance, and the King's command must be God's glory, and the honour of the subject is obedience to both.

Just as Laud emphasized political obedience as a religious duty, so too he identified religious dissent with political subversion. Thus, in his 1626 sermon he restated James I's maxim, "No bishop, no king."

"They that would overthrow the 'seats of ecclesiastical government,'" Laud argued,

will not spare, if ever they get power, to have a pluck at the throne of David.' And there is not not a man that is for 'parity' - all fellows in Church - but he is not for monarcy in the State.

It was a claim which Laudian propagandists would repeat persistently and which would long be accepted at face value by historians of Stuart England, namely, the causal link between Puritanism and revolution. For example, in a sermon preached on June 27, 1630, John Cosin portrayed the good Christian as being, among other things, a good subject ("the more we love God's house, the more we will love the king's also"), and he accused the Puritans of being neither, of threatening the peace of the state as well as of the Church.

Matthew Wren, who would earn notoriety for his strict enforcement of the Laudian program as bishop of Norwich, even more explicitly linked Puritanism with political subversion. In 1627, he preached before the king a sermon on Proverbs 24:31. According to this text, Wren argued, one who does not honor the king cannot be said to fear God. The one follows the other, "because of the image of God which is upon Kings ... yea the Image of that in God, for which feare belongs to God, that Image is upon the King, the lively Image of his Divine Power and Glory
both." Hence, "to fail one is to be false to the other, to defraud one is to defile the other." Without using the word "Puritan", Wren unmistakably directed his barbs at them when he condemned those "swarmes of great Professors" of religious zeal who in the name of God defied the ecclesiastical ordinances of the realm. "What e're is professed for God," he warned,

is not fear, but faction, not devotion, but hypocrisy, not religion, but abomination, unless they fall down before the throne upon earth also, by the life of spotless allegiance, and the quickening soul of all civil obedience.\[34\]

Several months later, in a sermon preached before the king at Windsor, Wren would specifically blame the Puritans for the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham. According to one source, Wren termed the Puritans a most pernicious sect & dangerous to monarchs, as bad as Jesuists in their opinions, that they hold the same tenet as their head Felton doth viz.: that it is lawful to kill any man, that is opposite to their partie, & that all their whole doctrine & practice tendeth to anarchy.\[35\]

By the mid-1630's, Peter Heylyn, perhaps the most passionate of all Arminian propagandists, had seemingly pushed these theories to their limits. Now the very thought, let alone the act, of limiting royal power was treasonous,

for as it is a kind of Atheism to dispute pro and con, what God can doe and what hee cannot ... so it is a kind of disobedience to question what a King can doe, being God's Deputie here on earth ...\[36\]

The claims of these divines did much to identify Arminianism with extreme royalism, but ironically it was the sermons of two men who seem
not to have been Arminians which all but made the two synonomous. On February 22, 1627, Robert Sybthorpe, vicar of Brackley in Northamptonshire, preached a sermon at the Northampton assizes in support of a forced loan recently levied by Charles I. The King claimed to have been forced to this action by the failure of parliament to grant him the subsidies necessary to conduct the war against Spain. Despite the king's urgent need for funds, however, there was widespread, often intense resistance to the collection of the loan, on the grounds that it had not been voted by parliament. Thus, the government enlisted the aid of the clergy to make the king's subjects more compliant.37

The cure was worse than the disease, for in defending the loan, Sybthorpe challenged widely held values regarding property rights, thus adding to the furor he was supposed to calm.

Sybthorpe began from the premise implied in his text, Romans 13:7, that Christians ought to submit "voluntarily and cheerfully" to their sovereign and that disloyalty or resistance, even to a tyrant, violated this sacred duty.38 Among the duties of a good subject is the maintenance of his prince. The forced loan, Sybthorpe argued, was an eminently reasonable request for supply, contributing as it would to the defense of religion at home and abroad and to a war which had been voted by parliament. However, he added, a good Christian would be obliged to comply with the loan even if it were "an immoderate, yea an unjust Taxe ... Nay, he is bound in conscience to submit."39

This sermon would have been controversial enough had it only been delivered orally, but its publication aroused fears for the safety of property, created alarm at the growing influence of the Arminians, and
at the same time increased their real influence in church and state. This train of events began when Charles I, much impressed by Sybthorpe's sermon, sent it to Archbishop Abbot to be licensed for publication. Abbot demurred, terming the task "chaplain's work," and he returned the sermon with objections to five passages therein. Charles answered three of these objections and agreed that one passage should be modified and another deleted. Abbot, however, voiced still more reservations, reservations which this time could not be dispelled. Thus, the task of licensing the sermon was left to that unabashed careerist bishop of London, George Mountain. The recalcitrant Archbishop Abbot was required to withdraw to Canterbury, and his jurisdiction was temporarily sequestered, to be exercised by a commission comprised of Laud, Mountain, and the Arminian bishops Howson, Buckeridge, and Neile.\(^{40}\)

Later that year, two sermons by Roger Maynwaring would make even more explosive the controversy that Sybthorpe's sermon had begun. Maynwaring, rector of St. Giles - in - the - Fields, London, and a royal chaplain, defended royal power in a manner which, compared to Sybthorpe's, was more spirited, more skillful, and even more uncompromising. Whereas Sybthorpe had been content to enjoin obedience to the king as a divinely ordained duty, Maynwaring argued that royal power was "not merely humane, but superhumane, and indeed no less than a Power Divine," surpassing that of all other creatures, even angels. Kings' lives, he claimed, are "worth millions of others."\(^{41}\) No persons, laws, or customs can either augment or restrict their power, for "Royalty is a Preemience wherein Monarchs are invested immediately from God ..."\(^{42}\) Hence, to an even greater extent than Sybthorpe, Maynwaring insisted on a complete,
willing submission to all royal commands. No law carries more force than the king's word, even when it abrogates statute law:

as a Father of the Countrey, "the king commands what his pleasure is, out of counsell and judgement. As a king of subjects, he enjoynes it. As a Supreame head of the body he adviseth it. As a Defender of the Faith, hee requires it as his subjects' homage. As a Protector of their persons, lives, and states, he deserves it ... And as the Soveraigne procurer of all the happinesse, peace, and welfare which they enjoy who are under him, he doth most justly claim it at their hands.

Only when the king commands something flatly contrary to God's laws is anything other than full obedience permitted. Even then, the subject may offer no rebellion or resistance but must passively accept his punishment. Furthermore, Maynwaring left the royal prerogative virtually unlimited in matters pertaining to the king's personal safety, the security of his realm, the honoring of his allegiances, and the defense and advancement of religion.

In preserving the king's freedom of action, Maynwaring effectively deprived Parliament of any meaningful role. Already he had placed the king above statute law, and now he transferred to the king its power over the purse. Parliament, he argued, adds not one iota to the king's power to tax his subjects but serves only

for the more equall Imposing and more easy Exacting of that, which, unto kings doth appertaine ... as their proper inheritance annexed to the Imperiall Crownes, from their very births ...

Compared to Maynwaring, Sybthorpe now seemed the very model of restraint.

According to Maynwaring, the king himself ordered the two sermons licensed and printed, and the title page does indeed bear the words "By His Majesties Speciall Command." The printer would later claim
that no such command emanated from the king himself, and there were those in Parliament who saw the publication of *Religion and Alegiance* as Laud's doing. However, a memorandum from Laud to Charles I provides strong evidence that the sermons were published at the king's command and despite Laud's misgivings. The king's official sanction, though, did nothing to deter Maynwaring's critics. In the House of Commons Francis Rous accused of plotting "to alter and subvert the frame and fabric of the whole commonwealth," while Richard Spencer, who earlier in the session had defended the Arminian Thomas Jackson (see Chapter I), termed Maynwaring "the cutpurse of the whole kingdom; gives all away, no need for subsidies."

The House of Commons voted an impeachment, and on June 9, 1628 the charges were carried up to the Lords. Though Lord Carlton and other privy councillors pleaded for leniency, the greater portion of the Lords were clearly as upset as the Commons. Archbishop Abbot termed Maynwaring's likening of royal to divine power sheer blasphemy, while Bishop Williams, the former Lord Keeper, saw Maynwaring's definition of obedience as incompatible with the survival of law and property. On June 14 the House of Lords passed sentence. Maynwaring was to be imprisoned for the pleasure of the House, fined £1000, required to make before both Houses a written acknowledgement of his offenses, suspended from performing any clerical functions for three years, and forever disabled from holding any ecclesiastical dignity or secular office. His highly apologetic and submissive answer to the charges probably saved him from an attainder.

Maynwaring signed a submission and repented before the House of
Lords, and on June 24 Charles I followed the Lords' recommendation by issuing a proclamation suppressing Religion and Alegiance. But here, as with the Petition of Right, subsequent events would show Parliament's victory to be more illusory than real. On July 6, the king directed his attorney general to prepare a pardon for Maynwaring, and on July 18 the errant cleric was presented to a new living at Stanford Rivers, Essex, the very one vacated by Richard Montagu on his elevation to the see of Chichester.51

The sermons of Sybthorpe and Maynwaring and the open protection the two received from the Crown not only exacerbated relations between Charles I and Parliament but also served to expand the definition of Arminianism, at least in the eyes of its opponents - this despite the lack of any evidence that Sybthorpe and Maynwaring were in fact Arminians, at least at the times they preached their sermons. True, Sybthorpe, along with his father-in-law John Lambe, later earned a reputation for vindictiveness and rapacity in their enforcement of Laud's policies in the diocese of Peterborough. Maynwaring would also faithfully implement the Laudian program first as dean of Worcester (1633) and than as bishop of St. David's (1635).52 However, in 1627, neither of their sermons contained any assertions which could possibly be construed as Arminian, nor in 1628 were they charged with any doctrinal offenses. Indeed, in Religion and Alegiance Maynwaring seems if anything more like a Calvinist than an Arminian when he insists that the subject cannot merit "Imperial Excellence" any more than a creature can merit "divine Beneficence", or when he rejects any possibility of accepted concepts of justice either in God's dealings with man or in
the king's with his subjects:

Now, as Justice (properly so called), intercedes not betwixt God and Man; nor betwixt the Prince, being a father, and the People, as children; (for Justice is between Equalls) So cannot Justice be any Rule or Medium, whereby to give God or the King his Right.  

But whether Sybthorpe and Maynwaring were in fact Arminians was no longer relevant. Their defense by the same Arminian clergy who had insinuated themselves into the king's favor rendered them guilty by association, as Nathaniel Rich and John Pym argued in the House of Commons. Francis Rous, who had been among the earliest and bitterest foes of the Arminians, warned that there were among them "men ... ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy." He could only have meant Sybthorpe and Maynwaring, for he identified the culprits as "the men that break in upon the goods and liberties of this Commonwealth, for by this means they make way for the taking of our Religion." Outside of Parliament the Puritan minister Henry Burton also linked Arminianism with extreme royalism. He prayed for the return of Parliament as the best means to check the growth of Arminianism, and he blamed the Arminians for the prorogation of Parliament in 1628. They had poisoned relations between the king and his subjects "by their plausible, insinuating, intoxicating flattery" through which they attributed to the king god-like powers and elevated his prerogative above the law. Burton identified the diminutive bishop of London as the alleged ringleader of these flatterers in the couplet

Great Potentates thus to applaude
They reckon it no little laud.
Under such circumstances the alliance between Arminianism and royalism began, an alliance which would make ultra-royalism a hallmark of the followers of Laud before, during, and after the English Civil Wars. Conversely, opposition to the common enemies of Arminianism and absolutism would help forge a powerful, fateful alliance between the Puritan clergy and their patrons in Parliament.

ii. The Cosin Connection

The association of Arminianism with royalism owed much to circumstances peculiar to the reign of Charles I and to men who had not advanced Arminianism per se. By contrast, Richard Montagu had from the very beginning been charged with advancing Popery as well as Arminianism, and the two charges remained intimately connected. Montagu's Gagg, it will be remembered, had originally been written not as a defense of Arminianism against Calvinism but as a defense of the Church of England against alleged misrepresentations of its doctrines and practices by a Roman Catholic missionary. According to Montagu's critics, however, he had, far from defending the Church of England, misrepresented it by associating it with questionable, Catholic-like doctrines and practices and by rejecting sound Protestant ones. Under the guise of combating Popery, he had allegedly advanced it.59

His Arminian sympathies were seen as the prime example of his Romish affections, for by allowing man a measure of freewill in the process of salvation, he had supposedly concurred with the doctrine defined by the Council of Trent.60 Montagu, for his part, did not deny
that he agreed in part with the Tridentine position on freewill, but,
he continued,

is it not possible to accord in some things
with the Counsell of Trent, and to bee no
Papist, nor maintaine Popery?

Evidently his critics did not agree, because, whenever they
charged him or his supporters with Arminianism, they accompanied
the charge with charges of Popery. Nor was it only the predestin-
arian issue that gave rise to these charges. After all, Montagu him-
self had asserted in his Carg and reasserted in Appello Caesarem that
the Church of England retained or at least did not explicitly reject
various beliefs and practices transmitted through the Church of Rome.
He commended traditions such as the use of images and stained glass
windows, the use of the sign of the cross, and fasting (in the sense
of abstinence from meat). So long as there is no adoration of physi-
cal objects and no superstition attached to ceremonies, such prac-
tices are harmless, instructive, pious, and of ancient usage.

Montagu also maintained certain propositions offensive to some Protestant
sensibilities. For example, he declined to identify the Pope as the
Antichrist. The public doctrine of the Church, he argued, nowhere
made this belief incumbent on its members, so that he was as free to
deny it as were his opponents to maintain it. Likewise, though he
denounced the invocation of saints, he held as a private opinion that
saints can and do intercede with God on man's behalf. He also refused
to condemn categorically all veneration of saints, though he cautioned
that not all those deemed saints by Rome were worthy of the title and
that respect for "those who have fought the good fight" ought never to
be confused with worshipping them. Montagu did not deny that on these and other points he was in partial agreement with Rome, but he did deny that this made him a Papist. The Church of Rome, he insisted, remained a true, albeit a corrupt Church, and while his opponents might profess "that the farther in any thing from communion with the Church of Rome, the neerer unto God and Truth," he remained convinced that

I ought not to goe farther from the Church of Rome in these her worst dales, than she hath gone away from her selfe in her best dayes.

Much to his discomfort, Montagu would learn that this was a good deal closer than many if not most English Protestants were prepared to tolerate. But though the controversy he thereby initiated shattered the peace of the Church, that peace had always been an uneasy one. Indeed, in some respects, Montagu had simply drawn attention to an unresolved conflict as old as the Church of England itself. The Reformation begun by Henry VIII in 1529 followed, to say the least, an uneven course before culminating in an unmistakably Protestant church under Elizabeth I. During this period of monumental change, English Protestants struggled not only with Catholics but with each other to determine the shape of the new church. The vestiarian controversy during the reign of Edward VI revealed just how deeply the survival of a Catholic practice could divide the reformers. While Bishop Hooper strenuously objected to wearing the vestments because of their lack of Scriptural warrant and their association with the Roman Catholic priesthood, Archbishop Cranmer just as vigorously insisted on conformity to the established practices of the Church in things indif-
ferent. Hooper eventually yielded, but he would not be the last to challenge the survival of Catholic practices in the Church of England. In the Convocation of 1563, there was widespread support for reform of the 1559 Book of Common Prayer. Among the practices objected to, besides the still offending vestments, were the eastward position of the communion table when it was not in use, the observance of traditional fasts and saints' days, baptism by laymen in case of emergencies, use of the sign of the cross in baptism, enforced kneeling at communion, and the continued presence of images in churches. However, though the proponents of further reform pressed their demands resolutely, they were opposed by an even more resolute queen. Elizabeth I had already accepted more of Cranmer's 1552 Prayer Book than she would have liked, and she was not prepared to yield any more ground. Moreover, her bishops, many of whom originally had held views closer to those of the reformers than to hers, were by 1563 prepared to support the queen. Though men like Parker and Cox had at first consented reluctantly to the Elizabethan Settlement, they now diligently enforced conformity to the established order. By the end of the reign, bishops like Whitgift and Bancroft were defending the settlement not simply as a political expedient but because of a genuine commitment to that specific ecclesiastical polity.

Patrick Collinson has recently argued that Whitgift, Bancroft, and their supporters were far less typical of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Churches than was the "reformed protestantism" represented by Edmund Grindal and the forces of moderate Calvinism. For the purposes of this study, however, it is significant simply that there were influ-
ential clerics during these years who sought to maintain a continuity between the pre-Reformed and the Reformed Church of England. It is also significant that among those who practiced and defended traditional ceremonies were men later identified with Arminianism; for example, Richard Neile, Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and, of course, William Laud. In fact, long before he or anyone else in England was labelled an Arminian, Laud had already gained notoriety for his alleged "Popish" sympathies. As early as 1603, he created a stir by asserting the historical descent of the Church of England through the Church of Rome, thereby beginning a lifelong enmity with the future Archbishop Abbot.

Montagu, then, could claim with some justice that he was in the company of eminently respected predecessors in his defense of traditional ceremonies. However, unlike these eminently respected predecessors, Montagu and his supporters were widely perceived as a real threat to the Protestant Church of England, first, because of the boldness with which they advanced their views, secondly, because of their open challenge to Calvinist doctrine, and, finally, because of the important support they received from ecclesiastical and civil authorities. Nothing better illustrates these developments and the alarm they occasioned than the activities of John Cosin. Cosin, as I have shown, contributed significantly to the writing of Montagu's Appello Caesarem. He also advanced Arminianism more directly. In two sermons, probably delivered in 1625, he argued that the doctrine of irrespective predestination was "an opinion fit for devils and not for Christians." He also attacked those who reduced Christianity
to St. Paul's "ladder of faith" and thereby ignored St. Peter's
"ladder of practice," which "joins faith to vertue and vertue to
knowledge."\textsuperscript{74}

But though Cosin did not hide his Arminian views, they earned
him less notoriety than did the liturgy and ceremonies he advanced.
In 1625 Montagu observed wryly that because of Cosin's deportment at
prayers in Windsor Chapel, particularly his practice of bowing at the
name of Jesus and toward the communion table, he had been taken for a
Jesuit.\textsuperscript{75} An even wider audience began to doubt Cosin's Protestantism
following the publication of his most controversial work, a collection
of private devotions.\textsuperscript{76}

Exactly how Cosin came to write this book is by no means clear.
In a preface to the second and subsequent editions, he claimed that
the \textit{Devotions} had originally been printed in a limited edition "for the
private use of an Honourable well disposed friend, without any meaning
to make the same publike to the World."\textsuperscript{77} This friend may well have
been the Countess of Denbigh, the Duke of Buckingham's sister, whom
Cosin was attempting to dissuade from converting to Catholicism.\textsuperscript{78}
However, nearly twenty-five years later, Cosin offered a rather differ­
ent explanation of the book's origin to the diarist, John Evelyn.
According to this version, the \textit{Devotions} had been written at the king's
request for the Protestant court ladies, who felt keenly the disparage­
ments of their religion by the Catholic ladies of Queen Henrietta
Maria's French entourage. The French ladies especially harped on the
lack of a Protestant breviary for the private devotion. On hearing of
this, Charles I asked Bishop Francis White to arrange for such a
prayer book to be compiled. White in turn assigned the project to Cosin, who completed it in three month's time. The book was licensed by Bishop Mountain of London, but only two hundred copies were printed for the first edition. The two accounts can be reconciled to an extent, for in both of them Cosin claims to have originally intended the book for a very limited readership, and the "Honourable well disposed friend" mentioned in the preface could have been a Protestant court lady such as the Countess of Denbigh or even Bishop White. Nevertheless, if the second account is true, it seems strange that no edition of the book says that it was written and published by royal command.

On the other hand, if the book had been intended for a limited readership, it seems strange that it went into so many editions so soon, for while no one seems to have defended it publicly, it was widely condemned as a scarcely veiled attempt to return the Church of England to Rome. Henry Burton and William Prynne, who were emerging as the most vocal critics of Arminianism, each wrote against Cosin's *Devotions* and called on Parliament to suppress it. (Perhaps it is significant that the more moderate, royalist Prynne, as well as the more radical Burton, chose to address Parliament rather than the king. He may already have noticed Charles I's unwillingness to use his authority against Arminianism). Burton and Prynne would not be disappointed, for on March 24, 1628, Sir Robert Harley, the member for Evesham, denounced Cosin's *Devotions* before the House of Commons and proposed the formation of a committee to investigate it and other doctrinally suspect works. Such a committee was formed and, reported Joseph Mead,
took a decidedly hostile view toward the Devotions. Mead, a moderate who during the 1630's defended the Laudian position on churches and altars, was delighted with the committee's actions. "No matter if they trownce him," he wrote his friend Sir Martin Stuteville, "he is a most audacious fellow, & I doubt scarce a sound Protestant & takes upon him the most imprudently to bring superstitious innovations into our Church ..." Even in the Court of the Arminians' royal protector, Cosin's book was attacked in a sermon by the influential Puritan John Preston and in a memorandum probably written by Sir Francis Nethersole, secretary to the king's sister, the Electress Elizabeth.

