GEORGE CARLETON

(1559-1628)

HIS ENGLISH WORKS

by

Nancy F. Hampton
B.A., University of Kansas, 1959

Submitted to the Department of History and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Professor in Charge

Committee Members

September 6, 1990
Date thesis accepted

ABSTRACT

A brief life of George Carleton (1559-1628), bishop of Llandaff (1618-9) and Chichester (1619-28) and head of the British delegation to the Synod of Dort (1618-9) in which it is argued that Carleton came to the notice of James I through his ecclesiastical and theological writings and that his elevation to the bench of bishops was the result of his writings in opposition to Dutch Arminian doctrine which the King identified and condemned as the source of growing tension in the northern Netherlands. A detailed examination of Carleton's English works in which it is demonstrated that their publication was occasioned generally by specific points of current controversy and that they can be considered indicative of the parameters of contemporary debate, including: Tithes Examined and Proved to be due to the Clergie by a divine right (1605), the first published jure divino argument in behalf of tithes; Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall (1610), the first published assertion of the independence of the episcopacy from any other authority in matters of faith and doctrine; Directions to Know the True Church (1615), a consideration of the continuity of the catholic, or universal, Church in light of recent ecclesiastical history; A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy (1624), a celebration of the providential nature of the

relationship between God and the English nation; An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England (1626), a refutation of Richard Mountague's Appello Caesarem and a defense of predestinarian theology, particularly the doctrines of election and perseverance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations

Attestation	A Joynt Attestation, avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synode of DORT
Chamberlain	The Letters of John Chamberlain
CSPD	Calendar of State Papers Domestic
Directions	George Carleton, Directions to Know the True Church
Exam	George Carleton, An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England
Golden Remains	John Hales, Golden Remains, of the ever Memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eaton Colledge, etc.
Hales	The Works of John Hales, v. 3
Juris	George Carleton, Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall
LBG	George Carleton, Life of Bernard Gilpin
Oration	George Carleton, An oration Made at the Hage, before the Prince of Orenge, and the Assembly of the High and Mighty Lords, the States Generall of the United Provinces
PRO	Public Record Office
Tithes	George Carleton, Tithes Examined and proved to be due to the Clergie by a divine right
TR	George Carleton, A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy

INTRODUCTION

In an essay on James I and his bishops, H. R. Trevor-Roper drew a portrait of the Jacobean bishops which characterized them as indifferent, negligent and secular and dismissed them as place-hunting dilattanti, nothing more than lay courtiers in clerical dress. It was a conclusion based upon a consideration of the ways in which James's bishops gained preferment with no notice given to what they did once they were in office. Recent scholarship, particularly by Patrick Collinson, Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, has focused on the churchmanship of the bishops appointed by James and a very different understanding of the prelates has emerged. Trevor-Roper's assumption that ambition and piety are mutually exclusive has been put aside as research has demonstrated that the "place-hunting" were not dilattanti, but men who showed a marked capacity for spiritual leadership.

George Carleton was one of those ecclesiastical creatures whose existence Trevor-Roper failed to notice; he was an unworldly, God-centered Jacobean bishop. Carleton was never among those who constituted the first rank of the episcopate. Although his letters suggest an awareness of court intrigue and church politics, he was

never politically active, never at the center--or even on the fringes--of power. Elevation came late in his ecclesiastical career. Lacking a powerful patron to promote his course along the more rapid paths to preferment, he sought promotion by the only path which was open to him, theological and ecclesiastical discourse; George Carleton wrote his way to a bishopric. He was almost sixty when he was named to the see of Llandaff, a poor bishopric in Wales. He may never have visited his Welsh diocese; shortly after his consecration, he went to the Low Countries as head of the British delegtion to the Synod of Dort and, upon its conclusion, was promptly translated to Chichester, a bishopric of considerably greater wealth and prestige.

An examination of Carleton's writings is enlightening as a consideration of the nature of early seventeenth-century Calvinist episcopalianism. Religion is at the center of his written works, though not the practice of religion; his subject is religion in conflict. The issues which he treated range from the status and the wealth of the clergy to the locus of ecclesiastical authority, from the apostolic origins of the episcopal discipline to the struggle against the Antichrist, from the preservation of right doctrine to the unity of the Church. However, Carleton's works are

of an even wider interest in that they reveal the religious diversity present in the Jacobean Church of England. Rarely did Carleton limit his disputations to the arguments of one party or faction; more often he addressed both those who had "strayed too farre on the left hand" and those who had "gone somewhat too farre on the right." His objections to extreme positions serve to indicate the parameters of theological debate and thereby expand our knowledge of the diversity of opinion which shaped theological and ecclesiastical discourse throughout the reign of James I.

Carleton took issue with those on the left who had strayed too far in their belief that the Church of Rome, though misguided, was still a part of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church; and on the right, with those who had gone somewhat too far in their refusal to recognize the validity of the pre-Tridentine Church of Rome as part of the Catholic Church. He argued on the one hand against the hypothetical universalists, who supported the thesis that Christ died for all men; and on the other, against the supralapsarians, who contended that God's absolute decrees of election and reprobation preceded the fall of man. He differed with those who would establish a parity of ministers and would place the Church rather than the prince at the center of the godly

community as well as with those who would place upon the prince's head all the powers claimed by the Pope.

How representative Carleton's opinions are of the mainstream of the Jacobean Church of England is problematic; however, a study of his writings affords some understanding of the diversity of opinion which existed within the English Protestant community. What follows is a consideration of the life and English works of George Carleton. First, I have considered the life of Carleton, with particular reference to his rise to the episcopate and his participation in the international gathering at Dort. Second, I have examined in some detail Carleton's English works and have attempted to present them in the context of the times in which they were written. I have not addressed the few works which Carleton published in Latin, nor have I done more than mention an early work by Carleton, The Madnesse of Astrologes, which was published by his son-in-law some twenty years after it was written. This work, written in answer to a defense of judicial astrology, agreed with the general ecclesiastical censorship of astrology and, although Keith Thomas has noted a sympathy for astrology at a somewhat later time among the Laudians, the work seems to be nothing more than the reiteration of a clerical opposition of long standing in the Church.

PART ONE

A Brief Life of George Carleton

Little is known either of the ancestry or of the early life of George Carleton, bishop of Llandaff (1618-9) and of Chichester (1619-28). He was born in 1559 at Norham in Northumberland. His father, Guy Carleton, was the second son of Thomas Carleton of Carleton Hall in Cumberland and was warder of Norham Castle, part of the patrimony of the bishopric of Durham. The Carletons of Northumberland and Cumberland were connected to the Carleton family of Oxfordshire of whom Dudley Carleton was the most illustrious member contemporary with George Carleton.[1] Letters between George Carleton and Dudley Carleton attest to the cordial relationship between the cousins but it has not been possible to trace the degree of consanguinity. Carleton's early schooling was under the direction of a kinsman, Bernard Gilpin, noted as a reformist preacher under Edward VI and the center of some controversy while archdeacon of Durham in the late 1550s.[2] Gilpin had established the Kepier Grammar School in the parish of Houghton le Spring near Durham for the

---

[1]Dudley Carleton was named ambassador to Venice 1610-1615, ambassador to the Hague 1616-1621, raised to the peerage as Lord Carleton of Imbercourt in May 1626, created Viscount Dorchester 25 July 1628.

[2]"This grave Patriot of my blood," Carleton called him. George Carleton, Life of Bernard Gilpin (London, 1636) hereinafter LBG, introductory poem.

purpose of improving the number of preaching clergy in the north. He gave private instruction to the most promising scholars and boarded many in his house, charging the sons of noble families while those "of his kindred were free." Gilpin sent many of his students on to the university and "unto divers whereof he also allowed maintenance in the University at his owne cost and charges."[3]

Gilpin's theological position as defined by Carleton in his Life of Bernard Gilpin is strikingly similar to Carleton's own position; whether Carleton was deeply influenced by his early teacher or whether he read back into Gilpin's teaching his own theology cannot be ascertained. According to Carleton, Gilpin proclaimed the absolute authority of Scripture as the guiding principle of faith and made scriptural studies central to the curriculum of his grammar school. Predestinarian in his theology, Gilpin discerned in the temporal affairs of man as well as in man's spiritual life the intervening hand of God. He condemned the Council of Trent in its judgment that the unwritten word of tradition had authority equal to the Word of God and in its readiness to confound matters indifferent to salvation with matters

---

[3]LBG, 72.

of faith.[4] Declaring himself to be "of the Catholicke faith, and the Catholicke faith changeth not," Gilpin maintained that, the Church of Rome having departed from the truth, the Reformed Churches had departed or separated from the Church of Rome.[5]

When Gilpin considered Carleton ready for the university, he sent him to St Edmund Hall, Oxford. There is some discrepancy concerning the date of Carleton's entry. Anthony Wood gives the date as the beginning of the year 1576, "Carleton being then 17 years of age," while Joseph Foster finds Carleton's entry to be listed under 20 December 1577.[6] Wood notes Carleton's diligence towards his studies, observing that he "took care that nothing should be wanting to advance his pregnant parts."[7] Carleton took his B.A. degree in February of 1580, "his disputes being then noted to exceed any of his Fellows that did their exercise in the same Lent."[8] In the same year he was elected a Probationer-Fellow of

---

[4]The Council of Trent was called by Pope Paul III, convened in 1545 and concluded in 1563.

[5]LBG, 55.

[6]Anthony Wood, Athenæ Oxonienses (London, 1691), 441; Joseph Foster, Alumni Oxonienses (1892; Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1968), 238.

[7]Wood, 441.

[8]Wood, 441.

Merton College. While at Merton he demonstrated a degree of versatility in his academic endeavors and gained something of a reputation both as an orator and as a poet. It would appear from Wood's account of Carleton's period at Oxford that he initially distinguished himself in philosophy but, in the course of his years there, was esteemed "a better disputant in Divinity, than he had before been in Philosophy."[9] Carleton's studies with Gilpin had been intensely scriptural; at Oxford he became well versed in the writings of the Church fathers and schoolmen so that he "wanted nothing that might make him a compleat Theologist."[10]

Evidence has not been found concerning the four years following 1585, the year in which Carleton took his M.A. degree, but in 1589 he was appointed vicar of Mayfield in Sussex, a post he held until 1605. It may be that the appointment came through the good services of Henry Neville whose entry at Oxford had also been on 20 December 1577 and whose father had a residence at Mayfield which in 1593 the younger Neville inherited. Although Neville sold the residence in 1597 and spent the last years of the century in France in a diplomatic capacity, he obviously was held in much esteem by

---

[9]Wood, 441.

[10]Wood, 441.

Carleton who in 1603 dedicated a volume of his Latin verses "Ad Illustrissimum Equitem Henricum Nevillum."[11] In his late years, Carleton was married to Neville's widow.

Although no record of an earlier marriage can be cited, there is confirmation of such in the person of a daughter, Anne, who was married in 1622 to Thomas Vicars.[12] Further evidence can be drawn from a letter, written to his cousin Sir Dudley Carleton in 1619, in which George Carleton recalled that, thirty years earlier, friends had advised him to remain single asserting that "the way to preferment was to keep myself single, and they who held the way to the best of preferments did so." He had not found the advice "reasonable" at the time.[13] Obviously, he did not follow it. There were also sons by an early marriage, possibly the same marriage that produced Anne, as evidenced by a petition to the Privy Council in 1624 praying the restoration of a ship which, having been stranded near Chichester, had been seized by Bishop Carleton whose

---

[11]George Carleton, Heroici Characteres (Oxford, 1603).

[12]Wood writes that Vicars was taken into the family of Dr. Carleton and by him preferred after Vicars had married Carleton's daughter. Wood, 449.

[13]PRO, SP 14/109.

sons, it was protested, refused to give it up without payment of a large sum.[14]

Carleton was forty-six years of age when, in 1605, he was named rector of Waddeston in Buckinghamshire. The removal to Waddeston marked that point in Carleton's career when he was able to devote himself largely to writing. Perhaps his duties as rector of Waddeston, and thereafter of Nuffield, were less demanding than those which he had known as vicar of Mayfield. Prior to receiving the living at Waddeston, he had published only a single volume of Latin verse, although Wood mentions that several of Carleton's Latin verses were published elsewhere.[15] It would appear that Carleton also had written a refutation of a book on astrology, either shortly before or after his move to Waddeston; the work was not published until 1624 when his son-in-law, Thomas Vicars, brought it out under the title, The Madness of Astrologes, with notation on the title page that the work had been "written neere upon twenty years ago, by G.C."

In 1606, the year following his installation at Waddeston, Carleton published the first of his ecclesiastical works, Tithes examined and proved to be due to the Clergie by a Divine Right. It had been the

---

[14]CSPD v.11, 430.

[15]Wood, 441.

conviction of Carleton's teacher, Bernard Gilpin, that impropriation, that is, the ownership of tithes by laymen, had brought about "the desolation of the Church...parsonages being in the possession of laymen who did not provide maintenance for ministers."[16] Although there are records of laymen impropriating tithes to their own use as early as the twelfth century, most impropriate tithes were part of the clerical property that was secularized in the 1530s when Henry VIII seized the monasteries of England; the Crown disposed of the tithes among private individuals either by gift or by sale. Elizabeth I had had little concern for the painful effects of impropriation on the local clergy and, furthermore, had looked with a covetous eye on the patrimony of the Church as a whole; on occasion she had bestowed a bishopric with the understanding that some of its lands, as well as the tithes belonging to them, would be alienated to the Crown upon the elevation of its new bishop.

In contrast, her successor, James I, was deeply concerned with the economic plight of the Church. At the beginning of his reign, the King had announced his intention of devoting royal impropriations to the augmentation of ministerial stipends, and urged the

---

[16]LBG, 63.

universities to do the same.[17] "No one thing is a greater impediment," he declared, "than want of competent living to maintain learned men in such places...where the ordinary benefit of the vicarages doth not suffice, and the parsonages are impropriate, and in laymens hands."[18] The King was dissuaded from pressuring the universities to restore impropriate tithes by his primate, John Whitgift, who was convinced such action would in time lead to "the overthrow of the universities and of learning."[19] Nonetheless, the King wrote to both of his archbishops in late October, 1603, of his intention to provide from impropriate tithes for those vicarages whose tithes were insufficient to maintain a qualified minister.[20]

Carleton must have found in the King's concern over the economic problems of the Church not only a great source of encouragement to publish his work on the nature of the tithe but also a shield of protection from the risk in doing so. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, one-third of the tithe holders of the country

---

[17]CSPD v.8, 19.

[18]Quoted in S.B. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft (London: SPCK, 1962), 302.

[19]CSPD v.8, 19.

[20]CSPD v.8, 49.

were laymen and, not surprisingly, impropriation was a sensitive subject. The impropriate tithe was a form of property which could be bought, sold or bequeathed; any attack on impropriation was an attack on property. Carleton's treatise was the first published statement of a jure divino case for tithes; it made the argument that tithes were owed to the Church neither by custom nor by law but by divine directive. Twenty years earlier, Lancelot Andrewes had defended the same thesis for his doctorate of divinity but had chosen not to publish.[21] Carleton was obviously appreciative of the delicacy of the subject and delivered his arguments with great tact. A second edition was issued in 1611.

In 1609, Carleton was presented the parsonage of Nuffield in Oxfordshire. Dudley Carleton wrote to the Jacobean court gossip John Chamberlain that his cousin Carleton rode by "in as great haste as yf he rode post for a bishoprick."[22] The following year, Carleton again published a pioneering ecclesiastical work. He undertook to sort out the jurisdiction of king, bishops and pope in a work entitled, Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall. By addressing a threefold jurisdiction, he was

---

[21]Lancelot Andrewes, Of the Right of Tithes (1647 translation).

[22]CSPD v.8, 552.

able to direct the reader's attention to the encroachment of the pope upon the powers of the king and of bishops while at the same time he unobtrusively established those areas of ecclesiastical jurisdiction which were beyond the power of the prince. While he vigorously upheld the supremacy of the prince over the Church, he demonstrated that this supremacy was limited to the execution of ecclesiastical policy and did not extend to the interpretation of faith and doctrine. He reserved all spiritual power to the bishops, the great watch-men of the Church. In contrast to the papist who identified the Church with the Pope and to the erastian who equated the Church with the Crown's ecclesaiastical policy, Carleton identified the Church with its bishops, the successors of the apostles, who, he maintained, had been entrusted by Christ himself with the preservation and proclamation of the true faith and doctrine of the Church. Carleton was by no means the first to defend a jure divino episcopacy. However, his treatise was the first published work to make a distinction between the jurisdictional authority of the bishops and that of the prince and to advocate disobedience to the prince, albeit of a passive nature, in the event of royal interference in those aspects of spiritual jurisdiction authorized by God to be the special province of bishops. It was a position which

enhanced the jurisdiction of the Church, but only at the expense of princely authority. There is no record of further editions of the work.

In a letter dated 30 September 1611 George Carleton indicated his intention to publish a theological treatise on the subject of his lectures at Oxford.[23] Two years later, in 1613, he published Consensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Tridentinos de Scripturis, Ecclesia, fide & gratia. The work was an expansion of the aforementioned lectures, and also may have been the subject of his doctoral defense.[24] Carleton dedicated the book to the fellows of Merton College; when he published an abbreviated version of it several years later, he referred to Consensus as having been directed "to the judgement of the learned."[25] The work made a favorable impression on the King as was indicated by John Chamberlain in a letter dated 23 December 1613 to Dudley Carleton:

> Your cousen Carleton the preacher was with the King on Sonday and had many goode and gracious wordes for a new worke of his,...if he could now (recenti merito)

---

[23]CSPD v.9, 77.

[24]Carleton had taken a B.D. degree from Merton in 1594 and was granted a D.D. degree 1 December 1613, completing final exercises in 1614.

[25]George Carleton, Directions to Know the True Church (London, 1615) hereinafter Directions, The Epistle Dedicatorie.

light upon any thing that were to be geven he might easilie obtain yt.[26]

There is no question that George Carleton aspired to rise in the ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He may have communicated the nature of his ambitions to his cousin, Dudley Carleton, when he sent to him a copy of his book, Consensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Tridentinos, though Dudley's knowledge of his cousin's hopes of preferment may have dated from an earlier time. In a letter dated 20 April 1614, Dudley Carleton, after acknowledging receipt of the book on which he bestowed a qualified praise, declared his confidence in his cousin's prospects of promotion, having as he did "two such pillars as the King, and Archbp. of Canterbury to support him."[27] Perhaps Chamberlain's letter several months earlier had prompted such encouragement.

Chamberlain's confidence that Carleton might easily find advancement depended upon something, preferably a bishopric, becoming available in the immediate future. But in the following year, 1614, only two bishoprics fell vacant, Lichfield and Lincoln, and each was filled by a man of much wider reputation than Carleton: John Overall

---

[26]John Chamberlain, The Letters of John Chamberlain, ed Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939) hereinafter Chamberlain, i, 494.

[27]CSPD v.9, 231.

and Richard Neile, respectively. Only one bishopric, Salisbury, fell vacant in 1615 and the archbishop of Canterbury's brother, Robert Abbot, was named to fill the office. In 1616, four bishoprics came open: Bath and Wells, Chester, Winchester and Carlisle. The first three were filled by Arthur Lake, James Montague and Thomas Morton, respectively; all had risen to prominence through scholarly achievement and each held a deanship. John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton from London on 6 July 1616, "I heare your cousen Dr. Carleton is to succeed the bishop of Carlile lately deceased,"[28] but three months later Chamberlain informed his correspondent that, although Dr. Carleton and all his friends believed he would be named bishop of Carlisle, "one Snowdown [Robert Snowden] an obscure fellow is come in at the window and shut him out."[29]

George Carleton had entered the service of Prince Charles as one of his chaplains in the preceding year, 1615. Writing to his cousin Dudley from this new vantage point, Carleton confessed his surprise at the "shameless avidity of persons about Court for preferment."[30] It was Carleton's conviction that "he begs best who makes his

---

[28]Chamberlain, ii, 15.

[29]Chamberlain, ii, 29.

[30]CSPD v.9, 273.

service speak for him."[31] However, neither his service nor the efforts of the Prince in his behalf could gain him the bishopric of Carlisle, as the King had been importuned to dispose of it elsewhere. Also in 1615, Carleton had published and dedicated to Prince Charles a theological work written specifically for the layman entitled Directions to Know the True Church. Based upon his Consensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Tridentinos, the work which Chamberlain had suggested might gain Carleton preferment, Directions was a consideration of the continuity of the universal Church in light of recent ecclesiastical history.

In the wake of being passed over for the bishopric of Carlisle, George Carleton expressed to his cousin Dudley a sense of shame over the manner in which bishoprics were obtained, and a profound weariness of the Court itself.[32] Several years later, when he was bishop of Llandaff and had just been nominated to the see of Chichester, Carleton revised his earlier convictions concerning the road to preferment, conceding that one's service alone was not enough and would soon be forgotten unless "one had a sure friend in place [at Court] to make relation of

---

[31]CSPD v.9, 273.

[32]CSPD v.9, 399.

the service."[33] The preferment to Chichester he credited to his cousin Dudley whom he believed was responsible, in his capacity as ambassador at the Hague, for focusing the attention of the Court upon the Synod of Dort, held in the northern Netherlands city in 1618-9, and particularly upon himself as head of the English delegation to the synod. "You made me bishop of Chichester," he wrote to Dudley Carleton 20 July 1619.[34]

In 1617 six bishoprics fell vacant: Bristol, Hereford, Lincoln, Worcester, Durham and Llandaff. Carleton was named to the last.[35] The economic value of episcopal sees varied widely and Llandaff was among the poorest, "made very small by the ungracious practices of my predecessors," George Carleton told his cousin Dudley Carleton.[36] The bishop elect betrayed little elation over the appointment, noting that want of the language would necessarily limit his service to the Welsh see. He would have preferred to have excused himself, not from episcopal preferment but certainly from this preferment; nonetheless, he was grateful to the King for his favor

---

[33]PRO, SP 14/109.

