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1. Commemorative window to Richard Montagu. (Dr. J. Sears McGee), Frontispiece.

Figure 1: Portrait of Richard Montagu in stained glass at Chichester Cathedral, West Sussex. The scroll in his hand bears the title of his 1625 work *Appello Caesarem*. The plaque reads “Richard Montague Bishop 1628-1638. Champion of the English Church.”
Charles I, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, was executed on January 30, 1649 in the name of his own people. His subjects did not set out to abolish monarchy as an institution but rid themselves of a king who had so alienated many members of the political and religious elite of his kingdom that they made war against him. Chief among the religious grievances was the eclipse of English Calvinism caused by royal support of English Arminianism. These Arminian divines espoused the importance of humanity’s free will working in concert with God’s to achieve salvation and introduced a new ceremonialism into the liturgy of the Church of England. The first public stirrings of the religious conflict occurred in the mid-1620s when Arminian controversialist Richard Montagu’s two books, *A New Gagg* (1624) and *Appello Caesarem* (1625), provoked enormous controversy. The two works attacked Calvinists, claiming that the Church of England was not Calvinist in doctrine and furthermore that all Calvinists were Puritans outside the bounds of the accepted church. The two books created a controversy out of which a recognizable English Arminianism or anti-Calvinism which represented a formidable challenge to the ideological hegemony of Calvinism. Combined with a sharp polemical style and royal patronage they sparked a conflict that involved the English episcopacy and laymen in the House of Commons like never before.

Broadly speaking and risking oversimplification of two complex ideologies, the respective definitions of English Calvinism and English Arminianism could boiled down to disagreement over soteriology and liturgy. English Calvinists espoused double and absolute predestination, believing that God had divided humanity into the elect and the reprobate, the former destined for heaven and the latter destined for hell. Since the foundation of salvation was God’s immutable decree, Calvinists denied the efficacy of good works and the free will of people to accept or resist saving grace. Calvinist liturgy deemphasized the role of the sacraments, largely rejected the wearing of the traditional vestments by ministers, and relegated the altar to a subservient role in relation to preaching. English Arminians, by contrast, asserted that Christians could freely choose to either accept or reject saving grace. Furthermore, a man who had accepted grace could still fall from grace totally and finally. In terms of liturgy, Arminians wanted to restore a ceremonial dignity to the service that they felt was lost during the Reformation. Arminian liturgy returned the altar to its much more prominent pre-Reformation position, emphasized the role of the sacraments in dispensing saving grace, and insisted on the wearing of the surplice and other vestments by priests. The disagreements between the two were manifold and amounted to two vastly different conceptions of English Protestantism and Christianity; the debate encompassed far more than a disagreement over predestination.

In the 1620s Montagu became, perhaps unfairly, the poster boy for the growing Arminian heresy in England. With the publication of *A New Gagg* and *Appello Caesarem*, he transformed from a heretofore obscure cleric into the object of national controversy. Predestinarian debate was not new to England. Controversy had embroiled Cambridge following William Barret’s attack on Calvinism in 1595,
becoming so acrimonious that it necessitated the intervention of Archbishop of Canterbury John Whitgift. Doctrinal disagreement amongst “moderate Puritans” and bishops occurred at the Hampton Court Conference (1604). Most significantly, English delegates participated in the condemnation of Dutch Arminianism at the Synod of Dort (1618) and put the term “Arminian” in the mouths of contemporary Englishmen. Indeed the contested issues touch upon an eternal debate in Christianity over the relationship between predestination, God’s foreknowledge, and humanity’s free will. The debate harkens back to antiquity and the battle between Pelagius and Augustine. However Montagu’s significance was that both his sharp polemical style and royal patronage brought the simmering controversy into the public sphere like never before.

However, Montagu and his supporters never labeled themselves Arminians and his opponents never labeled themselves Calvinists. Both parties simply thought of themselves as Christians. Their respective views were in their minds the true doctrine of Christianity, held in perpetuity since the days of the Church Fathers. His contemporaries as a rule did not argue explicitly for Arminius or Calvin but instead appealed to Scripture and the early Church to prove the fundamental rightness of their convictions. “Arminian,” “Calvinist,” “Puritan,” and “Papist,” among other labels, were terms of abuse that polemical opponents hurled at each other. Montagu himself was labeled with a dizzying array of terms: “Arminian, semi-Pelagian, Papist, Pelagian, pseudo-Lutheran,” “Pontifical Arminian,” and he even lent his surname to the term of abuse “Montagutian.” The nomenclature has been equally controversial among historians with varying descriptions of the religious divisions in the early Stuart Church: a conservative “Anglican” episcopacy wedded to the ancien régime pitted against a progressive Puritanism allied with the bourgeoisie, an insurgent English Arminianism espousing High Church ceremonialism and a more liberal theology of grace that shattered an existing Calvinist consensus, and recently an emphasis the unique character of the Church of England’s via media and the aggressive enforcement of conformity in the Caroline Church.

However, the objective of all of these labels was clear: the association of opponents with unacceptable and heretical ideas. Montagu redefined doctrinal Calvinism as Puritanism or accused Calvinists of holding perverse Antinomian doctrines that disparaged the Church and its ministry. He characterized his critics as Puritans, radical separatists and factious adherents of the foreign “Geneva discipline” that was contrary to the Church Fathers and the doctrine of the Church of England. Opponents smeared him as crypto-Catholic, a devotee of the Dutch theologian Jacob Arminius, an adherent of the ancient heretic Pelagius, and simply as a malevolent man bent on disturbing the peace of the English church. Furthermore, both parties claimed that they defended the orthodox doctrine of the
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Nevertheless it was the term “Arminian” which clung most tenaciously to Montagu and his compatriots. “Arminian” was imported to England in the aftermath of the Synod of Dort. The presence of English divines at the conference and James I’s approval of the synod lent a political potency to the term Arminian. But Montagu never read Arminius prior to the writing of A New Gag and an anti-Calvinist strain in English thought was developing prior to the publication of Jacob Arminius’s works in the early seventeenth century. Thus English Arminianism was more complex than a mere importation of Dutch anti-Calvinism.

The process of emergence was acrimonious and constantly in flux. While many earlier divines could retroactively be labeled “Arminians avant la lettre,” English Arminianism as a coherent and organized ideology only emerged in the latter half of the 1620s. Montagu’s works were what defined English Arminianism’s political and religious ideology by thrusting the issue into the public sphere for the first time. The nascent English Arminianism would acquire a coherent and recognizable “party platform.” It was impossible to separate the debate over Arminianism from the debate over Puritanism. Indeed the first and most controversial plank was the characterization of Calvinism: first that the Church of England was not Calvinist in doctrine and second that even conformist Calvinists were Puritans. Thus any discussion about Arminianism necessarily involved consideration of the definition of Puritanism. In opposition the anti-Calvinist divines formulated a soteriology that reserved a large role for human free will: election to salvation was on the basis of faith foreseen and therefore even the elect could fall totally and finally from grace. They developed an alternative liturgical program intimately related to their doctrinal program. Sacraments played an integral role, elevated to an equal or superior role to that of preaching, in dispensing saving grace and reaffirming the covenant with God to ensure perseverance to election. The upkeep and beautification of churches was a primary concern as well as intolerance for nonconformity to the Book of Common Prayer. The increased role of the sacraments, concern for the upkeep of churches, and intolerance for nonconformity were reinforced by an emphasis on clerical and episcopal authority.

In parallel to the ideological battle there was an interconnected struggle for control of the English body politic. Arminians became increasingly allied to monarch and increasingly emphasized his authority. Whatever their political inclinations, they were driven into the arms of the king by an increasingly hostile Parliament. Under constant attack from the overwhelmingly Calvinist House of Commons, the Arminians developed a vested interest in supporting extra-parliamentary rule. Time and again, Montagu and the Arminian party were saved by dissolution or prorogation of Parliament, a timely royal proclamation, the favor of a sympathetic royal courtier, or the advancement of like-minded divines to positions of power within the Church of England. The king’s controversial extra-parliamentary finance measures dovetailed with the Arminians desire to increase the power of the king and decrease his reliance on Parliament. With the House of Commons rabidly attempting to establish a justification for the prosecution of the “Montagutians,” royal preferment simultaneously inflamed the conflict while also representing an
affront to parliamentary authority in the governance of the Church of England. Thus English Arminianism attained its most distinctive and destructive element: a reliance on extra-parliamentary monarchical authority to support and enforce its ideas.

The Preamble: Religious Controversy in the Reign of James I (r. 1603-1625)

Religious controversy in the reign of James I left a formidable legacy and highlighted the rise of English anti-Calvinism separated from Dutch Arminianism and how Englishmen dealt with predestinarian controversy prior to the publication of A New Gagg. Furthermore, James I displayed a political acumen that his son Charles I would lack. James I was willing to deal with the moderate wings of both Puritanism and Roman Catholicism in order to divorce them from the radical wings of their respective movements. Conformity was the byword of the Jacobean church: subscription to the English episcopacy and the authority of the English monarch was the standard for inclusion.  

Subscription was a higher priority for the king than ceremonial conformity. In the Basilicon Doron republished prior to accession to the English throne in 1603, he castigated separatist Puritans whom he described as “brainsicke and headie preachers” willing to let “King, people, Law and all be trode under foote” rather than allow any of “their grounds be impugned.” However he qualified his denunciation of Puritans by specifying that he did not refer to those who

like better of the single forme of policie in our Church [of Scotland], than of the many Ceremonies in the Church of England; that are persuaded that their Bishops smell of Papall supremacie; that the Surplise, the cornerd cap, and such like, are the outward badges of Popish errours. No, I am so farre from being contentious in these things (which for my owne part I euer esteemed as indifferent) as I doe equally loue and honour the learned and graue men of either of these opinions.

The first stirrings of predestinarian controversy occurred at Cambridge in the 1590s while Montagu was studying at King's College, Cambridge. The administration of Cambridge was heavily Calvinist and Calvinist orthodoxy prevailed in university's religious instruction. It was all the more shocking then when William Barrett attacked Calvin and Calvinism in a sermon in the university church on April 29, 1595. Barrett asserted that no man may have the certainty of faith to be assured of his salvation, that the elect could fall totally and finally from grace, that reprobation was a consequence of God’s foreknowledge of sin, and therefore election was a result of the foreknowledge of faith. In an attempt to quell the controversy surrounding Barrett’s sermon, Archbishop Whitgift issued the thoroughly Calvinist Lambeth Articles which stated that faith “is not lost nor does it
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pass away either finally or totally in the elect” and that the “cause of predestination to life is not the foreseeing of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything innate in the person of the predestined, but only the will of God.” Whitgift and his fellow Calvinists hoped to obviate future predestinarian controversy by making the Lambeth Articles part of the doctrine of the Church of England. However, Whitgift was prevented from making the Lambeth Articles official doctrine of the Church of England because he was “threatened with a Praemunire [assertion of foreign jurisdiction against the supremacy of the English monarch] by Queen Elizabeth for presuming to tender anything contrary to the doctrine of the Church,” according to Montague’s partisan account.

The Hampton Court Conference (1604) foreshadowed the religious controversy of the reign of Charles I and dealt with many of the issues with which Montagu later grappled. Furthermore the conference was the last time Englishmen dealt with predestinarian controversy prior to the Synod of Dort and the publication of A New Gagge. The impetus for the conference was the Millenary Petition, presented by moderate Puritans to James I while he journeyed south towards London. Hopeful that the Scottish king would be amenable to requests for further reformation of the Church of England than Elizabeth I, the Puritans presented a list of requests to the new sovereign. The petition mostly focused on ceremonial and administrative concerns. Many of them were classic puritan grievances such as the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, the wearing of the surplice by ministers, sports and diversion on Sunday, improvement in the education of ministers and preachers, and opposition to pluralism and non-residency.

James I shrewdly dealt with the presentation of grievances by calling the Hampton Court Conference. Moderate Puritans, led by theologian John Reynolds, and representatives of the episcopacy debated Puritan requests for reform. Although the petition focused on ceremonial and administrative matters, a substantial portion of the conference focused on debate over doctrine and the efficacy of the sacraments. Reynolds’s first listed request was that the “doctrine of the Church might be preserved in purity according to God’s word.” What he meant by purity of doctrine was evident from his request to add the Lambeth Articles to the English confession of faith, probably in an attempt to head off further religious controversy after the debacle at Cambridge. If the Lambeth Articles were made the official doctrine of the Church of England there would no longer any ambiguity concerning the Church of England’s soteriology. As it stood the sixteenth article “Of sin after baptism” contained the troubling language “we may depart from [the saving grace] given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may rise again, and
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amend our lives.” Indicative of the ambiguous language of the Thirty-Nine Articles, many of the articles could be read to affirm both Calvinist and Arminian doctrine depending upon the reader’s interpretation and emphasis. Nevertheless, James I followed the same course as Elizabeth I by refusing to make the Lambeth Articles part of the English confession of faith probably fearing that such a move would only increase religious tensions. Instead, he offered moderate Puritans a deal: familiar Puritan grievances such as pluralism, a more vigorous preaching ministry, small reform of the Book of Common Prayer, and a new English translation of the Bible in return for conformity to the episcopacy, an acceptance of existing ceremonial forms, and absolutely no toleration for Presbyterianism.

Reynolds and the moderate Puritan party did not go unchallenged at Hampton Court. Richard Bancroft, vehement anti-Puritan and suspicious of the influence of Presbyterianism on mainstream Puritanism, represented the English episcopacy. In response to Reynolds’s request that the Lambeth Articles be added to the English confession of faith, Bancroft responded by attacking Calvinist predestination and asserting the necessity of baptism for salvation. Challenging the absolute and double predestination embodied in the Lambeth Articles, he attacked the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints by opining that “very many in these days, neglecting holiness of life, persisting of grace, laying all their religion upon predestination, [believing that] if I shall be saved, I shall be saved.” He had criticized extreme absolute predestination in response to radical English millenarians who attempted to proclaim a government of saints by arguing that through abuse of the doctrine of predestination “they meant to have had the blame of the wicked and intended mischiefs, both of themselves and of their partakers, removed from themselves, and laid upon the Lord’s shoulders.” Such an argument implicitly associated absolute predestination with “antinomian perversion,” meaning that morality and obedience to the church were unnecessary because a Christian was saved solely by God’s pleasure. Admittedly a gross caricature of the Calvinist position, it was nevertheless a powerful argument because it implied that Calvinists denigrated the episcopacy and the sacraments of the Church of England. Bancroft also stressed the necessity of baptism for salvation by defending both the administration of baptism by laypersons in cases of dire necessity and stressing that children died baptized could be assured of salvation. Also present were Lancelot Andrewes of Westminster, William Barlow of Chester, and John Overall of St. Pauls who had all opposed the extreme Calvinism of the Lambeth Articles. Overall and Barlow had espoused more liberal theologies of grace during the 1590s.
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were important differences between the doctrinal positions of these men, especially Bancroft, and the positions that Arminians would later adopt in the 1620s, but the level of continuity in the arguments pointed to the independent development of English anti-Calvinism.23

The Synod of Dort would hold the greatest significance for Montagu’s polemical career. The internal political situation in the United Provinces had deteriorated following the conclusion of the Twelve Years’ Truce with Spain. The religious disputes within the Dutch Church over Arminianism had become increasingly tied to the power struggle between the military leader of the United Provinces, Count Maurice of Nassau, and the political leader of the republic, Advocate of Holland, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt. The two men were identified with rival religious factions, Maurice with Dutch Calvinists and Oldenbarnevelt with the Arminians.