How had Cosin attracted such widespread and bitter censure? To begin with, the very form of his book rendered it doctrinally suspect. A Collection of Private Devotions was, properly speaking, a primer; that is, it included among other things the observance of the seven canonical hours of prayer. However, the public worship of the Church of England recognized only two daily services. Nor does Cosin's use of the canonical hours find any parallel among contemporary books of private prayer used by English Protestants. By and large, these other books were reflective of a practical piety, and the meditations therein were designed for specific spiritual needs, not for the formal observance of fixed hours of prayer. Accordingly, Cosin's critics saw in his use of the seven canonical hours prima facie evidence of Popish intent. The canonical hours, argued Henry Burton, had originally been established for ascetic monks with no useful occupation and for celibate priests who might otherwise occupy their idle hours less discreetly. As such, their observance hardly suits the life styles of busy husband-men
and tradesmen, ambitious courtiers, and married, preaching clergy. For those who cannot attend public worship or who wish the opportunity for private prayer, the Scriptures, Psalter, and Book of Common Prayer offer ample material for spiritual nourishment. Hence, because it serves no useful purpose in a Protestant church, Cosin's Collection of Private Devotions must have been intended as a step toward the restoration of Popish monasticism:

> This man hopes to convert all England at a cast, and bring them \( \textit{sic} \) with in the circle of his Canonickall houres, wherein they may traverse and turns around their heads, as a blind mill-horse in the in the round.\(^{85}\)

Cosin, of course, denied any such intent. The observance of fixed hours of prayer, he argued, was "in use among the best Christians, long before Poperie came in."\(^{86}\) His book was based on such unimpeachable sources as Scripture, the Early Fathers, and earlier liturgies of the Church of England. In fact, the title page of his first edition calimed, he had arranged the hours of prayer "As they were after this manner published by Authoritie of Q. Eliz. 1560."\(^{87}\)

Elizabeth I had indeed authorized a Latin primer entitled the Orarium in 1560, and despite some concessions to the Reformation, the Orarium resembled in most respects the traditional late medieval primer. However, it had been extensively revised in 1564 when it reappeared as the Preces Privatae. Among the significant reforms in the latter book was the reduction of the seven hours of prayer to two, in conformity with the Book of Common Prayers.\(^{88}\)

By his own admission, Cosin had used the earlier, less "Protestant" primer of Queen Elizabeth and had thus, charged William Prynne, re-
tained what the queen herself had rejected, supposedly upon more careful consideration. Even then, Cosin had not been as faithful to the 1560 Orarium as he had claimed. Both in form and in language, Prynne argued, Cosin's Devotions seemed much closer to contemporary Catholic breviaries than to either the Orarium or the Preces Privatae. Cosin did not respond to this charge, but he does seem to have conceded that his book was more than a new edition of the Elizabethan primer, for in the second and subsequent editions the title page claimed only that the Devotions appeared "as they were much after the manner published by Authoritie of Q. Eliz. 1560."

The content as well as the form of Cosin's Devotions also came under attack. For example, the frontispiece of the first edition depicted two women who, charged Prynne, looked suspiciously like nuns praying reverently before the emblem IHS, a symbol associated with the Jesuit order. Cosin protested the harmlessness and ancient usage of the symbol, but to Henry Burton it still was "the very Ensignes of Apostacie from Christ to Antichrist." Burton and Prynne also discerned evidence of Cosin's Popish leanings in his defense of the Lenten fast, in his inclusion of an excessive number of saints' days in the ecclesiastical calendar, and in his denunciation of those who "condemne the joyfull festivitie" of the Sabbath "under a pretence of serving God more strictly than others (especially for the hearing and meditating of Sermons." Furthermore, it was charged, he had failed to distinguish between the two sacraments (baptism and communion) of the reformed Church of England and the five additional Catholic sacraments of confirmation, penance, holy orders, marriage, and extreme unction.
Even though Cosin had expressly said that only the first two were "truly" sacraments and had denied that the other five have "the like nature that the Two principall and true Sacraments have," his denial was to Henry Burton unacceptably less emphatic than that in the twenty-fifth Article of Religion.94

The most notorious of Cosin's alleged offenses concerned the "prayers at the Point of Death", near the end of the book. These prayers, it was charged, flatly contradicted the doctrine of the Church by attempting to intercede for the souls of the dead.95 At any rate, this is how Cosin's critics interpreted the crucial work "then" which followed a series of prayers "to bee repeated untill the soule be departed" and introduced the final prayer, which included the petition

and that when the dreadfull day of the generall Judgement shall come, bee the deceased may rise again with the just and receive this dead body, which must now be buried in the earth, to be joined with his soule, and be made pure and incorruptible for ever after in thy glorious Kingdome ...96

Cosin protested that he had intended the offending prayer to be recited, as the others, before and not after the point of death. Any other sense it conveyed arose from an error on the part of the printer, who had inserted the directions in the text rather than in the margin.97 In the second and subsequent editions, the offending word "then" was deleted, the directions were amended as "and these to be repeated (with these prayers following) untill the soule be departed", and the section of the concluding prayer beginning with "receive" and ending with "Kingdome" now read

his body being reunited to his soule, pure and incorruptible, and be received into thy glorious Kingdome.98
Burton, Prynne, and the author of the memorandum (see p. 26) were understandably skeptical that what seemed a radical departure from received doctrine could be explained simply as a misunderstanding arising from a printer's oversight. According to the memorandum, the force of Cosin's argument was greatly diminished by the fact that since the appearance of the first, limited edition of the Devotions, many copies, some corrected and some uncorrected, had been seen in London bookshops. Henry Burton argued that for all Cosin's protestations, his original intent could only have been to offer a prayer for the dead, because the opening sentences of the prayer, he charged, were borrowed from a Collect for the Dead in the Communion Book. William Prynne, for much the same reasons, condemned the prayer and its author and also found in it evidence of belief in the Roman Catholic limbus patrum. For these and other reasons, Cosin's critics doubted his claim to have offered a decorous, distinctively Anglican book of private prayer. Rather, they charged, he was surreptitiously attempting to gain a foothold for Popery in the Church of England or "at least to give it some Grace and Countenance now among us."

In May, 1628, Cosin provided yet more occasion for attack on the already beleaguered Arminians. At an informal dinner, he allegedly denied that the king was "supreme heade of the Church next under Christ" and that he had "anie more poore sic J of excommunication than my man that rubs my horses heels." Cosin, with the support of other dinner guests, claimed that his remarks had been taken out of context and denied having intended any disrespect for the king. He had simply been rejecting any attempt to make the king's role in the Church of
England in any way analogous to that of the Pope in the Church of Rome. However, he readily acknowledged the king to be "the Supreme Governor both of Church and State" who "might command churchmen at any time to do their office, or punish them for the neglect of it." As for the remark concerning excommunication, he had only defended the administration of spiritual jurisdiction as a peculiarly clerical prerogative given by Christ to the Apostles and their successors. However, though the king, as a layman, cannot therefore excommunicate anyone by his own authority, he alone can exercise "that externall coaction ... whereby men were forc'd to obey the jurisdiction of the Church."104

Charles I may have been satisfied with Cosin's explanation, but the House of Commons was not. The Committee for Religion opened an investigation into Cosin's remarks which, said John Eliot, were "highe treason." By this time, though, the House of Commons admitted itself powerless to do anything, for Cosin enjoyed the protection of a royal pardon.105 Ironically, the Arminians, who, owing to their association with Sythorpe and Maynwaring, had been accused of ultra-royalism, were now, because of Cosin, denounced for undermining the royal prerogative.106

Meanwhile, Cosin was earning further notoriety because of his activities as canon of Durham Cathedral. Even as his Collection of Private Devotions was under investigation by the House of Commons, the ceremonies he used during services at the cathedral were attracting notice in Durham and beyond. One rumor had it that Cosin "was so blind at Evensong on Candlemas Day, that he could not see to read prayers in
the minster w 4th lesse then 340 candles, whereof 60 he caused to be placed round about the high altar.\textsuperscript{107} On July 27, 1628, one of Cosin's fellow canons publicly denounced his ceremonial practices in a sermon delivered in the cathedral and later published.\textsuperscript{108} Peter Smart, one of the senior canons, charged that Cosin and his sympathizers ("the whore of Bablons bastardly brood," he called them) "doting upon their Mothers beauty, that painted Harlot the Church of Rome, have laboured to restore her all her robes and jewells againe, especially her looking glasse the Masse ..."\textsuperscript{109} Smart was most upset by the candles and other ornamentation decorating the communion table, whereby it had been turned into an altar (the very word by which Cosin himself referred to the table.) This Smart saw as proof positive of apostacy from Protestantism:

\begin{quote}
Now indeed the originall cause of most of our superstitious ceremonies, is that Popish opinion that Christs Church hath yet Priests, Sacrifices, and Altars. Whereas in truth Christ was sent of God to be the last sacrifice upon the last Altar, that ever the world should have.
\end{quote}

Hence, those who refer to ministers as priests and communion tables as altars are guilty of "Antichristian presumption" and "derogateth much from Christs soveraigne sacrifice."\textsuperscript{110} Smart also condemned as "idolaters" and Whores "guilty of "spiritual fornication" those who bowed toward the altar upon entering and leaving the cathedral. He even went so far as to urge his listeners not to worship in the cathedral and to attend only their parish churches until the alleged abuses had been eliminated.\textsuperscript{111}

If, as Cosin would later maintain, this was the first sermon Smart had preached in the cathedral in seven years, then at least it was a
memorable one. The very day he delivered it he was brought before the Court of High Commission of the diocese of Durham, a court whose members included Cosin and other targets of the sermon. Smart refused to withdraw any of his accusations, and consequently he was suspended ab ingressu eclesea and the profits of his prebend sequestered. In late January of 1629, the still unrepentant Smart was sent to London to appear before the High Commission of Canterbury Province, which in turn transmitted him to the High Commission of York. His case dragged on for another year, during which he refused to answer the charges against him to the satisfaction of the court and unsuccessfully attempted to file counter-charges against the dean and prebendaries of Durham Cathedral. Finally, in November, 1630, having failed to make the public recantation ordered by the court and having already been fined £400, he was deprived of all his clerical livings, "degraded ab omni gradu et dignitate clericale," and imprisoned in the King's Bench.

In the meantime, the secular courts had become involved when Smart brought his grievances before the Durham Assizes. In 1628, Sir James Whitelocke, the presiding judge, having himself observed the offending ceremonies in Durham Cathedral, rejected Smart's charges, but in the summer of 1629 Smart found a more sympathetic judge in Sir Henry Yelverton. Yelverton, who openly applauded Smart's sermon and proudly admitted to being a Puritan, said that the accused prebendaries had exceeded the ceremonies required by the Book of Common Prayer and, he instructed the Grand Jury, "as it was against the law to doe lesse then was commandied ... so it was against it also to doe any thing more then
is expressly appointed to be done." Accordingly, the Grand Jury returned indictments against Cosin and Francis Burgoigne, a parson who had adopted some of Cosin's practices in the parish church of Wermouth. However, for reasons never made clear, Yelverton appears shortly thereafter to have attempted to effect a reconciliation between Smart and Cosin, to have grown weary of Smart's obstinacy, and to have stayed the indictments pending the king's disposal of the matter.

There the conflict seems to have ended, except for the occasional attempts by Smart to vindicate himself, until it was revived a decade later under the auspices of the Long Parliament, this time in a religious and political climate decidedly more favorable to Smart than to Cosin. Smart's petition to the House of Commons, which seems essentially to have been the counter-charges he had presented before the High Commission of York Province, was sympathetically heard by the House, which then impeached Cosin and the others named by Smart and sent the charges to the House of Lords. There Smart was restored to his ecclesiastical dignities, but evidently he did not receive full satisfaction from his old nemesis. In answer to the articles of impeachment, Cosin maintained that the offending communion table had been erected in the cathedral well before he had become a canon there (Smart himself had admitted as much in his sermon) and that Smart had greatly exaggerated both the cost and splendor of its trappings. After the summer of 1641, the case was heard at infrequent, irregular intervals until June 4, 1642, after which no further mention occurs. According to Cosin, his answers to the charges so discredited the case
against him that Smart's own lawyer abandoned his client, as did many of the formerly sympathetic lords, and the Earl of Warwick procured leave for Cosin to return to Cambridge until the House of Lords should send for him. They never did.118

That the affair ended to anticlimactically, though, does not vitiate its significance. Thanks to the publication of Smart's sermon and his trials before the High Commission, a local dispute had become part of a larger religious conflict. Furthermore, as will be shown in a subsequent chapter, the issue which Smart had raised, namely, the status and position of the communion table, would become the chief bone of contention between the supporters and opponents of Laud. Finally, though Smart scrupulously avoided the doctrinal issues of election and reprobation in his sermon119, in the counter charges he presented to the High Commission, he frequently referred to Cosin and the others as Arminians, apparently on ceremonial grounds alone, for nowhere in this lengthy indictment does he charge them with holding specifically Arminian doctrines.120

In retrospect, the clash between Cosin and Smart seems as inevitable as an event can be. Cosin's strong attachment to traditional ceremonies resulted in the hardly surprising explosion when it collided with Smart's equally fervent opposition to anything hinting of Rome. Furthermore, their respective writings reveal them both as men not overly concerned with avoiding controversy. Less predictable, indeed scarcely intelligible, is the equally bitter conflict between Cosin and John Howson (1557-1632), the bishop of Durham. On the surface, at least, Howson would seem to have been poles apart from Peter Smart
in his religious views. As an Oxford scholar, he had attacked the prevailing Calvinist orthodoxy, and later, as bishop of Oxford, he had been among the prelates who defended Montagu.\textsuperscript{121}

The House of Commons, in the religious grievances it drew up on February 24, 1629, called Howson "a long suspected Papist" and protested his translation from Oxford to Durham.\textsuperscript{122} Why he should have quarrelled to bitterly with his supposed fellow Arminian Cosin remains unclear, but quarrel they did.

Apparently, Howson had from the first thought Cosin's relentless prosecution of Smart indiscreet, and he also disliked at least one of the "innovations" which Smart had denounced, namely, the changes in the morning service at Durham Cathedral. Cosin had introduced more choir music, including the Nicene Creed, which had formerly been read, and an Anthem after the sermon, instead of the customary signing of Psalms by the entire congregation.\textsuperscript{123} At some time in late 1630 or early 1631, Howson ordered that the Creed be read rather than sung, so as to make it more easily understood and shorten the service, and that the congregational singing of Psalms be substituted for the "Quire Anthems." Howson's orders seem not to have been obeyed fully. In particular, the creed was sung rather than read during one morning service while the dean, Richard Hunt, was absent. (Hunt, who seems to have been on good terms with Cosin before this and had been among those denounced by Smart, fully supported Howson's directives.) Mutual recriminations followed, and the cathedral chapter split into factions, led by Bishop Howson and Dean Hunt, on the one hand, and Cosin and Augustine Lindsell (another prebendary of Durham and also
Eventually, a compromise was reached whereby the creed would be sung on Sundays and Holydays and read on weekdays. Cosin also tried to restore the anthem after the sermon, on the grounds that it was a long established practice and that the people sang the Psalms out of tune. On this issue, however, Howson stood firm. Singing Psalms, he argued, was far more edifying to the people than having them listen passively to the scarcely intelligible words of a choir anthem. (Smart had accused Cosin and the others of introducing the anthem because, being unable to conduct a fully Catholic service in Latin, they could come "as neer it as they can, in having service in the English so said and sung, that few or none can understand the same." )

The compromise and, along with it, the peace of the diocese were soon shattered. Cosin and Lindsell claimed to have observed the agreement (except on the first Sunday in January 1630/1, when an anthem was sung, supposedly with Howson's permission), but Howson, evidently dissatisfied with the extent of their compliance, threatened disciplinary action against them. The two prebendaries appealed for assistance, first from their patron, Richard Neile, formerly the bishop of Durham and now of Winchester, and then from William Laud, bishop of London and a member of the Privy Council. Laud supported Cosin and Lindsell, and Howson, realizing that his adversaries had powerful friends, arranged for the creed to be sung again. He also wrote a series of apologetic, panic-stricken letters to Laud, in which he claimed to have acted fairly and impartially throughout the dispute, attempted to prove the consistency of his decisions with the Book of Common
Prayer and long-established practice, and protested his loyalty to the King and Church of England "and the whole doctrine and discipline thereof." 127

Even at this point the dispute did not end, for by September 1631, Cosin informed Laud, Howson was openly expressing resentment at Laud's intervention, publicly denouncing Lindsell and him for "those accusations and articles preferred against him" (i.e., their complaints to Laud), and threatening "to proceed against them that had misbe­haved themselves towards him," especially Cosin, whom he promised "to rid ... out of the Church." Pursuant to this end, Howson had already formulated articles of misdemeanor against Cosin. Cosin protested that neither he nor Lindsell had sought to offend their bishops and again appealed for Laud's assistance. 128

This time the king himself intervened. On November 3, 1631, he ordered Howson "to desist from meddling with the said Augustine Lindsell and John Cosens, or any other of the prebends of that church, til we shall appoint some other to be joined with you." 129 Howson, for his part, denied having harrassed Cosin or Lindsell, despite their ample provocations ("more than ever was offered to any Bishop of Durham") and claimed to have been the victim of their slander. He also denied having favored Smart. He had only warned the cathedral chapter that their stubbornness and vindictiveness were discrediting the church and themselves. 130

He died two months later, having found something quite different from the "quiet end to a troubled life" that he had expected in Durham. 131 Lindsell, who since 1629 had been dean of Lichfield as well as a pre-
bendary of Durham, went on to become bishop of Peterborough and then of Hereford, where he died in 1634. Cosin continued in his efforts to beautify Durham Cathedral and the ceremonies performed there, for which he received praise and encouragement from the king. In 1635, he became Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he gained further notoriety for his enforcement of Laudian ceremony. In 1639, he became vice-chancellor of Cambridge and implemented his liturgical program on an even larger scale. Following his ordeal before the Long Parliament (see above), he returned to Cambridge, where his active support of the royalist cause led to the loss of his livings. He spent a long exile on the Continent as chaplain to the Protestants in Queen Henrietta Maria's household and, following the Restoration, became bishop of Durham.

The various incidents involving Cosin provide important insights into the nature of religious controversy during the reign of Charles I. First of all, the publication and frequent reprintings of Cosin's widely criticized Collection of Private Devotions and his triumph over his adversary Smart and even over his own bishop attest to the strength of the Arminians in general and of Laud in particular in the Church and at the Court. Even Archbishop Abbot, who purportedly supported Smart, was no more a threat to Cosin than he had been to Sybthorpe and Maynwaring. As both Smart and Howson would learn to their discomfort, it was William Laud rather than the archbishop who wielded the power of the Church. Though Laud was still only bishop
of London and Howson's junior, both in age and tenure of ecclesiastical office, Howson responded to his letters with deference and even fear. Secondly, the issues at stake signify the growing importance of ceremony rather than doctrine as a major source of religious discord. Arminianism per se seems not to have entered at all into the conflicts involving Cosin. Indeed, unless Howson had altered long held views, an explanation for which there is no support, his dispute with Cosin was one between two Arminians. Finally, although the Arminians were accused of ceremonial as well as doctrinal innovations, in neither case did they act entirely without precedent. In the last chapter, I showed how Montagu's attacks on Calvinism had been anticipated in the Church of England. In the same manner, Cosin found Elizabethan precedents for his Private Devotions (to be sure, he found them more significant than did many of his readers), and even Peter Smart had to admit that the offending altar in Durham Cathedral was not entirely Cosin's handiwork. The communion table there had first been placed altarwise when Richard Neile had been appointed over the diocese. Thus, Cosin had at least in part only continued a policy begun during the reign of James I, and by one of James's most favored bishops at that.

But whether or not ceremonies such as those Cosin practiced at Durham were new, those who had been alarmed at the growth of Arminianism saw here, too, dangerous, unwarranted innovations. Among the "Heads and Articles" in which the House of Commons expressed to the king its concern for the welfare of the Church was one protesting
The bold and unwarranted introducing, practicing, and defending of sundry new ceremonies, and laying of injunctions upon men by governors of the Church and others without authority and in conformity to the Church of Rome; as for example, in some places erecting of altars, in others changing the usual and prescribed manner of placing the Communion-Table ... in imitation of the high altar, by which name they also call it, and adorn it with candlesticks, which by the injunctions Anno 10 Eliz. were to be taken away. And also do make obeisance by bowing thereunto; commanding men to stand up at Gloria Patri; bringing men to question and trouble for not obeying that command, for which there is no authority; enjoining that no women be churched without a veil; setting up of picture, lights, and images in churches; praying towards the east; crossing ad omnem motum et gestum.138

William Prynne explicitly linked the alleged doctrinal and ceremonial innovations when he urged the bishops to

exile all Semi-Pelagian Errors, and Arminian novelties; all grace-defeating, all Church-molesting Heresies with their chief fomentors; all late-erected Altars, Images, Tapers, Crucifixes: all new revived Popish Doctrines, Ceremonies ... with all those other corruptions & superstitious Reliques which have lately crept into our Church.139

Likewise, he denounced the tendency in the universities

to give open Hospitality, and free welcome to all Popish, Arminian, and other seducing forraigne writers

who turn

our Grace into Freewill, or Nature; our Communion Tables, into Altars; our Cathedral Praying, into Piping; our Substance, into Ceremony; our Devotion, into Superstition; our Perserverence, into Apostacie; and the Certainty of our Salvation, into a bare Contingencie.