[34]PRO, SP 14/109.

[35]Nicholas Felton, Francis Godwin, George Monteigne, John Thornborough and Richard Neile, respectively, were named to the other sees.

[36]PRO, SP 14/94.

and especially to the Prince who had taken upon himself, so Carleton believed, "to make the way for me."[37]

The favor of princes is not to be underestimated, nor the favorability of the odds when so many bishoprics become available at once. However, Carleton's elevation to the episcopate appears to have been linked less with the favor of the Prince than with the interest of the King in the growing controversy in the northern Netherlands over the doctrine associated with Jacobus Arminius, the Dutch theologian whose modifications of the Calvinist theology of grace gave his name to the anti-Calvinist movement of the early seventeenth century. There is no record of the origin of Carleton's interest in Dutch Arminianism, though there is evidence that his interest was furthered in the 1610s in Oxford where Robert Abbot, Regius professor of divinity from 1612 and brother of George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, was the university's most vocal critic of Arminius and his teachings. Carleton was among those Oxford doctors of divinity who, between 1611 and 1617, lectured in refutation of the tenets of Dutch Arminianism; note has been made in particular of his opposition in 1614 to the theory of the universality of grace, one of the five

---

[37]PRO, SP 14/94.

points concerning predestination which the Dutch Arminians held to be open to debate.[38]

Carleton was joined, and no doubt encouraged, in his preoccupation with Dutch Arminianism by his cousin, Sir Dudley Carleton, when in 1616 his cousin was appointed England's ambassador to the Hague. At the time of Dudley Carleton's appointment, James I was deeply concerned over the United Provinces whose survival as a nation appeared to be threatened by increasing internal disorder. The focus of the King's concern, which both informed and was to be informed by the activities of his ambassador, centered on the Dutch Arminian movement which the King held responsible for creating division in both the Dutch church and the Dutch state. Although it cannot be more than speculation, it would appear that the elusive bishopric towards which George Carleton aspired came within his reach as the result of the convergence of Carleton's academic efforts to refute the doctrines of Arminius with the diplomatic endeavors of his cousin Dudley to persuade the leaders of the United Provinces that Arminianism was at the root of the state's internal conflict and, of ultimate importance to the ecclesiastical aspirations of George Carleton, with the

---

[38]Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of Arminianism, 1590-1640 (Oxford: University Press, 1987), 73.

active interest of James I in searching out a resolution to the Dutch conflict.[39]

The United Provinces were something of an anomaly in early seventeenth century Europe. Not only were the Provinces a republic but there was no national church, as such; and, though they were a Protestant state, they were not exclusively Calvinist.[40] England entertained neither the political nor the religious diversity of the United Provinces nor found such diversity desirable to church or state. Yet, the two countries had strong cultural connections: they were linked to one another by a lively interest in trade; they had each opposed successfully a common enemy, Spain; and they defended a common religion. Each country followed carefully the domestic politics of the other.[41]

---

[39]The archbishop of Canterbury explained in a letter to Dudley Carleton 12 December 1617 that one reason he had not written on Arminianism was because "the King my master is so far interested in this cause I should but add light to the sun by taking on me anything publicly." Quoted in Peter G. Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635" Past and Present, no. 114 (February 1987), 53n.

[40]"The spirit of Erasmus was too deeply rooted, for Calvin's doctrine to have a clear field." Johan H. Huizinga, Dutch Civilization in the Seventeenth Century (London: Collins, 1968), 49.

[41]J.R. Jones, Britain and Europe in the Seventeenth Century (New York: Norton, 1966), 38-9; S.R. Gardiner, History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642 (Reprint, New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965), ii, 128.

The English King's interest in the Dutch theological quarrel had first been evident in 1611 when Conrad Vorstius had been nominated to the chair of divinity at the University of Leiden, the chair formerly held by Jacobus Arminius who had died in 1609. The nomination of Vorstius had quickly become the field of battle in the ongoing struggle for power which had existed, at least since 1610, between the Remonstrants, who were aligned with the Dutch political leader, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, and the Counter-Remonstrants, who gradually came to receive the full support of the Dutch military leader, Prince Maurice of Orange. Each of the rival interests was identified with a theological position, the Remonstrants with Arminianism and the Counter-Remonstrants with strict Calvinism. The theological variations between the Arminians and the strict Calvinists centered on the doctrine of grace. Essentially, the Arminians questioned the Calvinist doctrine according to which man is predestined unconditionally and irrevocably by God either to eternal life or to everlasting damnation. They believed that certain theological issues concerning predestination were open to debate; among these issues were the universality of grace, that is, the availability of grace to all people, and the ability of man to freely accept or reject

grace. The Remonstrants and the Counter-Remonstrants alike attempted to enlist the support of the Church of England in the Vorstius affair.

The King came into the fray in opposition to the appointment of Vorstius primarily because he believed that Vorstius's presence on the faculty at Leiden would be a threat to the unity of the Provinces. Vorstius had preached and published in defense of the toleration of doctrinal diversity, a position which was essential to the policies of the Dutch Arminians. James believed, on the contrary, that the public expression of diverse opinions was politically as well as theologically hazardous, a danger to the fabric of the state, and to religion as well.[42] In addition, his opposition was a declaration of his own catholic orthodoxy. The King had been linked with the heresies of Vorstius several years earlier in a Jesuitical work and James wished to publicly disassociate himself from him. In a work entitled His Maiesties Declaration concerning His Proceedings with the States generall of the United Provinces of the Low countreys, In the cause of D. Conradus Vorstitus, published in 1612, James expressed his opposition to the specific theological teachings of Vorstius. He did not

---

[42]Frederick Shriver, "Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair" English Historical Review, v. 85 (July 1970), 455-63.

frame his arguments in terms of Calvinist orthodoxy but in terms of the ancient catholic faith, grounding his criticism on an understanding of the rule of faith as articulated by the Church Fathers and by the early Church councils. James accused Vorstius of departing from "the high beaten path-way of the Catholique and Orthodoxall Faith."[43] Vorstius had not written on "doubtfull matters,...where a man may resolve either one way or other, without danger of making shipwracke of Faith,"[44] but had introduced new opinions concerning "the auncient Faith [which] needes not be changed like an old garment, either in substance, or fashion."[45] The King declared that he had found it imperative to take issue with the appointment of Vorstius because of the bond between his kingdom and the United Provinces; they were neighbors and allies, "the principall bond of our conjunction being our uniformitie in the trew Religion."[46] Any threat to the one was necessarily a threat to the other, and James employed a very graphic metaphor: "not only the next

---

[43]James I, Declaration concerning...the cause of D. Conradus Vorstius The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James, ed. James, bishop of Winchester (London, 1616), 380.

[44]James I, 367.

[45]James I, 370.

[46]James I, 366.

house was on fire, but did also begin to creepe into the bowels of our owne Kindome (sic)."[47]

After successfully thwarting the appointment of Vorstius, James did not intervene in Dutch internal affairs again until 1616, the year in which George Carleton's cousin, Sir Dudley Carleton, was named ambassador at the Hague.[48] The political and religious climate in the United Provinces had worsened appreciably since the Vorstius nomination; there were even churches within the Dutch Reformed Church which had separated. Dudley Carleton viewed the conflict between the Remonstrants and the Counter-Remonstrants in theological terms alone, that is, as a doctrinal dispute. He did not appreciate the provincial orientation of the republic and, consequently, he did not see the correlation between the loose union of autonomous provinces and the necessity of a certain liberty of debate within the church. Carleton attempted to persuade Maurice of Orange and Oldenbarneveldt that a settlement of religious

---

[47]James I, 354.

[48]The following paragraphs as they concern the activities of Dudley Carleton as ambassador at the Hague during the years 1616-19 are based on Christopher Grayson, "James I and the Religious Crisis in the United Provinces 1613-19" Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750, ed Derek Baker, Studies in Church History: Subsidia (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), 205-19.

differences was imperative to Dutch unity. Despite the fact that the union of the Provinces had not been founded on a common ground of religion but that, on the contrary, religion had been left specifically to the authority of each province, the ambassador and his king became convinced that a national synod would be the most effective resolution of the faction and confusion in the republic. Carleton made a formal offer of English mediation.

Meanwhile, George Carleton continued his examination of the theological issues raised by Arminius. There are no copies extant of Carleton's writings on Dutch Arminianism; however, there is evidence of such work in letters from George Carleton addressed to his cousin Dudley at the Hague in 1616-7. In a letter dated 24 October 1616, Carleton described to his cousin the troubling effect that Dutch Arminianism was having on the university youth which, he related, had prompted him to write a brief examination of the writings of Arminius.[49] Shortly thereafter, Dudley Carleton mentioned in a letter to John Chamberlain that his cousin, Dr. Carleton, "hath written somewhat concerning Arminius' doctrine" and, after noting how poorly his cousin's other writings had served to advance him, added: "his diligence is to be

---

[49]CSPD v.9, 399.

commended though others go away with the preferments."[50] In the following year, George Carleton reported to his cousin that he had written a treatise in refutation of Arminius which had been approved. In this same letter, Carleton requested his cousin to confirm, if he could, the truth of a report that, as Arminius was writing a book, his right hand rotted and so he died.[51] Perhaps the ambassador found the rumor fully as credible as had his cousin.

Early in 1617 Dudley Carleton succeeded in persuading Maurice of Orange to reject any toleration of division among the Dutch Reformed churches and to pursue instead the imposition of a Calvinist orthodoxy. In March of 1617 King James sent a letter of encouragement to the Prince and another letter to the States General of the United Provinces, urging them to call a national synod to bring the Dutch churches together again. It has been argued that Dudley Carleton was crucial in fostering support among the States General for the King's proposal of a national synod; however, the means by which he gained their support have remained obscure.[52] In early

---

[50]Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters, ed Maurice Lee, Jr. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 226.

[51]CSPD v.9, 489.

[52]Grayson, 205.

October, 1617, the English ambassador addressed the States General "touching the discord...caused by the Schismaticall Doctrine of Arminius." He accused the Arminians of being the source of "schisme within the Church, and Faction in the State." He contrasted the Provinces's present estate, which he characterized as one of separation, faction and confusion, with that time before Arminius when there was "Christian love and charitie among the people" and all acknowledged "the blessing of God, which hath appeared miraculously in the defence of his cause, in the sight and notice of all the world in your prosperitie." Carleton concluded with a call for a national synod, "the Remedy which is found good by the greatest part of the Provinces, and that which is recommended to you by the King my Master;" by doing thus the States General might "give testimonie both of the respect your Lordships beare to the counsels of his Maiestie, and of the care you have to the union of your Church & Estate."[53]

It was in the following month, November, 1617, that George Carleton was named bishop of Llandaff. He wrote to his cousin Dudley Carleton shortly thereafter about

---

[53]Dudley Carleton, The Speech of Sir Dudley Carlton Lord Embassadour for the King of Great Britaine: made in the Assembly of the Lords the Estates Generall of the united Provinces of the Low Countries: Being assembled at the Haghe, 1617.

the nomination,[54] but the first part of his letter concerned once again the doctrines of Arminius. Carleton explained that, prompted by his cousin's latest letter, he had copied out his treatise against Arminius for his cousin to read that he might know "the things especially reproved in Arminius." It was not his intention that the treatise be published but he indicated that he would like the ambassador to put the work into the hands of those "amply learned" who held with Arminius that, "though they be adversaries in this particular, yett would I learn whatsoever I could understand from them." He concluded with an apology to his cousin for troubling him "yett a little more w[ith] that w[hi]ch hath so much troubled you already."[55]

George Carleton was consecrated bishop of Llandaff in July, 1618. It is possible that his cousin Dudley attended the consecration as he was in England during July and August of that year, perhaps to confer with the King concerning the decision, which the States General had reached in the late Spring, to call a national synod to meet 1 November 1618 for the purpose of settling the Dutch religious disputes. The Low Countries rather than Llandaff were to command the attention of the newly

---

[54]See above, 20-1.

[55]PRO, SP 14/94.

installed bishop as, shortly after his consecration, he was named to head the delegation which James had been invited to send to the synod. There is evidence that Carleton was selected to be a member of the delegation by the archbishop of Canterbury and that his performance at the synod justified in the primate's eyes his bias that "our Oxford men are of a better strand for judgment."[56] The other delegates were Joseph Hall, dean of Worcester, John Davenant, Master of Queens' College, Cambridge, and Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College.[57] It has been suggested that the delegates were chosen "with an eye to their generally Calvinist views."[58] However, it has also been argued that it was the moderateness of their Calvinism that recommended them as James's representatives.[59]

According to the near-contemporary church historian, Thomas Fuller, the delegates were summoned to Newmarket to receive the instructions of the King shortly before they were to depart for the Low Countries. The unity of

---

[56]PRO, SP 14/109.

[57]After the synod was in session, Walter Balcanqual, a Scot resident in England, was sent as a representative of Scotland and, when illness forced Joseph Hall to return to England, Thomas Goad, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, was chosen to replace him.

[58]Tyacke, 100.

[59]Lake, 54.

opinion that James had urged earlier upon the United Provinces he now demanded of his delegates; he advised that they reach agreement among themselves and that their joint resolve "be done agreeable to the Scriptures, and the doctrine of the Church of England." The need for peace, however, was at the center of the King's instructions and he recommended that the delegation work toward the formulation of positions sufficiently moderate as "may tend to the mitigation of heat on both sides;" further, he advised the delegates to convey to the other churches the necessity of restricting their ministers from preaching to the people on contentious subjects. As to the doctrines in dispute, it was the direction of the King that the churches be exhorted to teach the same things which were taught twenty or thirty years earlier and to conform their confessions to those of the Reformed Churches of neighboring countries. In addition, the King confirmed the special position of Dudley Carleton, directing the delegation to consult with "Our Ambassadour there residing, who is best acquainted with the form of those Countryes, understandeth well the Questions, and differences among them."[60]

---

[60]Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain (London, 1655), 77-8.

John Chamberlain related to Dudley Carleton in a letter dated 14 October 1618 that

> ...the Lord Bishop of Landaffe with his associats was to be gon towards theyre Sinodicall employment to morrow without faile, though they have no great encouragement to make haste considering the poore allowance is allotted them, but belike yt is presumed they shall want nothing there, but be defrayed to the uttermost, which wilbe all litle enough to make them savers by the bargain. God send them well to you, and so direct them in the busines, that theyre labor may be for the goode of the church, and for theyre owne and theyre countries honor.[61]

Fuller reassures us that the States General allowed the British delegation ten pounds sterling a day, "an entertainment farr larger than what was appointed to any other forreign Theologues," and the delegation "freely gave what they had freely received, keeping a Table general, where any fashionable Forreigner was courteously and plentifully entertained."[62]

The delegation, having "casually missed that Man of Warre, which the States had sent to conduct them over,"[63] arrived at Middleburg in Zeeland in late October and proceeded to the Hague where, on 6 November 1618, George Carleton, as the leader of the delegation, addressed a gathering of the States General at which his cousin, Dudley Carleton, as well as Prince Maurice of Orange were

---

[61]Chamberlain, ii, 169.

[62]Fuller, 79.

[63]Fuller, 78.

present. The bishop did not speak to the contentious doctrines which had occasioned the calling of the synod but limited his remarks to the disruptive effects of the contention itself. He conveyed his sovereign's distress over the turmoil that the United Provinces were experiencing and urged the republic to seek the "peace of God" which his royal master understood in terms of civil and ecclesiastical harmony. He reiterated King James's eirenic advice to conform to received doctrine and to avoid any innovation which might estrange the Dutch Church from the other Reformed Churches of Europe. Carleton lauded the vigilancy of Maurice of Orange in bringing peace to the commonwealth. He did not mention that this peace had been achieved by the arrest of Oldenbarneveldt and the expulsion from office of those magistrates who were inclined to the Remonstrant cause. Reflecting King James's conviction that civil authority was obliged to assume ultimate responsiblity for ecclesiastical matters, he called upon the States General to establish a like peace in the Church.

The bishop made few departures from the agenda given to the delegation by the King. However, he did touch upon a theme introduced by his cousin, the English ambassador, in his address to the States General the preceding autumn: the correspondency between the

reformation of religion and the blessings of God. "I suppose," the bishop asked his hosts, "it cannot be unknown unto your Lordships, what & how much you owe to true Religion. Religion it was, which from bloud and tempest reduced your State to these flourishing daies of quietnesse and Sunshine. Religion it was, which first begate, then enlarged, and finally established your prosperity."[64] Carleton's reminder to the states general that peace was a gift received from God was also a warning to them that its continued presence in their country depended upon the preservation of right doctrine. Carleton was firmly convinced that God would withdraw his blessings from those who would forsake true religion. His insistence upon the necessity of preserving purity of doctrine was a rejection, in effect, of the Remonstrants' stand in behalf of toleration. At the same time, he recognized that not all points of religion were absolute, that there were "those deeper speculations, which pose the Schooles themselves, and our sharpest wits, and may with probability on both sides be disputed."[65] But the confessions of the Reformed Churches, Carleton declared,

---

[64]George Carleton, An Oration Made at the Hage, before the Prince of Orenge, and the Assembly of the High and Mighty Lords, the States Generall of the United Provinces (London, 1619) hereinafter Oration, 3.

[65]Oration, 8.

could be subject to neither change nor alteration for they were of divine origin as evidenced by the fact that "though they were many, yet they so well agree in the consent and harmony of mindes, that we may plainly discover, it was the voyce of our onely Spirit, which in so many Nations, so many Languages delivered it selfe."[66]

The bishop's final words to the States General revealed less the influence of his King than of St. Paul, from whom he quoted: But all things turne to the best to those that feare God (Romans, 8:28). Carleton found the hand of God in all that happened in the world and, like the Apostle, he found God especially present among those who feared him. Believing that the fear of God demanded an absolute love of truth, Carleton admonished the brethren of the Provinces to so inform their minds with the love of truth that they "may not be ashamed to conquer and triumph over their owne errors...[but] may strive to excell each other in humilitie; not sollicitous who shall overcome, but applying all their strength, their skill, their labor, that Truth may have the victory, the Church Peace, and God the glory."[67] Carleton's speech met with the approval of the assembly, and the English ambassador noted that "both for the

---

[66]Oration, 6.

[67]Oration, 11.

choice of their persons and care in their instructions...they do all rest infinitely satisfied, ascribing to his majesty his due commendation of wisdom and prudence."[68]

The Synod of Dort may well be considered the high water mark of George Carleton's ecclesiastical career. The significance of the synod was not exclusive to the Dutch Reformed Church but was of importance as well to the Reformed Churches of Europe. In addition to the delegation from Britain, delegates were present from Geneva, Basel, the Palatinate, Hesse, Emden, Nassau and Bremen. The French Huguenots were forbidden to attend the synod by their king but were nonetheless represented by the frequent communiqués of Pierre du Moulin, French Calvinist theologian and active proponent of Protestant unity, and by the presence at the synod of the Duchesse de la Trémoille.[69] However, no delegation was more prominent than that which George Carleton headed and from the letters of John Hales, chaplain to Dudley Carleton

---

[68]Quoted in John Platt, "Eirenical Anglicans at he Synod of Dort" Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750, ed Derek Baker, Studies of Church History: Subsidia (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), 231-2.

[69]H.R. Trevor-Roper describes her as "the Huguenot grande dame...who behaved as a great power in her own right." H.R. Trevor-Roper, Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays (1987; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 58.

and his unofficial representative at the synod, it is evident that the bishop was held in much esteem both by the Dutch and by the foreign delegates.[70]

The synod was convened and sat for several weeks prior to the arrival of the Remonstrants and the activities of this period both within and without the synod must have heightened the British delegates' sense of themselves as figures of authority and influence at the theological assembly. The bishop, accompanied by the rest of the delegation, called upon the Duchess of Trémouille on the afternoon of her arrival "to entertain her, where my Lord Bishop made a speech unto her in Latin, which by her chaplain was interpreted unto her, who likewise in her name returned answer."[71] The opinions and advice of the British delegation were frequently requested in the early synodical sessions which were devoted to discussions on a variety of non-doctrinal matters. Not surprisingly, the delegates' responses were a fair reflection of English

---

[70]Knowledge of the British delegation's activities at the synod depends largely upon the reports of John Hales to Dudley Carleton and, after Hales's departure from Dort, on the letters of Walter Balcanqual to Carleton; included in the Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable Mr. John Hales are Balcanqual's letters as well as several letters to the archbishop of Canterbury from the English delegation and from Bishop Carleton and a letter from the bishop to the Dudley Carleton.

[71]John Hales, The Works of John Hales, v.3 (New York: AMS Press, 1971) hereinafter Hales, 27.

practice. The recommendation that "there should be censors to approve all such books as should go to the press"[72] was the advice of the delegation concerning the publication of theological writings; when asked his opinion on appropriate disciplinary measures for ministers who neglected their divine duties, "my Lord Bishop," reported John Hales, "shewed that with us in England the magistrate imposed a pecuniary mulct upon such as did absent themselves from divine duties; which...generally prevailed more with our people, than any pious admonitions could."[73]

The responses of Bishop Carleton bore witness not only to the outer world of the England in which he lived, but they also revealed much of the inner precincts of the man himself. The practice of moderation which the King had recommended to his delegation was wholly consonant with the bishop's intellectual inclinations. When in these first sessions the synod appeared ready to issue binding decrees on all matter of ecclesiastical minutiae, "my Lord Bishop," wrote John Hales, "being asked what he thought fit, made answer, that they were to distinguish betwixt things necessary, and not necessary. Things absolutely necessary should be absolutely decreed: other

---

[72]Hales, 44.