King James I was a keen observer of the struggles between Arminianism and Calvinism unfolding in the United Provinces, going so far as to personally write to the States General at the Hague to oppose the appointment of Arminian Conradus Vorstius to the chair of theology at Leiden University, and when Vorstius was appointed despite the king’s opposition, wrote a declaration that specifically condemned him.24 Following the controversy over Vorstius, James I addressed the States General of the United Provinces urging the suppression of the Arminian heresy because it posed a danger to the internal stability of the United Provinces.25 Fearful that the Arminian heresy would “creep into the bowels of our own kingdom,” James I watched the power struggle with unease.26

James I eventually sided with Maurice and the Dutch Calvinists, partially because Maurice favored closer ties to England even at the price of recognizing English rights in the East Indies; by contrast, Oldenbarnevelt favored the King of France and was “completely alienated” from James I.27 The price of an alliance with Maurice was a national synod to settle the religious disputes. By 1617, James I had definitively come out in favor of the meeting because he was alarmed at the continued spread of Arminianism and encouraged by his son-in-law, Elector Frederick of the Palatinate.28 The synod invited England to send a delegation and James I selected Oxford academic and bishop George Carleton, future bishops Joseph Hall (who would become ill and be replaced by Thomas Goad, a chaplain of Archbishop Abbot) and John Davenant, Samuel Ward of Cambridge, and the sole
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Scotsman Walter Balcanqual. The delegates shared the assumptions that “predestination was unconditional, that atonement was limited to the elect, and that grace was irresistible and perseverance final.”

While ostensibly a debate between Dutch Arminians and Dutch Calvinists, the synod was little more than a “show trial.” From the beginning the Arminians were on the defensive from Calvinist prosecution and the outcome was hardly in doubt. In the end Dutch Calvinists dismissed the Arminians from the synod and condemned them in absentia. The final product was the Canons of Dort, which reaffirmed Calvinist orthodoxy against the Arminian innovators. Election is the result solely of “the good pleasure of God” and not “any other good quality or disposition in man.”

An English translation of the Canons was duly printed in 1619 with royal approval though the canons were not added to the English confession of faith.

However the Synod of Dort only increased religious conflict in the Church of England. The involvement of leading academicians from Cambridge, where predestinarian controversy had raged less than two decades earlier, sharpened exiting religious divides and focused attention on the issues discussed at the synod. By attempting to suppress Dutch Arminianism, the English delegation to the Synod of Dort made neutrality in conflict over the theology of grace increasing untenable. Therefore when Montagu published his works five years later the Church of England had already experienced considerable religious turmoil. His arguments had English precedents independent of Dutch Arminianism and contemporaries perceptions of the argumentative cleric were colored by the decades long history of religious controversy. English anti-Calvinism was not merely a Dutch import but had a history and inheritance of its own. The Lambeth Articles and the Hampton Court illustrated the increasingly tense atmosphere into which A New Gagg entered. English participation in the condemnation of Dutch Arminianism at the Synod of Dort made the Arminian charge a potent political weapon and gave English Calvinists a term – “Arminianism” – with which they could easily identify English anti-Calvinists.

The Problem of Definition

The terms Puritan and Arminian raise multiple problems. Historians have debated the nature and usefulness of these terms in describing religious groups and ideologies. At the root of the problem is the fact that the labels were never self-applied. Hillel Schwartz pointed out that “no English divine in the early seventeenth century called himself an Arminian,” while Conrad Russell demonstrated that “Puritan’ was a term of abuse and was therefore normally reserved for those in
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Both terms are either applied retroactively by historians or flung at Englishmen by their opponents. However the difficulties inherent in the nomenclature of the early Stuart church illustrates how the meanings and connotation was in flux, and therefore subject to redefinition. As historian Anthony Milton has pointed out, “it may well be that divisions over the application of these polarizing labels, rather than the doctrine of grace, lie at the heart of the religious disputes that disturbed the early Stuart Church.” In other words, debate over how various streams of English religious though related to the church and international Christianity were as important as predestinarian and liturgical differences.

The most revolutionary and controversial aspect of Montagu’s works was the redefinition of Calvinism as “doctrinal Puritanism.” Although all Puritans were Calvinists, not all Calvinists were Puritans. Even committed anti-Calvinists were forced to admit that the Calvinists were the dominant force in the Church of England even if the official doctrine did not reflect the fact. However the Thirty Nine Articles retained their doctrinal ambiguity and English Calvinists were never able to make Calvinism the de jure doctrine of the Church of England even if it was undeniably the de facto standard. In fact English Calvinists were never to win a clear and decisive victory like their Dutch counterparts.

Broadly speaking, Puritanism had traditionally been defined as non-conformity. Puritans held to sola scriptura in terms of church governance. They believed that when “human authority failed to conform with even the general implication of scripture, as expounded and applied by the preacher, it must be resisted.” By contrast, conformists distinguished between the essentials of the Christian religion and the non-essentials or adiaphora of the Christian religion. In matters of adiaphora “human reason and human authority had the power to devise and enforce policy.” Therefore Christians could differ from one another and still be part of the same church. Following the definition of Puritanism as non-conformity, a Calvinist could either be a conformist or a non-conformist depending on his definition of adiaphora. Moderate Puritan was an apt name for the group of reform minded English Protestants who nevertheless conformed to the Church of England. By equating doctrinal Calvinism with Puritanism, Montagu pushed all Calvinists out of the Church of England.

Thus Puritanism traditionally laid more stress on liturgical and ecclesiastical reform than doctrinal reform. A revealing example was a gathering of more radical Puritans parallel to the gathering of moderate Puritans at Hampton Court. These Puritans thought that the retention of vestigial “popish” ceremonies was not a matter of indifference but offensive to both God and the Church of England:

The use of the surplice, cope, cross in baptism, kneeling at communion… imposition of hands in confirmation, ring in marriage, and sundry other
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offensive ceremonies in our Church, is not indifferent but simply unlawful in
the public worship and divine service of God.\textsuperscript{39}
Furthermore they desired reform of the Prayer Book to bring it in line with the Bible
and purge it of idolatry.\textsuperscript{40} Church government provided another sticking point
between radical and moderate Puritans. While moderate and conformist Puritans
could sympathize with widespread frustration at the rampant abuse, pluralism, and
ungodly lifestyles prevalent in the episcopacy, moderate Puritans steered clear of
Presbyterianism.

By contrast, numerous petitions circulated among the Puritan community
expressing a desire for “discipline, as it was delivered by our savior Christ and his
holy apostle” and “agreeable to the example of other reformed churches.”\textsuperscript{41}
Although these petitions usually warned that one should “not expressly desire the
removal of bishops,” such statements usually implied a move towards Presbyterian-
style church governance, increasing the power of local parishes and introducing lay-
elders.\textsuperscript{42} Thus both moderate and radical Puritans shared a desire to reform the
Church of England, but moderate Puritans disdained separatism and Presbyterianism. Whether such moderate Puritans made a “politique subscription” or truly believed in the legitimacy of the episcopacy was another matter.\textsuperscript{43}

Arminianism proper originated with Dutch theologian Jacob Arminius
(1560-1609) whose body of work formed the basis for the Dutch Arminian
movement. The term was imported to England to describe Montagu for both
political reasons and because of ease of use. James I’s opposition to the Dutch
Arminians, his support for the Synod of Dort, and the presence of an English
delegation at the synod meant that “Arminian” was a politically potent weapon even
if it obscured differences between English and Dutch Arminians.\textsuperscript{44} However,
predestinarian controversy stretched back to the 1590s and the English divines who
challenged Calvinist hegemony prior to the Synod of Dort were properly labeled
“Arminians avant la lettre.”\textsuperscript{45}

Thus Montagu’s claim that he had not read Arminius prior to writing A New
Gagg and Appello Caesarem could have been genuine because similar thought was
developing in England parallel to the development of Dutch Arminianism.
Contemporaries labeled Montagu an Arminian because of “community in his faith
(not his writings) that procures that [Arminian] title.”\textsuperscript{46} Historian Nicholas Tyacke
explained that “the term in an English context denotes a similarity of doctrine [with
Dutch Arminians], as regards a theology of grace, rather than a common source.”\textsuperscript{47}
English clergyman and Arminian apologist Peter Heylyn, actively involved in the
religious controversy of the 1620s under the tutelage of William Laud, rejected the
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use of the term Arminian to describe the anti-Calvinist movement of the 1620s and 1630s. He compared it to Amerigo Vespucci lending his name to the continent of America and preferred instead the term “Old English Protestant.”

The label Arminian was even more problematic. The relationship between human will and God’s foreknowledge had perplexed theologians since antiquity. Many Arminian teachings had precedent in antiquity among Pelagius and Chrysostom as well as more modern precedents in Lutheranism. The moderate Puritan Sir Simond D’Ewes, surveying the history of heresy in Christendom, saw Arminianism as merely the newest iteration of Pelagianism. He grouped Arminianism, Roman Catholicism, Anabaptism, and Socianism as variations on the “Pelagian theme,” the importance of humanity’s free will. However the presence of Calvinist delegates at the Synod of Dort put the term “Arminianism” in the mouths Calvinist divines. Furthermore, England was the only country in which Calvinism was eclipsed by Arminianism following the Synod of Dort. Therefore although Montagu wrote his works largely independent of Dutch Arminianism, similarities in core areas like predestination meant the label “Arminian” was the most intelligible and available even if it obscured subtle differences between English Arminianism and Dutch Arminianism. As Tyacke has pointed out, “anti-Calvinism is, strictly speaking, a more accurate description than Arminianism, yet to insist upon it seems unduly pedantic.”

_A New Gagg (1624)_

Even before the publication of _A New Gagg_, Montagu emerged as a contentious and formidable polemicist. In fact, prior to the publication of the _A New Gagg_, he published _Diatribae upon the First Part of the ‘Late History of Tithes’_ (1621) which tackled the question of the legitimacy and history of tithes, as well as _Analecta ecclesiasticarum exercitationum_ (1622) which attempted to refute Roman Catholic church history and vindicate the Church of England. His works showed a remarkable knowledge of patristics, Greek, and Latin. His erudition was supplemented by a caustic and vituperative polemical style that was sure to further rankle Englishmen already opposed to his ideas. Even so, Montagu, hitherto a relatively unremarkable ecclesiastical functionary, could not have foreseen the notoriety that _A New Gagg_ would bring.

Published in 1624 as James I’s reign neared its end, _A New Gagg for an Old Goose_ signaled a dramatic shift in the religious climate. However, the genesis of _A New Gagg_ was rather obscure. Montagu, then rector of Stamford Rivers in Essex, asserted in the introduction to the work that sometime in 1622 Catholics were...
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active in his parish with the intent to proselytize and convert his parishioners. Obviously concerned about this turn of events, he decided to take a confrontational approach, challenging the Catholic missionaries to prove the trueness and righteousness of the Roman Catholic Church and its doctrines. He then drew up three propositions to debate: first, that the present “Roman Church” was not the true catholic Church, that is the legitimate and universal church of Western Christendom; second, the Church of England was in fact the true catholic Church; and third, none of the doctrines which the Roman Catholic Church held contrary to the Church of England were in fact the doctrine of the true catholic Church. Montagu asserted that if any one of them were disproved to his satisfaction, he would convert to Roman Catholicism.

The response came from in the form of the treatise The Gagge for the Reformed Gospell (1623), the authorship of which was unclear. Montagu initially suspected English apostate Matthew Kellison but it was John Heigham of the Jesuit College St Omer and an English Catholic recusant who had published a number of Catholic books as well as smuggling Counter-Reformation works into the country who was most probably the author. His Gagge of the Reformed Gospell leveled various criticisms at Protestant soteriology, especially the doctrine of absolute predestination. Montagu appeared to be unaware of the identity of the author because he did not name him anywhere in A New Gagg. Apparently, the “gagger” had not made a case to his satisfaction because he replied with A New Gagg for an Old Goose. Ostensibly a defense of his church against Roman Catholicism, more ulterior motives were evident in his instructions to his close ally John Cosin to let no “Puritan” see it.54 To defend his church, Montagu made a list of forty-seven points of contention raised by his opponent and proceeded to consider whether they indeed constituted the true Protestant doctrine of the Church of England. In the end, he found that only eight or nine were the truly the doctrine of the Church of England. The points in question included a diverse range of topics, from the efficacy of prayers to saints to baptism, but many revolved around the issue of free will, justifying faith, and the relation of the sacraments to both.

Montagu’s novel response was not to defend the doctrines in question but to distance and disassociate the Church of England from them. With his usual brash and tactless manner, he asserted “against Protestants your Gag is directed, not Puritans and yet all your addresses, well-neer, are against Puritan positions, maliciously imputed to Protestants.”55 Many of the alleged errors of the Church of England were “mere opinions, private fancies, peculiar propositions” of which some were “raked together out of the lay-stalls [dung heaps] of deepest Puritanism, as much opposing the Church of England, as the Church of Rome.” 56 In other words, the Catholic gagger falsely assumed that the Church of England was Calvinist in doctrine. Calvinism was not the doctrine of the Church of England but merely the private opinions and doctrines of Puritans.
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Montagu attacked predestinarian ideas by opposing the Calvinist doctrine of the absolute perseverance of the saints. For example, in examining the sixth point of contention, that the fall of Adam robbed men of their ability to choose between good and evil, he came to three conclusions: firstly, that although man is in a state of corruption he “hath freedome of will in Actions Natural and Civil;” secondly, man “hath free-will in matters moral;” and thirdly, man “hath free will in Actions of Piety, and such as belong unto his salvation.”57 The summary of his conclusions is that no man could draw near to God solely through divine providence but rather a man could do so through his own actions. He consigned the question of the relation between free will and predestination to intricate disputation and academic debate, labeling such questions “points of inextricable obscurity.”58

Montagu’s views on the perseverance of saints are much clearer. He emphatically rejected the view that the Church of England held that the elect could not fall totally and finally from grace. Instead he explicitly stated that there “is no such Conclusion or Article tendered unto the Church of England or resolved of, unto us as of faith.”59 Again, he acknowledged the existence of a wide range of opinions on the subject but in this case argued that the both scripture and the Church Fathers were against the idea that the elect were forever assured of salvation. Quoting Ezekiel, he asserted that a righteous man may do evil and “all his righteousness that he hath done shall not be remembered but in his transgressions that he hath committed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.”60 Man, being mortal, fallible, and corrupt, can resist grace or lose it.

Montagu found absolute predestination to be a perversion of Scripture and he supported his position by applying his understanding of absolute predestination to Peter and Judas.

Peter was saved because that God would have him saved absolutely; and resolved to save him necessarily, because he would so, and no further; that Judas was damned as necessarily, because that God, as absolute to decree, as omnipotent to effect, did primarily to resolve concerning him, and so determine touching him, without respect of any thing but his own will. Insomuch that Peter could not perish, though he would, nor Judas be saved, do what he could.61

This is Montagu’s characterization of the orthodox Calvinism that many Calvinists would have objected was a misrepresentation of their views. Leaving that aside, he believed that absolute and double predestination necessarily completely obviated free will and morality. Furthermore the Church of England publicly opposed and condemned this doctrine.