To Prynne, then, the objectionable ceremonies were but an extension of Arminianism, which in turn was
but a bridge, an usher unto Popery, and all Popish Ceremonies, which winds themselves into our Church apace ... by their Arminian Agents, as some new erected Altars, Images, Tapers, and late usurped Altar-adorations, with the revolt of sundry Arminians unto Popery, doe experimentally testifie. 140

If the Arminians found themselves accused of harboring Popish sympathies and of plotting to undo the Reformation, they in turn portrayed their opponents as subversive Puritans seeking to overthrow the established government and discipline of the Church of England. Richard Montagu, it will be remembered, had written his controversial Gagg in large part to disassociate the Church of England from allegedly Puritan practices. He returned to this point with a vengeance in Appello Caesarem, and it was conforming rather than nonconforming Puritans who bore the brunt of his attack. William Laud would in retrospect justify his insistence on ceremonial conformity as an attempt to foster some degree of unity in a church polarized by doctrinal divisions. 141 Montagu, by contrast, taunted his Calvinists opponents to drop their alleged pretence of conformity and to admit openly their enmity to the existing ecclesiastical doctrine and discipline:

Sure it would be more pleasing unto God, and commendable with men, if your selves and such Halfers in opinions ... would openly avow what you covertly conceale, and publicly professe that ... you are dissentients indeed from the Church of England than to be the call yourselves Conformitants for fashion sake in some few and indifferent points of ceremony, and to be opposites in truth both from them and most points of Doctrine of the Church of England. 142

Privately as well as publicly, Montagu was obsessed by the spectre of Puritanism. In 1624, in response to rumors that the Calvinist, but
impeccably conformist, Oxford scholar, John Prideaux, would be named bishop of Gloucester, Montagu anxiously hoped for Laud to persuade Buckingham to block the appointment, "that we be not swallowed up with a Puritan Bishopriqy."^143 It was the excesses of the Puritans, he told his friend Cosin, that most dangerously exposed the Church of England to Romanist ridicule.^144 Even when he attacked Catholics, it was often for their allegedly Puritan qualities. Upon learning of the fate of the renegade Archbishop of Spalato (Marco Antonio de Dominis) when he returned from self-imposed exile in England, Montagu remarked

You see upon what desperate terms of separation we stand. No yelding or moderation to be hoped for in point of opposition from that Church, so long as Puritan Jesuits beare the sway.^145

Montagu's correspondent, Cosin, reflected the same views in his 1627 visitation articles as archdeacon of the East Riding of York. Among other things, he asked whether preachers

religiously and seriously labour to keep from the people as well the superstitious and grosse errors of the Papist, as the profaneness and wild madness of the Anabaptist, whose offspring be the Puritans.^146

Montagu and Cosin were not alone in their estimate of the Puritan threat. On 5 April 1625, Laud noted in his diary, he had at the command of the Duke of Buckingham prepared for the king a list of clergy "marked with the letters O and P," (apparently denoting Orthodox and Puritan, respectively.)^147 The same outlook was manifested at the oppostie end of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the activities of Richard Burgess, minister of Witney in Oxfordshire. Burgess used
catechizing sessions to make oblique attacks on Puritanism and also preached against it in his sermons. For these indiscretions, he was brought before the House of Commons and investigated. The Commons imprisoned him for refusing to answer its charges and eventually forced him to apologize to the House and to recant publicly his anti-Puritan diatribes.¹⁴⁸

Naturally, the wholesale denunciation of all anti-Arminians as Puritans and of Puritans as subversives did not go unchallenged. John Yates, one of the "Informers" against whom Montagu directed his Accumle to Caesar, protested his complete and unqualified subscription to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England. He readily condemned those who defied ecclesiastical authority, and he even claimed to have discouraged some Puritans from the paths of nonconformity and separation.¹⁴⁹ Daniel Featly argued that Montagu and men of his ilk, while accusing their opponents of reducing religion to anti-Popery, themselves reduced it to anti-Puritanism.¹⁵⁰ Even Robert Sanderson, a moderate who sought to reconcile Calvinists and Arminians, placed much of the blame for religious discord on the Arminians, who indiscriminately labelled all Calvinists as Puritans. Most Calvinists, he argued, opposed Puritanism as strongly as did any Arminian, and it scandalized the Church that men should be accused of Puritanism simply for supporting opinions sanctioned by divines of the stature of Whitgift and Hooker.¹⁵¹

iii. Bowing at the Name of Jesus

Both the shift away from specifically doctrinal issues and the
tendency of Arminians and their opponents to accuse each other of "Popery" and "Puritanism" respectively emerged clearly in a debate over a specific ceremony - bowing at the name of Jesus. In 1630 appeared the latest in a series of William Prynne's attacks on Arminianism, a book entitled Anti-Arminianisme. Is was a greatly enlarged edition of an earlier book, The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme ... (London, 1629). Though Prynne characteristically fills the pages and darkens the margins with a plethora of sources hostile to Arminian doctrines, the prefaces (which are the same in both books) warn against the ceremonies and practices favored by Arminians. (See p. 42 above.) As if to underline his concern with this latter aspect of Arminianism, Prynne included in the 1630 book an appendix concerning bowing at the name of Jesus.

A sermon recently preached by Giles Widdowes, rector of St. Martin Carfax (Oxford), occasioned Prynne's appendix, but the origins of the controversy extend many years earlier. In 1604, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury framed a series of canons pertaining to ecclesiastical ceremonies and discipline. One of these canons, the 18th, required "due and lowly reverence" of all worshippers "when in time of divine service the Lord IESUS shalbe mentioned." Though these controversial canons were never approved by Parliament and were bitterly opposed by many Puritans, they received James I's endorsement as laws governing both provinces of the Church. Archbishop Bancroft, who had been the driving force behind the framing and adoption of the canons, enforced them rigorously, to the point of depriving non-conforming clergy. During the primacy of Archbishop Abbot, the
more objectionable ceremonies were not as widely or as rigidly enforced, but they still found practitioners and defenders among the "High Church" clergy, most prominent of whom was Lancelot Andrewes. On Easter 1614 Andrewes defended the ceremony enjoined by the 18th canon in a sermon delivered before James I at Whitehall. Bowing at the name of Jesus, he argued, is expressly commanded in Philippians 2:8-11. The text plainly requires a physical submission to the name Jesus, and, continued Andrewes, "what better way, or more proper, then by our humilitie to exalt Him, who for His humilitie, was exalted."  

There is no record of any negative reaction to this sermon, probably because in 1614 relatively few Englishmen perceived any major internal threats to the essential Protestantism of their Church. Giles Widdowes' sermon was delivered in rather different times. Widdowes (ca. 1588-1645) was a staunch defender of traditional ceremonies (he was later accused of setting up a large crucifix with a picture of Christ on it), an eccentric, convivial minister who frequented alehouses and danced with his congregation on Whit-Sunday, and during the Civil War a devoted royalist whose sermons were very popular with the royal garrison at Oxford. In a sermon preached at Witney (no date is given, but it was published in 1630), he defended the ceremonies of the Church of England, including bowing at the name of Jesus. It appeared in print as The Schismatical Puritan, with a preface "To the Puritan." In this preface, Widdowes ridiculed the Puritan's self-professed religious zeal. They claimed to rely on Scripture as the sole rule of faith, but they rejected the liturgy, ceremonies, and discipline which the Church of England had derived from Scripture. The
Puritans, then, instead of truly following Scripture, "taketh fast hold only on the letter and chapter of the text," as it suits their quarrelsome natures. He called on them to abandon their alleged subversion of "our true, faithfull reforming religion" and their defiance of its royal governor. Somewhat incongruously, he commended himself as "your hearty well-wisher to solid Reformation" to the very Puritans he had earlier addressed as "nothing better in tenet, than ... Arch-Traitor".

In the sermon itself, which takes I Corinthians 14:5 as its text, Widdowes vindicates the authority of the Church to establish a decent order of worship. Specifically, he defended the ceremonies of the Church of England as

signes of church beauty for morall ornament.
And that to beautify gesture in acknowledging the Lord Jesus to be the King of heaven and earth, of the triumphant & militant Church.

Among the ceremonies reflecting this acknowledgement of Christ as Lord were bowing at the name of Jesus, kneeling to receive the sacrament, and the use of the sign of the cross in baptism. The establishment of these and any other ceremonies promoting beauty and order in the service is the Church's prerogative. And, inasmuch as "the same ceremonies will not sort in all places," churches in different places may find different ceremonies appropriate. The ceremonies of the Church of England, Widdowes continued, are entirely appropriate, for they admirably advance decency and order in public worship. They contain real religious significance, and "being significant, they are profitable for admonition, and testification of our duties ..." Even
if, for argument's sake, the ceremonies did lack explicit Scriptural warrant, "the custumes of Gods people, or the institutions of our Predecessors ought to bee received for lawes," so long as they may be logically derived from and are not flatly contrary to Scripture. So long as this broad rule prevails, the Church cannot err.\textsuperscript{159}

As Prynne was quick to note in his "Appendix", there was an apparent contradiction between Widdowes' defense of bowing as an exercise of the authority delegated to the Church by Christ and Andrewes's earlier defense of it as an explicit Scriptural injunction. Both arguments, he contended, are wrong. Prynne first attacked Andrewes's position on the grounds that Philippians 2:10 is to be understood metaphorically, not literally. It does not enjoin all Christians to bow "at" the name of Jesus but rather "in" the name of Jesus. If it enjoined the former, then one would be obliged to bow at any mention of the name "Jesus", not only during prayer and not only in reference to Jesus Christ. Moreover, because "all Creatures" do not in fact bow at the name of Jesus (Jews and pagans, for example), the text must be understood as a prophecy rather than an injunction. Only on Judgement Day, when all creatures, men, angels, and devils alike, submit to Christ will the text be literally fulfilled, and then the bowing will be an act of subjection, not of veneration, as the defenders of the ceremony would have it. Prynne also denied Andrewes's assertion that veneration of the name of Jesus is the most appropriate way to honor the Second Person of the Trinity. "Jesus" by itself denotes only the humanity of the Son, whereas "Jesus Christ" also conveys his majesty
Prynne then turned to Widdowes's argument that bowing at the name of Jesus is a harmless, decent ceremony lawfully commanded by ecclesiastical authority. Whereas a ceremony, properly so called, is merely an adjunct to "some sacred ordinance or religious duty" (such as kneeling to pray or standing to recite the Creed), the practice in question pertains directly to "the very person or Deity of Christ." God alone may determine such fundamental questions; they are not subject to human contrivances. Nor, Prynne continued, is the practice as innocuous as its defenders maintain. It promotes the superstitious worship of a name without specific reference to Christ as Lord and Savior. An ignorant worshipper would as likely bow at the mention of Joshua, Jesus ben Sirach, or any like-sounding name. The practice might even undermine the concept of the Trinity by elevating the Son above the Father and the Holy Ghost. At the very least, it could hardly be termed orderly and decent, for what could be less orderly and decent than having the congregation interrupt their prayers in order "to rise up, cring, to cop, and bow at the name of Jesus" or even attempt to do all of these simultaneously? Bowing at the name of Jesus, then, is no more a lawful ceremony than it is a duty of the text. Those who, like Widdowes, attempt to justify it on both grounds are simply contradicting themselves.  

Widdowes responded to Prynne in a book entitled The Lawlesse Knelesse Schismaticall Puritan. His earlier attack on the Puritans seemed mild by comparison, for whereas he had then attributed their nonconformity to obstinacy, he now saw it as part of a grand strategy.
to foist "the Pure, Holy doctrine and discipline of Elect Geneva" on the Church of England. True, he had already called them traitors, but now he specifically charged them with attempted subversion of ecclesiastical and civil government alike. Once they had accomplished their designs, "every presbyter shall be greater than a Monarch, and every Justice of peace above the Presbyter." 162

Returning to the issue at hand, Widdowes completely reaffirmed his previous position and denied that he had advanced two mutually exclusive arguments. Bowing was at once a duty of the text and a lawful ceremony commanded by the Church. It plainly proceeds from Philippians 2:10, whether one translates the verse as commanding bowing "in" or "at" the name of Jesus. It is also a bona fide ceremony, that is, "a decent, and orderly signe of the Regenerats or Churches signified duty." Some ceremonies, such as removing hats during worship, are expressly commanded by Scripture (I Corinthians 2:4-7); others may be deduced from the sense of Scripture, such as the use of the wedding ring (Matthew 16:24). The author of ceremonies commanded by Scripture is the Holy Ghost; the author of ceremonies derived "by pregnant consequences" from Scripture is the Church. In either case, a ceremony is "a morall Christian duty," whose object is decency and order. Because bowing at the name of Jesus is a ceremony expressly commanded by Scripture as well as the Church, its observance is an especially important duty; its omission is tantamount to resisting the Holy Ghost and therefore places the soul in jeopardy. 163

Nor, continued Widdowes, has the Church commanded the ceremony arbitrarily. It was, pace Prynne, a highly instructive practice, whose
significance lay in its affirmation of Christ as lord. That it might be used superstitiously is no reason to abolish it but only to instruct those who do not properly understand that they are bowing to the person, not the bare name of Jesus. Neither does the ceremony detract from the dignity of the service or interfere with the act of worship. Rather, the ceremony compliments worship, because "the heart serving God doth incline, and agitate all inferior parts to praise the Lords, so that the knee doth bow, and the tongue doth confess, that Jesus is the Lord; both serve the Lord thus together." Therefore, the practice of the ceremony in no way impugns one's sense of devotion, but its omission does:

The Inward man is the guide, and the Governor of the outward man in the state, and in the able practice of Grace. He then is no regenerate man, in whom there is so much contrariety, as that his soul, and his body agree not to worship the Lord Jesus.164

Widdowes may have offered an eloquent defense of ceremonies in general and of bowing in particular, but any pride he took in his accomplishment must have been short-lived. Prynne's rejoinder, entitled Lame Giles, was calculated to cripple both Widdowes's personal and scholarly reputations. Prynne addressed Lame Giles to his and Widdowes' alma mater, Oxford University, where the two had been acquainted at Oriel College.165 It seems that while passing through Oxford on his way to London, Prynne had read the manuscript copy of The Lawlesse Kneelsesse Schismaticall Puritan at the printer's shop, where it was awaiting publication. Already, claimed Prynne, the book had been so extensively corrected and revised by one William Page (see below), "that
there was scarce one page in all the Coppie, in which there were not severall written Erroirs, Absurdities and Impertinences quite expunged ... Even so, the final draft contained so many errors that, as soon as he arrived in London (October 20, 1630), Prynne wrote letters to Vice Chancellor of Oxford, Warden Smith, who had authorized the book's publication, and to Widdowes. In his letter to the Vice Chancellor, Prynne expressed concern for the reputation of Oxford if such a poor piece of scholarship emerged from its presses and warned that if it did, he would

\[\text{passe such a publike Censure on him, as will not onely scare the oft-distrest author out of his crazy wits, but draw perchance some blot of disreputation on your selfe, who should not suffer such cackling wild geese as these, to fly Cum privilegio from our Oxford presses.}\]

His letter to Widdowes, unlike the rest of Lame Giles, was surprisingly cordial in tone. For "College and old-acquaintance sake," he listed Widdowes's errors in citations and translations, so that they might be corrected before publication. He also requested Widdowes to provide stronger evidence of the antiquity and appropriateness of bowing at the name of Jesus. Both letters, said Prynne, went unanswered.

Prynne signed his letter to Widdowes as "Your loving Friend." That Widdowes regarded him in the same light is highly unlikely. Prynne effectively discredited much of Widdowes's argument, especially the evidence from the Fathers and the Councils of the Early Church, on which the historical case for bowing depended so heavily. He also enjoyed some humor at his adversary's expense, regarding the
latter's alleged predilection for strong drink. Widdowes's citations were from editions of books in the Oxford library, said Prynne, because he "hath converted all his books into good liquor." In refuting Widdowes's contention that Philippians 2:10 meant the same whether one translated it as bowing "in" or "at" the name of Jesus, Prynne quipped,

"Because in Grammar, In or at a place (viz. in a Taverne, or at a Taverne; in an Alehouse, or at an Alehouse) are both one to Mr. Widdowes; you may be sure to finde him in or at either, non obstante the 75 Canon."

As if all this were not damaging enough, Prynne also claimed that Widdowes himself did not bow at the name of Jesus. On October 12, 1630, he had heard Widdowes read the 8:00 pm prayers at St. Martin Carfax,

"and though he read all the prayers standing, yet hee never so much as bowed his head at the name of Jesus, (which he pronounced with a Stentorian voice) neither in the chapter, Creed, nor Collects."

Widdowes never responded to any of the charges Prynne made in Lame Giles, nor, for that matter, does he seem ever to have had anything published again. Instead, it was yet another Oxford scholar, William Page (1590-1663), who answered Lame Giles. Page, it will be remembered, had been identified by Prynne as having a major role in the revision of The Lawlesse ... Puritan. Page admitted having read the book before its publication but denied having made any alterations whatsoever. Thus, he took no responsibility for Widdowes' error, not did he undertake to answer Prynne on Widdowes' behalf.

Whether Widdowes and Page had in fact collaborated is unknown.
It is known, however, that whereas Widdowes had apparently entered into and pursued the bowing controversy on his own, Page received official support, support without which his book could not have been published. On May 31, 1631, Archbishop Abbot, in an attempt to dampen the fires of religious controversy, ordered Page not to publish his *Justification of Bowing.* On June 22, William Laud, still bishop of London, countermanded his superior's orders. In the name of the king, he commanded Brian Duppa, the Vice Chancellor of Oxford, to proceed with the publication of Page's book in terms which left no doubt as to the king's position in the controversy:

> It is, as I am informed, in defence of the canon of the Church, about bowing at the name of Jesus, and modestly and well written. And his majesty likes not that a book boldly and ignorantly written by Mr. Prynne against the Church, should take place as the church's opinion against herself, or as unable to be answered by the church.

Page would once again enjoy Laud's favor when in 1636 the Archbishop obtained for him the post of master of the grammar school of Reading, Laud's birthplace.

Page added few new arguments to Widdowes's defense of bowing at the name of Jesus, but he did present a more powerful case. Unfortunately, the format of his book sometimes conceals its best passages, because he chose to respond point by point to Prynne's "Appendix" and Lame Giles rather than to offer a systematic argument. He had not "first entered upon this business" convinced of the Scriptural origins of the ceremony. However, Andrewes's sermon had persuaded him that bowing at the name of Jesus was indeed enjoined by Philippians 2:9-10. But whereas Widdowes, in advancing this line of argument, had exposed him-
Page contended that grammatically and logically, "at" was the only plausible interpretation of the text. (How, he asked, could one observe a general injunction to bow in but not at the name of Jesus?) He conceded Prynne's point that the text would be universally fulfilled only on the day of judgement, but, he continued, this in no way excluded its practice now. Indeed, Christians are all the more obliged to bow in anticipation of and in testimony to the universal act of subjection. Whether "Jesus" is a more or less appropriate object of this act is immaterial, because the text explicitly mentions this name, not any other.

Page even more insistently defended the practice as a ceremony lawfully instituted by ecclesiastical authority. There is no contradiction, he responded to Prynne, in advancing it both as a duty of the text and as a ceremony. Even according to Prynne's own criteria, bowing at the name of Jesus qualified as a bona fide ceremony. Prynne, it will be remembered, had argued that a true ceremony is an adjunct to a religious duty, not a religious duty itself. But, Page contended, the act of bowing was not in and of itself a religious duty but only a sign of a duty, namely, of showing reverence and subjection to Christ. Thus, though the object of bowing is Christ, the cause from which it proceeds is the "humble hart and soule of man." Accordingly, the practice relates not immediately but intermediately to Christ and is therefore a true ceremony, a sign of "that obeysance and subjection and thankfulnes I owe unto my saviour."

Like Widdowes, Page could muster little evidence to prove the
historicity of the ceremony. But at least, unlike Widdowes, he recognized the limitations of his evidence. He frankly admitted the lack of any conclusive evidence of the practice in the first few centuries of the Church or of its explicit approval by the Fathers. But, he added, the Fathers do approve of bowing during worship, and nothing they say with regard to Philippians 2:9-10 contradicts the practice of the Church of England. Whereas in doctrinal matters, such silence would imply dissent, in things indifferent, it amounts to tacit consent. In the latter case, the Church can at its discretion implement or delete a broad range of practices. True, the Primitive Church provides "a very good direction for us to follow, both in matters of doctrine and practice." But its precedents do not bind contemporary churches. If in general the Church of England manifests its legitimacy by adhering to the legacy of the Primitive Church, it does not thereby abandon its right to frame new ceremonies it deems suitable, providing it does not flatly contradict the consensus of the Church through the ages. In fact, argued Page, "the present Church hath powers to adde, even in points of doctrine, much more in matters of discipline and ceremony, to those things the Fathers have left us."

Hence, even those who doubt the scriptural basis of the practice ought to bow at the name of Jesus. The interpretation of Philippians 2:9-10 may remain open to question; the authority of the Church to make ceremonies does not. Any ceremony the Church ordains, so long as it does not contradict Scripture or promote superstition, must be observed:

This I say is the principall and chiefest matter that I intend to stand upon, to wit,
that this ceremony of bowing at the name of
lESUS, is an innocent and harmlesse if not
a religious and devoute institution, which
the Church may well enact, and Christian
people ought carefully to observe and
practice. 183

For this reason, Prynne's charge that the practice was first
instituted by the Church of Rome is immaterial. In the first place,
said Page, echoing Hooker, Andrewes, Montagu, and Cosin, the Church of
England departs from the Church of Rome "onely where she swerveth from
the right rule." Where Roman Catholic practice is consonant with
Scripture and antiquity, "the Church of England's observance of this
particular practice differes radically in intent from that of the
Church of Rome. It attributes no magical properties to the name of
Jesus, nor does it attach merit to bowing at the name. Therefore, it
matters not if the Church of Rome observes a corruption of this cere-

mony but only that the Church of England lawfully commands it. 184

With Page's Justification of Bowing, the controversy seems to have
ended until 1636. No further defenses of bowing at the name of Jesus
were forthcoming, nor did Prynne or any other Puritan controversialist
essay a response to Page. Perhaps the official support Page enjoyed
deterred would-be respondents, or perhaps Prynne simply decided to turn
to other, more pressing issues (such as stage plays, the attack on
which would bring Prynne before the High Commission). It was not
until 1636 that there appeared Certain Quaeres Propounded unto Bowers
at the Name of Jesus, a clandestinely published, anonymous pamphlet
whose authorship Prynne later admitted. This new contribution to the
debate was occasioned, as the publisher and author explained, by the
enforcement of the 18th canon during the recent metropolitical visitation. For the most part, Prynne simply reaffirmed his earlier arguments that Philippians 2:9-10 does not require a physical act of bowing at the mention of "Jesus". However, to a greater extent than before, Prynne cast the late Bishop Andrewes in the role of the villain, not only for his Easter 1614 sermon but also for allegedly imposing his construction of Philippians 2:10 on the King James translation of the Bible. According to Prynne, Andrewes was also the first bishop to enforce the ceremony in his articles of visitation.