[73]Hales, 9.

things should be left arbitrary. Which sentence...was synodically concluded."[74] In addition, the even-handedness, which was so clearly evident in the bishop's statement to his cousin Dudley that he wished to learn whatever he could from the Arminians,[75] was again manifest in his refusal to deliver a sermon to the synod in its opening sessions. The English divines were the first among the foreigners invited to preach to the assembly, but Carleton declined the invitation in the belief that it would be difficult to preach so as to avoid touching upon some points in controversy and giving offense to one party or the other.[76]

Undoubtedly, the scrupulousness with which Carleton approached the judgments which he would be called upon to make as well as his status as the head of the preeminent foreign delegation account for the Remonstrants' application to him, immediately after their initial appearance in the synod, to intervene in their behalf. Several of the principal spokesmen of the Remonstrant cause came to Bishop Carleton's lodgings to entreat him to mediate for them with the officers of the synod that another of their company might be permitted to be present

---

[74]Hales, 39.

[75]See above, 31.

[76]Hales, 22.

with them at the synodical sessions. A record of the incident is to be found in a letter written by the bishop to his primate. Carleton related that, although powerless to help them, he had been particularly impressed with the seriousness of purpose exhibited by the Remonstrants who were disheartened by the exclusion of their colleague and pleaded the necessity of the man's eloquence to present their cause. Carleton, echoing St. Paul's declaration that the truth would become manifest without excellency of speech or the enticing words of man's wisdom, told them "they must trust the goodness of the cause, and not to the present abilities of any man."[77]

The Remonstrants were not the only party to make its way to the bishop's lodgings. Earlier the president of the synod had come to Carleton to express his fear that his presidency might be upset because he had been chosen by the Dutch alone without any respect for the wishes of the foreign delegates. Carleton assured him that the English delegation "had acknowledged him for their praeses, and so they would continue to do,

---

[77]John Hales, Golden Remains, of the ever Memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eaton Colledge, etc. (London, 1673) hereinafter Golden Remains, 173.

notwithstanding any objection might be fancied, so that of them he might secure himself."[78]

During the later sessions of the synod, it was the foreign delegates who met privately at the bishop's lodgings to consult, especially on the second article or tenet of the Remonstrants, which concerned Christ's death and man's redemption thereby and about which the Dutch theologian, Gomarus, had taken issue with one Martinius, a delegated from Bremen, and had disputed with such passion that twice he had thrown down his glove. Walter Balcanqual, who had joined the British delegation and who sent regular reports to Dudley Carleton at the Hague after the departure of John Hales, wrote to the English ambassador that following the initial dispute between Gomarus and Martinius the Dutch members of the synod "were most uncivil towards Martinius" and the foreign delegates "took it amiss as Martinius was very learned, very honest and very sound in all but the second article though he is not alone in his opinion."[79]

The dispute broke out a second time in synodical session and, according to Balcanqual, the bitterness of Gomarus's speech as well as his attacks upon the person of Martinius prompted Bishop Carleton to intervene.

---

[78]Hales, 32.

[79]Golden Remains, 109.

> At last my L of Landaffe, in good faith in a very grave, short, sweet speech, (for which as for one of the best I am perswaded he ever delivered, we and all the Exteri thought he deserved infinite commendations) he spake to the President to this purpose, that this Synodical disquisition was instituted for edification, not for any men to show studium contentionis: and therefore did desire him to look that the knot of unity were not broken: in this his Lordships speech he named no man.[80]

Barely had the bishop finished speaking when Gomarus rounded on him in a fury, objecting to his speech and declaring that no authority would abridge his freedom to speak. The president of the synod, giving his full support to Gomarus, refused to acknowledge Gomarus's abuse of Martinius's person and declared that there was nothing reprehensible in his conduct.

Martinius considered quitting Dort and his colleagues thought to return home with him, but some of the foreign delegates came to the English delegation and sought its assistance to effect a reconciliation. Balcanqual related that all the foreign delegates

> take to heart these two things, first that strangers should be used so disgracefully...; next that Gomarus durst openly in the Synod give such an irreverend answer to my Lord of Landaffe, for which unless all the exteri may have satisfaction, (except the Palatines) I believe there will be a shameful stir in the Synod.[81]

---

[80]Golden Remains, 112.

[81]Golden Remains, 114.

The bishop, Dr. Goad and Balcanqual conferred with the Dutch whom they found to be tractable; Dr. Ward and Dr. Davenant dealt with the Bremen delegates whom they found to be "mightily incensed." Balcanqual closed his report on the quarrel arising in the synod out of the second article by requesting that the ambassador counsel the president of the synod on the future course of the sessions.[82]

The division caused in the synod by the second article also existed within the British delegation itself. The question within the delegation, as within the synod, was whether the grace of redemption was general to all men or was restricted only to the elect. Carleton, in a letter to his cousin, the ambassador, wrote that Dr. Ward and Dr. Davenant "held, that the Redemption of Christ, and the Grace thereof was general to all without exception." The bishop could not see how this differed from general grace in the larger sense, as the Remonstrants would have it. "I took it neither to be a Truth of the Scripture, nor the Doctrine of the Church of England; and they thought it was both...I know, there be some Bishops in England that are of opinion that it is general without exception to all men; but I never thought that their

---

[82]Golden Remains, 114.

Opinions were the Doctrine of the Church of England."[83] Balcanqual, in his description of the delegation's divisions, noted that the controverted point was discussed "with much love and amity, no man desiring any thing to be put in our Articles, but that we should all approve of."[84] The bishop wrote in the same vein: "We keep peace and love among our selves notwithstanding some variety of Opinions."[85]

Unfortunately, love and amity could not entirely cover over the disparity of opinion that existed within the company. At Carleton's behest, they based their combined judgment on the second article on those things in which they were in agreement, leaving aside those things about which they could not agree. Nonetheless, the president of the synod took offense at some parts of the theses of the British delegation and requested the opinion of their archbishop on the matter. Carleton appears to have been disinclined either to alert the archbishop to the problems which the delegation was experiencing or to contend over the question in further synodical dispute and he engaged in a series of holding actions to avoid either course. Having already witnessed the offense

---

[83]Golden Remains, 180.

[84]Golden Remains, 103.

[85]Golden Reamins, 181.

given by Dr. Ward by proceeding so far with his opinions with various members of the synod, and even "opening the same publickly in the Synod,"[86] and convinced that the synod could not be swayed, Carleton was anxious to limit further controversy to private conferences within the delegation itself. First, he suggested that the delegation withdraw its theses from the synod and revise the offending parts. He was quite open in a letter to his cousin about his failure to convince his colleagues: "to this Dr. D. answered that he would rather have his right hand cut off, than recall or alter any thing. Thus were we driven to send to his Grace."[87] To his Grace a letter was indeed sent by Carleton; however, the object of the letter was not a request for an explication of the troublesome second article but a plea for a private admonition from the primate to the more outspoken of the British delegates to be silent if the second article caused further dispute in the synod.[88]

Eventually, the delegation received two sets of instructions concerning the second article from England; Balcanqual reported to the ambassador that

---

[86]Golden Remains, 181.

[87]Golden Remains, 181.

[88]Golden Remains, 182-3.

> my Lord his Grace's Letter is to have us conform our selves to the received distinction and restriction, with which his Grace acquainted his Majesty and received approbation from him: but I must needs say, that the directions which your Lordship hath sent from Secretary [Robert] Naunton do seem to will us to be as favourable to the general propositions as may be, giving as little offence to the Lutherans as we can.[89]

Neither the archbishop's nor the secretary's instructions arrived in time, although in Balcanqual's judgment the theses already delivered by the delegation in the synod had followed the wishes of the latter. The opinion of the British delegation was of little consequence for, as Bishop Carleton had predicted, "this Devise of the Universal Grace of Redemption will not be received in this Synod."[90]

The bishop's zeal for the good of the Church was not of a contentious nature and he had preferred in the synodical setting to assume the role of mediator and peacemaker. Nonetheless, he was to speak out once again, as he had in behalf of Martinius, against the reprehensible conduct of Gomarus who, in this instance, had misrepresented the doctrine of the Church of England. Balcanqual informed the ambassador that the decision to confront Gomarus had been reached by all of the English delegates who had then determined that the

---

[89]Golden Remains, 135.

[90]Golden Remains, 181.

bishop should be their spokesman. In formal session Carleton inquired of Gomarus if he had implied that the Church of England had not determined whether predestination had as its subject man after the fall or man before the creation. Gomarus confirmed that he had so spoken "since the words of the confession determine no farther of the subject, than (quosdam ex humano genere:)."[91] The bishop replied that he and his colleagues, having argued in behalf of the position that predestination is concerned with man after the fall, would then appear to be speaking contrary to the doctrine of their church. But, he declared, they spoke neither indiscreetly nor out of ignorance and he requested the synod to hear the words of their Confession, whereupon "Dr. Goad read publickly the seventeenth Article of the Confession, where the words are quosdam ex humano genere, in exitio & maledicto, which last words Gomarus had left out."[92] The president of the synod cautioned Gomarus not to meddle with the doctrine of other churches. The bishop then asked further leave to speak and proposed that

> Since all the forraign Divines, without exception, and likewise all the Belgick professors, except Gomarus, had already delivered their judgements for homo

---

[91]Golden Remains, 129.

[92]Golden Remains, 129.

> lapsus, and that he doubted not but the provincials would determine the same; it were very fit that the Synod should likewise determine so of it; neither was it any reason that for the particular opinion of one professour, who in this did disassent from the judgement of all the Reformed Churches, the Synod should abstain from determination of the question.[93]

Gomarus countered that Dr. Whitakers and Mr. Perkins had determined contrary to homo lapsus, and such men would certainly not be in dissent from the Confession of the Church of England, and called for discussion of both sides of the question. The president ruled that after the judgments of all of the delegations had been read, the synod would determine of that question what they thought best.

The synod lasted from mid-November of 1618 through the end of April of 1619 but as early as January it had become apparent to John Hales that the non-Dutch members were having little impact upon the proceedings and he reported to the ambassador that there was "little regard given to the judgment of the foreigners, except they speak as the provincials would have them."[94] However, the British delegates did not retreat into silence but continued to give voice to their opinions; they even introduced into the proceedings the matter of church discipline, knowing that their position was in direct

---

[93]Golden Remains, 129-30.

[94]Hales, 125.

opposition not only to the Dutch Church but to the practice of the other Reformed Churches of Europe as well. Bishop Carleton chose to introduce the subject of discipline when, in the final days of the synod, the Belgic Confession was presented to the assembly for its consideration. The Belgic Confession was the received confession of the Dutch Reformed Church, and of the Reformed French Church as well, and synodical approbation of its doctrinal tenets was sought in the belief that the international membership of the synod offered an opportunity to further establish the Confession. Special care had been taken to suppress those articles of the Confession which addressed church discipline and avowed the parity of ministers so as to insure the support of the episcopally-oriented British delegation.

Seven years later, in 1626, the members of the British delegation published a statement, concerning their testimony on the articles of the Belgic Confession on church discipline, entitled A Joynt Attestation, avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synode of Dort.[95] According to the statement, the British delegates had decided among themselves that it was not fit to remain silent

---

[95]The statement was published over the names of Carleton, Davenant, Balcanqual, Ward and Goad.

concerning the parity of ministers, which is the basis of the presbyterial discipline, even though they believed that there was no hope of persuasion, "especially in that Church, where the Civill government is popular, and so complyeth more easily with Ecclesiasticque Parity."[96] Accordingly, Bishop Carleton, "contrary to the expectation of the whole Synode," declared in the name of his delegation its "expresse exception against the suppressed Articles" and its utter dissent on the matter of the parity of ministers. Carleton then set forth the order and manner of church-government in the Church of England, contrasting the dominical origins of the episcopal order with the absence of any scriptural authority for the presbyterial system. He demonstrated to the synod that a presbyterial parity had never been instituted by Christ, for Christ had ordained twelve apostles and seventy disciples with the authority of the twelve over the others; furthermore, he argued, the bishops, as the successors to the apostles, were left the government of the Church while the ministers, who succeeded the seventy, were to be governed by the bishops. Carleton declared that this order of bishops and ministers had been maintained since the time of the

---

[96]A Joynt Attestation, avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synode of DORT (London, 1626) hereinafter Attestation, 8.

apostles and he appealed to the judgment of the early Church for confirmation of the superiority of the episcopal order.[97]

The British delegates acknowledged in the 1626 statement that they had been fully cognizant of the fact that they went beyond the scope of the royal instructions in their defense of the episcopal order; however, they related that in their private conversations with many of the Dutch Reformed ministry, they had found them "more ready to deplore, then defend their owne estate, and wished rather then hoped, to bee made like the flourishing Church of England."[98] The delegation had decided that their position should be principally argued by Carleton, "whom for prioritie of age, place, and dignitie it best became, and from whose person, and gravitie it might be the better taken by the Civill Deputees of the States there present."[99] It would appear that Carleton made a profound impact upon the assembly, for the statement goes on to record that

> not one word was answered by any of the Synodiques either Strangers or Provincialls. So that herein we may seeme to have had either their consent implied by silence, or at least approbation of our just and necessary performance of our bounden duty to that

---

[97]Attestation, 10-11.

[98]Attestation, 5.

[99]Attestation, 10.

> Church, whereunto they all afforded no small respect, though differing in government from their severall Churches.[100]

Joseph Hall was to recall in later years that one of the proudest moments of the synod was Carleton's speech in defense of the episcopal system, although Hall himself did not hear the speech as he had already left the synod.[101]

The sojourn at Dort is the only period of Carleton's life for which there is a descriptive record of the bishop and his activities. It is of particular interest because it provides an opportunity to observe his theological stance when subject to the contentions and passions of the public forum and his conduct under the pressure of conflict. Nowhere in his formal works do we encounter the man with the immediacy that is to be found in the accounts of the synodical gathering. Nothing of a startling nature is revealed about Carleton's theology; he conformed to the established orthodoxy of early seventeenth century England. He embraced the Reformed theology of grace in its entirety: that predestination is unconditional, that atonement is limited to the elect, that the elect cannot fall from grace but will persevere

---

[100]Attestation, 11-2.

[101]Frank Huntley, Bishop Joseph Hall 1574-1656: A Biographical and critical study (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer Ltd, 1979), 106.

in grace to the end. However, there was nothing in his performance at the synod to warrant Anthony Wood's description of him as "a severe Calvinist."[102] Carleton's Calvinism reflected the Reformed tradition of the mid-Elizabethan Oxford of his young manhood, a tradition more influenced by John Calvin than by his successors and affected as well by other Reformed traditions of the continent.[103] The moderateness of his position was clearly demonstrated by his argument before the synod in behalf of a sublapsarian approach to predestinarian theology.

While the synod did not offer the occasion to debate the validity of one church discipline as opposed to another, Carleton made the occasion and argued with great conviction in behalf of the apostolic origins of the episcopacy. Among the Reformed Churches, the episcopal order was unique to the Church of England. However, its origins remained a subject of dispute within the English Church and even within the episcopate itself. Nonetheless, it was not considered a radical position and Carleton had argued similarly in his ecclesiastical writings.

---

[102]Wood, 441.

[103]C.M. Dent, Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford (Oxford: University Press, 1983), 74-102.

However, it is not Carleton's conformity but his response to the theological diversity with which he was confronted at Dort that is matter for further consideration. Diversity was nothing new to him as he was well aware of the diversity of opinion which was to be found on the bench of bishops.[104] Throughout the controversy over the second article, concerning the universality of Christ's redeeming grace, the bishop's conduct appears in vivid contrast to that of his Dutch counterparts whose behavior ranged from unreasonable to savage. The evenness of his approach to the difficulties arising over the question of universal grace both within his delegation and within the synod declares his determination to avoid the adoption of a rigid stance which might lead to division. His conversations with Martinius of Bremen and the discussions held with his British colleagues are demonstrative of the significance which he placed upon the search for truth; only through the pursuit of the truth could one hope to know God and to find salvation. His conduct further attests to an appreciation of the fact that those whose opinions were in conflict with his own were neither his opponents nor his adversaries but were seekers after the truth as surely as he believed himself to be. Without denying

---

[104]see above, 45-6.

those things which were necessary for salvation, he concentrated his attention on those areas in which agreement might be found; ultimately, his aim was to include rather than exclude.

Equally significant is Carleton's concern for the excluded, for the Remonstrants. In a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury in the second month of the synod, Carleton conveyed the impression which he had received from conversation with some of the Remonstrants to the effect that they might withdraw themselves from the disastrous course which they had taken. However, he added, in the event that this did not occur and the States General took action to depose all offending ministers, might not some motion "be made to the States for some consideration or stipend to be given the Remonstrants, if they shall be deposed."[105] The generosity of spirit which frequently shows itself in Carleton's formal works is also to be observed in his personal conduct as revealed by his letters and the reports of his colleagues.

Bishop Carleton received a gold medal from the Dutch States for his service to the synod and was commended in a letter to King James I as the foremost man of the delegation and a model of learning and piety. Within a

---

[105]Golden Remains, 175.

few weeks of Carleton's return from the synod, the bishop's prospects for preferment were once again the subject matter of John Chamberlain's correspondence. In a letter to Dudley Carleton dated 31 May 1619, Chamberlain outlined the ecclesiastical moves which the death of the bishop of Norwich had been expected to set in motion, Harsnett of Chichester to Norwich, the Dean of Westminster to Chichester, the Dean of Winchester to Westminster; but instead, Chamberlain noted with obvious satisfaction over the news, the bishop of Llandaff had come "in tempore" to be translated to the newly-vacated see of Chichester, "which though yt be not altogether so goode as I could wish him, yet is yt a great deale better then his Welsh diocese."[106] For once Carleton's timing was right.

When Bishop Carleton sent news of the preferment to his cousin, he confided his belief that the promotion had come through the influence of the Duke of Buckingham.[107] However, in a subsequent letter to his cousin dated 20 July 1619, the bishop gave all the credit for his advancement to the ambassador himself.[108] Bishop Carleton had become convinced that his cousin's "friendly

---

[106]Chamberlain, ii, 241.

[107]CSPD v.10, 49.

[108]See above, 20.

relation of my poor service made the service to be remembered,"[109] and there are letters extant between John Chamberlain and Dudley Carleton which would appear to uphold the bishop's conviction. In a letter dated 14 November 1618 Dudley Carleton sent a copy of the bishop's speech at the Hague which "hath yet escaped the press" to Chamberlain with the request that he acquaint "my lord bishop of Winchester [Lancelot Andrewes] therewith and by that means to preserve me in his memory and good opinion."[110] Chamberlain delivered the copy to Andrewes which "he was glad to see and tooke kindly from you."[111] Again, in April of 1619, there is a letter from Chamberlain assuring the ambassador that his request to put the treatise of the Lord of Llandaff in the hands of the archbishop of Spalato has been carried out: "He tooke this curtesie very kindly from your Lordship and kepes the writing still by him."[112] Another letter in the same month included the news that Chamberlain had dined with the bishop of Winchester "and delivered him my Lord of Landaffes treatise."[113] It would appear that the

---

[109]PRO, SP 14/109.

[110]Carleton to Chamberlain, 262.

[111]Chamberlain, ii, 187.

[112]Chamberlain, ii, 226.

[113]Chamberlain, ii, 230.

bishop of Llandaff's cousin had indeed attempted to keep news of the bishop's service at the Synod of Dort current in England, though his motives for doing so may have been somewhat mixed.

However, Dudley Carleton's efforts in his cousin's behalf would not have been sufficient to have assured the bishop's advancement had not the King been interested in the nature of Bishop Carleton's service. Evidence of the importance which the Synod of Dort had for the King can be measured by the subsequent ecclesiastical advancement of his original delegation: Carleton to Chichester immediately upon the conclusion of the synod, the elevation of John Davenant to the bishopric of Salisbury in 1621 and the offer of the bishopric of Gloucester to Joseph Hall in 1624. Further evidence of the King's keen interest may be found in a letter from Bishop Carleton, again to his cousin:

> His ma[jes]tie is well satisfied with the doings att Dort, for he hathe taken diverse occasions to speak against the Remonstrants as men not tollerable. We have great cause to thank god that we have a king of judgement for otherwise how things might have been accepted here I know not. But now I am sure that his ma[jes]ties judgement putts all adversaries to silence and nothing is heard but approbation of those things which his ma[jes]tie approves.[114]

Before the year was out, Chamberlain had gossip of a different nature to relate to his friend, the ambassador

---

[114]PRO, SP 14/109.

at the Hague. "Your cousen Carleton bishop of Chichester shall marrie the Lady Nevill Sir Henries widow."[115] At the time of his preferment to Chichester, Carleton had received an admonition from his cousin to remain single to which the bishop had replied with gracious thanks for the ambassador's opinion on the matter and the recollection that he had received the same advice years earlier and had never regretted that he had not followed it; for "the report of the conversation of the unmarried made me to think better of the course which I took then of theirs."[116] Anne Neville, the daughter of Sir Henry Killegrew, had had five sons and six daughters by her first husband. According to Anthony Wood, there was issue from the union of the bishop and Anne, a son who was christened Henry.[117]

In the years after Dort, Carleton seems to have preferred to remain at home in his diocese, finding "such practices in the Court that he is best who is farthest

---

[115]Chamberlain, ii, 270.

[116]PRO, SP 14/109.

[117]Wood writes that Henry Carleton, "living sometimes in the Parish of Furte in Sussex, [was] elected Burgess for Arundel, to serve in that Parliament which began at Westm. 13. Apr. 1640. and from the unhappy Parliament which began on the 3. Nov. following, he received a Commission from the Members thereof to be a Captain, in which office and command he shew'd himself an Enemy to the Bishops." Wood, 442.

off,"[118] and turned his attention to a consideration of the special providence of God in the history of England since the time of Elizabeth I when "the Gospel beganne here to flourish." In 1624 he published A Thankfull Remembrance of God's Mercy, a recollection of the blessings which God had showered upon England from the accession of Elizabeth forward, a history of sorts which was structured upon the struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil, a struggle which would end only with the overthrow of the Antichrist. Carleton's preoccupation with God's providence is evident in a letter to his cousin, Dudley Carleton, written in May, 1624, concerning the existing struggle in Europe.