To begin, he argued that a Christian’s faith and therefore grace are mutable and in flux. He formulated a threefold hierarchy of grace through which men may move. First, a man must move from the state of nature and original sin to a state of
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grace primarily through remission of sin; second, a man may render himself more “just and righteous;” and third, a man may be declared and recognized as “just and righteous.” 62 The concept of a mutable hierarchy of grace in and of itself presented problems for absolute predestination because it implied that grace was not permanent. Coupled with his assertion that one may fall totally and finally from a state of grace, it struck at the heart of Calvinist certainty. It implied that God was not, after all, in control of the universe he had created.

The second assertion, that man could make himself more righteous, clearly indicated that not only was a state of grace impermanent but that man could through his own free will help or hinder his own salvation. The third and final step, that man must be declared righteous – that “his noble acts are made known, and men do praise him for his mercy, goodness, and salvation” – also made the retention of grace contingent on the actions and thoughts of man. 63 Furthermore in his summary of his hierarchy of grace, Montagu made a case for a distinctly different formulation of predestination from the Calvinist model. The change from a state of natural sin to a state of grace

is motion, as they say, betwixt two terms, and consisteth in forgiveness of sins primarily and Grace infused secondarily: both the act of God’s spirit in man, but applied, or rather obtained through faith which represents first God willing, and ready to forgive and renew. Draweth near unto him; closet fast with him. Adhereth unto him inseparably with, I will not let thee go, except thou bless. And God doth return, I will blesse thee pardon thy sins for names sake, and accept thee as mine own in Christ my Son, whose Blood hath made atonement for Man . . . God only justifieth, who alone imputeth not, but pardoneth sin . . . [Only God can] translate us from death unto life, reneweth a right Spirit and createth new heart within us . . . [But God] was drawn thereto by our Faith . . . The Soul of man is the subject of this act. In which, unto which, are necessarily required certain preparations, and previous dispositions. . . . 64

In other words, Montagu believed that man’s faith and actions were instrumental in salvation. Election to everlasting life is contingent on man’s faith: faith is the instrument of salvation of which God is the cause and God offered faith to all. He coupled justifying faith with the belief that good works and charity, while not the sole causes of salvation, were effective demonstrations of a man’s faith. For example, he pointed to I Cor. 13:2 (And though I have the gift of prophesy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge: and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing) as signifying that “Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing. Therefore only faith doth not justify.” 65

Montagu thought that the human will played a much greater role in salvation than many of his peers. He often relegated the intricacies of the points in contention
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to the category of *adiaphora*, things indifferent to salvation and private opinions, and claimed that they were more suited for academic discourse than popular preaching. Even though he admitted that many Englishmen held the points in question as the true doctrine of the Church of England, he asserted that “the learndest in the Church of England” were of the mind that even the elect could lose justifying faith totally and finally. He clearly found double and absolute predestination distasteful and wished to distance the Church of England from them. Having introduced free will into the debate, he envisioned a much greater role for the sacraments, good works, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy in salvation and the maintenance of the Church of England.

In *A New Gagg*, Montagu wrote extensively on the sacraments. He envisioned a large role for the sacraments in achieving salvation. Indeed his emphasis on human will in predestination and emphasis on the sacraments were “logically connected,” with “sacramental grace replacing the grace of predestination.” He devoted sections in his work to the role of baptism, last rites, and transubstantiation. Baptism was the most controversial of these three in England among Puritans, as he was careful to note. However he argued that as “all men are conceived and born in sin . . . one cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and borne anew of water and the Holy Ghost.” In his model, baptism dispenses grace necessary for an infant to be born again and be eligible for entry into Heaven. His insistence on the role of baptism in salvation made sense when the whole of his argument is considered. The role of sacraments in dispensing grace and buttressing justifying faith could only have increased when an individual was required to exercise their own wills in cooperation with divine predestination. He argued vigorously against the inclusion of extreme unction or last rites among the sacraments of the Church of England. But he viewed the remaining sacraments as vehicles through which the Church conferred “inward and spiritual grace” and represented “God’s love and promise, seals of his covenant and grace, and instruments and conveyances of his mercy.”

The Church of England’s stance on baptism was ambiguous. Indeed, the relation of baptism to salvation was a contentious issue in Montagu’s time. The Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer stated that baptized children were made “heirs of everlasting salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ” but their salvation was contingent on adherence to the word of God and his commandments. The sixteenth article, *Of sin after baptism*, of the Thirty Nine Articles (1563) was so ambiguous as to be impenetrable and could be interpreted to support a number of positions. The ceremony of baptism made bold promises on behalf of the baptized child and a body of expositions on the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer in order
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to square them with predestinarian soteriology. Montagu himself took issue with the gagger’s assertion that children could be saved solely by the parents without baptism. Referencing the controversy that surrounded the ceremony of baptism, he complained that the Church of England "had been put to maintain and justify it against schismatical humors, not Papists but Puritans at home." Montagu himself took issue with the gagger’s assertion that children could be saved solely by the parent without baptism. Referencing the controversy that surrounded the ceremony of baptism, he complained that the Church of England "had been put to maintain and justify it against schismatical humors, not Papists but Puritans at home." Again, he did not deny that some held this doctrine but it was merely a private opinion, and the Catholics themselves "would be loth to maintain all private opinions in the Church of Rome." Montagu devoted an entire section to refuting the gagger’s proposition “That the Bread of the Supper is but a figure of the body of Christ.” Here the gagger claimed that the Church of England held the Zwinglian position that the communion was a memorial of Christ’s sacrifice and furthermore that the body and blood of Christ were not physically present. Montagu rejected this claim outright, pointing to the Communion Book, which explicitly stated “the body and blood of Christ taken and eaten in the Lord’s Supper;” the English liturgy stated “This is my body, this is my blood” not “this figureth” or this “defineth.” As for the manner in which this transformation occurred, he considered it a moot question and he refused to delve into the “unexplicable labyrinths of Consubstantiation and Transubstantiation.”

Having asserted that baptism dispensed saving grace, Montagu then made the grace imparted by communion necessary for salvation: “Life, begun in baptism by the laver [wash basin of baptism] of regeneration, is confirmed and sustained in the holy supper by his body and blood.” Furthermore, he placed emphasis on the role of priests in consecrating the host. Citing the ancient apologist Justin Martyr, He explained that it was better to think of the host in terms of bread and wine transformed by consecration by “whom we call Deacons” instead of bread and wine transformed by transubstantiation. Elaborating on this idea, he appealed to the authority of the French Saint Remigius: “The flesh which the Word of God took in the Virgin’s womb, and the Bread consecrated in the Church, are of the same body.” He interpreted Remigius to mean that “the bread which was, being consecrated in the Church, is transubstantiated into that flesh which the Word of God took in the Virgin’s womb, and became the same body.” While he emphasized the miraculous nature of transubstantiation, he simultaneously emphasized the very concrete role of churchmen in effecting it.

Appello Caesarem (1625)
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According to Montagu, *Appello Caesarem* had been written with James I’s encouragement to defend himself in print. James I also instructed Francis White to look over the work to make sure that the book was in agreement with the doctrine of the Church of England.\(^{82}\) Indeed, the book bore the approbation of Francis White which stated that he found “nothing therein, but what is agreeable to the public faith, doctrine and discipline established in the Church of England.”\(^{83}\) However, since the early 1620s White had been identified with the Arminian party and would later defend Montagu at the York House conference, so his approval of the work did not satisfy Calvinists. Furthermore, by the time of publication James I had died and his son Charles I, a man of very different religious inclinations, had taken the throne.

There was significant continuity between the arguments of *Appello Caesarem* and *A New Gagg*. However, in *Appello Caesarem* Montagu was responding to direct criticisms of his previous work. He took his critics to task, saying that what his opponents had supposed to be the true doctrines of the Church of England were in reality “the problematical opinions of private Doctors, to be held or not held either way; or else the fancies many of the of factious men, disclaimed and censured by the Church, not to be held any way.”\(^{84}\) These factious men were “classical Puritans” who wished to pass their “strange determinations, sabbatarian paradoxes, and apocalyptical doctrine” as the doctrine of the Church of England.\(^{85}\) Montagu reiterated many of his arguments from *A New Gagg* but included much more explicit commentary. Reexamining his example of the perverse nature of absolute predestination (that Peter was saved and Judas damned solely because of God’s will), he remained as defiant as ever.\(^{86}\) He flung the attacks on his works back at his critics. In his mind, Calvinists had made “God the Author of Sin” and therefore the author of the treason of Judas.\(^{87}\) The chapter, which he labeled “Dangerous consequences brought by Others, upon the irrespective decree,” was directly addressed to “You Calvinists.”\(^{88}\) Though the substance of the argument is identical, in *Appello Caesarem* Montagu targeted the Calvinists more explicitly than in *A New Gagg*.

Indeed, with the authority of the English monarch behind him, Montagu became bolder. The work was full of broad accusations of “Presbyterian tricks” and “Puritanical refined malice.”\(^{89}\) He continued with his claim to defend the established doctrine of the Church of England versus the opinions of private men or sects. Employing a popular rhetorical device of the time, he asserted that he had not positively resolved any issue of doctrine. He had merely elaborated the established doctrine of the Church of England that was in full agreement with the Church fathers. In other words, *A New Gagg* was an attempt to defend the “consented, resolved, and subscribed Articles of the Church of England” against Catholic
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agitators bent on misconstruing said doctrine.\textsuperscript{90} As for the antique Church, the Church Fathers “affirm more than Mr. Montagu hitherto hath done.”\textsuperscript{91} The ideas that he had espoused in \textit{A New Gagg} were not invented by Montagu and were the established doctrine of the Church long before \textit{A New Gagg} or the author existed.\textsuperscript{92}

In \textit{A New Gagg}, Montagu had issued a challenge to the Catholic gagger. In \textit{Appello Caesarem}, He issued a challenge to his fellow English Protestants. He wanted his critics to point to one article or established confession of faith of the Church of England that contradicted \textit{A New Gagg}; not Arminius, not Calvin, and certainly not the private opinions or fancies of some English churchmen. Montagu did not have to wait long before the challenges came on to the scene.

The term Arminianism was absent from \textit{A New Gagg}. In contrast, the first eleven chapters in \textit{Appello Caesarem} concern Arminianism. Whereas \textit{A New Gagg} was written in response to a Catholic tract, \textit{Appello Caesarem} concerned itself with his fellow English Protestants. Therefore, Montagu directly addressed Arminianism and Calvinism, whereas in \textit{A New Gagg} his views have to be deduced. His critics were undoubtedly Puritans who wished to represent their own private opinions and thoughts as the doctrine of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{93} Terms like “Papist” and “Arminian” were, he contended, merely insults directed against him by malicious Calvinists bent on portraying anyone less Calvinist than themselves as threats to the Church.\textsuperscript{94}

He further elaborated on his criticism of absolute and double predestination through his affirmation of sublapsarianism. This position affirmed that God had divided humanity into the elect and the reprobate after the fall of man in Eden. Supralapsarianism, the position usually held by Calvinists claimed that God had divided humanity into the elect and the reprobate before the fall of man. The crucial distinction between the two positions was that in sublapsarianism man was responsible for his own destruction and in supralapsarianism God was the author of man’s destruction. Thus God created the human race knowing that he would consign the majority of humanity to eternal damnation. This was further evidence on Calvinism’s Antinomian perversion since it made God, not man, the author of sin, destruction, and death.\textsuperscript{95} To the contrary, according to Montagu, man was responsible for his own destruction: “Using his freedom of will not well as he ought, he [Adam] lost his freedom, undid himself and his whole race, then in his loins.”\textsuperscript{96} Adam’s actions caused mankind to be born into original sin, not God’s immutable decree. Thus man was ultimately responsible for his destruction and God lifted the elect out of reprobation through mercy; to argue the contrary meant that God was a capricious being who arbitrarily saved and damned individuals according to his pleasure.
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Montague claimed that he would no more label himself an Arminian than a Calvinist or a Lutheran. If Scripture and the ancient church supported Arminius, then he was an Arminian, and the same for Calvin. Whether or not his positions shared common ground with Arminius was of no import; he would affirm Arminianism as far as scripture supported it. His critics had represented him as an Arminian through “shreds cut out from several parts [of A New Gagg], and laid together again for most advantage to their calumnia.” However, he asserted that the judgment of antiquity was that faith could be lost totally and finally and furthermore that Lutherans held the same tenet. Again, he acknowledged that some men of the Church of England (“reputed learned,” in Montagu’s words) hold that “faith had cannot be lost.” However, they stand in opposition to the Church of England. The opposite opinion had been reaffirmed against Puritan agitators at Hampton Court and therefore all churchmen had consented to them upon receiving benefices or upon consecration. Furthermore, the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England (1563) were contrary to Calvinism. Montagu cited the sixteenth article which read “After that we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart away from grace, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives.” His reading of this article was that the saints might fall from grace and the possibility of returning to that state of grace exists but it is not a certainty.

Montagu also tackled the relation of the Church of England to foreign councils and synods to the Church of England. James I had sent a delegation of English divines to the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) where the Dutch Calvinists had
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Figure 2: Montague’s sublapsarianism compared to Calvinist theologian William Perkin’s supralapsarianism.
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condemned Dutch Arminians and produced a resounding endorsement of Calvinist doctrine in the Canons of Dort. He claimed that it mattered not what a foreign synod had proclaimed since he was bound by the doctrine of the Church of England, not the findings of a foreign synod. Continuing his theme of private opinions versus the public doctrine of the Church of England, Montagu maintained that those men who found the canons of Dort to their liking might subscribe to them. However, he would support the doctrines of Dort only so far as they “consent unto that which I am bound to maintain, the doctrine of the Church of England.” He knew of no decree or statute of Parliament, convocation, or the king that bound him to defend to the decrees of a synod that, in his view, “condemns upon the bye [by implication] the discipline of the Church of England.”

His ideas about the Catholic Church were no less explosive than his arguments about predestination. The Roman Catholic Church was anathema to many English Protestants. Indeed, it was common for the Pope to be labeled the Antichrist.

Montagu denied in their entirety charges that he was a Catholic: “I nor [sic] am, nor have been, nor intend to be hereafter, either Papist, or Romish Catholic; a Papist of State.” Leaving aside any similarities between Montagu’s doctrine and that of the Roman Catholic Church, his views on the nature of the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England relationship to it caused great controversy.

To begin, Montagu claimed that the “Church of Rome is a true, though not a sound Church of Christ.” The Roman Catholic Church, though flawed, did not err in essentials and fundamentals. What he meant by fundamentals were those universal and basic tenets of the Christian faith that all Christians had to believe to be saved. Not all that heretics believed was heresy and not all that Catholics believed was Popery. Some beliefs were central to Christianity in that one must believe in them to be considered a Christian.