*Certain Quaeres* departs even more radically from Prynne's earlier works by injecting politics into the controversy. On the one hand, he attempts to dismiss Widdowes's and Page's invocation of ecclesiastical authority by denying that not only Philippians 2:9-10 but even Canon 18 required a physical act of bowing. On the other hand, he tries to cover all bases by rejecting the authority of the Canons of 1604, on the grounds that they had never been confirmed by Parliament. True, he still rests his case primarily on the verdict of Scripture, the Fathers, and Continental and English Protestant luminaries, but he now also attacks the enforcement of bowing at the name of Jesus as contrary to

the Statute of Magna Charta c. 19, the Petition of Right, with other laws enacted for the peoples liberties, which cannot be taken from them but by Parliament which never yet prescribed this strange genuflection.

As early as 1629 Prynne had appealed to Parliament to extirpate Arminianism, but to insist that ecclesiastical ordinances promul-
gated by Convocation and authorized by the King were null and void until approved by Parliament was something of a rather different order. Furthermore, whereas Prynne had earlier hoped that at least some of the bishops might help combat Arminianism, he now categorically condemned all of them for issuing and enforcing articles of visitation without a commission from the king. In short, Prynne was already moving toward a political and religious radicalism and abandoning his earlier attachments to royalism and the Elizabethan Settlement.

This goes a bit beyond the purview of the subject at hand, though, because the 1630-31 debate over bowing at the name of Jesus had not yet brought into question the powers of Parliament and the very existence of episcopacy. Nevertheless, a special significance can still be claimed for the conflict, because a proper understanding of it does much to explain how the nature of religious controversy had changed since the appearance of Montagu's Cagg in 1624. In the first place, controversy now centered much more on ceremonial than doctrinal issues. To be sure, the ceremonial issues were not new. Bowing at the name of Jesus, as I have shown, had been a point of contention well before 1630. Furthermore, though Montagu's doctrinal position was the single most important source of religious controversy in the 1620's, the charges or "popery" levelled at him and his associate Cosin and their patrons Laud and Neile show that ceremonial issues were hardly dormant. In fact, in 1625 suspicion had been cast on Cosin simply because he bowed at the name of "Jesus" (see above).

But though ceremonial issues were present in the 1620's, it was not until the 1630's that they predominated (as public debate over
Arminianism came to a virtual halt, at least in print.) Significantly, the first debate over a specific ceremony was initiated by a man who had already contributed several pamphlets to the doctrinal debate and in a book entitled *Anti-Arminianisme*! Just as significantly, Bishop Laud and Charles I, both of whom had already given their support to the Arminians, strongly supported the defense of bowing, whereas Archbishop Abbot, who had earlier attempted to silence Montagu's expression of Arminian doctrines now just as unsuccessfully tried to suppress Page's defense of bowing at the name of Jesus. Thus, the earlier division between Calvinists and Arminians correspond closely to that between opponents and supporters of the disputed ceremony.

Though the disputants did not use this controversy to advance their respective views on predestination, this is not to say that it bore no relation at all to the doctrinal conflict. As I have shown, many English Protestants believed the advancement of such ceremonies to be simply another aspect of an Arminian conspiracy. Furthermore, the issues at stake in this controversy have been shown to have extended far beyond the omission or inclusion of a single ceremony to encompass the role of ceremony in general, the significance of England's Protestant Reformation, and the nature and extent of ecclesiastical authority. The controversy also encompassed one of the most fundamental points of Christian doctrine, namely, the nature of Jesus Christ. To Giles Widdowes, as it had been to Lancelot Andrewes, the name "Jesus" was of all the names of the Son the most worthy of man's devotion. "Jesus" was the name given Christ's human nature, and it was precisely Christ's willingness to suffer as a man that forms the essence of Christianity:
For seeing that God only in the name of Jesus would humble himself, and suffer shame, and rebuke: therefore in the same name, he is and wilbe to the worlds end, all magnified. 

Accordingly, the Puritans' refusal to bow at the name of Jesus reveals their self-proclaimed zeal for true religion as in reality an aversion to it:

They will not bow to JESUS. Not to his name nor to his person. Grace hath no knees; The time of Glory hath knees in everything. Glory shall bow; Grace must be unreverend and unmannerly. This is their holiness.

The very reasons that commended the name of "Jesus" to Widdowes made Prynne object to bowing at that name. "Jesus", he argued, denotes only the humanity of Christ and as such does not convey as fully as his other names (Christ, Savior, Lord) the majesty and power of the son. Hence, it is "not so excellent, so venerable as his name Christ," which alone is peculiar to him and encompasses both his divine and human natures. In fact, bowing at Christ's human name, to the exclusion of all others, and to the Son and not to the Father and the Holy Ghost might foster heresy, especially Arianism.

Page agreed that all of the names of God are worthy of respect but still contended that none of them deserved so much thankes and humble acknowledgement of favour done unto us, as this name IESUS; for these names are most of them names of power, majesty, and glory; but that name we glory in, is a name of mercy, tender compassion, and commiseration.

Other names celebrate God's power; "Jesus" celebrates his love, through the ultimate sacrifice of Christ not as he was the sonne of God, or Lord of Lords, or a mighty Prince, or King of Kings, but as he was a JESUS, and therefore doe we owe so much reverence and thankfull duty.
Just as Thomas Jackson had defended a doctrine that subordinated God's might to his goodness (see Chapter I), so Page defended a ceremony which demonstrated that God

> prefers goodnesse before greatnesse, he esteemes names of mercy and pitty, above names of majesty and power, and so should we, especially when this mercy and tender compassion extends thus to us, to our everlasting good.197

Thus, though the controversy over bowing was an issue in its own right and not simply an extension of the doctrinal conflict, the arguments advanced by each side do suggest a degree of congruence with their doctrinal views. It was entirely in keeping with Prynn's earlier defense of God's sovereignty in matters of election and reprobation that he now objected to a name less suggestive than others of that sovereignty. Conversely, Widdowes and Page defended the ceremony of bowing at the name of Jesus, just as Montagu, Jackson and the others had defended the doctrines of Arminius, because they wished to emphasize Christ's humility over his glory, God's goodness over his might, and his charity over his avenging power.

One final point of significance can be claimed for the controversy over bowing at the name of Jesus - it foreshadowed ensuing controversies of the 1630's. During this decade, religious debate would focus far more on ceremonial than doctrinal matters, and both the tone and content of the debate would follow the precedents set by Prynne, Widdowes, and Page. Opponents of the disputed ceremonies would condemn them as instructive, aesthetically pleasing, and harmless. Puritans would attack the Laudian regime and its supporters as allies of Popery; they in turn would charge their opponents with subversion of
church and state. Above all, the two sides would dispute with increasing bitterness the authority of the Church to frame and enjoin a broad range of ordinances.
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Chapter III

THE SABBATH OR THE LORD'S DAY?

Just as the question or bowing at the name of Jesus provided Giles Widdowes with a shibboleth by which to identify alleged schismatics, so did two other issues transcend their intrinsic importance to become rallying points for two increasingly hostile religious factions. The change in the nature of controversy became even more apparent as the contending parties defined themselves no longer by doctrine but by their views on (1) the proper observance of Sunday and (ii) the position and status of the Communion Table. Although there were serious inconsistencies between the arguments advanced by each side on the respective issues, in both cases they continued the vigorous debate begun in the bowing controversy over the sources and nature or ecclesiastical authority.

Of the two controversies, the one concerning the observance of Sunday had the most tenuous connection with the doctrinal issue. At the root of the controversy was a single, deceptively simple question: Is Sunday the Sabbath? If it is, then the day should be observed with those prohibitions against worldly activities set forth in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. If it is not, then the day carries with it no obligations other than those the Church chooses to impose.

The question was not new to the Church of England. During the reign of Elizabeth I, several books, the most famous of which was by
Nicholas Bound, protested the proliferation of profane recreations on Sunday on the grounds that under the Gospel the Sabbath and its attendant obligations had been transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week. Though this Sabbatarian position was generally supported by Puritans and opposed by defenders of the Elizabethan Settlement (such as John Whitgift and Thomas Rogers), the controversy does not seem to have had doctrinal roots. It may be tempting to attribute the Puritans' Sabbatarianism to a Calvinistic, literal interpretation of Scripture, but in fact Calvin himself rejected the identification of Sunday with the Sabbath. There was no need to observe it "with scrupulous rigour," he argued, because the Lord's Day was not "a figure of some spiritual mystery" but had been appointed only "as a remedy necessary for the preservation of the Church." Conversely, Lancelot Andrewes, to whom the early English Arminians looked for inspiration, upheld the Sabbatarian prohibition on Sunday recreation and work in a series of lectures delivered in 1578. True, Andrewes later changed his views on the Sabbath, but on the other hand, there is no evidence that he had ever held any distinctly Puritan views.

During the reign of James I, Sabbatarianism became a more recognizably Puritan cause. Conversely, anti-Sabbatarianism became more distinctively anti-Puritan. In 1611, John Brerewood, an apprentice to a London merchant, directly disobeyed his master's command to work on Sunday. John had recently been in Chester and had there listened to the sermons of Nicholas Byfield (1579-1622), a prominent Calvinist minister. Young Brerewood claimed to have been persuaded by Byfield that any servile labor on Sunday violated the fourth commandment. Therefore, he
argued, obedience to God's law superseded obedience to his master. John's uncle, Edward Brerewood, a professor at Gresham College, was alarmed at the fruits of his nephew's new-found conscience and, in the hope of discrediting the young man's mentor, wrote a long, argumentative letter to Byfield. The minister's teachings, the elder Brerewood contended

beginne in ignorance and ... and in sinne; ... beginne in mistaking the Law of God & ... in the wicked disobedience of servants to their masters, & in the rebellious contempt of the lawes of man.⁴

Brerewood first of all censured Byfield for subverting the social order. True, the fourth commandment obligated masters not to let their servants work on the Sabbath, but it did not forbid the servants to work. The distinction is vital, because it is only the master who incurs guilt when the servant performs work in violation of the commandment. Hence, servants may not plead conscience to excuse disobedience. By law they "have no right or power to dispose of themselves;" their actions proceed not from their own will but from their masters'⁵

Furthermore, since the commandment was clearly intended to grant servants a respite from their labors, it was absurd to increase their burdens by confronting them with the painful choice of obeying either their masters of God.⁶

For Brerewood, however, the point was moot, for he went on to argue that no work was in and of itself unlawful on Sunday. While the appointment of a fixed time of worship was a corollary of the law of nature common to all men, the seventh day Sabbath and its peculiar mode of observance were part of the ceremonial Law given only to the Jews. The Lords' Day, the term Christians use for
Sunday, is an observance appointed by the Church, having nothing in common with the Sabbath save its designation as a regular day of worship. The Church did not and could not transfer the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, for the Sabbath, along with the rest of the ceremonial Law, had been abolished by the Gospel. Brerewood challenged Byfield either to refute this argument or to recant his error and set John Brerewood's conscience at ease.

"I hold not myself bound to answer every strangers vaine challenge," replied Byfield in a letter to Brerewood, "especially when I see him so ingaged before hand to his prejudice, that he seeks more victory than truth." Accordingly, Byfield recapitulated only very briefly his earlier contention that Sunday was indeed the Sabbath and was to be observed with the same decorum commanded the Jews. However, he denied ever having taught that servants might not perform light chores, such as John had apparently been commanded to do, on the Sabbath. Professor Brerewood conceded that Byfield had not explicitly sanctioned his nephew's disobedience, but still maintained that warning young apprentices not to desecrate the Sabbath had virtually the same effect.

The correspondence between Brerewood and Byfield remained unpublished until 1630; that is, nearly 20 years after the dispute, 17 years after Brerewood's death, and 8 years after Byfield's. Nowhere in the book is there any explanation for the belated publication of this material. In 1631, Byfield's half-brother, Richard, defended the Sabbatarian position and also offered a rather different version of the events of 1611 in *The Doctrine of the Sabbath Vindicated*. According to
the testimony of a Master Walker, who had been minister of the London parish where the apprentice and his master resided, young John's disobedience had proceeded from less elevated motives than he had claimed. During his visit to Chester, he had been smitten far less by Nicholas Byfield's preaching than by his love for a local girl. His scruples regarding the Sabbath were merely a ruse to force his masters to dismiss him and thus leave him free to marry. Richard Byfield included in his book a letter allegedly written by Edward Brerewood in which he expressed doubts about his nephew's motives and resolved to abandon the controversy.

In view of these assertions, it is difficult to judge whether Brerewood in fact wrote A Second Treatise of the Sabbath, which was published under his name in 1632 and which elaborated on the distinction between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day. It is also difficult to assess the relationship between this dispute and the controversies of the 1620's and 1630's. Was it simply a bitter personal quarrel, or does it in any way foreshadow the later confrontation between Puritans and Laudians? Byfield's preaching style and views are recognizably Puritan; Brerewood is more difficult to classify, but perhaps it is significant that among his posthumously published works is a defense of episcopacy. Perhaps too it is significant that when Byfield attacked Brerewood for presuming as a layman to meddle in doctrinal matters, Brerewood in effect dismissed the Puritan concept of the "godly preacher," whose calling gave him superior insight:

Is it not possible for a man to knowe what doctrine is wholesome for soules, except he have the charge of soules? Or if he know it, is it not lawfull to utter it, to them that have charge? Is the light of divine truth confined to Ministers, that other men may not see it?
While the nature of the Brerewood-Byfield dispute thus remains ambiguous, the reason for its revival in the 1630's is not. Since 1611, the Sabbath question had assumed a special importance. To begin with, the Crown had entered the debate. In 1618, during his return from Scotland, James I heard grievances from the large recusant population of Lancashire concerning the Sabbatarian rigors imposed by the Puritan clergy of that shire. He acceded to their request for permission to enjoy once again their Sunday recreations, but apparently some of the recusants abused their royal protection. They danced and practiced archery near churches on Sunday mornings, deliberately disrupting the service. Accordingly, on the advice of Bishop Thomas Morton, a moderate Calvinist, James I issued a royal proclamation clarifying his original orders. This Declaration of Sports (or Book of Sports, as it was commonly called) permitted those who attended public worship on Sunday to participate afterward in any normally lawful recreation. The declaration was later applied not only to Lancashire but to the entire kingdom, and the clergy were commanded to read it from their pulpits.16

Much to his embarrassment, James I found support for Sabbatarianism far stronger than he had imagined. Many clergy, including George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, simply refused to read or even to allow the proclamation to be read from their pulpits. In the face of such stubborn resistance, James I rescinded this part of his command.17 The proclamation itself he did not rescind, but not for lack of opposition. In the 1621 session of Parliament, a bill calling for the stricter observance of the Sabbath was introduced in the House of Commons. It outlawed a variety of Sunday recreations, including
churchales, dancing, and may games.18

The bill apparently commanded overwhelming support, but Thomas Shepherd, a young lawyer from Lincoln's Inn, vigorously opposed it. The bill's title, he began, was a misnomer, inasmuch as Saturday, not Sunday, was the Sabbath. The contents of the bill he also found objectionable, because it forbade things explicitly sanctioned by the royal proclamation and, in the case of dancing, even by the Biblical King David. Finally (and for Shepherd, fatefully), he alleged that the bill was a Puritan-inspired measure and termed its sponsor (Sir Walter Earle) a "Perturber of the Peace." Shepherd further contended that the justices of the peace, who would enforce the bill should it become law, were "countenancers of the Puritans."19

The house was outraged by Shepherd's speech. He had slandered a fellow-member and accused the bill's supporters of being in sympathy with Puritanism and of seeking to undo a royal proclamation. Accordingly, they voted to censure and expel him, though they did not go so far as those who wished him committed to the Tower.20

The king's response to his supporter's punishment was surprisingly mild. Both James I and his spokesmen in the Commons agreed that Shepherd's intemperate speech warranted his expulsion, but the king was concerned that the House had by its actions abetted Puritanism. He also shared Shepherd's belief that the Sabbath bill was at least in part incompatible with his Book of Sports. In order to reassure the king, the House of Commons voted to revise the bill so as to reconcile it with the royal proclamation.21 This revised bill was subsequently passed and sent to the House of Lords, following which a
Joint committee recommended that "Lord's Day" be substituted for "Sabbath" throughout the bill, in order to avoid the appearance of "Judaizing." The bill then passed both Houses in May, 1621. However, it never seems to have received royal assent.

As one might expect, given the fate of Shepherd, the anti-Sabbatarians maintained a lower profile than did their opposites during the 1620's, but they were not quite silent. John Prideaux, the distinguished Oxford professor, attacked the Sabbatarians in a speech delivered at the university's divinity act in 1622. Like Brerewood, he insisted that the Lord's Day was distinct from the Sabbath, that it rested on ecclesiastical ordinance and tradition rather than Scripture, and that worship, not rest, was its object. Hence, anything not impeding public worship and otherwise lawful was permitted on Sunday, including essential work and harmless recreations, "which serve lawfully to refresh our spirits and nourish mutual neighborhood amongst us." Determining which recreations are lawful is the prerogative of the "Religious Magistrate"; hence, the Sabbatarians have no authority to impose their ascetic rigors on others.

Prideaux thus lent the prestige of his academic credentials and his irreproachably Calvinist theology to the anti-Sabbatarian position. And while his Latin speech may not have circulated much beyond the universities at first, twelve years later, its translation by his nemesis Peter Heylyn (see below) proved highly embarrassing to the Sabbatarians, who so venerated Prideaux's theological works.

A less prominent but more passionate spokesman for anti-Sabbatarianism was Thomas Boread (1579-1635), an Oxford graduate and
rector of Rendcomb in Gloucestershire. Broad wrote several treaties against Sabbatarianism, only two of which were published during his lifetime.26 His single-minded devotion to fighting Sabbatarianism at a time when it faced virtually no organized opposition earned him (and Edward Brerewood) the title of "our primitive English Anti-Sabbatarians."27 Broad, like Brerewood (whose then unpublished treatise he read) and Prideaux, insisted that the Sabbath, as part of the ceremonial law instituted for the Jews alone, had virtually nothing in common with the Lord's Day. The two share only their common basis in the law of nature, which requires the appointment of some fixed time of worship. Every other aspect of the Sabbath pertains only to the Jewish seventh day observance, which along with the other Old Testament ceremonies and festivals has been superseded by the Gospel. Thus, when after the reading of the fourth commandment (as after the other nine), members of the Church of England respond, "Lord incline our hearts to keep this law," they refer only to "so much of this law as appertaineth to the law of nature."28

Like Prideaux, Broad insisted that in disassociating the Lord's Day from the Sabbath, he did not intend to disparage it or to promote its profanation. All learned men, he reassured his readers, agree that the Lord's Day originated in the time of the Apostles and that it is of so great antiquity, so generally received, and so profitable to the church of Christ, that it ought to be observed ... according to the practices of good Christians from time to time and the godly lawes of our most famous Christian governor living at this present.29

To those who feared that disproving the Scriptural origins of the
Lord's Day might undermine public morality, Broad responded that his treatises posed no danger. People might even profit from learning that they no longer need observe the Sabbath, for they are thereby reminded that "you shall not Judaize." Some people might indeed seize on Broad's arguments as an excuse for desecrating the Lord's Day, but, he answered,

shall I therefore conceal any good thing from the children of God because the children of the devil will show themselves more in their colours?

Only those who before had "no fear of God" would so pervert his argument. Those who do fear God would observe the Lord's Day diligently because of its antiquity and in deference to temporal authority.30

In the 1630's, the basic anti-Sabbatarian argument set forth by Brerewood, Prideaux, and Broad was taken up by a number of other writers, as controversy over the Sabbath became part of a much broader controversy over the locus of authority in the Church of England. Two developments gave the issue a special immediacy. First of all, in their insistence on distinguishing the divine institution of the seventh day Sabbath from the human institution of the first day Lord's Day, the anti-Sabbatarians found a most unlikely and unwilling ally in Theophilus Brabourne (1590-at least 1661), a minister from Norfolk.31 Brabourne, like the Sabbatarians, argued for a strict observance of the Sabbath, but unlike them he maintained that it had never been transferred from the seventh day. He called on the king and bishops to return to the practice of the Church in its first four centuries and to restore the seventh day Sabbath.32

Naturally, the Sabbatarians rose to the defense of the Sunday

Conversely, the anti-Sabbatarians found that they could use the eccentric Braboume for their own ends. Though they naturally rejected Braboume's central thesis that the Sabbath remained in force, they concurred in his view that Sunday was not the Sabbath. Furthermore, to their delight, Braboume proved highly embarrassing to the Sabbatarians, for he took their principles to a different, albeit logical, conclusion. If, as the Sabbatarians maintained, the fourth commandment is part of the perpetual moral law, then not only should it be observed but it should also continue to be observed on the seventh day.