> Yet I think it a matter of the greatest importance that hath been moved in christendom this many hundreth years. For when arms are up on all sides it is not the recovery of the Palatine that will give full satisfaction, for all the power of the papists in christendom and all the power of the protestants will be ingaged in the quarrell. So that I think that either England must fall or Rome must fall in the end. Now because we have some prophesies of scripture that wantonly Rome shall fall and since no such prophesies of the fall of England, therefore I have this good hope in god that England that hath kept the faith shall by gods mercy and power prevail in the end against them that have forsaken gods truthe.[119]

A Thankfull Remembrance proved a popular book and ran to four editions within a space of six years.

---

[118]CSPD v.10, 371.

[119]PRO, SP 14/164.

In the same letter quoted above, Carleton mentioned that, as he was kept for reasons of health from attending Parliament which was then in session, he had written to the archbishop of Canterbury to inform him that "in diverse places the doctrine of generall grace is published with such confidence, as if it were the doctrine of the church of England." In his own diocese, he intended to "take order with some of these humorists." But it had been his suggestion to the archbishop that "for the peace of the church" either the articles agreed upon at Dort or the Lambeth Articles be approved in convocation. The Dort canons had been published in England but had never been formally accepted by the English Church.

The theological inquiry and discussion generated by the Dutch Arminian controversy throughout the second decade of the seventeenth century had served to accentuate differences among English divines concerning the doctrine of grace.[120] There was a dominance of Calvinist orthodoxy in the early seventeenth century Church of England; however, not all the clergy and educated laity were explicitly Calvinist. The broad membership of the Church had been possible because of the ambiguity which surrounded the Church's doctrinal stance

---

[120]Tyacke, 87.

and a certain measure of theological nonconformity had been permitted as long as it remained quiet and unobtrusive. The doctrine of grace had periodically occasioned intense controversy since the beginnings of the reformation in England as schoolmen tried to harmonize the belief in salvation as a divine gift with the notion of the liberty of man. However, the basic premise of Reformed theology, that salvation was by grace alone, was never in question; conflict arose out of differences in emphasis, "of theological temperature."[121] It remained a debate without resolution, but a debate that always took place within the Reformed tradition. In contrast, what came to be known as English Arminianism was marked by a radical and self-conscious departure from Calvinist orthodoxy and, consequently, the debate moved outside the Reformed tradition.[122]

In 1624 Richard Mountague published A New Gagg for an Old Goose to refute a Catholic work which, Mountague contended, misrepresented the doctrine of the Church of England. Mountague was an outspoken, anti-Puritan cleric, one of whose livings was in the diocese of Chichester. In his attempt to define the differences

---

[121]Patrick Collinson, The Elizabeth Puritan Movement (London:Methuen, 1982).

[122]Lake, 33-4, 61.

between the teachings of the Church of Rome and the Church of England, Mountague denied that unconditional election and the indefectability of the elect were doctrines of the English Church. He attributed such notions to the Puritans whose theological positions, he argued, did not reflect the orthodox faith of the Church of England. As George Carleton was his diocesan, it is likely that Mountague was the "humorist" with whom Carleton intended to take order. The bishop's concern was more than matched by Parliament's, where a petition was brought against Mountague. In the following year, 1625, Mountague published another work, Appello Caesarem, a defense of the earlier book.

Mountague was widely attacked in print for the Arminian position which he appeared to propound and Carleton was among those who publicly disputed his position. An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England was Carleton's final work. Published just two years before his death, two separate editions of An Examination appeared in 1626, the second of which included the statement on discipline by the English delegates to the Synod of Dort, A Joynt Attestation.[123]

---

[123]See above, 51.

Carleton deplored Mountague's book as an attempt to make mischief with the Reformed doctrine of grace which, he maintained, constituted the basis of English Protestant unity as well as the unity to be found between the Church of England and the Reformed Churches on the continent. While he conceded that the Puritans had disquieted the Church over discipline, he insisted that bishops and Puritans "held the same doctrine without variance."[124] In his dispute with Mountague, Carleton's tone was more sorrowful than angry:

> It troubled mee not a litle, I confesse, that I am to deale with a Minister of the Church of England; one that hath beene mine ancient Acquaintance, of whom I had greater and better hopes: But in Gods Cause all respects of Friendship and Acquaintance, yea if it were of blood and kindred, must give place to the Truth...I am not out of hope of reclaiming of him, seeing hee hath promised, that if the evidence be cleare against him...he will recall it.[125]

In his explanation of the theological errors and scriptural misinterpretations of Appello Caesarem, Carleton exhibited the same generosity towards Mountague which he had earlier evidenced towards his colleagues at Dort:

---

[124]George Carleton, An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England (London, 1626) hereinafter Exam, 121.

[125]Exam, 4-5.

> I thinke that the Author of the Appeale is but a young Scholler in the Arminian Schoole, and did not well foresee these consequences, but from the grounds that he hath layed, these things must follow: the grace of prædestination, and the grace of Gods calling must be lost.[126]

Carleton dedicated his refutation of Mountague's Appello Caesarem to Charles I who had assumed the throne in 1625. He was fully aware that the King had been the recipient of the dedication in Mountague's book as well. Both Carleton and Mountague were chaplains to the King, and each appreciated the power of the King to defend the embattled. However, in his request for the assistance of the King, Carleton declared "I wil not say, Defende me gladio," as Mountague himself had written, "but defend the truth and faith, whereof God hath made you the Defender, and God...wil not faile to defend you."[127] Charles gave his protection to Mountague and left to God the defense of truth and faith. He chose to defend instead the peace and quiet of the Church and issued a proclamation 16 June 1626 in which true religion was affirmed, innovation decried, and the peace of Church and state commanded.[128] The ambiguity of the Prayer Book, of the Articles of Religion and of the Homilies was upheld.

---

[126]Exam, 124.

[127]Exam, sig. A3.

[128]J.P. Kenyon, The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1986), 138-9.

Of Carleton's last years, there is recorded only the amiable observation of Thomas Fuller that as Carleton had, when young, been grave in his manners, "so when old he was youthful in his parts, even unto his death."[129] Wood notes that Carleton "lived to a good old age," dying in May, 1628 and "was buried in the Choire, near to the Altar, of his Cath[edral] Church at Chichester, on the 27 of the same month."[130] By the first of July, 1628 it was public knowledge that Richard Mountague, the "young Scholler" and "humorist" who had published his opinions "as if it were the doctrine of the Church of England," would be Carleton's successor in the bishop's chair at Chichester.

---

[129]Thomas Fuller, Fuller's Worthies (Reprint, London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1952), 447.

[130]Wood, 442.

PART TWO

The English Works of George Carleton

In 1616, Dudley Carleton, ambassador at The Hague, gossiped to John Chamberlain that if the most recent doctrinal treatise of his cousin, Doctor Carleton, "fare no better...than for other his labors he were better take his ease in his old age."[1] The ambassador characterized his cousin as diligent in his literary efforts, but singularly unsuccessful in his attempts to win preferment thereby. Lacking a powerful patron to further his advancement, it would appear that the pen was the only means to preferment available to George Carleton. However, Carleton was fortunate that, having no other recourse for advancement, he had James I for his king and the supreme governor of the Church. In contrast to his predecessor, James was vitally interested in theology and theological controversy, enjoyed the company and conversation of clerics and, occasionally writing on theological matters himself, took special interest in those learned divines who added to the literature of theological debate.

Recent scholarship on the Jacobean Church of England has centered on the stability and the apparent

---

[1]Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624 Jacobean Letters, ed. Maurice Lee, Jr. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 226.

harmony that was achieved during the reign of James.[2] The thesis has been advanced that James's ecclesiastical policy, as indeed his whole notion of kingship, was based upon the careful cultivation and balance of faction; James identified the ideological divisions that existed within the Church and was able to successfully maintain a balance among the differing interests by isolating and excluding the more radically-minded while incorporating those of more moderate opinions into the ecclesiastical establishment. Viewing the Puritan and the papist as representing a threat to royal authority, he appreciated as well the radical nature of the anti-Puritan and the antipapist and the potential threat of each to the unity of the Church. In the interests of ecclesiastical unity, he cultivated the diversity that flourished on his bench of bishops by elevating to the episcopate representatives of a variety of theological opinion and churchmanship, both "evangelical Calvinists who were committed to a preaching ministry and to an episcopal church...and Protestants who were sympathetic

---

[2]Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I," Journal of British Studies 24 (April 1985), 169-207; Lake, Anglicans and Puritans? (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988); Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635," Past and Present 114 (1987), 32-76; Patrick Collinson, The Religion of Protestants (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

to his irenic and ambivalent attitude to Rome."[3] It has been noted that the bench of bishops was never a unified body;[4] but the diversity of the Jacobean bench, it would appear, was the very intent and design of the King.

If, because of the broad spectrum of theological opinion to be found on the bench, it cannot be demonstrated that George Carleton was a typical Jacobean bishop, it can be determined that neither was he an anomaly. Having no evidence of the pastoral activities of Carleton, it is necessary to rely upon his written works in order to determine where Carleton finds his place in the Jacobean Church. Fortunately, his works contain a variety of subject matter both of a theological and of an ecclesiastical nature and offer position statements on a number of issues. From these works it is possible to establish at least a partial understanding of Carleton's theology and churchmanship and to appreciate the characteristics of his thought. His writings, taken together, do not form a coherent system, nor is there any evidence that they were intended to do so. It was not to abstract aspects of

---

[3]Fincham and Lake, 187.

[4]Claire Cross, Church and People 1450-1660 (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1976), 153.

doctrinal orthodoxy or Church polity that Carleton addressed himself; his theological and ecclesiastical publications were occasioned instead by specific points of current controversy and debate. Nonetheless, there is a consistency of perspective to be found in his work and a consideration of this, as well as a consideration of which points of contention he chose to defend, which to refute and which to ignore, provides sufficient data upon which to draw some conclusions concerning Carleton as a Jacobean bishop.

The over-arching concern of Carleton's works was with the search for and the love of truth. The love of truth was exemplified in the preservation of right doctrine, in purity of belief and in obedience to the faith, and Carleton insisted that these constituted man's obligation to God. Truth was to be found in the Scriptures, and it was obvious, visible, easily recognizable and readily available to the diligent seeker. Carleton did not limit his discussion of truth to expository discourse but frequently adopted a pastoral tone, exhorting his reader, sometimes pleading with his reader, to seek the truth. Even the Pope he admonished to labor to know the truth, that he might escape the snares of Satan. Yet Carleton also acknowledged that a love of truth was a gift from God.

Herein, there appears to be some conflict in the Calvinist orientation of Carleton's theology: he described the love of truth as a gift from God, yet declared that it was within the grasp of any man who cared to save his soul, which would imply universal election. Likewise, in his refutation of Richard Mountague's repudiation of the absolute decree of predestination, Carleton argued that God's will was irrespective of the will of man; yet in his guide to the true Church he argued that those who seek the truth will be saved from damnation. Once again, Carleton did not subscribe to the belief that Christ died for all men, believing instead that he died only for the elect; yet in his moderate Calvinism he emphasized inclusion rather than exclusion, God's goodness to man rather than man's perversity, the comfortable doctrine of election rather than the desperate sentence of reprobation. Carleton likened a love of the truth to Noah's ark; it was the saving means, the vessel of salvation. The metaphor of the ark seems singularly appropriate, although Carleton overlooks the fact that all those on the ark were invited.

The Reformation replaced the authority of the Pope with the authority of Scripture and it has been noted that, in their endeavors to define doctrinal truth, the

Reformers found it necessary to ascribe to the Scriptures perfect clarity.[5] It is not surprising then to find that Carleton, in his understanding of the truth of the Scriptures, did not admit the notion of interpretation, to say nothing of misinterpretation. He assumed a perfect congruence between his understanding of the Word and the intention of the Holy Spirit. Since it was his belief that the Scriptures were self-evident in their presentation of the truth, any question of dispute was deemed to be the result of blindness to the truth or, worse, of willful and obstinate striving against the truth. While Carleton held the Scriptures to be the sole and supreme authority concerning right doctrine, he also held in esteem the writings of the early Church Fathers, as well as the history of the early Church, as sources of authority and he frequently cited both. He took little notice of contemporary theological writings, except insofar as their authors might prove to be the adversary against whom to debate, and rarely cited a contemporary as an authoritative source.

The question of authority was inextricably bound up with Carleton's understanding of the truth of

---

[5]Conrad Russell, "Arguments for Religious Unity in England, 1530-1650," Journal of Ecclesiastical History XVIII (October 1967), 212.

Scripture, and the Council of Trent figures prominently in his work as that point in the history of the Western Churches when the Church of Rome turned her back on truth by overreaching her authority. It was Carleton's opinion that the break with Rome by the Reformed Churches was the result of a fundamental difference over the locus and nature of authority in the Church. He maintained that Rome had not only assumed an authority equal to the authority of the Scriptures but had attempted to make the authority of the Scriptures subject to the Pope. The decision at Trent to assign final authority to the Pope in matters of faith and doctrine reduced the Scriptures to a place of secondary importance. The course of the debate with the Church of Rome after Trent may have appeared to have taken the form of dispute over points of doctrine and faith, but to Carleton the real dispute after Trent concerned the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

It has been argued that the rights and authority of the king over the Church was for James the essential ecclesiastical issue. His conception of the Christian community had at its center the Christian prince, empowered directly by God to govern the Church and supported by a divinely ordained episcopacy.[6]

---

[6]Fincham and Lake, 189.

Carleton readily affirmed the authority of the king over the care and administration of the Church by divine right, but he was more deeply absorbed by the corollary issue, the status of the clergy as scripturally enjoined. Carleton published two works of an ecclesiastical nature, each a jure divino defense of a particular aspect of the clerical estate. In each he succeeded in expanding the concept of divine right: in the one work, to include the material assets of the Church; and in the other, to assert the independence of the episcopacy from any other authority in matters of faith and doctrine.

Carleton fashioned each of his ecclesiastical works in the form of a polemic against the Church of Rome, although in each work he was, in fact, making two arguments, taking issue with an opposing or differing position within the Church of England as well as disputing the position of the Church of Rome. The polemical device appears to have been used to veil the provocative nature of his theses. By disputing the position of the Church of Rome on questions which were still open to dispute in the Church of England, Carleton was able to present his counterposition as the orthodox teaching of the English Church.

Absent from Carleton's works is any reference to the practice of religion. In the Jacobean Church, some indication of the divisions which were present within the ranks of the clergy can be discovered by a consideration of the various emphases of worship. Roughly, division lay between the altar and the pulpit, between the grace of the sacraments and the efficacy of the Word preached. Considering the Word-orientation of Carleton's writings, the expectation would be that he would give primary importance to preaching, but of preaching he said not a word. Only once are the sacraments mentioned and only the sacrament of baptism; he distinguished between the external sign of baptism and the inward grace of rebirth and renewal in the spirit, and cautioned against confusion of the sign with the inner sanctification.

Carleton's orthodoxy was Calvinist. The argument has been made and widely accepted that Calvinism was the established orthodoxy of the majority of the clergy of the Church of England in the early seventeenth century and probably of most of the educated laity.[7] It provided a crucial link between the English Church and the Kirk of Scotland and between conformist and

---

[7]Nicholas Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution," Origins of the English Civil War, ed. Conrad Russell (London: Macmillan, 1973), 120-1.

nonconformist as well. However, Calvinism varied in texture and in emphasis and the Calvinist orthodoxy of the Lambeth Articles of 1595 was not the same as the Calvinist orthodoxy of the suffrages delivered by the English delegation to the Synod of Dort in 1619. Carleton's formal writings, and reports and letters concerning his activities and speeches at Dort, are characterized by a moderate form of Calvinism: defense of a sublapsarian position concerning God's double decree of election and reprobation; a careful distinction between the visible and the invisible Church; acknowledgement of the authenticity of the Church of Rome prior to Trent; some ambiguity concerning the identification of the Pope as the Antichrist. However, his Calvinism was not so modified as to permit the acceptance of the proposal of his younger colleagues at Dort of hypothetical universalism, that Christ died for everyone though not everyone is saved through Christ; nor could he waver in his allegiance to the crucial Calvinist doctrines of predestination and assurance.

Since most of his works were written in English, it was obviously not Carleton's intention to address an international audience; instead, he directed his opinions and observations to his countrymen.

Frequently, he made specific address to those Englishmen whom he deemed to be blind to the subtle seductions of the Church of Rome or to those innovators within the English Church who would set aside the episcopacy, despite its apostolic origins, in favor of a parity of ministers. Carleton feared that those who departed from the truth of God jeopardized not only their own salvation but the privileged position of the English Church before all other nations. To Carleton it was obvious that England occupied a special place in the Divine Providence and that the Church of England was blessed with the holy and heavenly protection of God; the English nation, like Israel of old, was a chosen people, a nation divinely elected to keep and preserve the truth of God. The Church of England and the English nation being one and the same for Carleton, he found a parallel between the English Church and the Church at Rome whom St. Paul addressed: "if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Treasonous plots, conspiracies and rebellions had been suffered by the English nation since it had chosen to establish God's truth, but in its suffering was its glory and by its suffering God's love of his people and of the Church had been made manifest. Carleton marvelled at God's favor to the

English nation, and admonished his readers to return God's favor with devotion to his truth, trust in his power and sincere and faithful service to his Church.

For all the passionate feeling which Carleton frequently brought to his work, his writings are never lacking in good will. The tone of his works is one of concern, of admonishment, of encouragement: a mix of father and teacher and pastor. Even in his indignation, his aim is obviously not to overwhelm his opposition but to persuade it to his opinion, to return the wandering soul to the orthodoxy of the Church and to the truth of God. In his final work, a refutation of Richard Mountague's Appello Caesarem, Carleton resorted to rhetorical invective and assimulated to his opponent's theses those of the Pelagians; however, he mitigated the sternness of his disapproval by attributing the misguidance of Mountague's opinions to his youth. The voice of his work is finally reminiscent of St. Paul, not least because Carleton cited the Apostle with great frequency in all of his works; but also because, like the Pauline epistles, Carleton's writings seem to be an attempt to share the writer's profound sense of the glory and the wonder and the blessings of God.

Tithes Examined and Proved to be due to the Clergie by a divine right

The reformers of religion, in their zeal to reform the doctrine of the Church, gave little attention to the means by which the Church and its ministers were to be maintained. However, as the focus of divine service in the Reformed Churches shifted from the sacrifice of the altar to the word preached, the focal point of the church became the pulpit and it became essential that a minister be learned, well grounded in Scripture and capable of giving a worthy sermon. The parliaments of Elizabeth I had consistently demanded that every parish be supplied with a sufficient preacher, despite the Queen's repeated declarations that the affairs of the Church were not the business of either House and the demand for a learned ministry continued to be heard in the parliaments of her successor. There were two obstacles facing the Church of England in its efforts to improve and extend the preaching ministry. One was the lack of control exercised by the Church over entry to church livings; at the time of the accession of James I, it was estimated that the patronage of five-sixths of the benefices of England was held by

laymen.[1] However, the Church perceived the major obstacle to be the poverty of thousands of livings,[2] and the foremost cause of that poverty to be the abrogation of tithes, either by impropriation or by commutation.

Immediately prior to the convening of the first Parliament of James I, the bishops came together to consider the directives given by the King at the close of the Hampton Court Conference. In a summation of their proceedings, it was noted that "the cheifest drifts which this Consultacon aymeth att is: how every parishe may afforde a competent mayntenance for a Preacher." It was the bishops' belief that once ecclesiastical incomes were sufficient "in shorte tyme there would be able ministers almost for every parish in England."[3] Among the several measures proposed to correct the economic inadequacies of many church livings were the restoration of tithes in kind, the readjustment of compositions and the allotment for

---

[1]S.B. Babbage, Puritanism and Richard Bancroft (London: SPCK, 1962), 307.

[2]Patrick Collinson, The Religion of Protestants (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 69.

[3]Roland G. Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1910), ii, 332.

preachers of a congruam portionem, a convenient portion, out of impropriations.

When Parliament met, the House of Commons also acknowledged the connection between tithes and a learned clergy; however, the Commons, reversing the reasoning of the bishops concerning the condition of the clergy, passed a bill allowing parishioners to withhold tithes from any minister who could not produce testimony to his moral conduct and ability to preach. The bill was rejected by the Lords.[4] In the same Parliament the bishops sponsored a bill "for a convenient portion to be assigned out of every Impropriation for the maintenance of a preaching minister." The Commons rejected the bill on first reading.[5]

In 1606 George Carleton published his work on the nature of tithes entitled Tithes Examined and Proved to be due to the Clergie by a divine right. Carleton took the position that the tithe belonged exclusively to the Church because it had been so ordained by God; his was the first published statement of a jure divino case for tithes. A similar position had been argued twenty

---

[4]S.R. Gardiner, History of England from the Accession of James I, to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642 (Reprint, New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965), i, 179-80.

[5]Babbage, 308.

years earlier by Lancelot Andrewes for his divinity determination. At that time Andrewes had claimed to be the first to argue from a jure divino position in behalf of tithes, "nor is there any by whose candle I shall light mine."[6] After having developed arguments from Scripture and having cited the Church Fathers, the Church Councils and the Decretals prior to 400, Andrewes had brought his thesis to a climax with the argument that no layman could ever rest assured in his possession of tithes, whether he held title or not, because time could not strengthen a claim to which the layman had no right from the beginning. Andrewes had declined to publish; his argument, had it been made public, would have alarmed close to one-third of the tithe holders of the country.

The tithe was originally, and primarily, an ecclesiastical levy, but it was by no means entirely so. Tithes were held as well by laymen in whose hands they became private property which could be bought or sold, leased or bequeathed.[7] In 1576 Edmund Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury, had pointed out to the Queen that "this church of England hath been by

---

[6]L. Andrewes, Of the Right of Tithes (1647 translation) n.pag.