The Pope was often identified as the Antichrist in Protestant literature. Montagu argued that the Pope was not demonstrably the Antichrist and furthermore that the question had never been resolved by the Church of England. Using a familiar trope, he asked his critics what “Parliament, Law, Proclamation, or Edict [of the Church of England] did ever command it be professed.” He acknowledged that some English divines or Churchmen held this belief and that Reformed Churches or synods had proclaimed it as fact but maintained that the Church of England had not resolved the question positively or negatively. For example, he acknowledged that the French Reformed Synod of Gap (1603) had inserted into the confession of faith that the Pope was the Antichrist but, in the same way that Montagu denied the authority of the Synod of Dort, he dismissed the authority of the Synod of Gap.

This strain of Montagu’s argument was often emphasized by his critics. They often demanded – before, during, and after – that the Church of England incorporate
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the Articles of the Synod of Dort (1618) or the Articles of the Irish Convocation of 1615. His rejection of the authority of foreign synods, usually Reformed or Calvinist synods, convincingly demonstrated where his sympathies lay. Since his critics generally wanted to bring the Church of England into the fold of the Reformed Churches, they saw his insistence on the fundamental agreement between Canterbury and Rome as evidence that he wanted to bring the Church of England into the fold of the Roman Catholic Church.
Henry Burton was the rector of St. Matthew’s, Friday Street, London. He was formerly the clerk of the closet to Prince Charles and Prince Henry until dismissed from his post for presenting a letter to Charles I accusing Bishops Richard Neile and William Laud of sympathy towards Roman Catholicism. Following his dismissal, Burton began to a series of polemical tracts that attacked Montagu, English Arminians, Roman Catholics, and the English ecclesiastical establishment.\(^\text{111}\)

Burton’s assessment of Montagu was that he championed “all the Arminian heresies” as well as maintaining “many gross points of Popery.”\(^\text{112}\) He was the advance guard of the “prelactical party” that caused Burton “to fall off from the ceremonies” both in conviction and practice.\(^\text{113}\)

Burton’s tract *A Plea to an Appeale* (1626) took the form of a conversation between the layman Asotus, the Jesuit Babylonius, and the Calvinist Orthodoxus. Following an appeal to Charles I and brief section addressed to the reader, the three debated the meaning of the label “Puritan,” the nature of predestination, and the Roman Catholic Church. According to Burton, Montagu made numerous errors in his works. First and most grievously, he misrepresented the doctrine of the Church of England. This error was manifold: Montagu said that the saints may fall from grace and that man’s will worked in concert with God in the achievement of salvation. Furthermore, Montagu characterized anyone who denied these doctrines as Puritans, besmirching many faithful Englishman and dishonoring the Church of England. Finally, Montagu had mischaracterized the English Church as being in total agreement with the Roman Catholic Church in fundamentals while simultaneously denying the authority of the Synod of Dort and other reformed synods, driving a wedge between the Church of England and Reformed churches in Scotland, France, Switzerland, and parts of the German-speaking lands.\(^\text{114}\)

Burton flatly rejected Montagu’s characterization of Puritanism. He labeled the word an “infamous term” and a “reproach.” Charging Montagu with using the term to turn “a peaceable conformist” into a “seditious schismatic,” Burton in turn labeled him an Arminian.\(^\text{115}\) The discussion of the term Puritan in *A Plea to an Appeale* revealed crucial differences in the interpretation of the term. Burton claimed, “Nonconformists only were accounted Puritans.”\(^\text{116}\) A churchman who conformed to the Church of England but wished for further reform was not a Puritan. For example, the same clergyman who inveighed against non-residency and pluralism, balked at thoughts of the mass and idolatry, and urged his parishioners
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keep the Sabbath holy rather than playing sports and drinking could also “practice himself, and preach upon occasion in the defence of ecclesiastical ceremonies” as well as refuse to give communion to those who refused to kneel.\footnote{Ibid.} Therefore, by Montagu’s definition any reformed Christian could be called a Puritan.\footnote{Ibid., sig. a1v.}

Burton accused Montagu not only of Arminian heresy but also “Pontifician [Papist] idolatry.”\footnote{Ibid., sig. a1r.} Similar to Francis Rous’s characterization of Arminianism as a Trojan horse for Roman Catholicism, Burton charged that Montagu was sympathetic towards and in agreement with Rome. \textit{A Plea to an Appeale}, Roman Catholicism and Arminianism were inextricably linked in. He denounced \textit{Appello Caesarem} as a work of “popish Arminianism” and those of Montagu’s ilk were “Pontifician Arminian[s],”\footnote{Ibid., sig. a3r, a4v.} Montagu’s rejection of the authority of the Synod of Dort as well as his claims that the Roman Catholic Church was fundamentally sound particularly irked Burton. He pointed to the fact that although Montagu rejected the authority of the Synod of Dort, he claimed that the Church of England was in agreement with the Council of Trent (in which the Catholic Church condemned Protestantism); that is, “in the main and fundamental points of religion, the Doctrine of the Church of England agreeth with the Council of Trent.”\footnote{Ibid., sig. a2r.} Montagu’s underlying error was his misrepresentation of the fundamentals and essentials of Protestantism. Burton included the perseverance of the saints, absolute predestination, and Calvinist teaching on man’s will and justification in the essentials of the Church of England.\footnote{Ibid., sig. ¶3.}

Therefore, in Burton’s eyes Montagu labored to align the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church, and indeed the Counter-Reformation Council of Trent to the detriment of the Reformed Churches. The Council of Trent was the foundation “of the main fabric of Rome’s religion, consisting in human satisfactions and merits, all devised to fill the vast emptiness of their justification.”\footnote{Ibid., sig. a4v.} Burton concisely explained the relation between Montagu, the Council of Trent and the Synod of Dort:

\begin{quote}
And what spirit, [trow we?] is that man of, or possessed with, that stands so much for the Council of Trent, and so little esteems the Council of Dort? I wot well the Synod of Dort is an adversary to his Arminian Pontifician opinions.\footnote{Ibid., 88.}
\end{quote}

At debate was “to what extent had the English Church truly separate from Rome, and what was her precise relationship with the Reformed Churches of the continent;” a struggle between “different groups within the church... over just how the English Church was to be understood as both ‘Catholic and Reformed.’”\footnote{Milton, 5.} Burton’s answer to the question was twofold: Montagu disparaged the Church of England and in the process the monarchy. He reminded Montagu that
James I helped the Synod come to fruition and sent a team of English divines. Considering how Montagu labored to prove that the Church of England agreed in fundamentals with the Council of Trent, it was presumptuous for him to defame the memory of James I and the authority of the learned English divines who attended the synod. Montagu spent many pages trying to prove that the Synod of Dort held no authority over the Church of England and Burton, as well as Yates, vigorously argued the opposite. Montagu’s critics repeatedly cited that James I lent his authority and his approval to the Synod of Dort.

Furthermore, the men who represented England at the Synod of Dort directly responded to Montagu with “A Joint Attestation avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synod of Dort.” This text was attached to An Examination of those things wherein the author of the late appeale holdeth the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians by Bishop George Carleton, who had himself been a member of the English delegation to the Synod. It challenged Montagu’s assertions that the synod was unlawful and that the synod had condemned the doctrine of the Church of England. Mirroring the later parliamentary prosecution of Montagu, the delegates forcefully argued that they had only affirmed orthodoxy in the face of Arminian heresy with the express approval of the king.

In the preface to his Plea, Burton inveighed against Montagu for destroying the “comfortable certainty of true faith.” Burton’s belief that when his “foot slipped, his [God’s] mercy held me up” was categorically dismissed by Montagu who asserted that the elect may fall totally and finally from a state of grace. Similar to Francis Rous’s assertion that Arminians would make God lackey to the will of man, Burton wrote that Montagu would have men “made thereby Gods, self-sufficient, self-wise, self-able to save themselves, not only in their receiving but retaining grace, which work of their own wills foreseen of God was (say they) the first moving cause of electing and predestinating them to salvation?” Burton thought that Montagu diminished the glory of God and denigrated God’s gift of eternal salvation by making it contingent on men.

John Yates: Puritanism, Ceremonialism, and the House of Commons

John Yates petitioned the House of Commons after A New Gagge and answered Montagu in print following Appello Caesarem. Yates’s polemical career had begun before the appearance of Montagu’s works. Yates’s first work was God’s Arraignment of Hypocrites (1615), a vigorous attack on Arminius himself. It came as no surprise that he quickly responded to Montagu’s second book with his Ibis Ad
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In it, he accused Montagu of fighting against the Church of England “under the ensigne of Arminius.”

Indeed Yates would play a large part in bringing Montagu’s case before the House of Commons. He reprinted his petition to the House of Commons at the end of his *Ibis ad Caesarem* (1626) and therein emphasized the fact that James I had approved of and helped set the Synod of Dort in motion. The king had seen the disorder and chaos that the spread of Arminianism had engendered. Now Montagu sought to spread these same opinions in England, and Yates charged that the result would be the same. Like Burton, he used James I’s approval of the Synod of Dort as a potent political argument against Montagu and reminded Charles I of his father’s actions.

Yates also rejected Montagu’s use of the term Puritan. Yates thought of Puritanism in terms of non-conformity to the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer rather than in doctrinal terms: “Neither Church nor State presumeth to judge the secrets of the heart, or condemn them for rebels, that religiously and dutifully conform themselves to order and government.” If Montagu’s redefinition of Puritanism were accepted, Calvinists who conformed to the Church of England would be included among Puritans and thus excluded. Yates claimed that Montagu portrayed Calvinists as schismatics loyal to the foreign “Geneva discipline” merely because they were in agreement in most points of doctrine. Montagu could easily be labeled an Arminian using the same logic. Yates proceeded to throw the charge of Puritanism back in Montagu’s face, claiming that he fit the label of Puritan better since he was the cause of disturbance in the Church of England and his writings, at least in broad themes, were very similar to Arminius. Yates recognized the true intention of Montagu’s redefinition of Puritanism: to “measureth a Puritan with Spalatois met-wand [measuring stick] concerning Free-will: God the author of sin; the good pleasure of God in damming many without cause.”

Much as Burton had, Yates criticized Montagu’s soteriology by examining the relationship between Christ’s death, God, and man’s free will. Montagu sought to make man copartner with God in salvation. Montagu, Yates claimed, made the argument that God can “do nothing but what the will of man imposeth upon him [God].” God’s will works upon all men infallibly and it made little sense to argue that Christ’s death had been sufficient for all men. Yate’s reasoning was that God chose Jesus Christ, his son, to die for the sins of all mankind. Yet God the Father remained the final arbiter of election and reprobation: “The Father hath begun a
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divine work for us: the Son by his death, resurrection intercession, hath fully dispensed it.”

Thus faith in Christ was only effective in so far as God chose which Christians it was effective upon.

Whereas Burton’s writing on the liturgy emphasized his conformity to the Book of Common Prayer to refute the imputation of Puritanism, Yates attacked Montagu for his liturgical innovations. Most of the liturgical material in A New Gagge and Appello Caesarem focused on the use of sacraments, but also the use of images and the excessive use of ceremonial forms like the sign of the cross. His underlying concern was that the sacraments and ceremonial forms were being imbued with holiness in and of themselves, placing them on the same level as preaching and godly worship. It was similar to conflict between the Zwinglian idea of the Eucharist as representative of the sacrifice of Christ versus the view that bread and wine transformed into the body and blood of Christ therefore making an actual reenactment of the sacrifice of Christ; in other words, were sacraments and ceremonial forms merely representations of God’s grace or actual instruments for dispensing God’s grace?

In terms of the use of images, Yates took issue with the assertions that religious images were useful for inspiring religious devotion in the liturgy, that they were appropriate subjects for religious veneration, that the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church’s views on the use of images were identical, and that images were especially useful for illiterate “simple people.” Predictably, he thought that these views inclined to Popish ceremonialism. His main concern was that Montagu was blurring the distinction between images used as representations of faith and idolatrous worship of the images themselves. “Popish” bits and baubles should never take precedence over preaching.

What concerned Yates more was the ceremonialism creeping into Montagu’s liturgy. The signing of the cross presented an interesting example. Yates took no issue with its use in baptism and freely acknowledged that the Church of England mandated its use. The real issue was what its use signified. He took it as a profession of faith that signified the entrance of the baptized child into the fold of Christendom. In the same way he took the image of the cross or the crucifix to be representative of the miracles of God or Christ’s sacrifice but rejected that the representations held any power in and of themselves. By contrast, Montagu had strayed into Popish territory when he claimed that both the sign of the cross and the representation were imbued with holiness, and he strayed into pagan superstition when he claimed that they might work wonders. “It is Idolatry now to put virtue in the cross,” Yates asserted, “[and] superstition to use it more frequently then Papists.”
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Montagu and the Parliament of 1624: The Troublesome Cleric

Yates and Samuel Ward bridged the gap between the clerical opposition and lay opposition by submitting a petition to the House of Commons following the publication of *A New Gagge*. Indeed, the 1624 Parliament was the first time Arminianism came before the House of Commons. This was evident from the confusion about the nature of the charges, how to effectively proceed, and even how the work was published in the first place. Very few MPs in the 1624 Parliament were “theologically alert” enough to appreciate Montagu’s arguments. When the theologically astute John Pym accused Montagu of Arminianism, even the staunch Calvinist Sir Walter Earle suggested instead the charge of Arianism, a heresy concerning the distinction between the human and divine natures of Christ from the fourth century AD. Indeed in the absence of any awareness of what “English Arminianism” was, the definition would have to be created in large part through what it was defined against, namely English Calvinism. Dutch Arminianism and English involvement in the Synod of Dort were the only reference points available to the Commons in 1624:

The strength of these accusations [of Yates and Ward] derived from the political associations of the Dutch Arminians. No English divine in the early seventeenth century called himself an Arminian. The petition of Yates and Ward to the 1624 parliament was the first in a series of opposing certain doctrinal and ceremonial attitudes, effectively defined English Arminianism. In 1624 this definition was essentially still unformed.

The Commons was initially confused over whether it could even discuss Montague and whether it was more advisable to defer the matter to Convocation or to initiate a joint prosecution with the House of Lords. MPs could draw from a large body of precedent of prosecuting Roman Catholics, recusants, and even errant bishops. The only recorded “Calvinist activists” for House of Commons in 1624 were Thomas Wentworth and John Pym, who from the 1624 Parliament onward took leadership of the prosecution of Montagu. However most MPs were more concerned with foreign policy matters and the prosecution of controversial Lord Treasurer Lionel Cranfield. They had little time or appetite to deal with a troublesome cleric who had published some controversial books. It was plainly evident that Arminianism was not an issue at all, except in relation to the condemnation of Dutch Arminianism at the Synod of Dort and concerns that Montagu’s ideas inclined to popery.

In the end the Commons decided the safest course of action was to refer the matter to Convocation:

‘After much debate,’ reported Sir Simonds D’Ewes, ‘and dislike of the book being so offensive to the state, yet not willing to become judges in so deep points of religion, it was ordered to send the book and petition to my Lord’s
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Grace of Canterbury, entreated him to take such course in it as he in his wisdom should think fit."\textsuperscript{148}

Thus the matter fell into the hands of Archbishop George Abbot. He proved unable to control the troublesome cleric and his attempts to resolve the matter were ultimately ineffectual. The only result, to the frustration of the Commons, was a light rebuke and an admonishment to not publish any more works until the fallout from the first could be sorted out, which was ignored.\textsuperscript{149} Following the Archbishop of Canterbury’s botched handling of the ordeal, the Commons proved much more ready to deal with Montagu directly. Indeed it was only in the first Parliament of Charles I’s reign that extensive opposition in the House of Commons would develop.