Braboume's usefulness to the anti-Sabbatarians did not save him from the authorities. Following the appearance of his *Defense of ... the Sabbath Day* in 1632, he was imprisoned by the Court of High Commission and charged with publishing an unlicensed book and with maintaining "erroneous, heretical and Judaical opinions." There the case dragged on for over a year, apparently because of Braboume's refusal to offer a recantation suitable to the court. Eventually, he did present a submission in which he renounced his "rash and presumptuous error," but once he was free, he in effect renounced his recantation. All he had
recanted, he said, were his statements that Saturday was "necessarily" the Sabbath. Save for this slight softening of his position, he stood by everything he had maintained in his books.37

Between the appearance of Brabourne's offending book and his censure, dispute in Somerset provided a second and even more significant occasion for the revival of the Sabbath controversy.38 It was an ancient custom in those parts to hold "wakes" or "churchales" on the day of the saint to whom a given parish church was dedicated. Since the 16th century, these celebrations had been held on the Sunday following the saint's day. Not only did "churchales" afford the parishioners an opportunity for refreshment and recreation; they also served as a relatively painless way to raise funds for the maintenance of church buildings and the clergy. Though these celebrations sometimes degenerated into lewd and disorderly conduct, there is no evidence that they generally led to serious crime or violence. However, some Puritans charged that these festivities promoted desecration of the Sabbath and interfered with preaching, inasmuch as they were held at the same time as afternoon lectures. While Somerset seems not to have had a strong Puritan influence, local magistrates also disliked churchales, not so much for religious reasons but rather because of the threat to public order and the apparent violation of laws restricting the sale of intoxicating drink. Thus, during the reign of Elizabeth, both the assize courts and justices of the peace issued orders forbidding churchales. Similar decrees were issued in 1615 and 1627 and most fatefuliy in March, 1632. At that session of the Somerset assizes, Baron Denham prohibited further churchales and commanded the reading of
this order form the pulpits of the county.

It was this last provision that took the issue beyond the boundaries of Somerset, for William Laud, just recently named Archbishop of Canterbury, could not ignore this attempt by laymen to usurp ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Furthermore, Laud and Charles I regarded churchales more favorably than did the Somerset gentry. They helped raise money for the church and offered an alternative social gathering to alehouses, which Laud saw as breeding grounds for sedition and discontent. Perhaps, too, the very fact that the Puritans so bitterly opposed churchales predisposed their opponents to favor them.

Thus, it was through Laud's influence that Charles I ordered the revocation of Denham's ban on churchales. However, Sir Thomas Richardson (1569-1635), Chief Justice of the King's Bench, who was responsible for the western circuit, demurred at enforcing the king's order. Sir Robert Phelps, a local magnate who had oddly enough been in the opposition in the last Parliament, informed the Crown of Richardson's insubordination. After receiving a strongly worded reprimand from the king, Richardson rescinded the prohibition on churchales, yet even as he did he encouraged others to challenge his actions. He also induced the other justices to sign a petition relating to the king the disorders associated with churchales. Phelps informed Charles I and Laud of Richardson's conduct, and as a result the Chief Justice was brought before the Council, reprimanded by Laud, and forbidden to ride the western circuit again.

These events had far-reaching consequences. First of all the
public humiliation of Richardson, a highly respected member of the bench, served to undermine the public image and morale of the king's justices in general. Furthermore, the justices of the peace, who played an indispensable role in implementing royal policy, became wary of the Crown and its agents, following this brutal and apparently arbitrary exercise of royal power. Significantly, too, a local dispute involving pre-existing local rivalries fed a much broader controversy. Phelips, now the champion of royal policy, had been among the leaders of the opposition in the Commons and later helped lead the local fight against ship money. Conversely, John Lord Poulett, one of Phelip's Somerset rivals, joined the Sabbatarian forces despite formerly close relations with the Court. This evidence, argues Thomas Barnes, suggests that neither faction had chosen its ground primarily on principle but more as a means of securing temporary advantage over local rivals. But if expediency more than conviction dictated the choices of Somerset's elite, other members of the community did indeed see the issue as one of principle and formed their allegiances accordingly. In this way, a local dispute "contributed to the merging of political and religious opposition to royal policy."^0

A more immediate consequence of the Somerset controversy was the reissue of James I's Book of Sports. During the dispute over churchales, William Pierce (Piers), the bishop of Bath and Wells, had at Laud's request surveyed 72 Somerset clergy for their views on the issue. Because Pierce was among the bishops most in sympathy with Laud, it is hardly surprising that the results of this survey supported Laud's personal conviction that concern for public order was merely a ruse being used by
those who would impose their Sabbatarian excesses on society. This was precisely how Charles I justified his proclamation:

because of late in some counties of our kingdom, we find that under the pretense of taking away abuses, there hath been a general forbidding, not only of ordinary meetings, but of Feasts of the Dedication of the Churches, commonly called Wakes.

His proclamation repeated the text of 1618 and, like his father's original, commanded the bishops to have the document read at all parish churches. Now the tables were turned, for the pulpits which the courts in Somerset had enlisted in the campaign against churchales were now employed in their defense. Charles I, like James I, soon found that demanding the support of the clergy was not the same as obtaining it. Many of the clergy who were expected to promote the new royal policy had serious misgivings. In Somerset, where the controversy had begun, many hitherto conforming clergy refused to comply with the proclamation. But Charles I, unlike his father, was less inclined to falter in the face of resistance, especially because his archbishop of Canterbury, unlike his father's, had helped formulate his policy. Thus, some recalcitrant clergy were deprived of their livings, and in Kent, magistrates who interfered with Sunday sports were fined.

Nicholas Estwick, rector of Warkton in Northamptonshire, reported that nearly sixty ministers in his diocese refused to publish the Book of Sports. Estwick himself agonized in deciding which was the greater evil - to promote the desecration of the Sabbath or to disobey a royal command. In the end, he decided to comply, inasmuch as the proclamation, however ill-advised, contained nothing explicitly condemned by the Church and concerned "such things as neither do nor should brake sic the
Communion of Saints." He sought the approval of the respected con-
forming Puritan, Samuel Ward, in order to persuade his colleagues to 
comply. Ward did support Estwick, to what avail is not known.46

Other Sabbataritians were less inclined to compromise. George
Walker, rector of a London parish, preached a series of sermons
against the Book of Sports and Bishop Francis White's defense of it.
(see below) When, despite warnings from Laud, he continued to attack
official ecclesiastical policy and to circulate manuscript copies of
his sermons ("having at that time no hope to get it licensed for the
Presse"), Walker was imprisoned by order of the King in Council and
suspended from his ministerial functions. He remained under house
arrest from 1639 to 1641, when he was released by the Long Parliament,
which also restored him to his living.47

When the Book of Sports first appeared, no one except Broad and
Prideaux seem to have defended anti-Sabbataritism. By contrast,
following its reissue in 1633, a number of writers rallied to the de-
fence of what was now the Church's official position. Like earlier
anti-Sabbataritians, they marshalled a variety of arguments to distinguish
the Lord's Day from the Old Testament Sabbath, but to this they added a
new theme - the subversive intent of the Sabbataritians. Increasingly,
the Sabbataritians' rejection of the Church of England's Lord's Day was
depicted as one aspect of a general rejection of the government and
practices of the Church. From this it followed that the Sabbataritians,
having gained their immediate goal, would not rest until all of his
implications had been realized.

An example of this new response to Sabbataritism was the first
official defense of royal policy, Francis White's Treatise of the Sabbath Day (1635). Francis White (1564?-1638) had earlier defended the Church of England against its Roman Catholic critics in The Orthodox Way and Faith and in a celebrated debate with the English Jesuit, John Fisher. Some of those who applauded his rebuff to popery felt less comfortable with his later Arminian sympathies. In 1621 or 22, Henry Burton suggested that White defend the Church of England's doctrine of justification against that formulated by the Council of Trent. White allegedly declined on the grounds that the differences between the two were minimal. He later helped edit Richard Montagu's Appello Caesarem. Thanks to White, the end product, though hardly restrained in tone, was far tamer than earlier drafts. White's service to Arminianism was rewarded with promotions from the see of Carlisle to the more prosperous dioceses of Norwich (1629) and Ely (1631).

It was as bishop of Ely that White became involved in the Sabbath controversy. Before Theophilus Brabourne was brought before the High Commission, White held a conference with him in a vain attempt to coax him away from his insistence on the observance of a Saturday Sabbath. Following Brabourne's censure by the Court of High Commission, White's services were again enlisted. Because Brabourne had dedicated one of his books to the king, Charles I deemed it necessary to disassociate himself from Brabourne's opinions. Furthermore, in view of the recent disturbances in Somerset and elsewhere, he also thought it advisable to settle his good subjects (who have long time been distracted about Sabbatarian questions) in the old and good way of the ancient and orthodoxall Catholic Church.
Archbishop Laud, to whom this request was conveyed, delegated the responsibility to White.52

Though Brabourne is ostensibly the target of White's Treatise of the Sabbath Day, the book attacks far more bitterly the advocates of a Sunday Sabbath. While White regarded Brabourne as merely deluded and eccentric, the others he branded as "factious and schismaticall spirits," members of a "Presbyterian faction" who threaten to subvert the entire Church of England, not merely its observance of the Lord's Day.53 In fact, said White, it was the Sabbatarians' attack on his position - which was only the logical conclusion of their adherence to a literal interpretation of the fourth commandment- that persuaded the well-intentioned Brabourn to recant his error, for he began to suspect that the holy brethren who had lent him his principles, and yet persecuted his conclusions ... might perhaps be deceived in the first, as he had been in the latter.54

In truth, continued White, both the seventh day Sabbath, whose observance Brabourne defended, and the rigors imposed by the fourth commandment, which the Sabbatarians would impose on the Church of England, have been abolished under the Gospel.

White argued, as had Brerewood and Broad, that the Lord's Day has been established by human rather than divine ordinance and as such is subject only to those laws appointed by the Church. For this reason, there need not be (nor has there ever been, White tried to prove historically) a general prohibition on Sunday labor. Abstinence from labor is required only insofar as work would interfere with worship. Similarly, except during hours appointed for public worship, recreations
are as lawful on Sunday as at any other time. (Here White directed his argument only at the Sunday Sabbatarians, for Brabourne had never attacked the Book of Sports.) Those who chose to spend the entire day in worship and "heavenly meditations" are to be commended, but the church does not and should not require this. After all, laws devised by man for man are meaningless unless everyone is at least capable of obeying them. By this standard, it is hardly realistic to expect most people to comply with a law requiring them to spend their only day of rest in prayer and the evening occupied with nothing but "Chapters, Lectures, Collations, Questions and Answers." It is for this reason that the King, with the support of the Church, has sanctioned lawful recreations on Sunday. Otherwise, those acting "upon Puritan principles" would forbid the people any pleasures, however harmless, and thus the Holy-day would be more unwelcome to them than the plough-day, and besides it might engender in peoples minds a distaste of their present religion and manner of serving God.55

Sabbatarianism posed even greater dangers than misdirected religious zeal. It was, said White, the creation of the same "Presbyterian faction" which rejected everything in the Church of England not explicitly commanded by Scripture - including the institution of the Lord's Day. Such institutions and observances, White contended, when they are based on "the Rules and Canons of Holy Scripture" and when they promote obedience to God's commandments, may be considered "by conformity and subordination to the Divine Law, and by divine approbation, sacred and venerable." It is not the Church which innovates by commemorating Scriptural injunctions with appropriate observances; rather it is "our Disciplinarian Guides" who tamper
with Scripture when they forbid what it does not, including Sunday recreations and bowing at the name of Jesus.\(^{56}\)

It is significant that White chose to link these two items, because his defense of ecclesiastical authority closely parallels that offered by Widdowes and Page. (See chapter II). Like them, he upheld the authority of the Church to frame a broad range of ceremonies and practices. In this particular case, the Church has discharged its responsibility with great care. Though in the absence of an explicit Scriptural command, it could have set aside any day for public worship, it has wisely followed the practice of the Primitive Church in appointing for this purpose the day of Christ's resurrection.\(^{57}\) Those who deny the Church the power to use its judgement and the verdict of antiquity thereby threaten its very foundations, for while Scripture contains all doctrine necessary to salvation and may serve to guide "civil, morall, and Ecclesiasticall duties and actions," the ability to derive these lessons from Scripture is not shared equally by all Christians. Hence, to dilute the authority of the Church is to "open a wide doore to Heretickes and Schmismatikes."\(^{58}\)

White, then, saw Sabbatarianism as part of a much broader threat to the Church of England. Like Giles Widdowes, he believed that those opposed to current ecclesiastical policy were radicals with subversive aims. Specifically, he believed that

1. they were Presbyterians in fact if not in name.

2. as such they rejected all extra-Scriptural traditions and practices of the Church of England.

To combat this supposedly pervasive influence (White, like other Laudian
propagandists, was perhaps a bit too willing to assume that radical Puritanism at this time commanded a large and dangerous following.

He recommended that the Church enlist its clergy and scholars to attack the principles of Presbyterianism. He also urged a greater emphasis on the study of Christian antiquity, particularly the writings of the Fathers, in the training of the clergy. Finally, he appealed to the conforming clergy to set a better example. "Their looseness of life, their avarice and ambition, in heaping together Benefices and promotions" to the neglect of their pastoral duties left the Church of England vulnerable to Puritan propaganda.

In a sermon delivered on August 17, 1635, John Pocklington argued even more boldly White's thesis that Sabbatarianism was but Presbyterianism writ small. Even in an age when restraint had little place in religious controversy, Pocklington (1578-1642) is conspicuous for his lack of it. Indeed, his spirited invective in defense of Laud's policies and his wholesale condemnation of their opponents made Pocklington one of the first clerical victims of the Long Parliament. It may seem ironic that this sermon defending Laud's policy was delivered during the visitation of Bishop John Williams, for Laud and the bishop of Lincoln were bitter enemies. The irony, however, is more apparent than real, for Pocklington was at this time Williams's protege. It was through Williams's influence that he had been appointed a royal chaplain and prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral. Though Williams later denounced Laud during the altar controversy (see below), Pocklington could at this time support both of his superiors without contradiction. So far was Williams from being a Sabbatarian that he once had a comedy per-
formed on Sunday at the episcopal residence at Bugden. It was only later that Pocklington lost favor with Williams, "because," says Williams's biographer and apologist, "Pocklington was a Tell-tale, and made needless complaints against his brethren." To what extent this sermon made Williams reassess his attitude toward Pocklington is unknown, but others certainly had strong and immediate reactions to it. Though Pocklington was a Cambridge man, his sermon was read widely and discussed among Oxford students, "who usually read it at their common fires and according to their dispositions liked or disliked it."

This polarization was hardly surprising, because Pocklington really left no middle ground. He without qualification equated Sabbatarianism with subversion. Insistence on Sunday as the Scriptural Sabbath, he argued, was merely the first step on the road to suppressing all non-Scriptural observances, in fact everything except the long sermons and extemporaneous prayers characteristic of Puritan worship. Once the Sabbatarians had established their Sunday Sabbath, the rest of their program would inexorably follow:

For allow them but their Sabbath, and you must allow them the service that belongs to their Sabbath. Then you must have no Letanie, for that is no service for their Sabbath ... but for Sundayes; nay, you must have no part of the Service in the Communion booke used, for that is service also for holy dayes, which are abominated as idolotricall, being dedicated to Saints. Well then, the Sabbath must be yielded them, otherwise there will be no day left for God to be served on.

Nor would they rest with the abolition of ceremonies they found objectionable. Their ultimate goal was "the casting downe of Crownes and Sceptres, and the laws of the Land" as well as ministers, bishops, and the Book of Common Prayer.
Needless to say, Pocklington had no interest in persuading his opponents to abandon merely their Sabbatarianism or in urging them to outward conformity. Like Richard Montagu, he believed that his opponents, under the pretense of reforming the Church "had eaten out her bowels long since." Their extremism had discredited the entire Church, and consequently, "many that reverence antiquity within us" had been driven into recusancy. If this faction really believed the Church to be as corrupt as they claimed it was, then they should at least have the courage of their convictions and separate from it.

This book and one similar in tone on the alter controversy came back to haunt their author and William Bray, domestic chaplin to Laud, who had licensed them. In February 1641, the House of Lords deprived Pocklington of all his ecclesiastical preferments and disqualified him from holding any in the future. Bray was required to preach a sermon recanting the opinions he had licensed. In this sermon he affirmed that the Lord's day ought to be celebrated both in Publick and in Private, in the Church and out of the Church, in the forenoon and in the afternoon, by hearing the Word of God read and taught by Publick Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, by holy Meditations, Private Prayer, Reading and calling to Mind what we have read or heard, by works of Charity to our Neighbour and the like.

He also acknowledged that the Lord's Day might "be fitly called a Sabbath, and the Christian Sabbath." Pocklington's intemperate, not to say libellous, language made him and Bray useful symbols of a religious establishment now being swept away.

In truth, though, the anti-Sabbatarian position did not rest solely
on invective. For example, Peter Heylyn argued in a tone quite different from White's and Pocklington's. Heylyn entered the controversy in 1634, even before White and Pocklington, with a translation of Prideaux's Latin discourse. (See above.) Though in the forward, Heylyn commended the treatise and its author, he had not acted out of friendship or admiration. On two earlier occasions, Heylyn and Prideaux had been involved in heated disputes concerning the perpetual visibility and authority of the Church. During formal disputations at Oxford, Heylyn had maintained, against Prideaux's vigorous objections, that the visible Church had an uninterrupted existence from the time of the Apostles to the present, that it had been transmitted to England through Rome, that it could not err, and that it had the authority to determine matters of doctrine and ceremony and to interpret Scripture. The translation of the Sabbath treatise was a young scholar's subtle revenge on a distinguished professor, who had openly labelled him a Papist. The publication of this attack on Sabbatarianism also "took off much of that opinion which Prideaux had among the puritans" because of his Calvinist theology. Prideaux's words were thus used to support the very position Heylyn has upheld against him, namely that the Church can appoint ceremonies as it sees fit.

Heylyn's own contribution to the dispute was his History of the Sabbath, an historical justification of the Church of England's rejection of a Sunday Sabbath. (Heylyn later claimed that he wrote this book at the king's command to supplement White's doctrinal assault on Sabbatarianism, but though the book is dedicated to Charles I, neither its title page nor any other contemporary evidence support this claim.)
In the first of the book's two parts, Heylyn argues that the Sabbath could not be part of the "moral, natural, and perpetual law," inasmuch as it had not been observed before the time of Moses and after that had been commanded to the Jews only. In the second part, he contends that the churches (Greek, Roman, and Protestant) have never kept the Sabbath and that the Lord's Day rests on human rather than divine authority.

At first glance, Heylyn seems merely to fortify familiar anti-Sabbatarian arguments with a wealth of historical evidence. But while he does, it is true, cover much of the same ground as Brerewood, Broad, and White, his History of the Sabbath offers a fresh approach to the issue. First of all, though Heylyn usually spared no invective against the enemies of Laud's policies, his was perhaps the most restrained attack on Sabbatarianism, especially in comparison with White's and Pocklington's. True, he did see the hand of Puritanism in the origins of Sabbatarianism. (Nicholas Bound, Heylyn alleged, had claimed divine sanction for the Lord's Day primarily to challenge the authority of the Church to appoint any holy day.77) But he did not impugn the motives of contemporary Sabbatarians. He allowed that they were ingenuous if misguided in maintaining their position and that they had no designs against the Church established by law. His aim was to persuade them of their error, not to condemn them for it.78

Though the tone of Heylyn's argument was relatively conciliatory, its substance was comparatively radical. Both Prideaux and White had insisted that the Lord's Day, unlike the Sabbath, derived from ecclesiastical rather than Scriptural authority, but both tempered this assertion by tracing this ecclesiastical institution to Apostolic times.
(Prideaux tempered this even further by adding that the Apostles "were ledde into all truth by the Holy Ghost."

Heylyn, by contrast, denied that even the Apostles, much less God, had instituted the Lord's Day. Rather, it had gradually been adopted by the Church over a period spanning several centuries. The rules governing its observance are thus not inviolable for all time but instead represent an accumulation of the canons, decrees, and customs of churches in different places and at different times. Furthermore, though the Church has chosen the day of Christ's Resurrection as particularly appropriate for public worship, it was in no way obligated to do so and even now could alter or abolish its observance.

Just as significant as the substance of Heylyn's argument were the terms on which he chose to argue. As might be expected in an historical approach to the Sabbath question, Heylyn examines in detail its status in the Old and New Testaments, under the Primitive Church, and among Continental and English Protestants. More surprising is Heylyn's long discussion of the observance of the Lord's Day between the reign of Constantine and the Reformation (nearly 100 of the book's 500 pages). It must be remembered, though, that this was the same Peter Heylyn who had maintained even against the distinguished Professor Prideaux the continuity of the visible Church transmitted through Rome. Thus, for Heylyn, the teachings and practices of the Church of Rome until the Reformation were a valid point of reference for the Church of England. Among the sources he cited were Pope Gregory the Great's condemnation of Sabbatarianism and the verdict of the schoolmen on the nature of the Lord's Day. Furthermore, in his discussion of the observance of the
Lord's Day in England, Heylyn began not with the Reformation but with the ancient Romano-British Church and that established among the Saxons by Augustine through the authority of the Pope. He cited the opinions of John de Burgo, chancellor of Cambridge under Henry VI, and even Papal decrees applying to England, on the grounds that the Church of England still upheld those not detracting from the royal prerogative or not contrary to the laws of the realm.

As boldly as Montagu, Heylyn had asserted the continuity between the Reformed and pre-Reformed Church of England. He had seized on a narrowly defined issue to assert a general theory of ecclesiastical origins, the same one which had so upset Prideaux. Also, like Widdowes and Page, he used the occasion to defend the authority of the Church to arrange as it saw fit a wide variety of ceremonies and practices.