[7]Eric J. Evans, The Contentious Tithe The tithe problem and English agriculture, 1750-1850 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976), 8-9.

appropriations...spoiled of the livings, which at the first were appointed to the offices of preaching and teaching....So as at this day, in my opinion, where one church is able to yield sufficient living for a learned preacher, there be at least seven churches unable to do the same."[8] In 1603, it was estimated that 3,849 livings were impropriate out of a total of slightly more than 9200.[9]

The tithe system had not been a divisive issue before the middle of the sixteenth century. However, in addition to the dissolution of the monasteries in the 1530s, through which much of the patrimony of the Church had passed into the hands of laymen, the sixteenth century witnessed a dramatic rise in the cost of living. Between 1500 and 1640 the cost of living rose 650 percent.[10] Inflation as much as impropriation created dispute over tithes. Initially, all tithes had been paid in kind. But by 1600, in many parishes, the payment of small tithes in kind had been commuted; agreements between parson and parishioners,

---

[8]Quoted in Christopher Hill, Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 139.

[9]Roger J.P. Kain and Hugh C. Prince, The Tithe Surveys of England and Wales (Cambridge: University Press, 1985), 10.

[10]Hill, 93.

either collectively or individually, had been reached in which a monetary payment was arranged in lieu of tithes in kind. These payments, some subject to periodic adjustment and others considered of a permanent nature, could not keep pace with the inflationary trends of the market; the real value of fixed monetary payments, agreed upon in a static economy, was drastically reduced, resulting in severe hardship to many of the clergy by the early seventeenth century.

Carleton approached the subject of tithes with caution. He did not directly attack those laymen who held tithes to their own use or who gave over to the Church only a fraction of a tenth. Instead he announced on the title page of the first edition that his work was directed toward "the contentious and prophane Atheists, as also the dissembling Hypocrites of this age, [that they] may learne to honeur the Minsters and not to defraude them, and to Rob the Church." Atheists and hypocrites as declared opponents were safer than impropriators. Carleton dedicated the work to the archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft, whose efforts to restore to the Church something of her lost patrimony particularly characterized not only his primacy but his life-long career in the Church.

Carleton indicated in the dedicatory note that the question of the tithe had long interested him, but that only upon Bancroft's assumption of the primacy was the prospect of the publication of his opinion a possibility. "Such hath beene the prejudice of the times" that fear of "censures hath moved me to suppresse for a long time that which I had written of this question." Carleton was confident of the archbishop's acceptance of the dedication because of Bancroft's efforts in behalf of the Church to remove, or at least to modify, the oppressions under which it labored; specifically, the archbishop had worked for the restoration of tithes in kind "that the malice of injurious customes and prescriptions against the Church may be abated: [and, secondly,] that the use of impropriating may now at least be staied from proceeding to any further greavance of the Church." Even impropriators might be persuaded to give consent to the staying of further impropriation.

Immediately following the dedication was a letter to the reader, written by William Covell, one of Archbishop Bancroft's chaplains. It has been suggested that the inclusion of an epistle by one of the archbishop's retinue may indicate that Carleton's treatise was part of a "pseudo-official campaign on the

issue [of tithes], prompted by Bancroft's longstanding desire to do something' about impropriations."[11] Covell exercised no caution in the expression of his opinions. He baldly stated that "five times five of our great families [have been] made richer by the spoiles of the Church" and suggested that the usurpation of the Church's portion had been the cause for the ruination of "many of our most auncient houses," drawing an analogy with the Old Testament story of Gehazi who, having taken what was the Lord's, was visited with leprosy, as were his descendants. With a millenarian reference to the present as "these last times," Covell urged "the indifferent Reader" to learn the truth from Carleton's treatise concerning the Lord's portion and to "assist the Clergy for obtaining their owne right; least...the Lord himselfe complaine both against them and us, that his house is a house of prayer, and we have made it a denne of theeves." Declaring the tithe to be the Lord's portion, "holy to himselfe," which "he hath given to his ministers that serve at the Altar" and which must not be denied them, Covell called for "all that are not alreadie

---

[11]Peter Lake, "Presbyterianism, the Idea of a National Church and the Argument from Divine Right" Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England, eds. Peter Lake and Maria Dowling (London: Croom Helom, 1987), 212.

forestalled by some great sinnes" to "make restitution with all humilitie, and desire the Lord with penitent hearts to receive at our hands the tenth part." He did not expand upon the notion of restitution but surely restitution, more than the leprosy of Gehezi, would have struck terror in the heart of the impropriator.

Carleton did not choose to attack impropriation directly; a direct attack might have been interpreted as a threat to property. Instead he chose to assail the bishop of Rome for initiating the practice of taking tithes away from the exclusive use of the ministers of the Church,[12] first by exemption and then by impropriation, which practices "laid wast the Churches everywhere."[13] Having adopted the Pope as his adversary, certainly as safe an opponent in Jacobean England as the aforementioned atheists and hypocrites, Carleton then developed his case for the divine origin of tithes and the Church's exclusive right to tithes as ordained by the divine will. Impropriation was never directly attacked; however, the contention that the layman had no right to tithes, which Andrewes had stated explicitly in his thesis,

---

[12]George Carleton, Tithes Examined and proved to be due to the Clergie by a divine right (London, 1611) hereinafter Tithes, 2.

[13]Tithes, 34-5.

remained the implicit argument in Carleton's treatise.

Carleton's examination of tithes took a chronological form, beginning "presentlie after the creation" when men had been in conscience bound to give the best of their goods to God,[14] knowing it was the will of God. Indeed, "even from Noah it was dispearsed among all people" and thus there had been among all nations a tradition of tithing.[15] Citing Genesis 14:18, which relates that Melchisedech the priest blessed Abraham and "Abraham gave him tithes of all," Carleton demonstrated the existence of tithes before the Law when "as soone as it can bee shewed that there was a Priest, then will it also appeare that tithes were payed unto the Priest of the Lord."[16] Turning to Hebrews 7, particularly verse 8, he cited its recognition of the priesthood of Christ as unchanging and perpetual, like that of Melchisedech, and from this Carleton drew the conclusion that tithes were due and must be paid as long as Christ's priesthood stood. Returning to Genesis, he further demonstrated the link between the house of God and tithes by recalling the

---

[14]Tithes, 5.

[15]Tithes, 11.

[16]Tithes, 6.

story of Jacob's vow, Genesis 28:20: "And this stone which I have set up as a pillar, shall be Gods house: and of all that which thou shalt give me, I will give the tenth to thee."

It was Carleton's purpose to build a scriptural argument to sustain his contention that tithes were not instituted by the law but were only confirmed by the law as the Lord's right and holy to the Lord. Carleton distinguished between what was perpetual and what was Levitical. On the one hand tithes were always due the Lord; they were his before the institution of the Levitical ministry; they were his to bestow upon the children of Levi. On the other hand, Levitical tithes were conditional, that is, they depended on service at the Tabernacle; tithes had been assigned by the Lord to the children of Levi "for the time of their service at the Tabernacle" (Numbers 18:21). Returning to Hebrews 7, Carleton contended that it was the author's meaning "that tithes are payed in the priesthood of Christ, not onelie in the Leviticall priesthood."[17] The perpetual right to tithes follows Christ's priesthood and therefore has no end. Before the law and after the law, tithes are to be paid to him that lives forever, that is, Christ. "Under the law they were by Christ

---

[17]Tithes, 16.

assigned to Levy; that assignation, and as we may so saie, that lease being expired, they returne again into his right of whom it is witnesseth that he liveth."[18]

Carleton declared that "no man hath right or proprietie in the tithes of his owne goods;" to him who would challenge the Levitical right to tithes, Carleton answered: "tithes are none of thy goods, thou hast no right in them at all, all tithes are the Lords."[19] Tithes were always the right of the Lord. Thus, man gave nothing of his own in paying tithes but only rendered to God what was already his by right. Since the right to tithes was not in man but in God alone and since that which was holy to the Lord was separate from man and man's use, any attempt to withhold tithes from the Lord was "usurpation and sacriledge."[20] Under the Levitical law tithes were not that which man consecrated to God but that which God had separated to himself. Before the law, tithes were consecrated unto God by the devotion and vows of godly people and so it was, Carleton held, among Christians. Citing a passage from Leviticus in which it is stated that nothing which a man devotes to the Lord from his own property,

---

[18]Tithes, 16.

[19]Tithes, 14.

[20]Tithes, 14.

whether it be a beast or ancestral land, may be sold or redeemed, Carleton declared that all were cursed who used tithes to their own purpose. "For, whatsoever is by man consecrated to God, is Sanctum sanctorum, and can never bee redeemed againe: Levit. 27.28. Againe whatsoever is so consecrate to God, is for ever after execrable for man to touch."[21]

Carleton's treatise on tithes had a two-fold purpose. It was most obviously a defense of the divine right of the Church to tithes. But it was as well an argument against the notion of a competent or sufficient maintenance for ministers in lieu of tithes. Carleton recognized that there were several contrary opinions current concerning tithes: one opinion was that tithes were mere alms; another, that a determined quantity was not due by God's law but only a reasonable and just maintenance; and thirdly, that a tenth was due to the ministers of the Church by the express word of God. A tenth was paid before the law by the patriarchs to the priests and under the law to the Levites. In the Apostles' time there was nothing but alms and, after the Apostles, tithes were in use again. But a competent maintenance was never the policy of the Church or of the magistrate: "the Scripture commands

---

[21]Tithes, 15.

it not, no Prince hath at any time ordained it, it never was, and therefore as we may well thinke never will bee."[22]

The call for a `competent maintenance' has been described by Christopher Hill as the

> hall-mark of Puritanism. It was a double-edged phrase since it implied a wish to augment livings as well as a rejection of tithes by divine right. It also contained the idea of equalizing the remuneration of ministers, and so concealed an attack on the position of bishops, deans, and other dignitaries.[23]

Carleton differentiated between what was God's by right and what was man's to bestow, what was God's ordinance and what was man's, and proposed to "seeke Gods ordinance, what God hath ordained for ministers, not what man appointeth."[24] Carleton contended that the maintenance of ministers belonged to the "moral immediate worship of God" and that it was not within the jurisdiction of civil authority to invent or devise or change that which God had ordained: "seeing the Lord himselfe hath once ordained a maintenance, that must stand, untill it can be shewed that God hath given libertie to man to change it."[25] Divine law could not

---

[22]Tithes, 3.

[23]Hill, 123.

[24]Tithes, 4.

[25]Tithes, 4.

be changed; statutory law could do no more than confirm it.

The concept of a competent maintenance could not be drawn from the use and practice of the time of the Apostles, for nothing could be proved of that time but alms. But they who argued for this competency did not mean alms; they held that the people should be compelled by the magistrate to contribute toward the maintenance. In the Apostles' time only that was taken which was freely given; this was an "extraordinary" practice. However, tithes were the "perpetual and ordinary practice of the Church before and since Christs time, and hath the ful consent and testimonie of the auncients" while a competent maintenance "was never used in the Church, and hath the testimony of no ancient father."[26]

Having earlier established the sacrilege of taking from the Lord that which is his, Carleton refused to overlook or excuse sacrilege, though men should establish something in place of the holy thing taken away. Citing the Old Testament story of the seizure of the vessels of the house of God by Nebuchadnezzar and the demand of his son, Belshazzar, that these vessels be brought forth for the use of his

---

[26]Tithes, 24.

lords and concubines, Carleton posed the question "If Nabuchadnezzer having taking away the holy vessels out of the house of the Lord, should in place thereof have put some other: might his sacriledge thereby be excused?"[27] Could the sacrilege of Nebuchadnezzar and of his son be justified if, instead of taking away the holy vessels, they had only exchanged them for other vessels? "No more can the taking away of tithes bee justified, though something in place thereof should bee appointed by men."[28]

Carleton dismissed the idea that a sufficient maintenance was possible without tithes. "This is a castle in the aier, that never stood on the earth."[29] Who would define a competent maintenance, and what stipend would be comparable to the God-given tithe? What stipend "would be sufficient at all times: but tithes are sufficient at all times; howsoever the price of things rise or fall, the minister hath his part with his people in all estates by tithes."[30] Proceeding from the wisdom of God, the tithe proportioned the

---

[27]Tithes, 26.

[28]Tithes, 26-7.

[29]Tithes, 27.

[30]Tithes, 27.

minister's estate to that of his flock. Man's wisdom was no match for God's.

The sanctification of the tithe to the ministers of God Carleton equated with the sanctification of the seventh day to the worship of God. Tithes, having always been due to God before the law, under the law and "in the time of grace," belonged to the moral law. Tithes were due to the ministers of the Church by the express word of God. "Late upstarts opinions," he declared, especially such as were verified neither by Scriptures nor by the Church Fathers, could not be maintained against the ancient truth. "Now certaine it is," Carleton concluded, "that the Church hath no right to demaund any other kinde of maintenance then tithes."[31]

In his treatise, Carleton touched on several issues collateral to tithes. Episcopal and cathedral incomes had been considered possible sources for funding the purchase of impropriations to be used to improve the condition of the clergy.[32] Carleton argued that it was plain sacrilege to take away from the bishops, "who hold the place of the Apostles," lands and temporalities as they were given them that

---

[31]Tithes, 39.

[32]Usher, ii, 338-9.

they "might comfort such as wanted, especially in the ministery."[33] He cautioned that bishopric lands and abbey lands not be confused. Bishopric lands were given for the purpose of planting churches. Whenever a church was planted, either land or the price of it was committed to the government of bishops for the use of the church. The endowment of abbeys with lands was a late practice, "brought in use, not upon the calling and planting, but upon the corrupting of Churches."[34] It was Carleton's judgment that what was given to the Church, "there being no errour or superstitution in the gift," ought to remain to the Church and he reiterated his conviction that the removal of a dedicated gift was sacrilege.[35]

Another issue which Carleton addressed in his treatise was the jurisdiction of princes concerning tithes. Noting that some learned men had thought that, because some princes had established by law that tithes were to be paid to the Church, it followed that tithes were held only at the pleasure of the prince, Carleton declared that tithes preceded princes, being "alwaies

---

[33]Tithes, 25.

[34]Tithes, 26.

[35]Tithes, 26.

held by the lawes of God, and not of Princes."[36] Though tithes ceased to be paid in the time of the Apostles, the right to tithes did not cease. "And as wicked Princes cannot take away the right by stopping the practise: so godly Princes cannot make a right, but onely confirme it when by their good lawes they yeeld to Gods ordinance."[37] Concerning patronage, Carleton noted that originally lay patrons were appointed "not to bestow church-livings, as now they doe, but to defend the right of the land given to the church." He lamented that these obligations were every where overthrown. Instead of defending the Church, which was preyed upon "as it were by a common conspiracy of men," its patrons stood aside and declared "it were too much for the[m] to defend the Church in this spoiling age."[38]

In the second edition of Carleton's treatise on tithes, published in 1611, the dedication was again to the archbishop of Canterbury; however, by this time Richard Bancroft had died and the see of Canterbury was held by George Abbot. The dedicatory note shows some revision, reflecting a more confident author. After

---

[36]Tithes, 33-4.

[37]Tithes, 40.

[38]Tithes, 31.

mentioning the favor which his book had found with "the reverend L. Archbishop, of late memorie," Carleton presented a much more aggressive position on the matter of tithes, first contrasting the attitude of past times towards the material endowment of the Church with that of the present:

> ...we be fallen into these evill times, wherin vertue, charity, and all godlinesse seem rather to swim in mens mouthes, then grounded in their hearts, much declining from those auncient times wherin without so great profession men lived in a godly simplicity, & thought nothing too much to bestowe upon God & his Church;

then, expressing a confidence that the truth of his argument in defense of the tithe would have a proper impact upon men of conscience:

> yet this may not dismay or discourage us from undertaking the defence of the truth: nothing doubting but that in the multitude of gain-sayers, some will bee found, with wisedome to consider, and with conscience to practice the things that stand with their owne good, and the comfort of Gods church.[39]

In the intervening years between the first and second editions, Carleton must have found that his opinions were esteemed by men in high places, not least of all by his Prince who had from the beginning of his reign evidenced a great concern for the patrimony of the Church. However, it was particularly the favor which the book found with the late primate that made Carleton

---

[39]Tithes, Epistle Dedicatorie.

"become thus bolde" and in the dedicatory note of the second edition his words bespoke a boldness absent in the first. While in the original edition he protested his inability to effect "the thing for which I plead" as only by "your Graces care the oppressions of the Church may be mollified," in the second edition it was the power of a grave and godly clergy which Carleton was convinced would draw many for the common good of the Church.

Jurisdiction: regall, episcopall, papall

In the Parliament of 1610 the House of Lords took under consideration "a Bill restraining the execution of Canons ecclesiastical, not confirmed by parliament." Drafted by the Lower House, the bill specified that no canon or ecclesiastical ordinance made within the preceding ten years "or hereafter to be made, constituted, or ordained, shall be of any force or effect...until the same be first confirmed by act of parliament."[1] It was the intent of the bill to render ineffectual the canons drawn up and agreed upon in Convocation in 1603-4 and ratified by the King. A conference between a committee of the Commons and a committee of the Lords was held 6 July 1610 to discuss the proposed legislation. Richard Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, opened the conference with a defense of the legal status of the Canons of 1604. He reminded the members of the joint committee that an Act of Parliament was not required to give canons legal force. Citing 18 Henry VIII, the archbishop pointed out that by Act of Parliament power had been given to the King and his successors forever, "that what canons the King

---

[1] Proceedings in Parliament 1610, ed. E.R. Foster (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), i, 125n.

shall ratify under his great seal of England shall be as good as though they were made in parliament."[2]

A member of the Lower House countered with the argument that prior to the time of Henry VIII the canons had never had the royal assent and that much earlier, prior to the usurpation by the Pope of the power to issue canons, "there was joined in making of canons 15 of the laity to 30 of the clergy."[3] Another member of the House recalled the number of clergy and laity to have been equal in the making of canon law. However, Francis Tate, member for Shrewsbury, in his summary of the objections of the Commons to the enactment of canon law without parliamentary ratification, placed at the center of their concern the expanding power of the bishops. He distinguished between the several aspects of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, and addressed the distinction thus:

> We reverence so much your Lordships in respect of your spiritual places that whatsoever you do deliver unto us, we do receive it from God's majesty by you as his ambassadors; but, my Lords, you have another power whereby you would take unto you temporal jurisdiction, but that we hope to have reformed by parliament.[4]

---

[2]Parliament 1610, i, 124.

[3]Parliament 1610, i, 125.

[4]Parliament 1610, i, 126.

Earlier, in the House of Lords, where the bishops constituted approximately one-sixth of the membership, the bill had been discussed exclusively in terms of the King's jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters. Richard Neile, bishop of Rochester, had declared that the bill's demand for parliamentary confirmation brought into question the prerogative of the King and had made the further observation that "if he that preferred this bill had known the power it hath, he would not have brought it in."[5] Lord Salisbury had voiced his opinion that the jurisdiction of the King was not a subject open to debate in either House and, perhaps in an effort to halt further discussion, had rhetorically asked the peers where the locus of ecclesiastical power lay: "I would ask the question whether the King hath not the power that the priest of Rome had."[6]

It is apparent that Salisbury assumed there was but one answer to his question. However, in a book published in the same year, George Carleton denied that answer. The work, which he entitled Jurisdiction: regall, episcopall, papall, addressed the question of ecclesiastical power and attempted to define its boundaries. Carleton believed himself to be the first

---

[5]Parliament 1610, i, 101.

[6]Parliament 1610, i, 103.

to explore "this confused masse" of jurisdiction; "none of late yeeres hath troden this path before me, whose footsteppes might have directed me."[7]

Characteristically, Carleton approached his subject with some caution. He acknowledged that ecclesiastical jurisdiction was vested both in the Church and in the prince but, rather than make a pronouncement on the whereabouts of the line of demarcation between Church and prince and define the territorial imperative of each, he chose instead to discover the boundaries of jurisdiction by considering the ways and means by which the Church of Rome, more particularly the Popes, had encroached upon the power of princes, upon the power of bishops and upon the power of councils. By attacking the various claims of the Pope, but most especially the papal claim to the right to depose kings, Carleton was able to adopt a position on the delicate question of the division of ecclesiastical power between the Church and the prince without being notably provocative. Jursidiction has the characteristics of a polemic against the Church of Rome and, particularly, against its doctrine of the sovereignty of the Pope. However, while Carleton championed the ecclesiastical authority

---

[7]George Carleton, Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall (London, 1610) hereinafter Juris, Epistle Dedicatorie.

of princes, it would appear that his larger purpose was to define the limits of princely authority.

Carleton began with the premise that the question of jurisdiction had been much confused initially by "those false workemen of Rome" who had taken the jurisdiction of the Church and the jurisdiction of kings and, "mingling both together," had added much to the power of the papacy. It was Carleton's contention that when Henry VIII took the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England there were those who, "suddenly brought from their olde opinion of Poperie,...retained a grosse and impure sense of those words." Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, had given much offense among the Reformed Churches when he declared that the king as Supreme Head of the Church had the power to prescribe ecclesiastical ordinances even in matters of faith and doctrine. Gardiner had "found this massie crown of Jurisdiction upon the Popes head, so he tooke it with gold, silver, coper, drosse and all and set upon the Kings head."[8]

It was Carleton's further contention that the priest of Rome had no right to much of the power he had claimed. The Pope had usurped the rights of the Church, claiming first that the authority of the Church

---

[8]Juris, Epistle Dedicatorie.

was above that of Scriptures and then that the authority of the papacy was above that of the Church. Further, the Pope had usurped the rights of States when he declared that it was "nessarie to salvation to beleeve that every humane creature is subject to the Pope at Rome."[9] Robert Bellarmine, a leading contemporary theologian of the Roman Church, had enlarged the Pope's dominion to include temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction. While conceding that the Pope as Pope had no temporal power, Bellarmine had claimed for the Pope "power supreame in respect of Spirituall good, to dispose of all the Temporalties of all Christians."[10] This concept of power in respect of spiritual good was the opening wedge for the exercise by the papacy of unlimited jurisdiction, spiritual and civil, even to the deposition of kings and emperors whom the Pope might judge heretical and to the release of subjects from allegiance to princes so judged.