\textit{Montagu and the Parliament of 1625: The Development of Opposition}

The contentious relationship between Richard Montagu and the House of Commons from 1624-1629 was an important indicator of lay attitudes towards the growing controversy. While clerical critics of Montagu published lengthy and learned responses to him, lay critics usually responded with action in Parliament rather than polemical tracts. Therefore Parliamentary debate about and Parliamentary maneuvering against Montagu provide our best sources of lay attitudes. As Nicholas Tyacke has pointed out,

Direct evidence, however, of lay attitudes is relatively hard to find. Hence the importance of the debates of the 1620s, in the House of Commons, provoked by the anti-Calvinist writings of Richard Montagu. Beginning with a petition to Parliament in 1624, the Montagu case involved the educated laity with these questions as never before. . . Throughout these debates Montagu’s books were the chief concern, although his opponents increasingly linked them with a wider conspiracy to subvert the established teachings of the English Church.\textsuperscript{150}

Though the monarch was supreme governor of the Church of England, the monarch and Parliament were historical copartners in establishing orthodox doctrine and liturgy. Thus the debate over Montagu in the House of Commons took on a political dimension that was absent in the ecclesiastical sphere. Layman John Pym, step-brother to Francis Rous and a fellow-Puritan, was indisputably the lead prosecutor of Montagu in the Commons, and his convictions concerning religion illustrated the religious assumptions of many MPs. For these men, absolute and double predestination formed part of the essentials of the Church of England as well as international Protestantism. Furthermore, these doctrines were the law of land backed up by an act of Parliament. Arminianism was an affront to the Church of England and to Protestantism. It was therefore a politically subversive and destabilizing force.\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{148} Schwartz, 45.
\textsuperscript{149} Cosin, \textit{Correspondence}, I 78.
\textsuperscript{150} Anti-Calvinists, 125.
Political circumstances exacerbated the controversy surrounding *Appello Caesarem*. James I died on March 27 1625, and therefore his son, Charles I, was the new king. James I had effectively precluded debate on *A New Gagge* during his reign. As previously mentioned, clergymen John Yates and Nathaniel Ward petitioned the House of Commons in protest *A New Gagge*. James I had reacted furiously and threatened “to make the kingdom too hot” for Yates and Ward. However, Charles I’s religious inclinations were unknown, and although Montagu hoped for support from Charles, his fate remained very much in doubt. An astonishingly virulent outbreak of the plague struck London and another “popish plot” scare was gripping the English nation. Charles I was negotiating for the hand of French princess Henrietta Maria and the prospect of marriage to a foreign Roman Catholic inevitably stoked the zeal of a country in which anti-Catholicism was a defining characteristic of national identity. The relaxation of recusancy laws as part of the marriage treaty and the fact that Parliament was largely kept in the dark about the status of negotiations only served to inflame the grievances.

At the beginning of Charles I’s reign, both Montagu’s allies and enemies maneuvered to gain royal support. John Buckeridge, John Howson, and William Laud lobbied George Villiers, duke of Buckingham, the favorite of both kings, for support and intervention in favor of Montagu. Archbishop George Abbott and his chaplains attempted to halt the publication of *Appello Caesarem* but to no avail. Before the opening of the first Parliament, it was reported that Charles I had resolved to leave Montagu’s fate to Parliament, perhaps as a sop to MPs angry over his foreign policy and his demand for increased funds. It remained to the House of Commons to make the first decisive moves against Montagu in the first Parliament of Charles I’s reign. With the Commons already in a black mood over religion, Montagu was an easy target for religious grievances.

The first Parliament of Charles I’s reign commenced on June 18 1625 and religious grievances were aired immediately. In the 1625 Parliament, some MPs asserted in their speeches and committee reports that Montagu’s works were linked to the growth of Roman Catholicism in England. They alleged that Richard Montagu’s works were “an encouragement to Popery.” This allegation was coupled with a charge of publishing works contrary to the Articles of Religion established by authority of Parliament. The fact that James I had sanctioned the publication of *A New Gagge* and *Appello Caesarem* made the case more politically sensitive. Montagu was duly called before the House of Commons on this matter, and he claimed in his testimony that James I had approved of both books.

Despite the revelation that the late King James I had lent his approval to Montagu’s books, on July 7 the committee assembled to review the cleric’s works
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presented their findings. The committee touched briefly on *A New Gagg* by recommending that the Commons forgo judgment upon the book until a conference with the Lords could be organized and a suitable measure drawn up to prevent a repeat of the controversy.\textsuperscript{160} *Appello Caesarem* was the target of the majority of abuse because by publishing it Montagu had allegedly disturbed the body politic.\textsuperscript{161}

Each general charge was broken down into several constituent points.\textsuperscript{162} Elaborating on the first charge, the committee focused on James I’s opposition to Dutch Arminianism and his censure of Arminian theologian Conrad Vorstius.\textsuperscript{163} The Commons proceeded carefully on this charge because of the revelation that James I had approved *A New Gagg*. Therefore they concentrated on Arminianism as a soteriological position condemned by English divines at the Synod of Dort with James I’s blessing: “the Committee conceiveth, the Fire kindled in the Low Countries by Arminius, like to be kindled here likewise by” Montague.\textsuperscript{164} While many clerical critics of Montagu had criticized him on both these accounts, the Commons committee used them as a potent political argument against him. As a corollary to the second charge, Parliament accused Montagu of publishing material contrary to the Thirty-Nine Articles as well as disrespecting the authority of Parliament.

The second charge concerned Montagu’s views on both Puritanism and the Roman Catholic Church. The committee immediately seized upon his redefinition of Puritanism. They rejected his claim that Puritanism can be defined in doctrinal terms. To say that “there are Puritans in heart” drew no distinction between those who do conform and those who do not.\textsuperscript{165} For example, Montagu asserted that “Mr. Ward and Mr. Yates are Puritans, and yet these are men that subscribe and conform.”\textsuperscript{166} Recusancy and non-conformity were already defined by statute, not Montagu’s opinions on doctrine. Interestingly, the Commons treated Montagu’s definition of Puritanism as a political issue and not a doctrinal issue. By defining Puritanism in terms of doctrine, Montagu sought to drive a wedge between the sovereign and his subjects by driving conformist Calvinists out of the Church of England. Therefore Montagu was actually guilty of disturbing the peace of the Church and State. “For by his opinion,” the report warned, “we may be all Puritans.”\textsuperscript{167} Furthermore, after slandering conformist Englishmen as Puritans, Montagu then affirmed the Roman Catholic Church to be a true, though flawed, church. The Commons took this as encouraging Englishmen to “persevere in popery” and also alleged that Montagu’s works found great favor amongst the “Papists.”\textsuperscript{168}

The third charge accused Montagu of publishing material that openly contradicted the Thirty Nine Articles and doing it when a complaint stood against him in the Commons. The first part of the charge stated that he had offended the
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authority of Parliament as an institution. Since Parliament had affirmed the Thirty-Nine Articles and various other religious statements, it was offensive to the “jurisdiction and liberty of Parliament” to publish opinions contrary to the Thirty-Nine Articles. The document failed to explain exactly how Montagu transgressed the Thirty-Nine Articles but the charge provided further justification for the Commons move against him. The second charge was fairly straightforward, as John Yates and Nathaniel Ward had petitioned the House of Commons following the publication of A New Gagg. Montagu had not only published Appello Caesarem while the petition was being considered in the Commons and the Lords, but also had the temerity to directly slander “the two unjust informers” while they were under the protection of Parliament.

Although the committee claimed that “there be tenets in that first book [A New Gagge] contrary to the Articles of Religion established by Act of Parliament,” they recommended that the Commons “forbear till some seasonable time to desire a conference with the Lords that course may be taken to repair the breaches of the Church and prevent the like boldness of private men hereafter.” To strengthen the case against Montagu, the Commons created a subcommittee to more closely examine Montagu’s works for seditious ideas that posed a danger to the English body politic. He was allowed to defend himself in absentia through a petition to the Commons, but no copy has survived. He was brought to the bar of the Commons and the duly informed that he was guilty of contempt [against the Commons.] He could either surrender to the sergeant-at-arms or post bond to guarantee his appearance at the next session of Parliament.

However, when the Commons presented their petition of grievances against Montagu the king informed them that he was now a royal chaplain in ordinary and that the king would take care of the matter personally. Convocation would judge Montagu, not the assembled laymen of the Commons. The Solicitor of the Commons protested that they were not aware of this fact and that the Commons had already found Montagu guilty of contempt. Charles’s simply “smiled without any further reply.”

Members of the House of Commons had once again been frustrated by royal intervention in favor of Montagu, but they could do no more than recommend that he should be publicly censured. The outcome of the brief 1625 Parliament did not bode well for the relationship between Montagu, the king and Parliament.

The proportionately large amount of time spent by the House of Commons on one troublesome cleric was indicative of the deep interest and concern for religion in England... The Commons proceeded outwardly as if Montagu were only guilty of contempt, but the real motive was a firm wish to prohibit his theological ideas... The King by his intervention revealed, at least indirectly, where his religious sympathies lay.
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Richard Montagu had driven a significant wedge between the King and Parliament. However, Montagu was still not home free, even though the king would soon make him a bishop. Though the prosecution against him stalled due to royal intervention, the 1625 House of Commons had taken a decidedly larger interest in his case than the previous year’s House. In a pattern that would repeat itself in each successive Parliament, the support of the court for the troublesome cleric only increased opposition. In the 1624 Parliament, the controversy over Montagu was confined to himself but the support of the court caused MPs to question where the king’s sympathies lay. With Calvinist Archbishop Abbot seemingly impotent, royal intervention caused many MPs to question where the Church of England stood on the doctrinal dispute. If the author of such a “dangerous book” was a royal chaplain, did that mean there ideas contained therein “the doctrine of the church of England?” Such questions caused a proliferation of Calvinist activists in the 1625 Parliament. Whereas Wentworth and Pym were recorded as the only MPs who took any significant interest in Montagu’s case in the 1624 session, many MPs in 1625 took up the cause: Sir Heneage Finch, Laurence Whitaker, Francis Drake, Sir George, and Sir Robert More. Furthermore in the following year the two controversial books would be debated by learned clergyman in the presence of powerful laymen and the royal favorite George Villiers at the York House Conference.

The York House Conference (1626)

George Villiers, duke of Buckingham, the royal favorite whom Charles I had inherited from his father, played a crucial role in the controversy over Montagu until the duke’s assassination in 1628. Already a target of criticism because of his lavish and preferential treatment by James I, Buckingham came under fire following debate in Parliament for patronage of the “semi-Pelagian and Popish faction” who espoused “liberty of free will” in salvation. One observer of the controversy opined that “The Duke is the great protector of the Montagutians; so that the business of religion is like to follow his standing or downfall.” Having failed to punish Montagu in 1625, disgruntled members of both houses of the 1626 Parliament sought to force the issue by procuring a disputation on his works. Laymen Robert Rich, second earl of Warwick, and William Fiennes, first viscount Saye and Sele secured the conference. They emphasized the fact that James I had approved and help set the Synod of Dort in motion and saw an opportunity to force Buckingham’s hand on the religious controversy. Up to the York House conference, Buckingham had supported both the “Montaguists” and powerful Calvinists. Chief among Buckingham’s Calvinist clients was influential and erudite John Preston, former chaplain-in-ordinary to Prince Charles, preacher at Lincoln’s
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Inn, and master of Emmanuel College. Seizing on Preston’s dissatisfaction with Buckingham’s support of Montagu, the peers urged Preston to “put it [Montagu’s works] to an issue” and force the duke to “leave the rotten and corrupted [Arminian] clergy.” In this way, the controversy “might come to a debate, and not remain, as it now did, unsettled.”

Montagu’s allies were uneasy at the prospect of the conference. Prior to it, John Buckeridge, John Howson, and William Laud lobbied Buckingham for support and intervention in favor of Montagu. Their main fear was that the Calvinist bishops and laymen would convince Buckingham to support confirming the resolutions of the Synod of Dort as the official doctrine of the Church of England. This move would render moot Montagu’s insistence that the foreign synod held no authority over the Church of England and be the first step towards political evisceration of the Arminian party. However, following the House of Commons’ attack on Montagu in 1625, the presence of powerful lay peers at the conference meant the possibility of persuading some of the members of the House of Lords to the Arminians’ side. Furthermore, the presence of the favorite meant that royal patronage and support was at stake. Both parties’ success depended on their ability to persuade the laymen present.

The York House Conference lasted only two days (11 and 17 February). On the 11th, Montagu, though summoned to the conference, failed to appear and like-minded allies defended him. John Buckeridge, bishop of Rochester and former chaplain to James I, was the principle spokesman for Montagu. Francis White, dean of Carlisle – responsible for the licensing of Appello Caesarem -- and John Cosin – responsible for the licensing of A New Gagg -- attended the conference at the last minute with Buckeridge since both had been involved in the publication of both books. Thomas Morton, bishop of Lichfield was present as Montagu’s chief accuser. The learned Calvinist John Preston was also present but did not participate in the conference until nearly the end of the first debate. Among the laymen present, James Hay, earl of Carlisle was the sole supporter of Montagu. William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, Robert Rich, earl of Warwick, William Fiennes, Viscount Saye and Sele, and Secretary John Coke attended in support of Morton. The assembled laymen sat as “auditors” while Buckingham fulfilled the role of moderator. Ostensibly the issue at hand was whether the Gagg and Appello contained anything contrary to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, though the conference became a proxy trial of Arminianism and Calvinism.

By all accounts, the first day of the conference was a triumph for Montagu’s allies. The objections raised fell into two categories: (1) the Church of England’s relationship to the Roman Catholic Church and to Christendom as a whole, and the Synod of Dort and (2) Montagu’s views on the sacraments, the perseverance of the saints, and soteriology. The two charges overlapped in many cases.
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The first charge concerning the Roman Catholic Church and Christendom was the assertion that General Councils could not err in fundamentals or things necessary to salvation. This, so Morton claimed, contradicted the twenty first article of the Church of England which read in part “things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.” Morton’s objection raised the oft-debated point as to what exactly constituted the fundamentals or essentials of the Christian faith, with Morton accusing Montagu of having in mind “Catholic Roman fancy and infallible madness.” Morton was pointing to the controversial assertion that “Not all that papists say is popery” and more specifically the claim that the Church of England agreed in fundamentals with the Council of Trent. Buckeridge spoke, claiming that even though Trent was not a true general council, it had not erred in anything “fundamental or necessary to salvation.” Buckeridge pointed out that the Council of Trent had stated that the Nicene Creed established at the first general council in the history of Christianity was the “unicum fundamentum fidei [the only foundation of faith],” and therefore anything else that the council determined was not fundamental or necessary to salvation. Morton, while agreeing that the first four ancient ecumenical councils were generally sound, angrily claimed that Montagu seemed to contradict himself when talking about the authority of ecumenical councils especially Roman Catholic councils. On this point Saye concurred, accusing Montagu of prevarication and doublespeak. The unspoken difference between Morton and Montagu, identical to the difference between Montagu and Burton, was that Morton’s definition of fundamentals was more inclusive, including the Calvinist doctrine of absolute and double predestination. Buckingham finally asserted his authority of as moderator, concluding that given Montagu’s definition of fundamentals and his qualification of the authority of ecumenical councils, he had not contradicted the Thirty-Nine Articles. Having been overruled by Buckingham, Morton then charged Montagu with violating the eleventh article, specifically that Christians are saved not for their “works or deservings” but are saved “by faith only.” Morton vigorously objected to the inclusion of “hope and holiness, the fruits of the Spirit in good works. All these,” Morton protested, “besides God and faith.” White responded that the Church of England recognized good works, in the twelfth article, as the results of election and faith and not as intrinsic to the act of being saved. Montagu had merely built on this concept. White elaborated by quoting the Appello Caesarem: the author acknowledged “instrumentally faith alone” and “causally God alone” in the act of
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election with good works merely the “fruits and consequences” of election.\textsuperscript{194} Morton protested that the overall effect of these words was to bring the Church of England closer to Roman Catholicism and make good works intrinsic to salvation. Morton then changed tack by leveling a series of critiques on the use of the words “merits” and “deservings”\textsuperscript{195} and his views on the number of sacraments in the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{196} White and Cosin adroitly defended Montagu on all topics, and Buckingham professed that he found nothing contrary to the Thirty Nine Articles. The religious semantics began to wear on the patience of the laymen present when the lay peer Saye for the first time in the conference explicitly broached the topic of Arminianism.