In his Seven Questions of the Sabbath, Gilbert Ironside, like Heylyn, linked an attack on Sabbatarianism with a general defense of the Church of England and, like White and Pcklington discerned in Sabbatarianism the allegedly fallacious and dangerous principles of Puritanism. Both his approach to the issue and his conclusion, though, distinguish Ironside from other anti-Sabbatarians. (Ironside (1588-1671) was at this time rector of Winterbourne Abbas in Dorset and after the Restoration bishop of Bristol.)

Ironside's Seven Questions first of all stands apart from the other polemical works on the subject because of its author's use of the scholastic method. To be sure, the Schoolmen still formed an essential part of the curriculum at Oxford and Cambridge, and many of Ironside's contemporaries referred with approval to or betrayed the influence of the
influence of the Schoolmen in their writings. To my knowledge, though, none of them employed the scholastic method so consciously or so thoroughly. The format of Ironside's Seven Questions parallels exactly that of Aquinas's Summa Theologica. Ironside, like Aquinas, begins by posing a question, follows with two opposing answers, states his own position, and concludes with a point by point refutation of the contrary position. Ironside preferred the logical rigor of this method to "the pleasing of the reader's fancy with quaint language and apt cadences or words" or "appeals to men's consciences, by which they are artificially caught before encountered," because the aim of his discourse was "the unmasking of all appearances and the discovery of naked truth." Some of the "truths" that Ironside discovered were only restatements of the by now familiar anti-Sabbatarian position, yet he presents it with unusual clarity and forcefulness. Like Heylyn, he held that the Lord's Day had been instituted neither by Scriptural injunction nor by Christ's example nor by the Apostles. Hence, its observance is not incumbent on churches in all places and in every age. But, like William Page, he also held that one need not prove an observance Scriptural to vindicate its practice. That the Lord's Day has been established by the contemporary Church of England suffices to make its observance a matter not only of temporal obedience but of conscience, for ecclesiastical power comes directly from God, and those who exercise it

May, if cause so require, lay their authority immediately upon the conscience, binding it to sinne, in cause either of neglect, disobedience, or contempt ...
If the Lord's Day is of human rather than divine institution, then it follows that commonly accepted standards of decorum, not Scriptural injunction, govern the manner of its observance. Thus, though man knows intuitively to cease ordinary activities at times consecrated to worship, the rigid Sabbatarian regime hardly follows from this premise. Quite the contrary, these standards are so beyond the capabilities of most people that enforcing them would change the Lord's Day from "a Christian man's Festival, wherein he should not only inwardly but outwardly rejoice in the Lord his God, into a day of Fast & humiliation."\(^\text{39}\)

This, of course, had been repeated by anti-Sabbatarians since Brerewood. What made Ironside unique was his contention that Sabbatarian standards were as unnecessary, even undesirable, as they were unattainable. A general prohibition on work cannot add to the sanctity of the Lord's Day, because work is not in and of itself profane. Instead, Ironside upheld what has commonly been called the "Puritan work ethic":

> Saving faith, and our honest imployments of this life are so farre from being incompatible as that the one is preserved and cherished by the other, when they are undertaken and performed as they ought to be, in the Lords presence, with reverence and feare and obedience, not intermitting the habituall bent of the soule towards heaven.\(^\text{90}\)

For the same reasons and with the same qualification (i.e., that it not interfere with public worship), Ironside deemed recreation as appropriate on Sunday as on any other day. Far from hindering the spiritual side of man's life, legally approved, moral recreations serve to advance the kingdom of God in us; first enabling the body; secondly putting life and cheerfulnesse into the mind; thirdly, increasing our thankfulness unto God, for being so indulgent a Father unto us in
Jesus Christ, allowing us all things, whereof our frailties stand in need.

Recreations, like all things of this world, are profane when used by profane people, but when "used by a Christian man in obedience to God ... they begin to change their natures, and are no more base and vile, but honourable and glorious."91

While Ironside's method looked back to the Middle Ages and the greater part of his argument did not distinguish him from contemporary anti-Sabbatarians, in other ways his book foreshadows the rationalism, latitudinarianism, and distrust of "enthusiasm" characteristic of the later Stuart and Hanoverian Church of England.92 He attacked the Sabbatarians less for the extreme rigor of what they themselves practiced than for their presumption in forbidding to others what God has not. At the root of their error (and of most other heresies) lay misplaced zeal and overscrupulous consciences. Those afflicted with such inactive sensibilities threaten the Church even more than do those with consciences. The latter take offense at practically nothing; the former at potentially anything. Thus have the Sabbatarians seized on a matter of no intrinsic importance, taken a position "unknowne even unto our Martyrs in the daies of Queen Mary," reduced all religion to this one point, and anathematized those who dare dissent.93 They even presume to enlist God on their behalf, as when they attribute misfortune befalling those engaged in Sunday recreations to divine judgement.94 Just as Arminians had earlier warned against meddling in the mystery of election and reprobation, so now Ironside warned against linking terrestrial catastrophes to celestial wrath, especially when the alleged offense concerns something that God has not declared punishable.95
There were attempts to link the Sabbath and doctrinal controversies more directly. Francis White, for example, alleged that Calvinism lay behind Theophilus Brabourne's insistence on a seventh day Sabbath. In this way, the Sunday Lord's Day would be reserved to those for whom Christ had sacrificed himself - the Elect. It is precisely because the Church of England affirms the contrary - that Christ's act of redemption was intended for all mankind - that its Lord's Day is observed by all its members. According to Gilbert Ironside, the Sabbatarians were the same people who maintained that an unregenerate man cannot preach as effectively or as truly as the regenerate. Ironside, by contrast, insisted that an unregenerate preacher might "as infallibly deliver the doctrine of religion" as anyone of comparable abilities. In public pronouncements on faith, as opposed to the private experience of faith, the elect can claim no special access to truth. Conversely, George Abbot (1603-1649, a layman who was no relation to Archbishop Abbot) explicitly linked anti-Sabbatarianism and Arminianism. In his reply to Thomas Broad's Two Treatises, he identified a lax attitude toward observance of the Sabbath with a generally lax attitude toward clerical responsibilities and traced both to Arminianism:

For non-residency, a formall and lazy ministry, and such like follow as naturally upon this, as falling away doth upon free will.

Indeed, the one was the consequence of the other:

because they entertain not the truth in the love of it, God hath either given them over to beleive a lie, or else... they take up this opinion more to countenance their corruption than to maintain the Truth.
By and large, though, neither side introduced doctrinal issues into the controversy. Furthermore, while Sabbatarians were for the most part Calvinists and anti-Sabbatarians men associated with Arminianism or Laud, the correspondence was not perfect. John Cosin, one of the leading defenders of Arminianism and of ceremonies associated with it rejected part of the anti-Sabbatarian position. True, in his *Collection of Private Devotions*, he had ridiculed the more extreme claims of the Sabbatarians, and in a series of sermons preached in 1633 (the year of the re-issue of the Book of Sports), he agreed that the Lord's Day was not the Sabbath. However, in these same sermons, he did insist that the fourth commandment required the consecration of one day in seven to public worship and also voiced his disapproval of Sports and dancing on the Lord's Day. In 1636, he quite explicitly (though privately) rejected the position taken by White, Heylyn, Pocklington, and Ironside that the Lord's Day was an ecclesiastical observance instituted by human authority. Cosin insisted that the Lord's Day was instituted by the Apostles through Christ's authority and thus by Christ himself. Hence, Cosin dissented from "our new writers" (he does not name anyone) who argue that as the Church has established, so may it alter the observance of the Lord's Day. Inasmuch as it was established by Christ through the Apostles, the Lord's Day is as immutable to Christians as was the Sabbath to the Jews. In 1640, Cosin defended this position publicly, when he affirmed at a Cambridge disputation the thesis *Dies Dominicus est immutabiles*.

If the Arminian Cosin did not reject entirely the Sabbatarian position, then neither were all anti-Sabbatarians necessarily
Arminians. John Prideaux, as I have shown, was at the same time a staunch Calvinist and an anti-Sabbatarian. David Primerose, a French Calvinist (though of the moderate "Amyraldian" persuasion) also disassociated the Lord's Day from the Old Testament Sabbath. His Treatise of the Lords Day and Sabbath Day (1636) was translated into English by his father Gilbert Primerose, who had lived in England since 1632 and had received ecclesiastical preferment from James I and Charles I.¹⁰⁴ Joseph Mead, who had been so scandalized by Cosin's Book of Private Devotions, likewise distinguished between the two observances, though he did not subscribe completely to White's and Heylyn's position.¹⁰⁵

The example of Robert Sanderson, too, disturbs the congruity between the doctrinal and Sabbath controversies. Sanderson, who in his Pax Ecclesiae had tried to resolve the doctrinal controversy from a moderate but unambiguously Calvinist perspective, entered the Sabbath controversy with his Sovereign Antidote Against Sabbatarian Errors (1636). Perhaps Sanderson had altered or at least swallowed his earlier doctrinal position, for in 1631 he had been made a royal chaplain at Laud's recommendation. Still, he did not become a wholehearted supporter of Laud. In 1641 he helped revise the Book of Common Prayer, primarily to omit controversial ceremonies, and in 1643, he was nominated to the Westminster Assembly of Divines. (He never sat there, because he refused to take the covenant.)¹⁰⁶

Sanderson's Sovereign Antidote was according to him originally a letter written to dissuade a friend from the errors of Sabbatarianism. The brief pamphlet reflects its author's lifelong commitment to moderation. On the one hand, Sanderson denied that the Sabbath had been
transferred to Sunday and defended Sunday sports. "Walking and dis-
coursing" might provide suitable recreation for his scholarly friend, but not for "the ruder sort of people, who scarce account anything a
sport which is not loud and boisterous." On the other hand, he
warned participants in these sports to pursue them only to the extent
that the activity facilitated their participation in public worship or
improved their performance at work. Similarly, while Sanderson
denied the Sabbatarian contention that Scripture expressly enjoined
the dedication of one day in seven to public worship, he conceded that
such an observance could be "probably deduced from the Word of God, as
a thing most convenient to be observed by all such as desire unfainedly
to order their wayes according to Gods holy will." Along with episco-
pacy, excommunication, and infant baptism, the weekly Lord's Day was
too useful, indeed indispensable, for the Church not to practice, even
though it might lack direct Scriptural warrant. As might be expected,
then, the moderate Sanderson allowed somewhat more to the Lord's Day
and somewhat less to episcopacy than did the more partisam supporters
of Laud.

But if the debate over the Sabbath only incidentally concerned the
doctrinal issue of predestination and did not correspond perfectly to
the divisions between Calvinists and Arminians, then neither was it
totally unrelated to the doctrinal conflict. As I have shown, the most
passionate supporters of Charles I's and Laud's policy were the same
clergy who had earlier supported Arminianism or the ceremonies associ-
ated with it - White, Pocklington, and Heylyn, for example. Further-
more, though anti-Sabbatarianism was not implicitly an Arminian
position, it was historically associated with men such as Whitgift and Rogers, whereas Sabbatarianism was generally supported by those more inclined toward Puritanism. Thus, anti-Sabbatarianism could be traced to men to whom the Arminians in turn traced their views.

Arminianism and anti-Sabbatarianism also shared common assumptions. Just as the Arminians had opposed to the harsh, irrespective decree of predestination a merciful, benevolent creator, so the anti-Sabbatarians opposed to the Sabbath rigors demanded by their opponents a Creator who did not demand the impossible from his creatures or begrudge them harmless recreations. It was Ironside, it is useful to recall, who had argued that permitting recreations on Sunday would encourage "thankfulness unto God, for being so indulgent a Father unto us in Jesus Christ, allowing us all things, whereof our frailties stand in need." 110

Even more significantly, the Sabbath issue brought to the fore a point on which Arminians since Montagu had insisted, namely, the power of the Church to resolve a broad range of questions and the attendant obligation of its members to submit to its judgement. Laud and Charles I in this way justified their suppression of the doctrinal debate; Widdowes and Page similarly defended bowing at the name of Jesus. And, as I have shown, the anti-Sabbatarians, even those not associated with Arminianism, all agreed that the observance of the Lord's Day was one of those practices which God had invented the Church with the power to settle.

Finally, none of the anti-Sabbatarians had objected to a stringent observance of the Lord's Day by private individuals, any more
than the Arminians had objected to maintaining irrespective predestination as a private opinion. Rather, they opposed only the attempt of the Sabbatarians to impose their position on others, because, as Gilbert Ironside argued,

First, it is false in itself.
Secondly, unnecessary burdens are laid upon conscience.
Thirdly, many doubtful perplexities are occasioned thereby.
Lastly, an apparent schism is made, and formed in the Church.

Maintaining the authority of and peace within the Church, preventing its takeover by those who would impose their idiosyncratic views as dogma, safeguarding practices consistent with centuries of tradition and common sense - these were the objectives first avowed by the Arminians and then upheld by the supporters of practices associated with Arminianism. How ironic, then, that the supporters of Laud would themselves soon occasion "many doubtful perplexities," burden consciences, and make "an apparent schisme" in the Church over another issue. For while they were prepared to allow each individual decide for himself whether to observe Sunday as the Lord's Day or the Sabbath, they made no such allowances for those who doubted that the Communion Table was an altar.
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CHAPTER IV

THE ALTAR OR THE COMMUNION TABLE?

Because they held that Sunday was not the Sabbath, Laud and his supporters opposed banning recreations on that day. For this, they were accused of fostering a lax attitude toward God's commandments. Because they held that the communion table was in some respects an altar, they enforced and defended placing the table altarwise (lengthwise against the east wall of the chancel), rail ing it in, and bowing toward it. For this, they were accused of fostering superstition, of disregarding the legacy of the English Reformation, and even of paving the way for the revival of the Mass.

The status of the communion table, like that of the Lord's Day/Sabbath, had been a point of contention within the Church of England well before the rise of Arminianism and the ascendancy of Laud. Elizabeth's Book of Common Prayer, following the Edwardian Prayer Book of 1552, had provided that the stone altar formerly used in the Mass be replaced with a wooden table and that this table be moved from the east wall of the chancel to a place more accessible to the congregation. This change served to emphasize the abolition of the Mass; that is, the rejection of the Eucharist as a sacrifice performed by the priest for the recipients. During the royal visitation of 1559, Elizabeth I modified this arrangement. According to the injunctions she issued, the table was henceforth to be returned to the east end of the chancel when not in use. Naturally, this return to the practice
before the Reformation upset many Protestants who even before this in-
junction found the Elizabeth Settlement too conservative.¹

The canons of 1604 continued this practice, but during the reign
of James I, it was not consistently enforced. Probably because of the
difficulty of moving the table back and forth, it remained permanently
at the east end of the cathedrals and royal chapel and in the middle
of the chancel (or of the church itself, if the chancel was too small
to accommodate the congregation) in most parish churches.² There were,
nevertheless isolated but important efforts to maintain the traditional
status of the communion table. In 1617, William Laud, then dean of
Gloucester, aroused quite a controversy in the diocese when he attempted
to move the table alterwise in Gloucester Cathedral and to require
those entering the cathedral to bow toward the table.³ Lancelot
Andrewes also kept the memory of the altar alive through the use of
expensive communion plate, chalices, and other trappings.⁴

The relatively dormant controversy was revived during the reign
of Charles I. John Cosin, as I have shown, caused an uproar first in
Durham and then throughout the country when he termed the communion
table in Durham Cathedral an altar and furnished it accordingly.
(See chapter II, above.) William Prynne, in the same books in which
he denounced bowing at the name of Jesus, also attacked those who were
turning "our communion tables into altars" and condemned bowing toward
the table, "which how it differs from Papists Altar-adorations, or from
their bowing and cringing to Pictures and Crucifixes, or how it can be
excused from superstition, wil-worship & idolatry, I cannot yet con-
jecture."⁵ He expressed alarm particularly at the turning of
communion tables altarwise ("like a Kitching Dresser, not a Table at which men usually sit around"), contrary to the "Statutes, Homilies, Articles, & Canons" of the Church. Giles Widdowes and William Page defended bowing toward the altar as a harmless, commendable practice which acknowledges Christ's special presence at "that place where those high and heavenly mistereys of our salvation, are to be consecrated with all the solemnity and devotion we can possibly imagine...

It was in the Lincolnshire town of Grantham, though, that the most significant controversy over the communion table emerged. In 1627, the vicar of Grantham, a man named Titly, decided to move the communion table to the east and of the parish church, in an altarwise position. He claimed that in its former position in the lower west end of the chancel, the table had been too accessible to schoolboys, who piled their hats and coats on it. In its new position, the table would be more visible to the congregation and would follow the practice of Lincoln Cathedral, of the bishop's chapel, and of the royal chapel. Some townspeople, led by an alderman named Wheatly, protested the change as an unwarranted innovation and restored the table to its former position.

John Williams, the bishop of Lincoln, who ultimately resolved the dispute in favor of the vicar's opponents, maintained that this was not the first dispute between Titly and his parish. The vicar had once removed "two grave and painful preachers" and had quarrelled with Alderman Wheatly over tithing. Another version of the incident,
apparently related by a resident of Grantham and placed among the
notes used by Peter Heylyn for his reply to Williams (see below),
concedes that Titly was quick-tempered but denies that he constantly
quarrelled with his parishioners. One of the two preachers allegedly
dismissed by Titly had not been hired before the altar dispute; the
other had been dismissed not by the vicar but by the bishop, at the
petition of the parishioners. Furthermore, the author of this
account claims never to have heard of a dispute between Titly and
Wheatly over tithing. He did suggest, though, that Wheatly's objections
to moving the communion table may have been rooted less in his own
convictions than those of some important customers of his malt busi-
ness. With two accounts so diametrically opposed and no evidence to
corroborate either, it is an open question whether or not Titly,
subsequent to Wheatly's actions, really did threaten to replace the
communion table with a stone altar, as Williams claims he did. On
the one hand, the account in Heylyn's notes is more credible, because
on virtually every disputed point it is more specific. On the other
hand, if contemporaries would have immediately recognized it as more
truthful, then it is curious that Heylyn did not include it in either
of his two books on the altar dispute.

What is certain is that Wheatly and some other townspeople (though,
again, how many is disputed) appealed the matter to John Williams,
bishop of Lincoln. Williams is, to say the least, an enigmatic figure.
He is remembered as a bitter personal enemy of Laud and as a critic of
his ecclesiastical policies. But his was not the opposition of a
Puritan but of a moderate, one who never challenged the liturgy or government of the Church. He saw in Laud's high-handed methods a threat to the established Church which he wholeheartedly supported and which in turn made him rich and powerful.

The two had not always been enemies. It was Williams who over the objections of Archbishop Abbot persuaded James I to approve Laud's elevation to the episcopacy. Williams had also been on good terms with Richard Montagu. They had cooperated in an unsuccessful attempt to have Archbishop Abbot declared irregular because of a homicide he committed in a hunting accident. Montagu even dedicated his Immediate Address unto God Alone to Williams, at whose suggestion it was written.\textsuperscript{12}

As the fortunes of Laud and the Arminians rose, though, those of Williams fell. Almost immediately following the accession of Charles I, he lost his position as Lord Keeper. Thus, Williams's enmity with Laud involved personality as well as policy. True, there is no evidence to support Perer Heylyn's charge that Titly's family ties to Richard Neile, the Arminian bishop of Durham, and his general support of Laud predisposed Williams against the vicar.\textsuperscript{13} On the other hand, it is strange that Williams opposed the vicar's actions when the communion table in the bishop's private chapel was placed altarwise and furnished with expensive communion plate and ornaments.\textsuperscript{14}

At any rate, Williams, in a letter to Titly and his adversaries, arranged a compromise which on the whole favored the latter. The communion table, Williams decided, should be placed "table-wise" (i.e., along an east-west axis) at the upper end of the chancel when not in use and, during the communion service, any place where the vicar might
be conveniently heard and seen by the communicants. In a private, more
detailed letter to the vicar and "the divines at the lecture of Grant-
ham," Williams explained his decision. Titly's placing the table, he
contended, was a throwback to Roman Catholic practice and therefore
to the Catholic conception of the sacrament as a sacrifice. The
_tablewise_ position, by contrast, was more dignified (placing communion
tables lengthwise along the wall would invite the congregation to
"suppose them Dressers, rather than Tables"), more consistent with the
practice of the Church of England since the reign of Elizabeth, and
less likely to cause offense. Though Williams thus basically favored
retaining the table in its former position, he ended his letter to the
_vicar_ with a plea for reconciliation:

> Whether side soever (you or your Parish) shall yield
to the other, in this needlese Controversie, shall
remaine in my poor judgement, the more discreet,
grave, and learned of the two; and by the time you
have gained some more Experience in the Cure of
Soules, you shall finde no such Ceremonie. as
Christian Charitie, which I recommend unto you ...15

Williams's solution to the Grantham dispute was fairly close to
the procedures enjoined by Elizabeth and by the Canons of 1604, but it
was opposed to the one formulated in 1633 by Charles I and Laud. This
emerged from a "test case" involving the church of St. Gregory's in
London, located literally in the shadow of St. Paul's Cathedral. The
dean and chapter of St. Paul's had recently ordered the communion table
of St. Gregory's moved from the middle to the east end of the chancel.
Some parishioners appealed the matter to the Court of Arches. The
king, realizing that Sir Henry Marten, the Dean of Arches, would pro-
bably favor the suit, stopped the proceedings and brought the matter
before the Privy Council. On November 3, 1633, an Act of the Privy Council endorsed the action of the dean and chapter of St. Paul's. Not only did the decision uphold the authority of the dean and chapter, as ordinaries of the church, to initiate the change in question; it also applauded bringing the position of the communion table in a parish church into conformity with that of the cathedral, or "mother church."  