Throughout his lengthy work on ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Carleton focused attention primarily on the unscrupulous ambition of the priest of Rome, and the greater part of the book is an irate account of the

---

[9]Juris, 3.

[10]Juris, 8.

attempts of the Popes through the centuries to encroach upon the civil jurisdiction of princes. However, at the same time he constructed with great subtlety a second theme: the successful encroachments of the papacy upon the powers of the bishops. These powers, Carleton held, were divinely ordained, being instituted by Christ, and belonged by right to all bishops as the successors of the apostles. Through a careful exegesis of Scripture and of the writings of the Church Fathers and a detailed recounting of the history of the early Church, Jurisdiction is a survey of the jurisdictional boundary between king and priest, but it is as well an attempt to reestablish the ancient hedge "which of old stood betweene these two powers Civill and Spirituall."[11]

Carleton divided ecclesiastical powers between those of order and those of jurisdiction. He reserved to bishops and priests by their consecration the power of order, that is, the right to celebrate the sacraments and to preach the Word. It was given to all bishops and priests alike, "wherein the Pope hath no priviledge above other."[12] The power of order was held by divine ordinance only, and not from earthly

---

[11]Juris, 48.

[12]Juris, 7.

princes; in this power the Prince had no part. The jurisdictional aspects of ecclesiastical power were two-fold: internal jurisdiction or the inward government of the conscience; and external jurisdiction which was the coactive, or coercive, power necessary to govern. Internal ecclesiastical jurisdiction, like the power of order, was given exclusively to the Church and included the examination of controversies of faith, the judgment of heresy, the excommunication of notorious offenders, the ordination of priests and the institution and collation of benefices and spiritual cures. These powers, Carleton asserted, "Princes cannot give or take from the Church."[13]

However, external and coactive jurisdiction, by which ecclesiastical law is established and enforced, "belongs to Kings only, & not to Ecclesiasticall persons, but as they have commission from their Prince."[14] The Church of England called the King the supreme governor of the Church, and "our meaning is, that hee is appointed by God to be a Father and preserver of religion, a keeper of Ecclesiastical discipline, and as the Prophet Isaiah calleth him, a nourcing father of the Church; he is the soveraigne in

---

[13]Juris, 9.

[14]Juris, 9.

all affaires of coactive Jurisdiction."[15] With the ancient Fathers, the Church of England maintained that the Catholic Church is one with one head, Jesus Christ, perfectly known only to God; the visible churches are many, at many times and in many places, and, therefore, must have governors answerable to themselves. The spiritual government of the Church was committed to spiritual governors as Christ to his twelve apostles, none above the rest; while temporal governors had custody of external coactive jurisdiction, both in civil and ecclesiastical causes.

Carleton was well aware that Rome did not define the Church in the same way, "for our adversaries saying, that the Pope is the head of the Church: understand thereby the Catholike Church spread over the whole world."[16] The apologists of the Church of Rome varied in their interpretation of the powers of jurisdiction. Augustinus Triumphus declared all jurisdictional power, spiritual and civil, vested in the Pope. Not only did bishops derived their spiritual jurisdiction from the Pope, but the power of temporal jurisdiction held by kings, emperors and secular princes was "not immediate from God, but is given first

---

[15]Juris, 6.

[16]Juris, 6.

to the Pope, and so to Kings for the use of the Church, and helpe of Pope and Prelates."[17] Bellarmine ascribed to the bishop of Rome a triple power: first of order, referring to sacraments; secondly of internal jurisdiction, the inward court of conscience; and thirdly of external jurisdiction, external coactive government. "The question between us and them," stated Carleton, "is only of Jurisdiction in the third sense, and therein especially of Jurisdiction coactive in externall courts: binding and compelling by force of law."[18]

Through a consideration of how the Popes had encroached upon the jurisdiction of bishops, of kings and of councils, Carleton proposed to demonstrate "how late, how new and strange that Jurisdiction is, which the flatterers of the court of Rome now yeeld to the Pope."[19] The form of his work appeared to be a debate betweeen the Church of England and the Church of Rome on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but within that framework Carleton addressed three much larger questions: 1) where does the power to establish canon law repose; 2) in whom is vested the authority of

---

[17]Juris, 7.

[18]Juris, 9.

[19]Juris, 10.

the Church; 3) what are the proper, distinct and ancient rights belonging to the Church and to the civil magistrate?

Carleton declared that all law was established by the authority of the civil magistrate, ecclesiastical canons as well as civil law. Canon law had no force of law where it was not received and established by kings in their kingdom. "It is against all reason, and rules; whether we looke upon the light of nature, or upon the Scriptures, or the lawfull practise of authoritie since the Scriptures were written, that any Lawes should be imposed upon a Prince against or without his consent."[20] The Church had no authority to enforce law. It could neither compel nor restrain. Force of law depended on coactive jurisdictional power and such power was not given to the Church. It was given to the civil magistrate, the king. Carleton made both a scriptural and a historical case in behalf of the jurisdictional power of the king to establish ecclesiastical canons.

Turning first to the Old Testament, Carleton found in Moses and the Mosaic Law the "perfect patterne for all law-makers."[21] Moses had the place of a king

---

[20]Juris, 18.

[21]Juris, 19.

in the government. All the laws "which in truth proceeded originally from God" were established by the authority of Moses; "and this we finde true, not onely in Judiciall and Civill Lawes, which were to rule that state; but even in ceremoniall and Morall Lawes which were to rule the Church."[22] Not one ecclesiastical law can be proved to be established on the authority of Aaron, the high priest; concerning the Church, nothing was established without the authority of Moses, the civil magistrate. The occasion might arise wherein Aaron was called upon to interpret the law, to act as judge, just as the Church is called upon to interpret Scripture and to determine controversies of faith. But the example of Moses was a clear confirmation of the prince's God-ordained right to establish ecclesiastical law.

The king's jurisdictional powers included:

> First, to confirme lawes Ecclesiasticall and Temporall, Secondly, to place Judges for both causes, Thirdly, to see that those judges of both sortes judge justly according to right and equity, Fourthly, to punish them if they shall be found to give unjust and corrupt sentences, Fiftly, and last of all, his Jurisdiction appeareth in appellations.[23]

---

[22]Juris, 18.

[23]Juris, 21.

The jurisdiction of the king to hear appeals was especially demonstrative of his preeminence in the establishment of law. To those who questioned whether appeal might be made from an ecclesiastical judge to a prince, Carleton found in the New Testament one example sufficient to confirm the appellate jurisdiction of the prince. In the Book of Acts, 25:11, "S. Paul being accused for causes Ecclesiasticall, appealed from the high Priest to Casar [sic]. Therefore it is lawfull in matters Ecclesiasticall to appeale from judges Ecclesiasticall to the Civill Magistrate."[24] Carleton condemned the papacy which, in its attempts to assume greater jurisdiction, had insisted that all ecclesiastical matters must seek appeal only from the Court of Rome. At the same time he acknowledged that the power of appeal was necessary to the Popes to realize their ambition of supreme sovereignty. "The Popes & their flatterers understanding well, that Supreame Jurisdiction could never bee prooved to rest in the Popes, unlesse first Appellation should be made to them, wrought by all subtilty...to cause Appellations to be made to them." However, since the last resort of appeal belonged by the law of God to the civil magistrate, it could be concluded without any

[24]Juris, 23.

doubt that "Supreame Jurisdiction belongeth to him onely."[25]

The authority of the civil magistrate to establish ecclesiastical law had not only scriptural sanction but could be demonstrated historically as well. The ancient Church was governed by bishops and metropolitans. They governed in accordance with the canons of the Church formulated at "those foure most famous Councels of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon: For that the Canons of these Councels were held for the lawes of the Church, it appeareth by a Constitution of Justinian, extant in the fift Synode, held at Constantinople."[26] The emperors never took upon themselves the definition of faith and doctrine but, when the Church had defined the truth of such matters, the emperors "concurring with the Church...did by their coactive power give strength to the Canons of the Church." It was Constantine who declared that the canons of the five general councils, including the second Council of Constantinople, "were the rules or Canons of the Church."[27]

---

[25]Juris, 24.

[26]Juris, 177.

[27]Juris, 178.

Having attempted to intrude upon the jurisdiction of the Church by the assumption of the power to hear appeals, the Popes had further assumed the right to give laws. But no man, Carleton contended, had the right to make and give laws unless the right were given to him by God or by men who had this right before in themselves. The Pope did not have this right from God "for God hath no where given any such Commission to him;" nor had it been within the power of men to give the right to make and give laws "for every man cannot give this right, but onely such as have it, and have power to give it."[28] Carleton never made explicit reference to the movement within the Lower House of Parliament to secure the right to confirm or reject the canons formulated in Convocation. But his argument in behalf of the supreme jurisdiction of the king to establish ecclesiastical law left no doubt as to his position. Neither historically nor scripturally could it be proved that the assent of anyone other than the king was necessary to the establishment of the canons of the Church.

Nor could there be any doubt as to Carleton's position on the episcopacy. When he referred to the spiritual governors of the Church, to those in whom

---

[28]Juris, 179.

Christ had vested the authority of the Church, he meant the bishops. He was not a bishop himself at the time Jurisdiction was published and was not to be named to the bench for another seven years. However, he believed the office of bishop proceeded directly from God, having been instituted by Christ in his choosing of the Apostles, and he identified the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church with its bishops. The bishops were the successors to the Apostles: "the ancient Fathers deliver it as a truth never questioned, not doubted, that in the government of the Church, the Bishops are the undoubted successours of the Apostles."[29]

In an attempt to discover the ancient rights of bishops, Carleton gave a detailed account of the encroachments of the Pope upon episcopal rights: "the Pope hath intruded like a Foxe, and maintaineth his intrusion like a Lion."[30] Citing passages from Matthew 18:1, Mark 9:34 and Luke 9:46, in which Christ rebuked the Apostles when they disputed among themselves who should be the greatest, Carleton argued that "Christ left an equalitie and paritie among his Apostles, often affirming and confirming that one of

---

[29]Juris, 43.

[30]Juris, 46.

them should not be greater then another."[31] However, as early as the fifth century the bishops of Rome began to pursue a policy designed to enlarge their jurisdiction. They claimed that the bishopric of Rome was superior to those of other nations, substantiating that claim with a canon of the Nicean Council. However, the canon was not authentic but a forgery: "the Popes Jurisdiction was first attempted by forgery, and afterward by falsehood, and tyrannie effected."[32] By the seventh century the Church of Rome had achieved jurisdiction over the other Churches and the Pope was "the chiefe Bishop of all Bishops."[33] But the ascendancy of the bishop of Rome over other bishops was neither dominically instituted nor the practice of the early Church.

The doctrine that the Pope, as the universal Bishop, was above the Church constituted the most recent development in the jurisdictional expansion of the papacy; and it "is now the sense, and religion of the present Court of Rome: but it was not the sense and religion of the Church of Rome before the time of

---

[31]Juris, 47.

[32]Juris, 77.

[33]Juris, 81.

the Council of Trent."[34] With the Council of Trent, the Church of Rome had separated from the rest of Christendom and the separation had not been caused by dispute over points of faith and doctrine but over the Pope's jurisdiction "which crossed all peaceable purposes."[35]

The parity and equality among the Apostles did not lead Carleton to the conclusion that all ministers were equals. Without naming the presbyterian movement but with an allusion to those who would "devise a new government of the Church,"[36] he briefly set forth the ancient order of the Church, giving to the bishops a superiority over the rest of the clergy based on divine sanction. "The Apostles were in governement above other Ministers: and that by the institution of Christ himselfe: For the Lord after that he had chosen his twelve Apostles, did chuse also seventie Disciples...saith S. Luke."[37] Carleton drew a parallel between the bishops and the Apostles and between the inferior Pastors' and the disciples. Although there was an equality among bishops, "yet

---

[34]Juris, 94.

[35]Juris, 108.

[36]Juris, 44.

[37]Juris, 47.

Bishops [were] in government above other Ministers: for Jurisdiction was never in the multitude, but in governours: the Bishops then being the governors after the Apostles, the like Jurisdiction was in all."[38] To depart from the ancient and known government of the Church was to go against "the testimony of those that lived in the first age, and heard and sawe those that were endued with miraculous gifts;" to strive for a government which came only recently to men "seemeth to proceede from affections too much blinded with the love of innovation."[39] Innovation. The word was a flash point in theological dispute. The charge of innovation conveyed a lack of authenticity, a departure from sound scriptural interpretation, from the testimony of the Church Fathers and from the life of the early Church.

It was Carleton's contention that the jurisdictional claims of the papacy represented a distortion and corruption of the Scriptures as well as of the patristic writers and a notable divergence from the ancient practice of the Church. Though the apologists of the Church of Rome might argue that the jurisdiction of the Pope was jure divino, such arguments were "against learning, judgement, conscience

---

[38]Juris, 47.

[39]Juris, 44.

& all."[40] To appreciate the extent to which the papacy had encroached upon the jurisdiction of the king and of the Church, Carleton undertook to delineate "the true limits betweene the power of Princes, and the power of the Church."[41] He stated that such a description of the limits of power would produce a better understanding of what the Popes had wrested from temporal princes. However, his description, as indeed the whole of Jurisdiction itself, made a strong case against any attempts "to give as much [jurisdictional power] to the Prince, as they doe to the Pope."[42]

On the title page of Jurisdiction Carleton had used as an epigraph a verse from the Gospel of John: "My kingdome is not of this world: if my kingdome were of this world, my servants would surely fight." Carleton identified Christ's kingdom with Christ's Church; to his Church Christ had given all spiritual jurisdiction. For the first three hundred years of the Church there was no Christian magistrate. "Christ that appointeth all times & states for his Church, appointed that all this time she should be without Princes for her nourcing Fathers: that by wanting it so long, we

---

[40]Juris, 104.

[41]Juris, 47.

[42]Juris, 137.

might understand the greatnesse of this blessing."[43] Christ had left to his Church only inward and spiritual power: nonetheless, it was by this power and this power alone that "the Church was called, faith was planted, divils were subdued, the nations were taken out of the power of darknesse, the world was reduced to the obedience of Christ."[44]

The apostolic jurisdiction which the bishops received from their predecessors included the power to ordain ministers, "which ordaining signifieth also institution in the place or cure they ministered in;"[45] the power to command that the truth be preserved and preached without heresy; and the power to silence false teachers. The most grave right and duty of the bishops, as successors of the Apostles, was to preserve the true doctrine of the Church. They were "the great watch-men" of the Church and "herein they are authorized by God."[46] If princes attempted to thwart them in their obligation to maintain the truth, the bishops "have warrant not to obey Princes, because

---

[43]Juris, 37.

[44]Juris, 39.

[45]Juris, 40.

[46]Juris, 44.

with these things Christ hath put them in trust."[47] Carleton introduced both scriptural and historical evidence to support an understanding of the independent position which the bishops occupied as the `watch-men' of the Church. From the pastoral First Letter to Timothy he quoted St. Paul's admonition to teach a doctrine free of heresy. From the early life of the Church he related the story of St. Ambrose's refusal to permit Auxentius, the Arian bishop, to have any place to teach in his diocese, "the one like a vigilant watch-man, seeking to remove all dangers from his flocke, the other like a Wolfe seeking to spoile."[48]

Carleton found the account of St. Ambrose to be an excellent illustration of the divisions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. When the Emperor Valentinian was made aware of the controversy between Ambrose and Auxentius, he proposed that he be the judge of the cause between them. But Ambrose "denieth the Emperour to be a sufficient Judge in a cause of faith and religion"[49] and refused to appear before him. If the Emperor had by force insisted upon it, Ambrose acknowledged that he would have had no power to resist

---

[47]Juris, 44.

[48]Juris, 44.

[49]Juris, 45.

by force: "the faith and right of the Church, was not, in his judgement, to be maintained by force and armes, but by prayers and teares;" though resolute in matters of faith and doctrine, Ambrose claimed "no privileges, no immunities."[50]

The jurisdiction of the Church had never been extended to include coactive power; such power was given only to the civil magistrate. The power to command and the authority to punish for the breach of that command were within the jurisdiction of princes alone. What coactive jurisdiction was to be found in the Church had come from the authority of princes. "For as Kings receive the knowledge of faith and Religion from the Church and not the Church from Kings: so coactive Jurisdiction the Church receiveth from Kings, and not Kings from the Church."[51] The origins of episcopal jurisdiction in the government of the Church were not exclusively apostolic; some powers had been added to the bishops by godly princes. Except in matters of faith and doctrine, the Church was subject to the civil magistrate. Thus had jurisdiction been ordered and established by Christ.

---

[50]Juris, 45

[51]Juris, 62.

It was against the nature of the Kingdom of Christ and of his Church "to worke any trouble to the kingdomes of the world. And that kingdome which worketh trouble to the kingdomes of this world, is not the kingdome of Christ."[52] The controversy and confusion created by the papacy troubled the states of the world; the government of the Court of Rome was "contrary to the government of Christ's Church."[53] It had drawn onto itself an unlimited jurisdiction, having taken away the ancient and distinct rights of the civil magistrate and of the Church. It had lifted itself above the Church and, finally, had separated itself from the Church. "This present Church of Rome is not that which our fathers called the Church of Rome,"[54] wrote Carleton of the post-Tridentine Church. "The ancient Church of Rome...can now bee found no where in the world but among Protestants."[55]

Carleton closed his work on ecclesiastical jurisdiction with a consideration of the jurisdiction of the councils of the Church. The councils he declared to be "the greatest power or Jurisdiction of

---

[52]Juris, 49.

[53]Juris, 49.

[54]Juris, 258.

[55]Juris, 259.

the Church because the whole or many chiefe parts together, is greater then any one part."[56] He refuted the notion that the Pope had no superior. "The Pope in matters of faith is subject to Councels...Moreover in matters of divine right, a Councell is above the Pope."[57] He contended that a council was superior in jurisdiction to the Pope because a Church Council had the right to hear appeals. Citing an attempt in the fourteenth century by John XXII to invalidate the election of the Holy Roman Emperor by excommunicating him and declaring him to be schismatic, heretical and rebellious against the Church, Carleton described how the Emperor appealed from the Pope to a General Council and that

> it was the judgement and common received sentence of that age, that a general Councel is above the Pope, may judge the Pope, censure and depose him: this is here declared and confirmed: this was not onely the doctrine of the Church then, but long after it continued, and was never denied by the Church of Rome, before the Councell of Trent.[58]

Carefully distinguishing between the papacy and the Church, Carleton observed that the Emperor had denied

---

[56]Juris, 42.

[57]Juris, 231.

[58]Juris, 232.

the Pope to be his judge while insisting that he be judged by the Church.

Here, Carleton's argument veered towards a more zealous stance than perhaps he had intended. His historical example logically led to the statement that the authority of the Church "bindeth the greatest numbers thereof, even Kings and Emperors...[and that in matters of faith and religion] the King is no judge, but to be judged by the Church: as we see godly Princes have beene."[59] He was perilously close to placing the king in a subordinate position to the Church, a position which would not have accorded well with his Prince, and, in the following pages, the cautious Carleton promptly pulled back to center with a general condemnation of papal jurisdiction and of those who "from an obstinate and willfull ignorance"[60] would confound the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the king with those powers of bishops and of councils, which the papacy had worked relentlessly through the centuries to usurp.

Carleton did not cite the Articles of Religion in his discussion of jurisdiction, although article XXXVII, `Of civill magistrates,' clearly distinguishes

---

[59]Juris, 232.

[60]Juris, 232.

between the ecclesiastical powers of the prince and those of the Church.[61] The testimony of the Articles had no significance for a work that was shaped to be part of the on-going debate with Rome; only Scripture, the Church Fathers and the history of the early Church could be considered as `given' in the dispute. However, Carleton's distinction between the ecclesiastical authority of the king and the authority of the Church rested firmly on the thirty-seventh article. Indeed, his treatise was an enlargement of the article itself and concluded with a restatement of the article.

> ...we who denie this Papall Jurisdiction, giving to the Church on the one side, and to Soveraigne Princes on the other side; their proper, distinct, auncient rights respectively belonging to each of them, are the followers and the children of our forefathers, that is the true, ancient, unchaunged Catholicke Church.[62]

Yet, in his brief brush with the question of final authority and in his affirmation of the obligation of

---

[61]"...we geue not to our princes the ministring either of Gods word, or of Sacramentes, the which thing the Iniunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queene, doth most plainly testifie: But that only prerogatiue whiche we see to haue ben geuen alwayes to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God him selfe, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Temporall, and restraine with the ciuill sworde the stubberne and euyll doers." "The Articles of Religion, 1571" The Evangelical Protestant Creeds, ed. Philip Schaff The Creeds of Christendom, v.3 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), 105.

[62]Juris, 302.

bishops to preserve right doctrine, even in defiance of the Prince, Carleton had pushed beyond the concept of ecclesiastical jurisdiction as stated in the article. Carleton attempted in Jurisdiction to remove from the article on civil magistrates some measure of the ambiguity with which it had been framed; by defining more precisely the nature of ecclesiastical authority, he proposed changes in the article of some significance.