“The chiefest matter of all is yet behind,” Saye declared, “which is touching falling away from grace and concerning the definitions of the synod of Dort against Arminianism, wherein Dr. Preston shall speak.”\textsuperscript{197} The debate shifted from away from a conference on the two books and into an open debate about the perseverance of saints. Montagu’s allies, previously on the defensive, now had a chance to attack their opponents. White immediately criticized double and absolute predestination by asking if a man “prodigal in acts of drunkenness and whoredom” could still be in the grace of God.\textsuperscript{198} He then answered his own question by affirming that a man who was in a state of sin could not be justified or declared righteous before God. “Praedestinatio nihil point in praedestinato [predestination supposes/implants nothing in the predestined],” White explained.\textsuperscript{199} Saving grace is contingent on remission of sins and repentance. Thus any Christian could lose faith or fall into perdition and, barring repentance and renewed faith, be damned to Hell.

Preston countered that God is the final arbiter of salvation and damnation and explained the concept through a series of metaphors, presumably for the benefit of the laymen present. Two men might commit the same sin but one being among the elect, “the children of God,” would feel his father’s wrath but would not and could not be cast out of God’s family.\textsuperscript{200} Similarly, Preston explained, “two tenants of God, not paying their rent, or keeping covenants, forfeited their leases; yet the Lord might seize the one, and not the other, as He pleased.”\textsuperscript{201} Furthermore, God would necessarily raise the elect out of a state of sin, repairing them to a state of grace.\textsuperscript{202} The elect might temporarily sin or lose faith but the seed of God remained in them and guaranteed that they would not fall totally and finally into reprobation. If a Christian did, then he was never among the elect to begin with.

White and Cosin seized on this statement, decrying it as “the way to all licentiousness and looseness.”\textsuperscript{203} They claimed that if the elect were subject only to
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God’s wrath and temporary punishment then the elect were essentially free from moral law and free to commit sin. If the elect were destined for salvation, then it followed they must have repented their sins. Cosin and White’s line of questioning relied on the same argument that Calvinism was equivalent to antinomian perversion that Montagu had labored to expose with his exposition of the logic of absolute and double predestination applied to St. Peter and Judas.204 “If I shall be saved, I shall be saved” was Montagu’s characterization of this belief. By using this line of attack White and Cosin, and many other anti-Calvinists, could caricature absolute and double predestination as equivalent to the beliefs of decidedly radical groups in the Protestant spectrum; in other words, doctrinally outside of the Church of England.

It was now the Cosin and White’s turn to accuse Preston and Morton of violating the doctrine of the Church of England. Cosin and White pointed to the Church of England’s teaching on baptism and grace. The exchange is instructive because it highlights the different views that the two camps had on the role of sacraments in dispensing grace and achieving salvation. White pointed to the catechism’s description of baptism, which read “None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost.”205 He interpreted this as meaning that in “baptism they were made the sons of God, and the heirs of everlasting life.”206 White pointed out that this statement implied that baptism was necessary to salvation, which was difficult to reconcile with absolute and double predestination. Pressing on with his critique, White asked what was the point of baptism if those baptized “received no grace, nor remission of sins by it?”207 Even St. Augustine, usually cited and associated with absolute predestinarian views, wrote in his Epistles “Quicumque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi perditione liberari, et salutem percipere aeternam, anathema sit. [Anyone who denies that the children are to be freed by the destruction of the baptism of Christ, and to receive eternal salvation, let him be.]”208 Morton, the anti-Calvinist disputants claimed, disparaged the Church of England and his own ministry by debasing the sacrament of baptism.

White’s line of argument intrigued Buckingham who queried Morton as to whether he believed in the efficacy of baptism. Morton scoffed at the notion that baptism dispensed saving grace in and of itself, and he asked White “will you have the grace of God tied to Sacraments?”209 Morton asserted that “election was a perquisite of sacramental efficacy” and that the Catechism charitably assumed that the child being baptized numbered among the elect.210 The layman Saye concurred, arguing that one should not take the language of the Catechism literally. It was a “judgment of charity” because election or reprobation were unknowable, and Morton elaborated that only God could know whether the child was destined for
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election or reprobation.\textsuperscript{211} White countered that logically this meant that preaching, among other services provided by the Church and its ministry, were only effective for the elect. Through the debate over the sacraments, White was able to oppose a common idea among Calvinists that the church consisted solely of the “company of God’s elect and chosen.”\textsuperscript{212} This defined membership in the Church as equivalent to election which, since not all members of the “physical” Church could be elect, created the problem of an invisible Church within the Church. In the Arminians’ minds, this idea was unacceptable because it rendered the Church of England’s ministry and ecclesiastical personnel useless. If election based on God’s immutable decree was the only prerequisite for membership in the church and salvation, then everything else – the liturgy, the sacraments, the ministry, etc. – were at best redundant or at worst useless. Buckingham concurred.

The first day’s conference, having reviewed all the charges against \textit{A New Gagg} and \textit{Appello Caesarem}, was ready to disband and reconvene at a date when the author could be present to defend himself when Saye and Coke moved that the canons of Dort be established as authoritative in the Church of England. White responded immediately by implying “your lordships” that the “Church of England be not put to borrow a new faith from any village in the Netherlands.”\textsuperscript{213} The Synod of Dort wronged the Church of England by reserving Christ’s death and the sacraments solely for the elect. The “Dortist” doctrine would only denigrate the Church of England, its sacraments, and the gift of salvation promised to all in baptism. The earls of Pembroke and Carlisle spoke in support of Montagu and White, saying “Let the Synod of Dort bind them that have submitted themselves unto it.” Buckingham concurred, opining that “We have nothing to do with that synod; it is all hidden and intricate points of predestination, which are not fit matters to trouble people withal.”\textsuperscript{214} Cosin elaborated on this sentiment by clarifying “the conclusion of that Article [Article Seventeen “Of Predestination and election]” was that predestination should be taught within the Church of England, but not in a way that disparaged the Gospel, the Church, and its sacraments.\textsuperscript{215}

Buckingham was pleased with Cosin and White’s performance. Morton and Preston failed on all counts, even failing to secure a stay on publishing the two books. One day remained in the conference but it was already apparent that the royal favorite, and by proxy the king, was disowning Montagu’s opponents.

The second session of the conference was held on February 17 and dealt with many of the same issues as the first. Montagu had the opportunity to respond in person to the objections raised during the first session but his responses did not differ significantly from White and Cosin’s.\textsuperscript{216} However, Preston took over the prosecution from Morton and covered some new ground. Preston’s first objection was what he called the “Doctrine of Traditions.”\textsuperscript{217} Preston took issue with the
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statement in *A New Gagg* that “unwritten traditions” and “written instructions” had “a like force unto piety.”\(^{218}\) The implication of this idea, that “religious ceremonies ceased to be a matter of ‘indifference’ and became instead obligatory by divine law” – could not have been lost on Preston.\(^{219}\) Preston pointed to several traditions in Christianity such as praying in a certain direction or the use of oil in baptism that, while considered canonical and traditional in other Christian denominations, were rejected by the Church of England. Furthermore Preston alleged that the support for this statement was based on a Roman Catholic gloss of St Basil.\(^{220}\)

Having attacked ceremonialism, Preston moved on to the Arminian charges by attacking Montagu’s conception of absolute and double predestination.\(^{221}\) He rejected the notion that election was based on faith or works foreseen. Election must impart some inherent quality to the elect. According to Preston, the question boiled down to “whether saving grace were an effect, or fruit, of election or no?”\(^{222}\) If a Christian had saving grace, then he numbered among the elect. If he did not, then he had never done so. Saving grace was the cause and election the effect.\(^{223}\) If one could fall from the state of grace then the term was meaningless. Arguing that Christ’s death was sufficient for all or that saving grace was common to all resulted in the same conclusion.

With the conference rapidly drawing to a close, White wearily voiced the sentiment that “it is a matter very difficult, and peradventure impossible in this life, exactly and distinctly to declare the whole manner and order of divine election, and how the same being one eternal and simultaneous act in God is to be conceived according to several acts in our apprehension.”\(^{224}\) In the end Montagu promised to write a book in “butter and honey” in order to explain the controversial aspects of his works more fully.\(^{225}\) However some of the laymen again urged that the canons of Dort be established as the official doctrine of the Church of England, but the proposal was shot down again.

The York House Conference did not resolve any doctrinal issue nor did it quell the growing controversy. However the conference marked the point in which Montagu and his like-minded allies “emerged as the effective spokesmen of the English Church.”\(^{226}\) Many Calvinist peers were unhappy with Preston’s performance and were disappointed that the troublesome cleric was not effectively prosecuted.\(^{227}\) Throughout the conference Buckingham had shown favor to Montagu’s ideas. According to Preston, Buckingham decided to side with Arminian faction.\(^{228}\) Cosin reported that following the conference Charles I swore “perpetual
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patronage of our cause.” 229 The favorite’s failure to endorse the Calvinist bid to make the resolutions of Dort part of the doctrine of the Church of England or endorse the censure of Richard Montagu alienated many of his former allies. However the support of the royal favorite would actually work against Montagu. Following the York House Conference and Buckingham’s alienation of his Calvinist allies, the 1626 Parliament launched concerted and effective attack against the duke. Unfortunately for Montagu, his name was now linked to the increasingly unpopular royal favorite.
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Montagu’s situation grew increasingly worse following the York House Conference. The support of lay and clerical authorities only served to make Montagu a more prominent target for Parliament. Buckingham’s support of the recalcitrant cleric linked the two men to the detriment of both. Buckingham, already under heavy criticism because of his status as failed expeditions to Cadiz (among other things), further infuriated his enemies by protecting Montagu. Furthermore a conference of bishops consisting of Montaigne, Neile, Andrewes, Buckeridge, and Laud had determined that the Gagg and Appello contained nothing contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England.\footnote{Laud, \textit{Works}, 6:249.} The bishops had gone further and asserted that Parliament did not have the right to judge matters of doctrine.\footnote{Heylyn, 137.} Montagu’s case was igniting a power struggle between Parliament, the king, and the Church about the right to judge doctrine. Thus English Arminianism rapidly acquired a political element in addition to its doctrinal and liturgical innovations: “resistance to Parliamentary judgments upon religious matters (interpreted broadly), reliance upon royal authority for protection of orthodoxy, [and] refusal to accept the doctrine of the Church of England as understood by Parliament.”\footnote{Schwartz, 52.}

Thus in the aftermath of York House, Charles I’s intervention on behalf of Montague, and the support of several bishops for Montague, his case became heavily politicized. Montagu’s doctrine was now tied to the royal favorite Buckingham, the king, and increasingly the ecclesiastical establishment. Charles I’s insistence that he would deal with Montagu personally, coupled with Montagu’s insistence that his doctrinal soundness could not be judged by Parliament, angered Parliament. They pointed to a long history of Parliament cooperating with the sovereign to establish doctrine: the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, the Thirty Nine Articles, and legislation concerning recusants.

The Commons established a general committee on religion in addition to a subcommittee to specifically examine Montagu’s works to make preparations for a conference with the Lords. The committee reiterated the charges brought against Montagu in the 1625 Parliament, stating that Montagu held opinions contrary to the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England and that were also condemned at the Synod of Dort, was sympathetic to Roman Catholicism, and accused conformist Englishmen of being Puritans. The York House Conference was discussed, especially Montagu’s promise to write a book in "butter and honey" instead of “in gall and
vinegar.” The committee was unimpressed and agreed to make preparations for a conference with the Lords.

However, the controversy over Montagu had begun to bleed into the impeachment of Buckingham. Montagu was repeatedly used as evidence of Buckingham’s religious malfeasance. The York House Conference had come to a close on February 17 during the first days of Parliament. Many laymen were unhappy with the performance of Preston and even unhappier that Buckingham had favored the “Montaguists” during the conference. Buckingham’s unwillingness to support censure of or a ban on the publication of his works as well as his statement that the Church of England was not bound by the Synod of Dort infuriated many members of the 1626 Parliament. Split from his Calvinist allies, Buckingham was the target of a series of religiously motivated attacks. Segueing from the charge that Buckingham was responsible for installing men sympathetic to Roman Catholicism in positions of power, the rabidly anti-Arminian Sir Walter Erle complained that “Montagu receives too much countenancing from the Duke [of Buckingham].” Calvinist lawyer Christopher Sherland concurred, adding that anybody who supported Montagu “cannot but be enemies to the state and church.”

Religion was only a part of a much larger set of grievances against Buckingham. In the six page remonstrance on Buckingham presented to Charles I, Buckingham’s support of Montagu merited only a single sentence. However members of the Commons were aware of Buckingham’s role at York House and the appointment of Buckingham as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge during the 1626 Parliament only heightened the Commons’ antagonism towards Buckingham. That John Cosin, close friend and ally of Montagu, helped secure the chancellorship reinforced the idea that Buckingham was beholden to the Arminian faction. When the Commons raised objections to Buckingham’s appointment as chancellor, Buckingham’s support of Montagu was raised multiple times. That a man who supported Montagu, a man bent on bringing “half popery and Arminianism” into the Church of England, could be Chancellor of Cambridge university indicated “the whole frame of religion lies at the stake.”

Ironically, Buckingham proved to be Montagu’s savior in 1626. The Commons, occupied with the overriding issue of Buckingham, sidelined the case against Montagu. Indeed, the Commons might have ruined Montagu if Charles I had not dissolved Parliament to protect the duke of Buckingham.