Armed with royal support, Laud ordered his vicar-general, Sir Nathaniel Brent, to require that communion tables throughout Canterbury province be placed altarwise and railed in during the metropolitical visitation of 1634-5. It is no coincidence that this visitation began in the diocese of Lincoln. After all, Bishop Williams had approved a rather different policy not only in the 1627 Grantham dispute but as recently as December, 1633. At the request of the vicar, churchwardens, and other prominent townspeople of Leicester, he had permitted the removal of the communion table from the chancel (to which he had ordered it moved in September, 1633) to its former position in the body of the church, where it was said to be more accessible to the communicants and allowed them to hear the minister more easily. In preparation for the visitation, Laud informed Williams of the new guidelines for the communion tables. He also, in reply to one of Williams's questions, told him that even though the canons of the church allow the ordinary to decide whether the sacrament should be received in the Chancel or the body of the church, the king preferred that it be done in the chancel, so that the minister might see if the recipient were kneeling, as required, and might more easily approach the
Apparently, Williams did not diligently enforce the new policy, because Brent reported to Laud that he found the communion tables in the diocese of Lincoln "not very decent" and the rails even worse.20

Elsewhere the policy was enforced with varying degrees of success. In some places, it was imposed in the face of stiff resistance. In the diocese of York, for example, the caseload of the church courts greatly increased as Archbishop Neile instituted disciplinary actions for failure to move and rail in the communion table.21 William Piers (also spelled Peirs and Pierce), bishop of Bath and Wells, was along with Matthew Wren of Norwich Laud's most loyal bishop. Despite his strict enforcement of the new guidelines, though, only 140 of the 469 parishes of the diocese were certified to have conformed by the end of 1635.22

The most notable holdout was the parish of Beckington in Somerset. The rector, Alexander Huish, supported the relocation of the communion table, but some of his parishioners, including the churchwardens, opposed it as an unwarranted departure from the practice observed since the Reformation. Huish brought charges against the churchwardens before the bishop's court, whereupon Piers appointed a commission of 8 ministers (among whom was Huish) to investigate the dispute. Not surprisingly, its report (written by Huish) supported the altarwise position of the table. According to the oldest parishioners, the report claimed, the altar had been placed tablewise some 50 to 60 years earlier (i.e., in the 1570's or 80's) without the consent of the
ordinary. Hence, Bishop Piers's directive finally gave legality to what had been an irregular arrangement. The change also eliminated some practical difficulties posed by the former position of the table. It had formerly rested in the middle of the dirt floor of the chancel surrounded by a "trench" 3 feet wide, through which a door provided access. This arrangement wasted space (space which, according to Huish could be better used for burials or for seats for the minister's family), left the communicants little room to stand and kneel, and made access difficult for the minister. Also, there was a one foot gap between the bottom of the door and the floor, thus "giving admittance to dogs while keeping Christians out."^2^3

Acting on the report, the bishop's commissioner ordered the churchwardens to move the table. When they refused, they were excommunicated. When they persisted in their refusal, they were imprisoned. After spending a year in prison, they finally submitted and were released. Following this show of force, the rest of the diocese more readily fell into line. Conformity, though, had been achieved at a cost; a broad section of the community was incensed by the application of a seemingly arbitrary policy by a seemingly tyrannical, vindictive church hierarchy.^2^4

Sometimes even a diligent bishop could not overcome local resistance. Richard Montagu, bishop of Chichester, extracted compliance to the new altar directives with great difficulty. Despite his insistence on them in his visitation articles, the task was very far from complete even by 1639, when he was translated to the diocese of Norwich. The physical labor alone required to move and rail in the table deterred
some clergy and churchwardens, while others preferred not to contend with the complaints and threats of their neighbors. Hence, most clergymen, who were more concerned with collecting their fees than with earning unpopularity, were only too glad to connive with churchwardens in glossing over their noncompliance. Even in Laud's own diocese of Canterbury, many parishes simply ignored directives from above, left the table in the nave of the church, and sometimes did not even enforce the long-established requirement of kneeling to receive the sacrament.

Not surprisingly, this innovation (Laud himself admitted that hitherto the table had not been placed altarwise in most parish churches) provoked a chorus of protest. In the diocese of Norfolk, where Bishop Matthew Wren strictly enforced this and other aspects of Laud's program, copies of Williams's letter to the vicar of Grantham were widely circulated. Wren and his supporters were mercilessly attacked in the most famous underground pamphlet of the 1630's, *Newes from Ipswich*. The implementation of this measure in the diocese of Chester led John Ley, a sub-dean of Chester Cathedral, to write a letter of protest to Bishop John Bridgman. Though Bridgman had generally been tolerant of nonconformity since his appointment in 1619, he had since the metropolitical visitation enforced the observance of ceremonies more vigorously. He has also replaced the communion table in the cathedral with a stone structure placed altarwise. Ley argued that Bridgman's reform actually contradicted the requirement in the recent articles of visitation that the table be placed wherever it would be accessible and the minister audible, inasmuch as the table was now
further removed from the congregation. He also warned that however far this may have been from Bridgman's intentions, the new practice smacked of popery. As a result, nonconformists might be less inclined to kneel during communion, because the spectacle of an altar would vitiate arguments that kneeling did not imply belief in transubstantiation. 29

In Colchester, Essex, a minister upset many of his parishioners when he placed the communion table altarwise, railed it in, and required all communicants to receive the sacrament at the rail, kneeling. Those parishioners who defied him he reported to the Court of High Commission. At least one of those reported was excommunicated, leading William Prynne to say of Aylot, Laud's surrogate in the court, that "hanging is too good for him," and of the other Judges that

\[
till the skins of these Spirituall Devil-Judges be fleyde off, and their neckes graced with a Tiburne-tippet ... the people shall never live in quite, but the Wolves will bite and devour them.\]
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Clearly, the new position of the communion table was introduced with difficulty, and in some cases it even further radicalized those already hostile to Laud's policies. Still, it is important not to overstate the case. In many instances the directives regarding the communion table were peacefully and uneventfully obeyed. In Buckinghamshire, most parishes complies without resistance to the instructions of the archdeacon of Buckingham to set the tables altarwise and rail them in. 31 In the diocese of London, where Laud had already introduced these measures before his elevation to the primacy, resistance was scattered and ineffective. In the parish of St. Margaret's,
it in at the church of his parish in Alresford, Hampshire, and had decorated the communion table in his private chapel with silk hangings. In addition to his evident sympathy for Laud's policies and his personal loyalty to the archbishop, Heylyn also had personal motives for attacking Williams. It began when Williams refused to institute Heylyn to the rectory of Hemingford in Huntingdon.

Williams, Heylyn's biographer alleges routinely required incumbents to pay a portion of their earnings in his name to designated charities. As a royal chaplain Heylyn would presumably have been less vulnerable to such manipulation.

The antagonism between the two grew when the king, to compensate Heylyn for the loss of Hemingford, named him a prebendary of Westminster Abbey, of which Williams was dean. The two were constantly at odds over the respective rights of the deans and other prebendaries, some of whom joined Heylyn in filing complaints against Williams. The even deeper rivalry between Williams and Heylyn's mentor, Laud, gave Heylyn more reason, were any needed, for his attack on the bishop. In fact, John Hacket, William's biographer, claims that Heylyn's Coale from the Altar was written in 1634 and was not published until 1636 so as to fortify the case Laud was then assembling against Williams in the Court of Star Chamber.

A Coale from the Altar takes the form of a letter from one minister to another who has ostensibly been persuaded by the letter to the vicar of Grantham not to move his communion table altarwise. In this "letter," Heylyn sought first of all to vindicate the use of altars in the reformed Church of England and secondly to reveal the opponents of this
practice as subversive Puritans. With regard to the first point, Heylyn asserted, using the same sources cited in the letter to the vicar of Grantham, that neither the use of the term "altar" nor the altarwise position of the communion table had been conclusively rejected during the English Reformation. It often took some effort on Heylyn's part to make the evidence fit his argument. While he admitted that the 1552 Book of Common Prayer substituted "Lord's Board" for "altar", he attributed this to Calvin's influence over Lord Protector Somerset and Archbishop Cranmer, who in turn persuaded young Edward VI to change what he and Parliament had formerly declared consistent with the Word of God and with the practice of the Primitive Church. Even then, some of the Marian martyrs and their martyrologist John Foxe sometimes referred to the table as an altar and to communion as the sacrament of the altar. Heylyn concedes that many altars were removed from churches during the reign of Elizabeth and that "altar" does not appear in the liturgy, articles of religion, or canons of the Elizabethan Church, but he tempers this admission by asserting that not all altars were removed, that the use of the term "altar" was nowhere explicitly forbidden, and that hence altars were never categorically rejected by the Church of England. Heylyn may still have been uneasy with his historical evidence, because to it he adds the assertion that the kings of England, by virtue of the statutes of the realm and of the rights granted all Christian kings, have the power to revise ecclesiastical ceremonies as the need arises.

Heylyn also sought to prove the use of altars consistent with the doctrine of the Church of England. Placing the table altarwise, he
argues, does not necessarily connote the Roman Catholic mass; on the contrary, continuing this time-honored practice vindicates the Church of England from those Catholics who accuse it of innovating. Furthermore, though the Church of England has renounced the Mass, it still regards the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice; not, to be sure, a propitiatory sacrifice of Christ's body and blood offered by the priest, but a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving offered in commemoration of Christ's sacrifice. Because the sacrament of communion may in this sense be termed a sacrifice, "so may the holy Table be called an Altar, and consequently, set up in a place, where the Altar stood."43

In addition to vindicating the altarwise position of the communion table, Heylyn also attacks its opponents. Because the letter to the vicar of Grantham was circulated anonymously, he was able to avoid the embarrassment of openly attacking Williams, who as a bishop was his superior. Instead, he disingenuously attributes it to John Cotton, a Puritan who had lately emigrated from Lincolnshire to New England, or to "some other neighboring Zelote."44 The language and content of the letter, he maintains in an oblique attack on Williams, are what one would expect from a Puritan, not from a bishop of the Church of England. Who else would assert that parish churches need not place communion tables in the position used in the cathedrals and royal chapel, thereby intimating that the latter are guilty of "some foule transgression, some breach of Law and public order, the better to expose them to the censure of a race of men, who like them ill enough already"?45 The qualified approval given bowing at the name of Jesus ("so it be done humbly, and
Heylyn also saw as indicative of Puritan sympathies, because bowing at the name of Jesus is enjoined by a canon of the Church, and its observance is therefore not subject to debate or contingent on the bearing of the minister. Even the plea for mutual charity at the end of the letter Heylyn saw as a ruse. To appeal to Christian charity as an excuse for neglecting a ceremony enjoined by the Church is to put the reines into their hands, who are too frowards in themselves to contemne all ceremony, though in so doing they do break in sunder the bonds of Charitie.

Heylyn expanded on this theme in his second attack on Williams, Antidotum Lincolniense. Williams had replied anonymously to A Coale from the Altar in a book entitled The Holy Table, which purports to be an answer "by a minister in Lincolnshire" to "D. Coal, a judicious Divine of Q. Maries dayes." The book bears Williams's imprimatur, in which he judges it "to be most Orthodox in Doctrine, and Consonant in Discipline, to the Church of England: And to set forth the Kings Power and Rights, in matters Ecclesiasticall, truly and judiciously . . ." Evidently, the king did not agree, because when John Hacket publicly defended it and denounced A Coale from the Altar (its author, said Hacket, "shewed himselfe the greatest puritane that could be, in so abusing a prelate in a namelesse and private manner . . ."), he found himself in trouble with his superiors. Shortly after the publication of The Holy Table, Heylyn was by royal command authorized to reply to it "and not in the least to spare the author."
Of course, Heylyn needed no such encouragement. As in *A Coale from the Altar*, he maintains the fiction that his adversary is not Williams but a Puritan in the mold of Henry Burton or William Prynne. True, he admits, *The Holy Table* does in several places attack the Puritans for their overly scrupulous objections to harmless ceremonies, but the author in fact advances the same objections as do the Puritans to the altarwise position of the communion table. Like them, he slanderously represents it as part of an attempted restoration of Catholicism,

as if the Table could not stand where the Altar did, or be placed Altar-wise along the wall, but it must needs imply some Popish and prohibited sacrifice . . .52

He also, despite protestations to the contrary, promotes "faction, schisme, and disobedience," and offers "everywhere a Pillow for a Puritan Elbow." While he supports the royal ecclesiastical authority in the abstract, he in practice denies the king's power to rearrange a detail as minor as the position of the communion table. Heylyn, of course, had to admit that the king had not explicitly mandated the altarwise position for all parish churches, but certainly his disposition of the St. Gregory's case has "thereby given encouragement to the Metropolitan, Bishops, and other Ordinaries, to require the like in all Churches committed to them." The position of the table in the royal chapel even further justifies extending the practice to parish churches, because
I trust you [Williams] will not say that the King's Chapell is set out in a contrary way, to that required in a law of the Kings owne making; or that the constant usage of the Chappels in this particular, since the first making of that law, may not be thought to be a good Interpreter of the law it selve.53

Heylyn's implication was clear—challenging the altarwise position of the communion table was tantamount to challenging royal authority and to questioning the king's orthodoxy.

It also, said Heylyn, brought into question Williams's orthodoxy. Williams had argued against terming the communion table an altar because any other part of the church (the reading pew or the pulpit, for example) might as properly be termed an altar with regard to the prayers of praise and thanksgiving offered there or the memory of Christ's passion commemorated there. He had also argued that these prayers might as accurately be termed sacrifices as are the collects read at the communion table. Hence, the term "Holy Table" is obviously more appropriate than "altar", because it alone distinguishes the place which "doth offer unto us the body and blood of Christ, in the outward forms of bread and wine . . ."54 Heylyn interpreted ("distorted" seems closer to the truth) this passage as denying the table or the sacrament, as opposed to other parts of the church or service, any special significance and thus of reducing the Lord's Supper to a mere symbol. The sacrament, he insists, by virtue of its commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, is a mystical, commemorative but nonetheless real sacrifice (as real as the sacrifices commanded the Jews), distinct from the spiritual sacrifice required of all Christians "at all times and places." By denying that
the communion table is an altar, Williams has in effect embarked "Westward ho, for Salem, and the free Gospel of New-England."\(^55\)

Yet another resemblance Heylyn discerned between The Holy Table and contemporary Puritan propaganda was its willful misrepresentation of Laud's ecclesiastical policies. Williams had termed turning the communion table altarwise part of the "imaginary piety of our times" and had suggested that this and similar reforms threatened the Protestant character of the Church of England. This pretended defense of the Church was in truth, said Heylyn, an attack on those who "out of their due zeal to God, and for the honour of the Reformation against the unjust imputations of Rome, and the procuring of due reverence to Christ's holy Sacrament (too much slighted in these times, and in many places)" have attempted only "to reduce this Church to that antient order, which hath been hitherto preserved in your Majesties Chappels and the Cathedralls of this Kingdome ...\(^56\) It is not innovations or the threat of popery to which Laud's opponents object but rather to his efforts to restore uniformity to the Church of England.\(^57\)

Yet for all his attempts to portray his adversary as an iconoclastic Puritan and to defend the altar policy as a lawfully imposed, time-honored ceremony, Heylyn was to an extent inconsistent and perhaps disingenuous. On the one hand, he maintained that the altarwise position of the table formed part of the ancient, unwritten tradition inherited by the Church of England. This tradition included practices which might lack a firm basis in any written sources (even Heylyn admitted the paucity of evidence before the Middle Ages for placing the communion
table along the eastern wall) but "which yet we ought to entertaine ex vi catholicæ consuetudinis, by reason of said tradition and continuall custome." On the other hand, only a few pages later, he vitiates this argument by maintaining that the strongest case for the altar rests on the current ordinances of the Church of England, for "if the present Law bee contrary to the antient practice, the antient practice must give way, and the Law shall carry it." But even changing his standards of evidence in mid-argument did not help Heylyn, because prior to the St. Gregory's decision, as I have shown, the laws and general practice of the Church of England did not mandate the altarwise position of the table. The strongest evidence Heylyn could produce, namely, Elizabeth's injunction returning the communion table to the east wall, also quite plainly required that the table be moved during the communion service. Heylyn could only try to explain this away by the excuse that the injunction only provided permission to move the table and did not categorically require it. Two books, with a combined total of over 400 pages, ultimately rested on nothing more solid than this.

Even before Heylyn's Antidotum Lincolniense had been licensed, John Pocklington's Altare Christianum, also a response to Williams, had been published. Pocklington, a former protege of Williams, had earlier defended the anti-Sabbatarian position in Sunday no Sabbath (see chapter III above). He had also, in the course of that book, supported the altarwise position of the communion table as another ecclesiastical policy unjustly attacked by Puritans and their sympathizers. For example, in one part of the book, he reconstructs a Lord's Day service in the
Primitive Church, and among its features is an elaborately decorated communion table, placed altarwise, to which both the priest and the congregation bow and at which they kneel to receive the sacrament.\textsuperscript{61} In the book's conclusion, which offers a general defense of the ceremonies of the Church of England, he pays particular attention to bowing toward the altar:

\begin{quote}
And if we do not onely bend or bowe our body to his blessed Board, or holy Altar, but fall flat on our faces before his footstoole so soon as ever we approach in sight thereof, what Patriach, Apostle, blessed Martyr, holy or learned Father would condemne us for it.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Events within the diocese of Lincoln led Pocklington to become even more directly involved in the altar controversy. A Bedfordshire minister named James Fisher intensified an already heated controversy when he erected a stone altar in his parish church. He had come across a discarded marble gravestone in the chancel and, impressed with its beauty, had set it up on brick pillars to replace the more humble wooden communion table. This outraged his parishioners and, when the news reached him, his bishop, John Williams. Williams ordered the new table removed, and even Laud criticized Fisher for acting without first consulting his ordinary.\textsuperscript{63} When Williams shortly thereafter was brought before the Court of Star Chamber and imprisoned in the Tower, Fisher managed to restore the stone altar. It ultimately led to his impeachment by the Long Parliament.\textsuperscript{64} Meanwhile, John Pocklington, who was
friendly with Fisher, expressed his approval of the stone altar in a short, unpublished treatise defending it on Scriptural grounds.65

Perhaps this inspired Pocklington to write a longer defense of the altar, for his Altare Christianum was licensed and published that year.66 He wrote it to complement the arguments presented in A Coale from the Altar against the letter to the vicar of Grantham, both of whose authors he professed not to know. Whereas Heylyn controverted especially Williams's use of evidence from the reformed Church of England, Pocklington proposed to challenge his use of older sources.67 He asserted that Christians did indeed have altars during the first two centuries of the Church (sometimes on the basis of questionable evidence, as in his citation of Matthew 5:23 or I Corinthians 9:13) and that the writings of the Fathers and the records of Church Councils prove that in the early Church the sacrament of communion was considered a commemorative sacrifice to be performed at a specially designed table by a priest.68 The Reformation, Pocklington continued, had abolished not these ancient traditions but only Rome's corruption of them. Sound Protestants (Lancelot Andrewes, Francis White, and Richard Montagu were among those he cited) readily accept the Lord's Supper as a commemorative sacrifice. It is not "Altars . . . or Sacrifices, or Oblations" that Protestants reject but only "the grosse and vile abuses of these." Even the time-honored term "Mass", could it be shorn of any implication of transubstantiation, would be unexceptionable.69

The use of the altar, concluded Pocklington, rests on solid historical evidence, has been affirmed by the English Reformation, and
is now part of the religion established by law. (By what laws, Pocklington, like Heylyn, does not show specifically.) One cannot challenge its use without challenging the basis of the Church itself, for

if there be no Christian Altar, there is no Christian Sacrifice; if no Christian Sacrifice, there is no Christian Priest, away with the Book of Ordination of Priests and Deacons, away with the Rubrick, and the Book of Common Prayer, that directeth the Priest how to officiate, away with the authority of the Prince, or Acts of Parliament that confirme this Book.70

Given these assumptions, it is hardly surprising that Pocklington scorned compromise. Charity, he answered Williams, has no place in a contest between truth and error:

if that be true, that there is no such ceremony as Christian Charity, it is as true, that there is no such substantiall way for Christians to walke in, as Divine Verity.71

Several years later Pocklington fell victim to those whose verities he had attacked. On February 12, 1640/1, the House of Lords found him guilty of the charges voted by the House of Commons in connection with his Sabbath and Altar books. He was banned from the king's court (he was a royal chaplain), deprived of all his ecclesiastical livings and titles, banned from future civil or ecclesiastical preferment, and his books were to be publicly burned.72 William Bray, Laud's chaplain who had licensed both books, was ordered to preach a sermon repudiating
Pocklington's errors, the list of which was drawn up by none other than John Williams. Among the "errors" Bray renounced was referring to the communion table as an altar, "because there is no Christian Altar but the Cross of Christ."  