Directions to Know the True Church

In 1615, George Carleton wrote a brief instructional handbook, Directions to Know the True Church. It was based upon a more scholarly work which he had published two years earlier entitled Consensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Tridentinos de Scripturis, Ecclesia, fide & gratia. Intended for a lay readership, Directions was written to present a counterposition to the many works being produced "in this scribling age" by papists whose purpose, Carleton asserted, was to seduce the simple who "are led with appearances and shadows."[1] Carleton hoped that Directions would serve as a standard by which the less learned of his Majesty's subjects would be able to discern between those things which were part of the external ceremonies and discipline of the Church and that which must be received as the doctrine of the Church. First John 4:1 warned of false prophets and admonished "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." Carleton exhorted his readers similarly to "trust neither us nor them, untill you have tried: for we are all

---

[1]George Carleton, Directions to Know the True Church (London, 1615) hereinafter Directions, Epistle Dedicatorie.

contentious men, though some contend for the trueth, and some against it."[2]

The primary concern of Directions is with the nature and extent of the Church as expressed in the article of the Creed which declares the Church to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic and with the question which arose from the article in an age of division among churches: who was in unity with the true Church of Christ as handed down from the Apostles, the Church of Rome or the Reformed Churches? Carleton's interpretation of the credal statement closely followed that which was propounded in The Institution of a Christen Man, commonly called the Bishops' Book, of 1537. Thomas Cranmer and his fellow churchmen had held that the catholic, or universal, Church was made up of free and equal national churches, `particular churches' they called them, gathered together and "incorporated by the holy spirite of Christe into one body."[3] The Bishops' Book insisted that the Church of Rome was a particular church and could not have "any superioritie over thother churches of Christ, which be in England, France, Espaine, or in any other realme."[4] Carleton

---

[2]Directions, Preface.

[3]The Institution of a Christian Man (1537), 14.

[4]Institution, 15.

echoed this understanding of the universal Church as the body of Christ and of the particular churches as its members.

In the opening pages of his work Carleton undertook to establish through scriptural evidence the headship of Christ of the Catholic Church, the difference between the universal Church and a particular church and the necessity of spiritual regeneration for membership in the Church. He quoted from St Paul's letter to the Ephesians, 1:23, in which the Apostle defined the Church as "the body of Jesus Christ, and the fullness of him that filleth all in all;" and from Ephesians, 5:23, "Christ is the head of the Church, and he is the Savior of the body;" he cited Paul's declaration to the Church at Corinthe: "By one spirit we are baptized into one body" (First Corinthians, 12:13) and "You are the body of Christ, and members in particular" (First Corinthians, 12:27). By defining biblically the terms which he was to employ throughout his work, Carleton attempted at the outset to avoid the confusion which had been generated by the appropriation by the Church of Rome of the title `The Catholic Church' and by the Pope of `Head of the Church.' Carleton conceived the universal Church as transcending time and space; it was spread out over the

whole world; it had been and would be at all times. It was called by many names, reflecting its various aspects: the true Church, the Church of Christ, the invisible Church and, most frequently, the Catholic Church. He defined particular churches as visible assemblies of particular men governed by diverse visible heads; they were many in respect of place but one in the unity of faith. If one would belong to the Catholic Church, he must take himself to "some particular Church heere on earth, which holdeth Unitie with the Catholike Church. And then shall they be sure to bee in the Catholike Church, when they are found in such a Church which holdeth Unitie with the Catholike Church."[5]

Carleton was at variance with the Bishops' Book concerning the membership of the Church of Rome in the Catholic Church. Between the time that the Bishops' Book was issued and the publication of Carleton's Directions, the Council of Trent had effected some major changes in the Church of Rome and it was Carleton's contention that these changes had altered fundamentally the Church of Rome and had removed it from its former communion with the Catholic Church. It was Carleton's intenion to sort out the confusion that

[5]Directions, 100-1.

currently existed concerning the continuity of the true Church by addressing the recent history of the Western Churches.

The Council of Trent (1545-1563) was regarded by Carleton as a watershed in the life of the Church of Rome. Prior to Trent, the Church of Rome was in unity "in some measure" with the Catholic Church.[6] It was necessarily a qualified unity because of the errors which had crept into the Church over the years. As an example, Carleton cited the attempts of the papacy through the centuries to assume a greater authority than was warranted either in Scripture or in the writings of the early Fathers. Consent to the supremacy of the Pope had been accorded by the Council of Constance and by the Council of Basel despite a lack of scriptural evidence for any universal headship other than that of Christ. There was no denying that this had been a critical error; but it had not been such as to jeopardize the foundation of the Church. Acquiescence in the papal supremacy had not changed the foundation of the Church, for the Church still maintained the rule of faith which had come down to it from the Apostles.[7] Prior to Trent, all the Western

---

[6]Directions, 65.

[7]Directions, 80-1.

Churches had been in communion with the Church of Rome and because they recognized "the Popes Supremacie in things spirituall, as then the supremacie was understood, but not as now they understand it...they were therefore understood as belonging to the Church of Rome."[8] They "might have continued in that course, if the Church of Rome had not bin notoriously changed" by Trent.[9]

Carleton took issue with those who insisted that the unity of the Western Churches dissolved with the commencement of Martin Luther's preaching against indulgences. He maintained that Luther had not been in revolt from the Church or from the Pope. Luther had preached long before the Council of Trent was summoned and had died while Trent was still in session; he had preached what was at that time the doctrine of the Church of Rome, doctrine agreeable to the rule of faith as it had been preserved since the Apostles. Luther had sought peace with the Pope and, when the Pope turned his back on truth, Luther had appealed to a General Council of the Church, following "the common practise of many that were oppressed by the Pope, or that feared the Popes oppression in the Church of

---

[8]Directions, 67.

[9]Directions, 66.

Rome."[10] But since that time "all these things are changed in the Councill of Trent."[11]

The gravest charge which Carleton leveled at the post-Tridentine Church of Rome concerned the rule of faith. The rule of faith consisted of those beliefs which were necessary to salvation. Received from the Apostles, the rule of faith was that by which the true Church could be known and was, necessarily, one, constant, unchanging and unalterable. Carleton believed that the rule of faith was determined by the authority of holy Scripture, the sole source of the word of God, and it ruled the Church. Consequently, "wee must not take whatsoever the Church teacheth without any limitation or rule," Carleton cautioned.

> For the Church hath a rule to teach by: this rule is the rule of faith taken out of the holy Scriptures: so long as any particular Church teacheth according to this rule, so long is that Church to be heard: but if a Church once fall away from this rule of faith, then it ceaseth to be a true Church of God, as many particular Churches have fallen away, because they have forsaken this rule of faith.[12]

Carleton charged that the Church of Rome, rather than being subject to the rule of faith, had altered the rule of faith at the Council of Trent. Rome no

---

[10]Directions, 71.

[11]Directions, 74.

[12]Directions, 25.

longer taught that the rule of faith was contained entirely in the Scriptures; instead it declared that the Scriptures were only one part of the rule of faith while the unwritten traditions of the Church were the other part of the rule. In behalf of this altered rule of faith, the Church of Rome now made claim of apostolic origin, although the rule as taught by Rome was no more than fifty years old, dating only to Trent: the "boasting of their antiquitie, and of the continuance of their faith from the Apostles...be but vaine brags."[13]

In contrast to Rome's elevation of unwritten tradition, Carleton contended that it had been the common doctrine of the Church that the Scriptures were perfect in themselves and contained the whole rule of faith; that there was no basis either in Scripture or in the writings of the Church Fathers to substantiate the newly adopted teaching of Rome that the unwritten traditions were a part of the rule of faith; moreover, the unwritten traditions concerned no more than the external ceremonies of the Church and might be maintained or discarded at the discretion of particular churches. Carleton found in Second Timothy 3:16 a declaration of the Apostle's belief that Scripture was

---

[13]Directions, 35.

the means for perfecting the man of God and determined from it that "if the Scripture can make the man of God perfect, then there is no neede of any traditions of men to make up this perfection."[14] Clement of Alexandria had written that only the holy Scriptures can bring salvation to men. Athanasius had declared the holy Scriptures sufficient to instruct men in the truth. Basil had written, "It is a manifest sliding away from faith, and an evident signe of pride, either to reject any thing of that which is written, or to bring in any thing that is not written," for the voice of Christ was to be heard only in the Scriptures and Christ must rule the faith of the Church.[15] "What then shall wee call this adding of unwritten Traditions to the Testament of Jesus Christ?" Carleton demanded, but a falsification of that testament of faith as handed down in the Church from the time of the Apostles?[16]

Carleton cited St. Hilary who had referred to the "unchangeable constitution of the apostolic doctrine" and St. Jerome who had called holy Scripture "the bounds and limits of the Church, out of which limits

---

[14]Directions, 32.

[15]Directions, 36-7.

[16]Directions, 38.

the Church of Christ never goeth." It was Carleton's judgment that since the Council of Trent "the Church of Rome is gone out of these bounds."[17] Formerly, the writers of Rome had been in agreement with the ancient Fathers and had supported the sole authority of Scripture. Carleton gave examples from the works of Peter Lombard and of Thomas Aquinas, both of whom cited the Scriptures as the rule of understanding and the sole authority in matters of faith.[18]

Carleton did not doubt that the innovations which had been initiated by the Council of Trent were prompted by the ambitions of the papacy. The Council had been the creature of the papacy; the Emperor had not been in favor of calling it and had protested against it, as had many kings. It had been "neither generall, nor free, nor lawfull" and many held it to be no more than a "private conventicle of a few gathered together against the Church"[19] because voice had been given only to "such as should bee bound by an oath of bondage and slavery to the pope."[20] Trent vastly extended the power of the Pope when it redefined the

---

[17]Directions, 45.

[18]Directions, 46.

[19]Directions, 75.

[20]Directions, 76.

rule of faith. It had ascribed to the unwritten traditions of the Church, as determined by the Pope, an authority equal to that of the Scriptures. These traditions Rome called the word of God but "they [have] made a word of God of their owne invention." The traditions were no more than the Pope's word "and they blush not to teach that the word of the Pope, is the word of God." Trent had set up another God and another word of God and had "turned the Supremacie into a Godhead, and will not understand that they worship Antichrist in the Church."[21]

Moreover, Carleton argued, Trent had not simply equated the authority of the Pope with that of Scripture; it had supplanted the authority of Scripture with that of the Pope by its confirmation of papal sovereignty in the determination of matters of faith. Never before Trent had the Pope been held to be the final judge in the resolution of controversies concerning doctrine.

> Hee hath bene by divers reputed a Judge of controversies of right and wrong, in such things as come to bee pleaded by the Canon Law: But of matters of Faith he was never held to be a Judge...The Popes Canons doe confesse, that for exposition of Scriptures and matters of Faith, the Expositors of Scriptures are to bee preferred before the Popes, as for their learning and

---

[21]Directions, 50.

> godlinesse farre excelling the Popes in the knowledge of the Scripture.[22]

Both the Church Fathers and the General Councils of the Church had held that the final judge in matters of faith and doctrine was Christ who was to be found in the Scriptures themselves and "that all determinations of doubts must be taken from this written word."[23] The Popes prior to Trent had not claimed final doctrinal authority; Pope Clement I declared that "one may have the full and firme rule of faith and trueth in the Scriptures" and again that "the understanding of the trueth, must be sought out of the Scriptures themselves."[24] The Council of Basel maintained that "the divine Law (or holy Scripture) the practise of Christ, of his Apostles, and of the Primitive Church, together with Councils and Doctours grounding themselves truely thereon, shall be admitted for the most true and indifferent Judge."[25]

Earlier councils had "proceeded roundly against the Popes authoritie," and had refused to relinquish to the papacy final judgment in controversies of faith,

---

[22]Directions, Preface.

[23]Directions, 53.

[24]Directions, 58.

[25]Directions, 59.

protesting that the danger therein gave "an open entrance for Antichrist [to come] into the Church to subvert Christian Religion."[26] But the Council of Trent had handed over to the Pope the authority so carefully defended by the general councils in the past. In so doing, Trent had repudiated the concept of the general council as the representative body of the Church whose authority was a bulwark against the errors and encroachments of the Pope. In effect, it had placed the Pope above the Church. "Is this a thing to bee tolerated in the Church," Carleton asked, "that a companie of Italians, men without Religion, without the feare of God, shuld in the pride of their wits put a trick upon all the Churches in Christendom?"[27]

It was at Trent, according to Carleton, that the papacy had succeeded finally in realizing the magnification of power for which it had long striven. However, this had been accomplished only by an alteration of the rule of faith so radical that the Church of Rome fell away from the Catholic Church in consequence. By forsaking the ancient rule of faith, the unity of Rome with the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church was severed. Although the Church of

---

[26]Directions, 74.

[27]Directions, 63.

Rome called itself the Catholic Church, it was not and never had been the Catholic Church and was no longer even in communion with the Catholic Church.[28] There could be no continuity with the true Church in those church communions, such as the post-Tridentine Church of Rome, which had forsaken the rule of faith. Since the one, true Church "must continue to the end of the world," Carleton reminded his reader, "it must needs be granted, that it is continued in them that holde the unitie with the Catholike Church, and the rule of faith;" the Reformed Churches had held to the ancient, apostolic rule of faith and, in their faithfulness to the rule, "must needes proove themselves to stand in the true succession of the Church."[29]

Carleton wrote Directions, as he had written several of his earlier works, Jurisdiction and Tithes Examined, in a polemical mode, casting the Church of Rome in the adversarial role. Rome had frequently attacked the validity of ordination in the Church of England and a debate with Rome on the subject of the continuity of the Church was not an unexpected response to these attacks. In the preface to Directions, Carleton recounted Rome's imputation that there had

---

[28]Directions, 82-3.

[29]Directions, 78.

been irregularities in the installation of the bishops of the Church of England which would have constituted a break within the English communion in the apostolic succession. Carleton disposed of this slander within a few pages of his preface, refuting the charge with evidence from a work by George Mason which documented all of the consecrations of bishops in the reign of Elizabeth, and for some years before, as taken from the public records. Having authenticated the legitimacy of the English clergy at the outset, he proceeded to devote the body of his book to proving that, because of its radical deviation from the ancient rule of faith, it was the present Church of Rome that was no longer a part of the succession handed down from the Apostles nor could the present Church of Rome claim continuity with the Church of the past.

Carleton did not question the unity of the Church of Rome with the Catholic Church prior to the Council of Trent; he acknowledged Rome to have been a true and visible, although corrupt, member of the Church of Christ. Carleton's inclusion of the old Church of Rome within the continuity of the true Church was a point of theological dispute and division in the early seventeenth-century Church of England and Carleton's position represented one side of the dispute. The

issue appeared to be centered on the antecedents of the present English Church: were they restricted to the godly remnant, the few Christian children to be found among the Antichrist's brood throughout the centuries, or were they to be found in the Christian community which, until the age of Henry VIII, had recognized the spiritual supremacy of the Pope? Division over ecclesiastical antecedents was, however, a manifestation of a much larger theological question about the nature and extent of the visible Church: did it include all who professed Christianity, or was its membership limited to the visibly godly? The latter position attempted to carry out in the visible Church the separation of the elect from the reprobate, while the former position held it to be impossible to recognize the elect in this life. The division had caused much debate in the 1570s and, though temporarily silenced, was yet to be resolved.[30]

Carleton defended those who had lived and died in the old Church of Rome as having possessed all necessary means of salvation because they held to the apostolic rule of faith.[31] His belief in the

---

[30]Peter Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church" Past and Present no. 114 (Feb 1987), 38-43.

[31]Directions, 83.

apostolic validity of the pre-Tridentine Church of Rome, however, was not shared by his metropolitan, George Abbot. Abbot maintained that the notion that the Church of Rome was once within the apostolic succession should be disclaimed "as a flattering tale."[32] Instead, he held that the visible Church "need not ever be eminently visible and apparently sensible to us."[33] In his understanding of the continuity of the Church, the Archbishop emphasized an individual rather than a collective membership in the true Church, citing the gospel of Matthew that, wherever two or three are gathered together in his name, Christ is in the midst of them; he asserted that every man who had raised a voice against the Antichrist embraced that religion now professed in England.[34]

In considering the Church of Rome prior to the Council of Trent, Carleton carefully distinguished between the papacy and the Church. He referred to the papacy, and to all who championed the power of the Pope at the expense of the Church, as the Court of Rome. He defined the Church of Rome as "all these Westerne

---

[32]George Abbot, A Treatise of the Perpetual Visibility and the Succession of the True Church in All Ages (1624), 3.

[33]Abbot, 25.

[34]Abbot, 74.

Churches, that helde Communion with the Church of Rome then."[35] At the Council of Trent, the Court of Rome had prevailed. It was Carleton's belief that, following Trent, the Church had no other recourse than to separate from the Court of Rome.

> But the Church, though falling away from the Court of Rome, continued still the same Church because it helde still the same rule of faith, and forsaked not the communion which before it had with the Catholicke Church: But the Court of Rome, which now calleth itselfe the Church, and the onely Catholike Church, altered the rule of faith, and fell away from the communion of the Catholike Church. (83)

Carleton defined the Reformed Churches "as now they are called, [as] being the generation of them that have lived of long time before, in the Communion of the old Church of Rome" and would have remained so had it not been for the vast changes wrought by Trent.[36] It is apparent that he believed that the Church of England was a continuation, greatly reformed, of that common communion held among the Western Churches prior to the Council of Trent, which not infrequently had been identified as the Church of Rome.

Carleton briefly addressed the holiness of the Church. He defined the membership of the universal Church as those who had been "sanctified by the spirit

---

[35]Directions, 66.

[36]Directions, 66.

of God, [and] washed by the blood of Christ from their sins," a communion of saints, according to the creed.[37] Inward grace was necessary to be in communion with Christ as well as among the saints who were cleansed from all sin. Carleton observed that the papists no longer taught the necessity of inward grace, only of the external profession of faith and of the reception of the sacraments. The Apostle had written that by one spirit we are baptized into one body, but the papists were mindful only of the externals of baptism and not of its gift of inward grace and regeneration.

Carleton declared that only they who loved the truth would be gathered into one Body. The Calvinist orientation of his theology is evident in his recognition that the love of truth is a gift and that they who are not given the love of the truth will be "justly deceived and [will] perish."[38] But his inclinations were inclusive and, though intellectually he gave his consent to the doctrine of predestination, he appears to be excluding no one when he urges his readers to love and seek the truth, "as they would seeke silver and golde," and they will "undoubtedly bee

---

[37]Directions, 10.

[38]Directions, 103.

saved from errour and damnation" and will be brought into the true Church, "that therein, as in the Arke of Noah, they may be saved."[39]

[39] Directions, 104.

A Thankful Remembrance of God's Mercy

In 1624 George Carleton published a work entitled A Thankful Remembrance of God's Mercy, which the title page further described as a "Historicall Collection of the great and mercifull Deliverances of the Church and State of England since the Gospel beganne here to flourish, from the beginning of Queene Elizabeth." The book focuses upon the works of the Lord. Man's works, his intentions or policies are noted only as they reflect his pursuit of the truth and his openness to God's grace. The epigraph on the title page is from the one hundred and eleventh psalm, the second verse: "The works of the Lord are great, and ought to be sought out of all them than love Him." Carleton's book is an attempt to realize the admonition of the Psalmist to observe the great good works of God.

The fact that the book reads like a history of the reign of Elizabeth I can be attributed to Carleton's identification of the English nation with the people of the Lord. As Patrick Collinson has observed, the Church in England, following the severance of its tie with Rome, ceased to have any distinct or separate existence from the political community: "the whole

nation...was deemed to be `the people of the Lord.'"[1] Richard Hooker had written, "there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is a member of the Commonwealth, nor a member of the Commonwealth which is not also a member of the Church of England."[2]

In his dedicatory note, Carleton declared that his purpose was not only to glorify God but to justify the cause "which God hath maintained from Heaven." Carleton was convinced that the Church of England occupied a special place in the providence of God and often drew a parallel between the people of England and the people of Israel. God had chosen the people of Israel not because they were better or wiser than other nations but because he had made a covenant with their fathers and would fulfill that promise. It was God's expectation that his people would be faithful and trust themselves to his care. The protection which God formerly had extended to Israel, he now extended to the Church of Christians and to no Church more than to the Church of England.

A Thankful Remembrance was dedicated to Charles, Prince of Wales; all men, Carleton wrote, need to

---

[1]Patrick Colinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement (London: Methuen, 1982), 25.

[2]Quoted in Collinson, 22.

remember the great works of God, but especially princes who, because of their responsiblity for those under them, must be mindful that "safety is not in worldly policy, but in God which never forsaketh them that trust in him."[3] It was Carleton's thesis that the fear of God made nations strong against their enemies; no where did he find this more clearly demonstrated than in the early years of the reign of Elizabeth I of England. When she came to the throne, Spain, France and Scotland could be numbered among the enemies of England; furthermore, the treasury was exhausted. England appeared to be a "weake and poore State, destitute of meanes and friends."[4] Elizabeth could easily have overcome all of these difficulties by submission to the Church of Rome. Instead she chose to establish the true gospel in her kingdom to the glory of God "and in hope of Gods holy protection."[5] She did not act in vain. Moving with resolution, she worked to increase the store of arms, to provide domestically for the making of gunpowder and to strengthen the numbers and might of the navy; and "the

---

[3]George Carleton, A Thankfull Remebrance of Gods Mercy (London, 1627) hereinafter TR, 5.

[4]TR, 3.

[5]TR, 3.

Noble-men, the Gentle-men, and Yeomen did all strive to answer so noble a resolution of their Prince."[6] Quickly she became strong and her adversaries were not able to do her injury. It was Carleton's contention that England's deliverance from so vulnerable a position had to be the work of God; that so weak a Prince, and a woman, had defended herself against such powerful enemies could only be achieved through God's interference. "Behold," Carleton declared, "what it is to trust in God, and not in an arme of Flesh."[7]

In the half a dozen years preceding the appearance of A Thankful Remembrance, the politics of international power had taken on a confessional guise. Rebellion had broken out in Bohemia in 1618 over the anti-Protestant policies of Ferdinand, archduke of Inner Austria and king-designate of Bohemia. The religious balance of the Empire, precarious at best, was upset beyond correction. Confessional alliance within the Empire and with co-religionists abroad confirmed the division of Germany between Catholic and Protestant and threatened to divide Europe as well along religious lines. In 1619, Ferdinand was deposed as king and the crown of Bohemia was offered to and

---

[6]TR, 5.