John Pym continued his role as lead prosecutor in the Commons. On the seventeenth of April, Pym read out a statement outlining the nature of Parliament’s role in the case as well as the general charges. Wary of offending the authority of the bishops and the king over questions doctrine, he asserted that Parliament did not intend to judge the soundness of doctrine, that being the right of convocation. But
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the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Homilies were sanctioned by Parliament, and Montagu had published material contrary to both. He was also guilty of contempt of the Commons by publishing *Appello Caesarem* while there was an unresolved petition against *A New Gagg* in the Parliaments of 1624 and 1625. However, in addition to the standard charge of publishing material contrary to the Thirty Nine Articles and popery, the struggle between Parliament, Montagu, and Charles I meant that Arminianism was acquiring political overtones. In the minds of Pym and other Parliamentary Calvinists, Arminianism was defined as “an espousal of doctrine contrary to that of the Church of England (above all, in its views of election, predestination, and the sacraments); a refusal to accept Parliamentary jurisdiction [over religious matters] (and so setting ‘King against the People, and the People one against another’) and purposes and beliefs similar to those of the Church of Rome.”

Pym, representing the committee on religion, alleged that Montagu’s characterization of conformist Calvinists as Puritans was sedition. Aside from being a smear on respectable English churchmen, his redefinition of Puritanism posed a danger to the English body politic. For example Pym, in the section of the charges labeled “sedition,” put forth three propositions: “1. M[ontagu] does draw together in one collective name of Puritans the greatest part of the King’s true subjects. 2. Diverse crimes laid to their charge, and endeavors to bring the King into jealousy with them. 3. By diverse odious terms endeavors to bring them into hate and scorn with the rest of the people.” Montagu’s writing on the political danger of Puritanism, namely his associations of Puritanism with anarchy and antipathy towards authority, angered Pym and other members of the Commons. Just as Burton and Yates objected to being called Puritans and therefore nonconformists when they were obedient members of the ecclesiastical administration, Pym objected to the accusation of political nonconformity. How could they be accused him and fellow Parliamentary Calvinists of “antipathizing to kings and princes” when they were obedient if contentious members of Parliament?

The committee’s second concern was Montagu’s “Popery” and Arminianism. Pym and the religion committee found it especially irritating that Montagu labored to slander Calvinism while simultaneously laboring to prove that the Roman Catholic Church was a true if flawed church. He had drastically reduced the doctrinal distance between the Church of England and Rome, stated that the Roman Catholic Church was built on a sound traditional and doctrinal foundation even if it had subsequently erred, claimed the pope was not demonstrably the Antichrist, espoused the efficacy of prayers to saints, and written favorably of popish ceremonialism. Taken with the definition of doctrinal Calvinism as Puritanism, it was clear to the committee that Montagu sought to defame the Protestant religion and reconcile with Rome.
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Montagu’s Arminianism was offensive on multiple counts: he dishonored the late King James I who had lent authority to the Synod of Dort and disparaged the Reformed churches and their divines. He had the temerity to insist that the elect may fall from grace; a doctrine roundly condemned by both the Church of England and by English delegates at the Synod of Dort.244 His rejection of the authority of the Synod of Dort and his attacks on the Continental Reformed churches was evidence of his Arminianism. Taken with Montagu’s sympathy towards Roman Catholicism, the committee surmised that he wished to push the Church of England away from Geneva and towards Rome.245

Charles I seemed content to let the Commons’ case move forward. With the royal favorite Buckingham under attack, the king could ill afford to lend support to his unfortunate chaplain Montagu. The Commons’ first priority was to silence Montagu. Worried by the rumor that he was composing a response to Bishop George Carleton’s An Examination of those Things wherein the Author of the Late “Appeale” Holds the Doctrines of the Church of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrines of the Church of England, the Commons petitioned the king to forbid Montagu from publishing any books until Parliament resolved the current controversy. Charles I expressed distaste for the chaplain’s works and agreed to refer his case to Convocation. Any future writings would be thoroughly examined for “sedition or false doctrine” before they were allowed to go to press.246 Charles I’s promises to the Commons sat oddly with his intervention on Montagu’s behalf in 1625. He appeared to be using Montagu as a sop to the Commons, appearing to yield to Parliament’s demands to deflect criticism elsewhere.247

The Commons was not satisfied with the king’s halfway measures. Pym’s presentation of the accumulated grievances against Montagu took a full two hours to deliver. The effect of the speech was such that “no man spoke in the house but in detestation of him and his best friends were observed to leave the house [of Commons] before the question came [to vote.]”248 On April 29 the Commons found Montagu guilty of a sweeping set of charges: publishing doctrine contrary to the Thirty-Nine Articles, disturbing the peace of the church and state, encouragement to Roman Catholicism and of popish ceremonialism, slander of conformist Englishmen as Puritans, Arminianism, disgrace of Reformed churches and divines, and denigration of godly preaching.249 Contrary to the assertion of the committee that they did not presume to judge doctrine, the resolution included the doctrine of falling from grace.250 The resolution could not have come as a surprise to Montagu or Charles I as the resolution merely reiterated and formalized the charges of the 1625 Parliament. Pym, the perpetual thorn in Montagu’s side, was chosen to present the case to the House of Lords.

244 Ibid., 2:206.
245 Ibid., 3:6-11.
246 Ibid 30,34.
247 Anti-Calvinists, 154-155; Macauley, 324-325.
248 Macauley, 318.
249 Proceedings 1626, 3:8, 101. The resolution includes Pym’s “four heads of aggravation.”
250 Anti-Calvinists, 128.
However the case was sidelined by preparations for the impeachment of Buckingham. No significant progress was made during May and it was not until mid-June that the Commons made significant progress against Montagu. Charles I forced the Commons’ hand by issuing the “Proclamation for the establishing of the peace and quiet of the Church of England” on June 14/16. The proclamation indirectly referred to Montagu’s works, referencing religious questions “at first only being meant against the papists” which later disturbed the peace of the Church of England.251 The proclamation banned “any new inventions or opinions concerning religion [other] than such as [are] clearly grounded and warranted by the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England heretofore published and happily established by authority.”252 The authority of the sovereign and the church, not Parliament, would enforce this proclamation. Bishops and archbishops were charged with preventing further religious controversy, and Charles I reserved the right to punish transgressors.

The Commons responded by reading in a bill “for the better continuing of peace and unity in the Church and Commonwealth” on June 13 and 14.253 The bill sought to incorporate the Irish Articles (1615) into the official doctrine of the Church of England alongside the Thirty-Nine Articles. The motive behind this move was clear: the Irish Articles incorporated the Calvinist Lambeth Articles formulated during the Cambridge predestinarian controversy of the 1590s.254 The incorporation of the Irish Articles would mean the incorporation of Calvinist orthodoxy into the doctrine of the Church of England. Montagu’s goose would have been cooked. However he was saved by Charles I’s intervention on behalf of Buckingham on June 15. The Lords were moving steadily toward the impeachment of Buckingham, going so far as to present Charles I with a remonstrance of grievances.255 Charles I obstinately defended Buckingham, claiming that the Duke had faithfully executed his office and was not guilty of any political malfeasance.256 When it became clear that the Lords would not dismiss the charges against Buckingham, Charles I dissolved the Parliament.257

Charles I’s dissolution of Parliament as well as his proclamation for the peace and quiet of the Church of England at the eleventh hour temporarily spared Montagu. The bill to incorporate Irish Articles never came to a vote, though it would be reintroduced into the 1628 Parliament. Booksellers were ordered not to print or sell any tracts against Montagu although his Appello Caesarem would not be suppressed until two and half years later.258 But the controversy was escalating into a confrontation about the direction of the Church of England. Charles I’s
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proclamation for the peace and quiet of the Church of England was enforced selectively, silencing the “Puritans’ [Calvinists’] mouths and [giving] an uncontrolled liberty to the tongues and pens of the Arminian party.”

However the patronage of Buckingham and increasing royal support for the “Montaguists” again served only to increase the strength of opposition. Three new Calvinist activists rose to prominence during the 1626 Parliament, some drawn into the dispute because of opposition to Buckingham: Henry Sherfield, Christopher Sherland, and Sir Thomas Fanshaw. The anti-Arminian party had grown from two committed Commons MPs in the 1624 Parliament to a group large enough to constitute an identifiable interest group in the House of Commons. Many more were brought into the fold by the rapid rise to power of a handful of Arminian bishops in the intervening years between the 1626 Parliament and the 1628 Parliament.

"Is an Arminian now made a Bishop?"

Indeed, in the years between the 1626 and 1628 Parliaments the idea of an “Arminian party” emerged. Francis White, a man who defended Montagu at York House and was involved the publication of Appello Caesarem, was consecrated bishop of Carlisle at Durham House. John Cosin, a man of identical credentials to White, was appointed rector of Brancepeth at Durham. At White’s consecration ceremony at the Durham house chapel, Cosin delivered a sermon celebrating the start of a new era in the Church of England. The authority of the apostolic succession would elevate the clergy to their proper place and a new ceremonialism would be introduced into the liturgy.

Against critics would denigrate the English episcopacy as lacking authority and wanting of respect, “no lawful succession” and “no orderly consecration,” Cosin preached that English bishops benefitted from the an unbroken line of succession from Christ’s apostles. The apostolic succession infused each successive bishop with God’s grace. Bishops depended solely on God for their authority and were “subordinate to no power beside [that of God].” The bishop’s authority did not derive from Parliamentary precedent or statute but from apostolic succession itself. The implication of this idea was that bishops and other ecclesiastical personnel were beyond the authority of Parliament. Their desire to increase the authority of bishops through ties to ancient Christianity meant a willingness to accept Rome as a true if flawed Church.

The power of sacraments and ceremonies to dispense grace was similarly elevated. Cosin scorned Calvinists who would “believe that there is nothing to be done more but to believe and so be saved.” These Englishmen were the reason
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that the Church of England’s service and liturgy had fallen into disrepair. According to Cosin, the Church of England had a service, but no servants at it . . . churches, but keep them not like houses of God . . . Sacraments, but few to frequent them; Confession, but few to practise it . . . religious duties . . . but seldom observed; all good laws and Canons of the Church, but few or none kept; the people are made to do nothing; the old discipline is neglected, and men do what they list.267 An anonymous Englishman, frustrated at the preferment of the “Montaguists,” posted a sign on Durham Chapel on the day of White’s consecration reading “Is an Arminian now made a Bishop?”268 Thus Cosin articulated both the motives of the new “Arminian party.”

Further evidence of the rise of an “Arminian party” came with Charles I’s appointment of Montagu himself to the bishopric of Chichester previously held by the Calvinist George Carleton, who had scathingly denounced Montagu in print, in the month following the 1628 Parliament.269 The appointment infuriated Calvinists who thought Montagu was better suited to “fire and faggot than further preferment.”270 Archbishop Abbot, who had heretofore attempted to restrain Montagu, was exiled into the country and power was transferred to a council consisting solely of Arminian sympathizers: George Mountain, Richard Neile, John Buckeridge, John Howson, and William Laud.271 William Laud now replaced Abbot as archbishop in all but name and a man who was sympathetic to Montagu in doctrine, if not personally, was the de facto head of the Church of England.272 Thus by the 1628 Parliament Arminianism acquired a dual political and religious definition: in addition to the doctrinal elements concerning predestination and the sacraments, English Arminianism now carried the connotations of an enhancement of monarchical authority, an elevation of the status of bishops, and a liturgical program that emphasized the beauty of holiness.

**Montagu and the 1628 Parliament: The Arminian Conspiracy**

Much of the 1628 Parliament was dominated by foreign policy and the growing constitutional conflict between the king and Parliament in addition to the odium caused by a disastrous foreign policy. The attempt to relieve battered Protestant forces of La Rochelle with English troops under the command of the duke of Buckingham had failed spectacularly. The cost of this expedition was met by imposing the Forced Loan, which generated considerable opposition and became a test for the boundaries of the royal prerogative. The presence of a large body of troops under the king’s command only served to heighten tensions.273 Nonetheless
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religion tensions continued to mount. The summoning of a new Parliament did not bode well for Richard Montagu, whose elevation to a bishopric only increased the ferocity of the attacks against him. Paradoxically, royal patronage made his position more vulnerable. Parliament was increasingly aware that Montagu was not alone in his views, and royal patronage made members suspicious of an Arminian conspiracy to subvert the established church. Thus Montagu and his party, reliant on the protection of the king and the episcopacy, were fearful of another Parliament being called especially when the king and Parliament were increasingly at odds. William Laud feared that they would “fall upon church business which (in the way they have gone) is not fit for them.”

Although Arminianism was not the primary concern of the 1628 Parliament, it began to bleed over into other grievances such as Buckingham and Charles I’s arbitrary royal policies. Thus the 1628 Parliament saw the birth of an idea of an “Arminian party” allied to political innovators. Montagu and the religious innovators were now inseparably connected to political innovators; the bishop and his allies were now identifiable members of a “malignant and popish party.” The “Montagents,” disciples of Montagu, were “advanced and preferred, and have meetings and, under authority and a monarchy, will undermine, authority, and will preach that we have no property.” Because Montagu and his ilk were now a political threat, the 1628 Parliament were more confident in attacking his doctrine and soteriology. Overall, the strength was overwhelmingly with Montagu’s enemies in Parliament.

The 1626 bill for the “better continuing of peace and unity in church and commonwealth,” which aimed to make the Lambeth Articles part of the official doctrine of the Church of England, was read into the Commons on April 3, 1628. The reintroduction of the bill did not bode well for Montagu. John Pym, reassuming his role as lead prosecutor, reported the accumulated grievances were to be made into official charges at the end of April. Much of the material was a retread from the 1626 Parliament. However, Pym attacked Montagu’s “Arminianism,” especially his insistence that the elect might fall totally and finally from grace, much more strongly. In addition, his views on baptism and the use of images in the liturgy formed a larger part of the complaints against him. The rise of ceremonialism was clearly a growing concern of Parliament. Cosin, Montagu’s closest friend and ally, came under attack from Parliament for his Collection of Private Devotions. Published in 1627, the work’s inclusion of prayers for the dead, emphasis on the power of the Christian martyrs and saints, and the veneration of the authority of the clergy irked Englishmen still reeling from the earlier controversy over Montagu. The work was added to the list of troublesome books alongside Gagg and Appello, indicating the growing concern with ceremonialism in Parliament.
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The committee reiterated its justification for considering the books: they contained doctrine contrary to the Church of England, disturbed the peace, and strove to reconcile the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{280} However, Montagu’s contention that the elect could fall from grace totally and finally is mentioned in four different sections more than even the politically potent charge of reconciliation with Rome.\textsuperscript{281} Such a view was contrary to the 17th Article, which the committee took as espousing the supralapsarian position that God divided humanity into the elect and the reprobate before the creation of the world.\textsuperscript{282} Montagu’s insistence on the efficacy of baptism irked Pym, especially since the bishop’s books already muddied the waters of absolute predestination with freewill.\textsuperscript{283} Given the statements that the Roman Catholic Church constituted a true church and his views on the sacraments, it seemed that Montagu was proposing to replace the grace of predestination with the grace of sacraments. Increasingly, the committee on religion in Parliament with John Pym as its leader emphasized the “ceremonial” aspects of Montagu’s thought, previously sidelined to his redefinition of Puritanism and his “doctrinal Arminianism.” For example, the committee considered the liturgical ideas in detail for the first time. Citing the sermon “An Homily against the peril of Idolatry” from the Book of Homilies urging “soberness, modesty, and chastity” in the adornment of churches against Montagu’s assertion that images were not necessarily idols.\textsuperscript{284}

The committee’s case again stalled in the Commons, and Pym was again prevented from bringing the charges to the Lords. Nonetheless opposition was growing in the Commons. Whereas less than a handful of dedicated MPs prosecuted Montagu in the Parliaments of 1624-1626, 1628 witnessed a proliferation of anti-Arminian activists: Sir Nathaniel Rich, Sir Robert Harley, Sir Henry, Midmay, Sir Edward Giles, Sir William Beecher, Richard Knightley, Walter Long, Sir John Jackson.\textsuperscript{285} Commons sat as a Committee of the Whole House for three days, June 6, June 9, and June 11 to consider, among other things, “innovation in religion.”\textsuperscript{286} For three days the Commons sat as a committee, heaping abuse upon the troublesome Arminian party. The Commons complained that the Arminians were favored and Montagu’s books were sold freely while his critics’ books are prevented from going to press, only Arminians were advanced, and preaching was neglected.\textsuperscript{287} The Houses’ religious grievances were formalized into a remonstrance delivered on the June 14. Much of the remonstrance concerned Buckingham, and the MPs concern over Buckingham’s offenses. However, the grievances concerning innovations in religion hammered out during the committee as a whole were a significant portion of the remonstrance. Appealing to the memory of James I and the
Synod of Dort, the Commons warned Charles I against those Englishmen, “Protestants in show but Jesuits in opinion,” now being advanced to bishoprics. The remonstrance named Richard Neile, bishop of Winchester and William Laud, bishop of Bath and Wells as the luminaries of the burgeoning Arminian movement. The remonstrance also expressed dissatisfaction with the uneven application of the proclamation for the peace and quiet of the Church of England, complaining that Montagu and his ilk wrote freely in their defense but defenders of the “orthodox” church were silenced.