Heylyn and Pocklington made acceptance of the altar and of the practices associated with it a litmus test of loyalty to the Church. Because they considered these things historically based, doctrinally sound, and lawfully commanded, anyone opposing them was necessarily a threat to the peace of the Church. Joseph Mead, a Cambridge scholar, took a more moderate approach to the problem. Indeed, his life was a study in moderation. Mead (1586-1638) was universally respected for his Biblical and scientific learning. Though he had at one time been thought by his superiors at Cambridge to "look too much toward Geneva," he generally avoided controversy, so much that it is impossible to discern his views on the predestinarian question. His anonymous biographer claims that he rejected "that Black Doctrine of Reprobation," but offers in evidence only an excerpt from a letter no longer extant. He was a life-long friend of the Calvinist William Twisse, but when he visited Oxford, he was the guest of the distinguished Arminian Thomas Jackson. Mead's discretion and erudition were probably responsible for his appointment as chaplain to Laud, even though the two never met. Though he consistently urged obedience to ecclesiastical authority and generally supported Laudian practices, his was not the support offered by Widdowes, Heylyn, or Pocklington. Rather, he just as consistently denounced "that
immoderation I see divers now run into, whether out of ignorance or some other distemper I cannot tell."78

How had someone of this temperament become involved in the altar dispute? The question is especially intriguing because Mead had earlier condemned John Cosin for his elaborate decoration of the altar in Durham Cathedral (see Chapter II above). About 1634, he delivered a treatise on altars at a college exercise, subsequent to which the manuscript was circulated privately. Some unidentified superiors, who believed that the cogency of the argument and the prestige attached to Mead's name would "satisfie all reasonable men", ordered its publication. Mead characteristically agreed to enter the debate precisely because of his distaste for controversy:

For whom would it not grieve to see that the very NAME of That, the approach whereunto was wont, and still should, dissolve all differences, should now become the occasion of so much quarrel?79

Mead's purpose is less ambitious than Heylyn's or Pocklington's. He seeks only to demonstrate that Christians have for a long time referred to the communion table ("that sacred Biere of the body and bloud of Christ") as an altar. He concedes, unlike Pocklington, that there is no conclusive evidence of this before the third century, but neither, he added, was the term "table" used before then. Furthermore, even very early sources refer to the Eucharist as a sacrifice. After the third century, "altar" is used as consistently as "table." Centuries of usage, then, vindicate the denomination of communion tables
as altars. The term quite innocuously and properly emphasizes the special function of the communion table, because "a Table is a common name, and an Altar is a Holy Table."80

To more than this, Mead would not commit himself. He refused to infer from the use of the term "altar" anything regarding the "matter or form" or position of the communion table.81 In fact, he said in private that though he agreed with Heylyn on the use of the term "altar", he was more inclined to accept Williams's arguments regarding the proper position of the table.82 He did support, though, the practice of bowing toward the altar, not, he reassured William Twisse, because he supposed any holiness inherent in the altar itself, but because of the "relative holiness" it possesses by virtue of God's presence in the Eucharist. This holiness remains at times other than the communion service, just as the clergy remain distinct from the laity even when they are not preaching or just as the Lord's Day remains holy even after public worship.83

On this last point, of course, Mead stood opposed to the Laudian position. He was not a Sabbatarian, but he believed that White and Heylyn, in denying the sanctity of the Lord's Day, "would overthrow a great deal more than they are aware of."84 Specifically, he saw a serious contradiction between their sort of anti-Sabbatarianism and support for the altarwise position of the communion table, both of which were generally favored by the same men. On the one hand, they would argue that the altar, by virtue of its use in the sacrament of communion, should always be accorded the respect due a holy object; on the other
hand, they refuse to recognize the Lord's Day, by virtue of its consecration, to public worship, as holier than any other day. In asserting the latter, they implicitly deny the former. "But it is ordinary," said Mead, "with men who make passion and studium partium the rule of their Judgements, thus to cut the throats of their own principles."85

William Prynne discerned yet another contradiction between the two positions. How, he asked, could one term the observance of the Sabbath "Jewish" and at the same time defend the blatantly Jewish presence of an altar in a church?86 Most defenders of the altar either did not see or chose to ignore these apparent contradictions, except for Gilbert Ironside, who did try to reconcile the two positions. He admitted that "the name Sabbath is no more Morall, and to be retained in times of the Gospell, than the name Priest, Altar, Sacrifice . . ."87 However, this does not imply that either the Lord's Day or the communion table should be neglected. Because the Lord's Day has been specially consecrated to worship, "holy duties are on this day ordinarilily performed with greater fervency of spirit, benefit to ourselves, and therefore acceptance with God," than usual, whereas "all irreligious conversation is therefore the more execrable upon that day." This is not to say that such devotion is appropriate only on Sundays. Likewise, bowing toward the communion table (Ironside does not refer to it as an altar) serves to recognize the special use to which it has been consecrated. It does not arise from a superstitious worship of the table, any more than the observance of the Lord's Day arises from a superstitious worship of the first day. Rather, as the first day is set aside only for its power to
evoke Christ's resurrection, so "the table is only a memorial instrument, unto which the assistance of grace is never wanting, either, to beget in our minds such thoughts of the death of Christ . . .".

The points raised by Mead, Prynne, and Ironside suggest a broader question, namely, to what extent did the positions taken in the altar controversy reflect more fundamental religious issues? The predestinarian issue, with which this study began, is the logical place to begin. In general, those who supported the altar policies were either Arminians themselves or closely identified with Arminianism. Heylyn, of course, was in virtually complete accord with Laud. Though during the 1630's his pronouncements on the question of predestination were few, they were unmistakably Arminian. Edmund Reeve and Thomas Lawrence, whose support of Laud's altar policies I will discuss below, were also Arminians. Reeve (d. 1660), vicar of Hayes-cum-Norwood in Middlesex, explicitly rejected the Calvinist doctrine of irrespective predestination and affirmed the Arminian tenet that Christ died for all mankind in the very same book in which he defended the altarwise position of the table and bowing toward it. Lawrence (1598-1657), master of Balliol College, Oxford, was not quite so explicit (his book, unlike Reeve's, was licensed), but he did condemn those who disputed on forbidden topics (he could only have meant the topics encompassed in Charles I's proclamation of 1629) and who accused the Church of England of "sloth and Apostacy" simply because "she will not impose an absolute faith upon the airy projections of their distempered brains." John Pocklington, to my knowledge, never discussed the predestinarian
question publicly or privately, nor did the charges brought against him by the Long Parliament include accusations of Arminianism. However, his strong support of Laud's policies, his outspoken attacks on Puritanism, and his unusually frank sympathy for certain Catholic views and practices (he cited approvingly Cardinal Borromeo's position on the altar and also, it will be remembered, professed no aversion to referring to the Lord's Supper as the Mass) make it highly unlikely that he was a Calvinist.

But though the most passionate supporters of the altar were Arminians, they never invoked their doctrinal views in its support, nor did they use the issue to attack Calvinism. Moreover, not everyone who defended the altar policies was an Arminian. Joseph Mead, as I have shown, scrupulously avoided the predestinarian issue. Humphrey Sydenham (1591-1650?), a prominent Somerset clergyman who as late as 1637 had sermons upholding Calvinist views published, defended the new position of the communion table. True, he did prefer "Holy Table" to "Altar", but he applauded the measures which restored the tables to their former dignity, so that they were no longer derisively called "dressers" or "Oyster-boards."

Conversely, none of the opponents of the altar measures attacked them from a specifically Calvinist stance. Most of them seem to have been Calvinists, except for Bishop Williams, whose views, like Mead's, remain a secret. Only William Prynne, though, comes close to linking the two issues. He warned that enforcing the altarwise position of the communion table formed part of a conspiracy "to bring the whole body of
Popery into our Church againe, yet secretly by degrees, with as little noyse as might be . . . ." The first stage of this conspiracy, he said, had been the open advancement of Arminian views.  

If, then, doctrine did not enter directly into the altar controversy, what issues were perceived to be at stake? Not surprisingly, those who differed over the position of the communion table also differed over the significance of the sacrament of communion. True, as Charles and Katherine George note, there was a broad consensus among English Protestants on the sacraments, a consensus which led them to reject the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, on the one hand, and the "Zwinglian" view of the sacraments as mere symbols, on the other hand. There was general agreement that God really, indeed usually, dispenses grace through the sacraments. The Georges concede that this consensus did not preclude occasional pitched battles over the manner of administering the sacraments. They contend, however, that these disputes arose not from deep-seated theological differences but rather from Laud's

taggressive absolutism, the expression of a firm and bureaucratic temperament bent upon stating a point determinedly and determinedly assuring that the policy is also carried out."

No doubt, it was Laud who forced the issue, but one need not deny this to acknowledge that deeper differences in outlook divided the two sides. First of all, some of the proponents of the altar emphasized, more than some of their opponents were willing to countenance, God's
special presence in the sacrament. William Prynne, for example, did not deny a real presence in the sacrament but still asserted that

God is most specially present by his grace in Heaven, in the Church-Bible, and midst of his people, not at the East end of the Church. . . .

John Pocklington, on the other hand, defended bowing toward the altar, because that is "where Christ is most truly and really present in the blessed Sacrament. . . ." Thomas Lawrence, too, while he emphatically rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, just as emphatically insisted on a real presence in the sacrament,

because Christ saith 'tis there, and S. Paul saith 'tis there, and the Church of England saith 'tis there . . . and that not only by way of representation or commemoration, and yet without either con, sub, or trans; by a reall and nevertheless, a spirituall, and mysticall and supenaturall presentation, and exhibition.

Closely related to the question of the real presence was the question of the relative importance of the sacraments. William Prynne opposed bowing toward the altar, because he believed that the practice exaggerated the significance of the table. The pulpit and the reading pew, he argued, far more than the communion table, should be considered "God's mercy seate . . . from which he is heard speaking in his Word." Conversely, Laud defended bowing toward the altar precisely because he believed that the sacraments took precedence over preaching. The communion table, he said, is "the greatest place of God's residence upon
greater even than the pulpit, because Christ himself said that his body was present in the sacraments, whereas the pulpit was reserved for his word, "and a greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the body than to the word of our Lord."¹⁰⁰ Robert Shelford (1563-1639), rector of Ringfield in Suffolk, who defended bowing toward the altar and other ceremonies in his Five Pious and Learned Discourses (1635), argued that "preaching is but a preparation for the Sacraments, and there the principall grace lies hid."¹⁰¹

Here perhaps may be found the strongest link with the doctrinal conflict. It was a logical conclusion of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination to view the sacraments as "sealing" or "authenticating" the prevenient grace already granted to the Elect, whereas the Arminians just as consistently saw the sacraments as the means by which God actually dispenses grace to those who have of their own free will turned to him.¹⁰² At any rate, it is noteworthy that at the York House Conference (see chapter I above), the Calvinist John Preston sharply dissented from Montagu's and White's opinion that baptized infants who died before reaching the age of understanding are undoubtedly saved.¹⁰³

These differences over the significance of the sacrament in turn reveal differences over the function of the clergy. Peter Smart and William Prynne argued that turning the communion table into an altar would also turn the clergy of the Church of England into priests, whose main task was not preaching but administering the sacraments.¹⁰⁴ Others charged that altars threatened to replace the Protestant Eucharist, which was a communal celebration, with a Catholic Mass, or a
spectacle performed by a priest with powers beyond those of the laity. Some of what supporters of the altar said justifies these charges. In a
general defense of Laud's ecclesiastical policies, William Hardwick,
rector of Reigate in Surrey, defended the use of the term "priest" to
describe the clergy and lamented that the

Title wherewith Almighty God hath been
pleased to grace us . . . is not mentioned
but in derision; every ignorant and
prophane wretch hath the name of Priest
in his mouth, which with a kind of scumme
hee casts into the faces of those who
professe this sacred function . . . .

John Pocklington, in answer to Williams's contention that the Lord's
Supper is not uniquely a sacrifice and the communion table not uniquely
an altar, replied that

the sacrifice of the Altar . . . is the
particular function of the Priest to
performe . . . When the Priest lawfully
ordained doth use the words of consecra-
tion and other prayers appointed, and
doeth receive and distribute the holy
Eucharist, he doth offer a spirituall
sacrifice, which no Layman, or woman;
no nor any Deacon may use.

Thomas Lawrence professed to believe "every faithfull soule in the World
[a] Priest; every angle of the world a Temple and an Altar", but at the
same time he maintained that "a Collect from the Priests mouth goes
further, then a Liturgie from the peoples . . . ." Robert Shelford
offered perhaps the boldest expression of this view when he maintained
that when the minister administers the sacrament
In this one part of his office he hath performed a better work, than all thy lands and goods are worth; and this no king, no noble-man, no monarch can do for thee, but onely Gods Minister.\textsuperscript{109}

Laudian propagandists thus presented the altar as historically and doctrinally sound, but there remained an important obstacle to its introduction. Even its most adamant supporters had to admit that none of the various ecclesiastical regulations actually enjoined the altarwise position of the communion table, that at most those who exercised ecclesiastical authority were not explicitly forbidden to implement this practice. In May, 1640, Laud sought to give this arrangement a sounder legal basis in the Canons adopted by the Convocation of the Clergy following the dismissal of the Short Parliament. One of the canons provided that communion tables in all parish churches be placed along the east wall of the chancel, "saving always the general liberty left to the bishop by law." The canon went on to explain that the position of the table was a thing in itself indifferent, that a specific position was mandated simply to resolve the current differences within the Church by the expedient of having parish churches follow the practice of the cathedrals, and that the altarwise position in no way implied that the table "is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, wherein Christ is again really sacrificed . . . ." Though the canon commended the practice of bowing toward the altar upon entering or leaving a church, it did not require it and commanded only
that they which use this rite, despise not them who use it not, and that they who use it not, condemn not them that use it.\textsuperscript{110}

The Canons of 1640, of course, did not resolve the altar controversy. The peace of the Church which Laud had hoped the canons would strengthen was already beginning to succumb to forces which would soon destroy the entire Laudian program. As early as 1639, there were reports from several dioceses of people simply refusing to receive the sacrament at the communion rails.\textsuperscript{111} By July, 1640, barely a month after the canons had been adopted, English troops, mobilized to fight the Scots, were rioting in Cambridge and Essex and, among other things, pulling down the communion rails in parish churches.\textsuperscript{112}

When Charles I summoned the Long Parliament, grievances concerning the recent administration of the Church were among its first orders of business. On December 16, 1640, the House of Commons declared the Canons of 1640 to have been illegal. Shortly thereafter, Laud was impeached of high treason and committed to the Tower.\textsuperscript{113} The destruction of his ecclesiastical order now proceeded apace. In churches throughout the kingdom, communion rails were dismantled in a spontaneous, unauthorized wave of protest.\textsuperscript{114} In September, 1641, Parliament authorized what was already taking place and passed a resolution calling for the removal of the "Communion table from the East end where it stands altar-wise to a convenient place in the church or chancel, removing the rails and leveling the chancel."\textsuperscript{115} The controversy was resolved. The communion table was not an altar.
What is the significance of this prolonged, bitter, and often very confusing dispute? To begin with, it made even more pronounced the shift away from the predestinarian issue in the field of religious conflict. To be sure, as I have shown, the earlier divisions between Calvinists and Arminians were not completely irrelevant to the altar controversy. The alignments in each case correspond fairly, if not perfectly, well. Furthermore, to the extent that the dispute concerned the sacrament of communion itself, it encompassed questions at the heart of the doctrinal controversy; namely, to whom and by what means does God confer grace?

However, questions of this nature were really not central to the dispute, and they certainly were not the main concern of those who defended Laud's policies. These men, rather, were especially concerned to assert two points:

1. that the altarwise position of the communion table—and by extension, other practices from the pre-Reformed Church of England—could be retained without endangering the Church. Indeed, the implication was that such practices should be retained wherever possible, in order to enhance the dignity of the church service and to maintain centuries of ecclesiastical tradition.

2. that the king and the ecclesiastical hierarchy had the authority to enjoin such practices, even where they might lack explicit warrant for a particular
practice, and that to resist or even to question this authority cast doubt on one's political and religious loyalty.

The altar controversy also helps explain the rapid collapse of the Laudian Church in 1640-41. The heavy-handed imposition of an unpopular practice helped form a reservoir of hostility—hostility which for the moment could be contained but which, given the opportunity, was ready to be directed against a specific target, namely, Laud and his accomplices. Not only had the practice been introduced on rather slender legal and historical grounds, it was introduced in such a way as to feed widespread fears of popery. It did little good to disassociate the altar from the Mass when Pocklington openly defended the use of the word "Mass", when he and others referred to the clergy of the Church of England as priests, both by name and by function, and when still others replaced the wooden tables brought in by the Reformation with stone altars. Thus, not only the strident Prynne and Burton sounded the alarm of popery, but even the more moderate Henry Parker wished, with specific reference to the altar that

our Doctors would not mingle so far with Popery as they doe, or if they will, yet they would not speake so upbraidingly of those which feare to doe the like . . .

Just how imprudently these fears were disregarded can be seen when Heylyn equated Williams with John Cotton or Henry Burton and when Thomas Lawrence charged those who would deny respect to the communion table with
Presbyterianism ("For how have the same which aimed at a parity in Churchmen, sided also for a parity in the Church, risen to a parity of all places within the Church . . .").

Ironically, the attempts of these propagandists to convince their countrymen of the merits of Laud's program and to ease their fears probably served only to strengthen their prejudices and confirm their fears.
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CONCLUSIONS

When the subjects of James I and Charles I warned of an Arminian threat to the Church of England, they meant just that. They were above all concerned with a challenge to the Calvinist theology so many Protestants believed to be an integral part of their reformed Church. Those labelled Arminians also saw themselves in this light. Though they usually disavowed the appellation, they in fact offered specifically Arminian objections to Calvinism. The doctrine of absolute reprobation, they maintained, was incompatible with God's promises in the Scriptures and with the worship of a just and good creator. They also, like the original Dutch Arminians, dismissed the entire question of predestination as one irrelevant to salvation, a speculative matter whose resolution was not worth dividing the Church.

But though Arminianism per se played a direct and even, for a time, a leading role in the religious controversies of Early Stuart England, it was hardly the only issue, nor was it necessarily the most important one. Even before Charles I's suppression of the doctrinal conflict in 1629, Arminians such as Richard Montagu and John Cosin had been attacked for upholding allegedly Catholic propositions and supporting "Popish" practices. As a result, those who attacked Arminianism soon came to link it with these phenomena, as well as with the ultra-royalist views supported and advanced by some Arminians.
The connections were real enough. In the 1630's, those who defended these controversial positions, and certainly the most partisan among them, were usually either known Arminians or men closely associated with prominent Arminians. Furthermore, there was a noticeable congruence between their doctrinal and ceremonial views. Calvinists favored forms of worship as well as doctrines suggestive of God's sovereignty; Arminians, on the other hand, both professed and celebrated a belief in God's compassion. Calvinists rejected rituals which seemed to make the priest's consecration of the sacrament rather than God's decree of election the source of grace; Arminians conversely sought to emphasize the sacraments as the instrument by which God actually dispenses grace, not merely the means of ratifying grace.

On the whole, however, the disputes over bowing at the name of Jesus, the observance of the Lord's Day, and the position of the communion table were less significant for continuing the doctrinal conflict than for shifting the focus of conflict. Those who objected to those practices connected them hardly at all with Arminianism. Instead, they objected primarily to the lack of Scriptural warrant for these practices and to their similarities to practices observed in England before the Reformation and still observed in the Roman Catholic Church of their day. Likewise, their opponents rarely linked these issues to the doctrinal controversy. In not only these matters but in general, they believed perpetuating the legacy transmitted by the Church of Rome to be not only harmless but in fact desirable. At the root of these differences were opposing views of the English Reformation. While none
of the supporters of Laud's policies actually rejected the break from Rome, they tended to explain it as above all a rejection of Papal authority and a reform of flagrant abuses. Time and again, they emphasized that the Reformation had rejected only Rome's corruptions, not everything associated with it. Some of them, like Montagu and Pocklington, even minimized the differences between the Churches of Rome and England over the doctrine of justification and the sacraments.

Many Englishmen were convinced that asserting these views and implementing these practices disrupted the status quo achieved under Elizabeth I and James I. To what extent was this charge justified? On the one hand, as Tyacke has shown, the rise of Arminianism constituted a challenge to a basically Calvinist doctrinal consensus. The strict enforcement of bowing at the name of Jesus and of the provisions of the Book of Sports also departed from what had been widely practiced, while moving the communion table altarwise changed the arrangement of most parish churches. In each of these cases, though, the legacy of the Elizabethans and Jacobean Churches was ambiguous. Even if Calvinism predominated among English Protestants, it had never been universally or officially accepted. Even if certain ceremonies were not widely practiced, the canons and injunctions enjoining them remained in effect, available to an ecclesiastical leadership prepared to enforce them. Even the most clearly innovative measure, the altarwise position of the communion table, was not entirely unprecedented. Thanks to Elizabeth I's injunctions, Laud and his supporters could honestly claim that the altar had not been completely rejected by the Church of England.
Not only the traditions of the Church of England but also the authority of the existing Church and of its royal governor were in dispute. The Church, argued Laud and his supporters, has the right to determine a wide variety of ceremonial and even doctrinal matters. Obedience to the Church and its leadership is accordingly a corollary of obedience to God. Hence, they considered and treated opposition to the policies of Charles I and Laud as *prima facie* evidence of opposition to Church and Crown in general. As Stephen Foster has noted, the recklessness with which this charge was made and the brutality with which all opposition was suppressed probably created more dissent than it discouraged and made existing dissent all the more radical.\(^2\) No doubt this uncompromising assertion of ecclesiastical authority owed much to circumstance—Charles I's strong support of the Arminians and of the disputed practices and Laud's leadership of the Church. Still, it must have had some ideological basis, because substantially the same views had been advanced well before this time by men associated with Arminianism and would be maintained during the Civil War, Interregnum, and Restoration by Laud's intellectual heirs.\(^3\)

In short, the continuity of the Church of England with its past and the authority of its leadership had overshadowed the doctrine of predestination as the central issues in the religious conflict. Just how dramatically the focus of conflict had shifted can be seen in the Root and Branch Petition of 1640, which, to be sure, denounces the advancement of Arminian doctrines, but gives greater prominence to grievances concerning the introduction of "Popish" practices and,
above all, the abuses proceeding from the exercise of episcopal power. It is also noteworthy that comparatively few of the clergy investigated by the Long Parliament in its attempt to cleanse the Church of alleged corruptions were charged with upholding specifically Arminian doctrines, whereas far more were cited for practicing objectionable ceremonies. Thus, though Arminianism did indeed precipitate an era of religious controversy, it figured less prominently in its violent conclusion.
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