The remonstrance came to naught. Buckingham, increasingly blamed for a disastrous foreign policy and the failure to relieve the beleaguered Hueguenots of La Rochelle, was spared further attack by Parliament only to be brutally assassinated by a disgruntled subordinate on August 14. The passing of the Petition of Right assuaged the Commons’ political grievances, and Buckingham’s assassination meant the hated royal favorite was no longer between Charles I and Parliament. Charles I issued a pardon to Montagu and appointed him to the vacant see of Chichester. Charles I suppression of Appello Caesarem by proclamation actually helped Montagu because it meant the book was no longer a target for the Commons. However the removal of the major political obstacles between Charles I and Parliament meant that the Commons were no longer distracted from the issue of religion. Charles I’s patronage only infuriated the MPs further.

Though Montagu reaped the rewards of royal patronage, he knew he was vulnerable to further attack from the Commons. Publicly, he kicked dirt into the bonfires of Englishmen celebrating the passage of the Petition of Right while warning the celebrants they would answer for their actions. Privately, he confessed to Cosin that there was “no man I can build upon” in the Commons. Montagu’s assessment of the situation proved correct. With many of the grievances that had previously distracted the House of Commons from the Montagu case removed, the 1629 Parliament was poised to make a concerted and direct attack upon the newly consecrated bishop.

Montagu and the 1629 Session: Enemy of Church and State

Charles I prorogued the 1628 Parliament, meaning that the same members reassembled for the 1629 session. The death of Buckingham and the fall of La Rochelle removed important points of conflict between the king and Parliament. However, it was clear to all observers that Arminianism would be the overriding issue of the 1629 Parliament. If the Commons’ was already concerned about the rise of the “Montagents,” the king was forcing their hand by blatantly favoring the Arminian party. It seemed to many MPs that “for a clergyman to be complained of by the Parliament was the shortest road to preferment;” Charles I was deliberately
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snubbing the Commons’ complaints about religion. Arminians in the English episcopacy was an affront in and of itself. But Charles I patronized Arminian clergy in the face of Parliamentary opposition, thereby drawing more MPs to the anti-Arminian cause.

Thus more than in any previous Parliament Arminianism and political issues were intimately linked. While the awareness of the existence of an “Arminian party” had materialized earlier, in the 1629 Parliament MPs began to view Arminianism as a conspiracy to subvert the established order and doctrine of the Church of England. Whereas in previous sessions Montagu had been sidelined, indeed saved by more pressing political grievances, religion took precedence over all other business in 1629. Beginning on January 21, resolute Calvinist Sir Walter Erle elucidated the sentiment of the Parliament on January 27:

I am of the number of those that at our last meeting thought the time best spent in vindicating the rights and liberties of the subject . . . [and] to postpone the business of religion . . . Now give me leave to tell you, that religion offers itself to your first consideration at this time . . . As for the passing of bills, settling revenues, and the like, without settling Religion, I must confess that I have no heart in it . . . [There is not] a more near conjunction between matter of Religion and matter of State in any kingdom in the world than there is in this Kingdom at this day.

Indeed dedicated anti-Arminian activists such as John Pym and Robert Rich, earl of Warwick used political and financial issues to force Charles I’s hand on Arminianism. The king badly needed revenue and the two men sought to make the granting of tonnage and poundage, import duties crucial that were crucial sources of royal revenue, conditional on the king abandoning the Arminian episcopate. Montagu, White, and others, recently advanced to bishoprics and under the protection of royal pardons, knew that a new session of Parliament would open them to attack. In many MPs minds, Arminians had a vested interest in supporting Charles I’s extra-parliamentary taxation in order to not call another Parliament. Furthermore English military failure against continental Catholic countries like France and Spain made many MPs more sensitive to religious heresy at home. For example, Sir Francis Seymour, relatively uninvolved in the controversy over Montagu and Arminianism heretofore, complained on January 26 that “If God fight not our battles, the help of man is in vain . . . the cause thereof is our defect in religion, and the sins of idolatry and popery.” Therefore many new MPs were drawn into the controversy besides the more religiously motivated MPs like Pym and Rous.

Francis Rous, stepbrother to Pym, made the connection between the two evident in his speech before the Commons. Segueing from debate about tonnage and poundage, Rous implored the Commons to make religion their first priority in the
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coming months. Whereas in the last session the Commons concerned itself with the Petition of Right and the liberties of subjects now the Commons must turn itself to “far greater things, eternal life, our souls, yea our God himself.”\textsuperscript{299} The Church of England was under siege from an Arminian conspiracy:

I desire first that it may be considered what new paintings are laid upon the whore of Babylon to make her seem more lovely, and to draw so many suitors to her. I desire that it may be considered how the See of Rome doth eat into our Religion ... since their Popery is a confused mass of errors, casting down Kings before popes, the precepts of God before the tradition of men, living and reasonable men before dead and senseless stocks and stones. I desire that we may consider the increase of Arminianism, an error that maketh the grace of God lackey it after the will of man, that maketh the sheep to keep the shepherd, that maketh mortal seed of an immortal God. Yea, I desire that we may look into the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy. For an Arminian is the spawn of a Papist.\textsuperscript{300} These same Arminians sought to “break in upon the goods and liberties of this Commonweath” as the means to “avoid or break Parliaments, that so they may break in upon our Religion, and bring in their errors.”\textsuperscript{301} Arminians were thus both a threat to the political and religious order of England.

None of the ideas and charges against the Arminians in the Commons were new, but the unanimity of the MPs was. MP after MP harangued Montagu personally and Arminianism in general in emotional speeches. With the recent rash of Arminian preferment, an apocalyptic mood seized the Commons. Indeed, whereas in 1625, 1626, and 1628, the Commons had been content to forward the case against Montagu to the Lords for further consideration, in the 1629 Parliament the Lords were a helpless bystander against the increasing religious fury of the Commons. The Commons as whole was increasingly radicalized. The whole of the Commons, sitting as the Committee of Religion, agreed that Arminianism was contrary to the Thirty-Nine Articles even without the addition of the Irish or Lambeth Articles.\textsuperscript{302} Half a decade of religious grievances were coming to a head. Pym, heading a Committee of the Whole on Religion on February 13, recounted the steps prior sessions took against Montagu. He bitterly informed the Commons that all of their efforts had come to naught and that the number of heretics increased daily. Montagu himself had been elevated to the bishopric of one of his greatest opponents.\textsuperscript{303} Many MPs were in a dire mood and felt that decisive action must be taken because “if God be God, let us follow him, and if Baal be God, let us follow him, and longer halt between two opinions.”\textsuperscript{304} The culmination of the Commons’ religious grievances was the Heads and Articles agreed upon by the House on February 23. The grievances therein had the
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assent of the whole house. The articles laid the blame on Charles I’s ministers for subverting the doctrine of the established church. The Commons charged that the Church of England had been hijacked by the Arminians who wished destroy the Church of England and all true “Protestant Churches in Christendom.” These religious innovators sought to cleave England from the Reformed Churches, sow division among the ranks of English Protestants and drive them to popery, and incline or sympathize to popery. Montagu was condemned by the articles for publishing and defending points contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, all without punishment or censure. The articles also condemned the ceremonialism creeping into the liturgy.

All of this was the contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, which was found in the Book of Common Prayer and the Book of Homilies, both confirmed by the authority of Parliament. However they also cited the Lambeth Articles, the Irish Articles, and the resolutions of the Synod of Dort. The Commons had indeed thrust itself into the role of arbiter of orthodoxy. Montagu remained the bête noire of the Commons and was used, perhaps unfairly, as the symbol of all that was wrong with the church. “That great bishop of Chichester,” as Sir John Eliot sarcastically labeled him, was an aider and abettor of the spread of Arminianism especially since his elevation to a bishopric.

Charles I was increasingly frustrated with the Commons combative rhetoric on religion and finance. On March 2, the Speaker informed the Commons that the king had ordered an adjournment and rose to end the session when several MPs grabbed him and forced him back into his chair. With the speaker pinned to the chair, Eliot inveighed against Montagu and Lord Treasurer Richard Weston for their role in innovation of religion. With the House in chaos, the Articles of religious grievances were read in to the house and shouted in with a resounding voice vote. Furthermore, Denzil Holles then read in the Protestations of the Commons in Parliament which declared that any Englishman who controverted the orthodox doctrine of the Church of England as understood by the Commons or sought to introduce Arminian innovation was a “capital enemy to this Kingdom and Commonwealth.” The Commons responded with a resounding Yea. The whole House of Commons had turned on Montagu.

Thus the House of Commons declared Montagu a heretic and enemy of the state on March 2. This time Charles I directly intervened to save Montagu and his fellows from destruction. The king could not abide by the behavior of the Commons and he dissolved the Parliament on March 2. After ordering the Captain of the Pensioners and Guard to force the door of the Commons and facing further defiance
from the Commons, the king dissolved the Parliament.\textsuperscript{314} Arrests and imprisonments soon followed. In a series of royal proclamations following the dissolution, the sovereign attacked the Commons and announced the inauguration of Personal Rule. Malevolent factions and overzealous MPs had caused the Commons to act rashly and dishonor the king’s authority.\textsuperscript{315} Furthermore Charles I would summon no more Parliaments for an as yet indeterminate period of time.\textsuperscript{316}

\textit{Conclusion}

The eleven-year interlude from parliamentary rule could only mean a golden opportunity for the Arminian party. Freed from parliamentary attack, the Arminians lost no time imposing their doctrinal and liturgical program on the Church of England. Montagu enjoyed the spoils of the bishopric of Chichester and was later transferred to lucrative bishopric of Norwich. His actions as the bishop were predictable to any informed observer of the religious controversy of the 1620s. He attempted to clamp down on “Puritan” activity by suppressing Calvinist clergy, and his visitation articles displayed a profound concern for the upkeep of churches and a mission to enforce conformity in liturgical practices. The obstreperous cleric was still not immune to attack even with the protection of the monarch and the episcopacy. His residence at Chichester and Norwich saw the implementation of a tolerant policy towards recusant Roman Catholics exemplified in his tract “Certain considerations touching Recusancy,” contact with Roman Catholics to start the process of reconciliation with Rome, and continued production of religious tracts which exemplified his focus on patristics and church history.\textsuperscript{317} Nevertheless, the rumblings of discontent beginning in 1639 and into the 1640s in Montagu’s bishoprics demonstrated the fact that decades of religious turmoil were coming to a head. Two years before his death in 1641 parishioners began to revolt against the beatification of the church and liturgy by pulling down the altar rails in Norwich.\textsuperscript{318}

Montagu’s death in 1641 proved timely as the Arminian ascendancy during the Personal Rule was rapidly coming to an end. The king finally called a new Parliament in 1640 because the Achilles heel of the English monarchy, lack of money, forced his hand. Parliament would prove no more cooperative in 1640 than in 1629, and the imposition of the Arminian program in the intervening years had increased the strength of religious grievances. However important the political conflict between king and Parliament in the 1640s, in the case of religion the die had been cast in the latter half of the 1620s. The blame cannot be laid solely upon the head of Charles I since he inherited an increasingly divided church from his father.
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The anti-Calvinist opposition had been vague and formless during James I’s reign and religious controversy had been managed in a way that obviated major conflict. However the legacy of Hampton Court, the Synod of Dort, and the rise of Arminians *avant la lettre* left a delicate situation for the Caroline Church.

Nevertheless, it was Charles I’s move in support of Montagu and other controversial divines initiated a drawing of definitive battle lines between the two parties. English Arminianism would never have been defined in the way it did without its increasing ties to the court. *A New Gagg* and *Appello Caesarem* as well as the polemical response articulated the ideological framework of English Arminianism. Beginning with York House, the nascent Arminian ideology was thrust into the political sphere where it would through a series of political maneuvers and timely interventions by the king become intimately associated with political and religious innovation. Montagu’s ideas could not have gained the potency that they did without the religious opposition in the House of Commons. Pushed into the arms of a welcoming sovereign by a concerted and vigorous opposition in the Commons, the troublesome cleric and his allies immediately saw the benefit of supporting extra-parliamentary rule if it would protect them from censure by Parliament. The parallel emphasis on clerical and episcopal authority made Convocation the ultimate judge of doctrine, not the assorted rabble of laymen in the Commons.

In the process, the “Montagutians” succeeded in temporarily pushing Calvinists out of the Church of England. The Montagu controversy actually witnessed the birth of English Arminianism and of the a new “Puritanism.” These new Puritans were actually the “Anglican” establishment of yesteryear, slowly squeezed out of the establishment by an innovating party of avant-garde divines. The epithet “Puritan” was well established by the 1620s and even though the Arminians substantially redefined it they did not create it. By contrast, the 1620s truly witnessed the coinage of the term “Arminianism” in England. The arguments espoused by Montagu and allies during the 1620s were similar in core areas like predestination to Dutch Arminianism and similar arguments had been aired in the universities during the reign of Elizabeth I and ecclesiastical conferences but during the 1620s the predestinarian dispute was violently thrust into the public sphere. There anti-Calvinist thought logically took shape through disputation with its ideological enemy Calvinism.

However the most crucial player in the controversy turned out to be Charles I, not Richard Montagu. Without the king’s support, Montagu might have been a footnote in history and there might not have been a rise of Arminianism in England. Montagu had made a *quid pro quo* offer to the young king in his *Appello Caesarem*: “Domine imperator, defende me gladio, et ego te defendam calamo [O Emperor, defend me with the sword and I will defend you with the pen.]” The sovereign took up the offer, wedding himself to a group of divines willing to ally themselves to and preach in support for the monarch’s experiment in extra-parliamentary rule.
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