[7]TR, 5.

accepted by Frederick, the Elector Palatine, son-in-law of James I, and "one of the best-connected princes in Protestant Europe."[8] Within England and the Protestant communities of Europe there were some who placed an apocalyptic interpretation on the events in Bohemia, perceiving Frederick's assumption of the crown to be part of a divine scheme to commence the final struggle of the godly with the Antichrist. In 1619 Sir Edward Herbert, ambassador to Paris, described it as "the apparent way His providence hath opened to the ruine of the papacy" and added "I hope therfore his Ma[jes]tie will assist in this great work."[9]

However, in 1620 Frederick was overthrown in Bohemia by Catholic forces while the Spanish army of Flanders invaded the Palatinate, Frederick's hereditary lands. Within the Empire, fear of the Emperor limited support for Frederick; abroad, both the Netherlands and Denmark looked to England to take the lead in the determination of a Palatine policy. Within England there existed a significant body of opinion that equated the resolution of the Palatine question with

---

[8]Geoffrey Parker, The Thirty Years War (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 52.

[9]S.R. Gardiner, Letters and Other Documents Illustrating the Relations between England and Germany at the Commencement of the Thirty Years' War Camden Society, vol. 98 (Westminster: Nichols, 1868), 13.

the fate of Protestantism in Europe.[10] However, James refused to consider the crisis in Germany as more than a local struggle and the Reformed ideology did not inform his response to it. He was a credal Calvinist with a taste for apologetics but he did not identify the Church of England with the other Reformed Churches of Europe. Neither did he perceive the conflicts in Germany as part of a millenarian struggle between Christ and the Antichrist, between the true religion and popery, between the forces of good and the forces of evil. James did not want war, certainly not a religious war. Throughout his reign, he had consistently manifested a desire to foster religious peace and had sought for himself the eirenic role of peacemaker, for they shall be called the sons of God. Early in his reign he had expressed the desire for a general council, with representation from Rome and from the major Reformed traditions, at which all differences could be freely discussed and the unity of the Church restored.[11] In a speech to Parliament 19 March 1604 James had declared,

---

[10]Parker, 63.

[11]S.R. Gardiner, History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642 (Reprint, New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965), i, 202.

> I could wish from my heart that it would please God to make me one of the members of such a generall Christian union in Religion, as laying wilfulnesse aside on both hands, wee might meete in the middest, which is the Center and perfection of all things.[12]

Although he refused to support Frederick's pretensions in Bohemia, dynastic loyalty obliged James to support and promote the restoration of the Palatinate to Frederick; but it was his intention to achieve this objective by diplomacy rather than by war. Reminiscent of his earlier desire to organize an ecumenical council, he did in fact conduct a series of diplomatic negotiations to bring about a general conference for the purpose of defusing any further confessional confrontation and of mediating a settlement among the various parties involved.[13]

At the center of James's foreign policy was rapprochement with the major Catholic powers. He believed that an alliance with Spain was in reality "a peace policy, offering the chance to avoid the crippling cost of military support for continental Protestants and possibly a means of curbing the

---

[12]Quoted in W.B. Patterson, "King James I's Call for an Ecumenical Council" Councils and Assemblies, ed. G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker, Studies in Church History, v. 7 (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), .

[13]Simon Adams, "Spain or the Netherlands?" Before the English Civil War, ed. Howard Tomlinson (London: Macmillan Press, 1983), 87-8.

commercial expansion of the Dutch."[14] He had determined that an alliance would best be secured by a royal match between the Prince of Wales and the Spanish Infanta. After 1620 the resolution of the Palatine question became part of the terms to be settled in the negotiations of the marriage treaty; the crucial question was whether Spain would assist or restrain the Emperor.[15] James invited the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624 to advise the Crown on foreign policy; however, both Parliaments avoided debate on the ideological issues facing English foreign policy. Simon Adams has discerned two very different mind-sets among the participants of the parliamentary debates: on the one hand there were "men who saw contemporary events as part of a pattern of protestant apocalyptical history and [on the other hand there were] men who, fearing the revolutionary implications of such an ideology, sought a policy more conducive to the stability of the political and social status quo."[16]

---

[14]Simon Adams, "Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624" Faction and Parliament, ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 141.

[15]Conrad Russell, Parliaments and English Politics 1621-1629 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 88.

[16]Adams, "Foreign Policy," 140.

In early February of 1624, Carleton had appointed the bishops of London (George Monteigne) and St. David's (William Laud) as his proxies in the ensuing parliament;[17] there is no record of his presence in the House of Lords at any time during the Parliament of 1624. However, his opinions on the probable course of European affairs can be ascertained from a letter, dating from May of 1624, to his cousin, Dudley Carleton, in which he wrote that he had been expecting the political quarrel between Frederick and the Emperor to turn into a religious quarrel and to escalate into a war between Papist and Protestant.[18] Carleton indicated that he saw the present struggle as predestined, the fall of Rome having been prophesied in Scripture. In the 1624 Parliament, he would have fallen within Dr. Adams's first category of members, that is, those who saw contemporary events in the context of a Protestant apocalyptic history.

A Thankful Remembrance, with its emphasis on the great good works of God in behalf of his people who have trusted in him, could conceivably have been an excellent vehicle to propound arguments in favor of an assumption by England of the defense of the Reformed

---

[17]CSPD v.11, 161.

[18]PRO, SP 14/164.

religion in Europe and of a declaration of war with Spain. Praise of Elizabeth's assistance to the Scots against the French and to the Netherlands against Spain could have been used analogically to promote the defense of "the true professors of the same Christian religion professed by the Church of England in foreign parts" in their distress.[19] An enumeration of the frequent instances of treachery committed by the Spaniard in his relations with England could have been the basis for a call for the repudiation of all treaties with Spain. Peace with Spain might have been rejected with a biblical image as powerful as that employed by the bishop of Durham when in the House of Lords he had compared it to peace between Israel and the Ammonites; "The Amonytes would have peace with Israell &c. but woulde pull out their right eye firste."[20]

But Carleton's book is not an exercise in foreign policy. It is a celebration of the multiple occasions on which God delivered the realm from danger. It is a

---

[19]Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf and Hartley Simpson, Commons Debates for 1621 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), v, 203-4.

[20]S.R. Gardiner, Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords officially taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, A.D. 1624 and 1626 Camden Society, New Series, vol. 24 (Westminster: Nichols, 1879), 10.

celebration of treachery discovered and plots foiled, having the same spirit of rejoicing as the bellringing, bonfires and feasting which celebrated the exposure of a plot against the monarch. Carleton accepted the fact that evil was ever present. The wonder was that God did not permit evil to triumph but, through his miraculous interference, protected his people and gave witness to their special status. A Thankful Remembrance is concerned with the English nation's relationship to God. The nation was understood to include both the Church and the State, the welfare of the one being inseparable from that of the other and the welfare of both resting in the person of the monarch: for upon "the Queens life and safetie...both the estate of the Kingdome, and of Religion depended."[21] Carleton located the source of the nation's strength in the Church's careful preservation of right doctrine which he contrasted with the false practices and doctrine of the Church of Rome since the time of the Council of Trent. Although the adversaries of England were many and "seldome did any yeare passe without some treason,"[22] the real enemy was Satan, the

---

[21] TR, 85.

[22] TR, 74.

Devil; and the "instrument and servant of the Devill to disorder the world" was the Pope.[23]

Carleton's England was part of a providential world whose scenes and actors and stage business had been preordained before the foundations of the world were laid. The direction of the world was simple: those who loved God by maintaining his truth were themselves maintained by God; those who dishonored God were dishonored by him. In his delineation of the dangers and intrigues which threatened the nation throughout the reign of Elizabeth, as well as after the accession of James I to the English throne, and of the defeat of these infamous designs, Carleton demonstrated how prophesies had been fulfilled and how God's plan had unfolded.

> England was as a Stage, whereupon divers entred to play their parts, one after another. The part that they played was alwayes treason; some was kept farther off by Gods providence, to do lesse harme; some brought the danger nearer home. But GOD taking the protection of his Church in England, none prevailed.[24]

Carleton was convinced that only the power of God had prevented the Church from being swallowed up by its cruel adversaries. Against their wicked practices and bloody mischief the hand of him who commanded all the

---

[23]TR, 21-2.

[24]TR, 36.

world had kept in safety his Church. In God's time England's adversaries would be cut off: "they have their power limited, and they have their time limited, and set forth unto them beyond which they cannot passe."[25]

One of the most powerful of the prophesies which informs Carleton's text is that of the woman and the serpent found first in Genesis 3:15: "And the Lord God said unto the serpent...And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." In the center of the frontspiece of A Thankful Remembrance is pictured the true Church in the form of a woman whose foot rests on the neck of a prostrate Pope. Looking out from under the drapery of the woman's skirt are the devil and a Jesuit whose broad-brimmed hat has rolled to one side. It was Carleton's interpretation that the Church was the woman's seed and the seed of the serpent consisted of the instruments of Satan, the most dangerous being the Court of Rome, the Pope, the seminary priests and the Jesuits, who bring men, "even princes, nobles and gentlemen of good place" to destruction.[26] Although the enmity between the

---

[25]TR, 23.

[26]TR, 120.

woman's seed and the seed of Satan had been known since the fall of Adam and the Church had experience of it, "never had any Church in the world a more lively experience hereof, then this Church of England."[27] The Jesuits and priests "come in secretly, and scraule in corners like Serpents...They plot and practise treasons, they raise rebellions, their heads and hands are full of blood and murther...They are men acquainted with the deepenes of Satan."[28]

Carleton cited the consequences of the papal bull, Regnans in excelsis, issued in 1570 by Pope Pius V whereby Queen Elizabeth was declared to be deposed and the Queen and all who adhered to her were excommunicated; further, the Pope absolved all of the Queen's subjects from the oath of their allegiance. "The first poysoned fruit of this excommunication" was a rebellion, plotted by the Pope, aided by the King of Spain, which attracted the support of the Duke of Norfolk and the Earls of Westmorland and Northumberland.[29] Carleton contended that their purposes had nothing to do with heresy; rather rebellion was raised and subjects set to murder their

---

[27]TR, 120.

[28]TR, 120-1.

[29]TR, 15.

Prince out of greediness, that England might come under the power of the papacy, that the Spaniard might have greater security in his affairs in the Netherlands and that the Duke of Norfolk might advance himself through marriage with the Scots Queen. The Pope had authorized sin, he had commanded sin, he had committed sin, he had gloried in sin. "If the Popes presume that they have such a priviledge, that the things which are horrible sinnes in other men, are no sinnes in them; this were in effect as much as for the Pope to proclaime himselfe the Man of sinne."[30]

The Popes had not always been thus. There was a vast difference between the ancient bishops of Rome and the Popes of late. "The ancient Bishops did never draw the sword to propagate the faith."[31] Carleton had argued elsewhere that after the fourth century there had been a decline in the worthiness of the bishops of Rome.[32] However, it was not until the Council of Trent, held between 1545 and 1563, that the Church of Rome ceased to be "the religion of our Fathers." The Council declared the rule of faith to consist not of the Scriptures alone but of the unwritten traditions of

---

[30]TR, 22.

[31]TR, 55.

[32]Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall.

the Church as well, thus authorizing a change in the rule of faith; and "where the rule of faith is changed, there must needs follow a change of Religion, and a change of the Church."[33] Carleton cited St. Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians in which the Apostle wrote that they who have not received the love of the truth shall believe lies. "What greater lyes can be invented then to say, that Whatsoever the Pope will allow for a tradition of his Church, that is the Word of God."[34] The standard by which the Church of Rome judged what was righteousness and what was unrighteousness was determined not by the word of God but by the word of the Pope. However, Carleton maintained that these deceitful men were themselves deceived and were the victims of the "workings of Satan, with all power and signes and lying wonders...because they receive not the love of the truth." The papists professed false doctrine which had led to unrighteous actions, the two being usually joined together. In consequence, "we hold them undoubtedly to be the servants of Antichrist, who are

---

[33]TR, 26.

[34]TR, 55.

given up to beleeve lyes, because they love not the truth."[35]

Carleton held that the love of the truth was the cornerstone of righteousness, the key to deliverance; it was that which distinguished the seed of the woman from the serpent's seed. Elizabeth had chosen to establish God's truth in England and the worship of God as he himself had revealed and commanded. Ever since, it had been the experience of England to "rest in patience and commit the vengeance to God."[36] God had made the enemies of England his enemies; no longer could they fight against England, but must fight against God himself. Thus had God shown his favor towards the Church of England. At the same time the Jesuits had been sent into England to sow the seed of the religion of Rome, but it was nothing more than a doctrine of lies and unrighteousness.

> What greater unrighteousness, then to give away other mens possessions to strangers that have no right to them; to dispossesse Kings; to give Kingdomes which is none of yours to give; to kill, to murther, to massacre, to doe any act of unrighteousnesse at the commandement of the Pope or any superiour.[37]

---

[35] TR, 57.

[36] TR, 58.

[37] TR, 55.

Differentiating between the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome before and after the Council of Trent, Carleton fully acknowledged that, formerly, the papists had served God with sincerity and in accordance with the measure of knowledge which they possessed. But when God had revealed a greater knowledge of himself through the spreading of the gospel, the Church of Rome turned its back on the revealed truth, choosing to forsake truth, and brought down a curse upon itself.

The truth was to Carleton an easily identifiable object which was to be found along a readily accessible path. It was contained in the Scriptures, the word of God, and the Scriptures were obvious and certain. Frequently, he exhorted his reader to love the truth. Although he acknowledged that the truth was a gift from God, he believed that the truth was within the grasp of any man who had a care to save his soul; all that was necessary was a desire to know the truth and the will to seek it. The truth was even within the grasp of Popes who, Carleton was willing to believe, acted "rather from their blindness, then from a wilfull and obstinate striving against the knowne truth."[38] He warned the Pope that unless he labored to know the truth, setting his heart upon finding it, he would

---

[38]TR, 54.

become more and more deeply enmeshed in the lies of Satan. The King of Spain Carleton portrayed as enthralled to Rome and, consequently, was "in some sort to be excused. For what can a Popish Prince doe, but follow the common examples and practises of them, to whose counsell and advise hee hath given himselfe over wholly to be governed?"[39] But Carleton was not without hope that one day all the kings and princes who had long been beguiled by Rome might understand the difference between truth and falsehood and might join with the religious kings against the Devil. As for the Jesuits, they were beyond the pale: "there is no hope to amend these Jesuites...no hope to perswade them, because they love not the truth."[40]

With the exception of the Jesuits, Carleton maintained a very inclusive position concerning God's mercy and protection. It was available to all who sought God's truth and kept it and there was assurance of God's constant help if one did not fail him: "for God will not forsake us, if we forsake not him."[41] This would appear to contradict the Calvinist doctrine of grace, particularly the doctrine of election, by

---

[39]TR, 195.

[40]TR, 162.

[41]TR, 238.

which salvation is granted by the grace of God alone, apart from any human merit, and the doctrine of perseverence, that is, that the elect cannot fall away from grace. However, Carleton was not addressing individual souls but the nation as a whole. The most-favored-nation status which England had been enjoying had no doctrinal guarantees; as a nation it was not covered under the doctrine of grace. The English nation could experience the same fate as Israel. The people of Israel, once the elect nation of God, had been unfaithful to God and God had forsaken them.

> Indeed if we forsake him, and fall away from the truth of Religion in the Church, and from the execution of Justice in the State, and from obedience to the faith: then may wee lose our part in God, and lose our confidence in his helpe, and lose the blessed benefit of his protection. They can never prevaile against us by any other way then by our forsaking of God."[42]

In chronicling the history of God's special protection of England from Elizabeth's accession to the throne to the time of James I, Carleton demonstrated that the old serpent had been nibbling continually at the heel of the Church, troubling the Church. There had been rebellion, plots against the monarch's life and attempted invasion. But what had all her adversaries achieved against England in the end? St.

---

[42]TR, 238.

Paul had promised that "the God of peace would tread Satan under your feet shortly" (Romans 16:20) and, though the Apostle wrote of spiritual battle, God had yet comforted his Church by delivering it many times, "and many times beateth downe Sathan and Sathans instruments under the feet of his Church."[43] Carleton therefore concluded that God must be worshiped according to his law and the truth of his religion must be maintained because

> it pleased him...to call us out of Babylon, to give us hearts to obey his calling, to make choise of this Church which himselfe hath planted in Great Britain, to inable it to stand against all the furious rage and wicked practises of the Pope and his adherents.[44]

---

[43] TR, 234.

[44] TR, 288.

An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England

In 1626, George Carleton published what is the only surviving statement of his position on the doctrine of grace. Issued under the lengthy title, An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England, it was written to refute what Carleton considered to be the Arminian orientation of one of his diocesan clergy, Richard Mountague, as stated in his book, Appello Caesarem (1625). In an earlier work, A New Gagg for an Old Goose (1624), Mountague had denied that unconditional election and the indefectability of the elect were doctrines of the English Church, attributing such notions to the Puritans. The work had provoked a violent reaction, and indignation was expressed not only among the clergy but in Parliament. Mountague's doctrinal stance, which has been described as combining an anti-Puritan rhetoric with "a more risky and marginal anti-Calvinism,"[1] was perceived as a threat to the essence of Protestant religious

---

[1]Fincham and Lake, 205-6.

sensibility: he appeared to be striking at the heart of Reformation theology, displacing that most basic Protestant doctrine, justification by faith alone. Appello Caesarem had been written, with the encouragement of King James, as an explanation and defense of the earlier work.[2] Carleton was troubled that the unity of English Protestants within their shared doctrinal confession was threatened by Mountague's allegations that the Puritan doctrines of grace and salvation were distinct from Church of England orthodoxy.

The doctrine of grace, as defined by the Dutch Arminians in the early seventeenth century and as given confessional status in their Remonstrance of 1610, had been at the center of debate at the synod convened at Dort in 1618. The Arminians had readily acknowledged that grace was a gift of God, bestowed upon man entirely out of God's mercy; however, they had denied that it followed that God's grace was irresistible. Although their arguments did not prevail at Dort, the debate succeeded in redirecting theological attention to the issues surrounding the relation of grace to free will in conversion and justification. By the 1620s, a

---

[2]Sheila Lambert, "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship," Past and Present 124 (1989), 43-7.

doctrinal plurality of opinion concerning the doctrines of election and perseverance was manifesting itself in the Church of England. Despite Carleton's deep involvement in the Dutch controversy of the preceding decade, both through his writings and in his participation at the Synod of Dort as head of the English delegation, it is from the period of the English debate over human merit and the will of God that Carleton's position on the doctrine of grace can be documented and his particular shade of Calvinism determined.

Numerous books attacking Mountague's position were published;[3] Carleton's has been described as the most authoritative,[4] possibly because of the prestige of his episcopal office. The most important responses were published before the proclamation for the peace of the Church of 16 June 1626 which called for the cessation of all writing, preaching and printing that introduced new opinions concerning religion. The second edition of Carleton's An Examination was issued

---

[3]J.S. Macauley has identified eight authors who answered Mountague's Appello Caesarem, one of whom published four separate responses. "Richard Mountague 1575-1641" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1966), appendix 3.

[4]Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 155.

after the proclamation and, it has been suggested, in defiance thereof.[5] Much has been made of the licensing of Mountague's works to be printed as indicative of the increasing power of an Arminian party within the English Church and of changes within the ecclesiastical power structure.[6] However, the shift in the balance of power among episcopal factions did not alter the doctrinal position of most clergymen; the Church of England remained predominantly predestinarian in its salvation theology throughout the first half of the seventeenth century.[7]

The Reformed doctrine of grace had its roots in the fundamental Protestant doctrine, as articulated by Martin Luther, of justification by faith alone which affirmed that man's righteousness before God is the freely given gift of God's mercy and is not to be obtained or acquired by man's efforts or through any power of man. The doctrine of justification was grounded on the premise that God's sovereignty is absolute and that the corruption of man is total.

---

[5]Lambert, 59.

[6]Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 47; Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church," 34.

[7]R.T. Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649 (Oxford: University Press, 1979), 79.

Luther based the doctrine of justification by faith alone on the writings of St. Paul, finding further support in the anti-Pelagian writings of St. Augustine. It was a doctrine widely debated in England and confirmed by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in his Homily of Salvation:

> Because all men be sinners and offenders against God, and breakers of His law and commandments, therefore can no man by his own acts, works, and deeds, seem they never so good, be justified and made righteous before God; but every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness or justification, to be received at God's own hands, that is to say, the remission, pardon, and forgiveness of his sins and trespasses in such things as he hath offended. And by God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God for our perfect and full justification.[8]

Justification by faith alone supported a doctrine of grace which emphasized the antithesis between God and man: God freely electing and justifying and giving salvation to man, man totally undeserving and sinful and dependent upon God's mercy; a pure act of divine pardon without reference to man's merits. Such a doctrine of grace made necessary a doctrine of predestination to explain the gift of election to salvation. The concept of predestination was acknowledged by Luther but it was in Geneva that the

---

[8]Quoted in Porter, 62.

concept found its full expression and development; thus it is a doctrine more characteristic of Reformed Protestantism than of Lutheran Protestantism and, in time, became a source of division between them.[9]

In the teachings of John Calvin there was a distinct emphasis on predestination and sanctification; election was regarded as an act of God in which he extinguishes the natural will, which is corrupt and incapable of regeneration, and gives in substitution a new will from himself. Election is above nature, a supernatural conversion.[10] Special prominence was given to the comfort to be derived from the assurance of salvation in Reformed theology which led to the doctrine of the indefectability of the elect: that the elect are not only given the grace of perseverance but cannot fall from grace was a critical theological issue between Reformed and Lutheran theologians and further divided them.[11]

---

[9]By 1576 the Lutheran Formula of Concord, rejecting totally any decree of reprobation, declared that God predestined all to life. Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 34.

[10]Kendall, 20-1.

[11]Lutheran theologians did not accept the grace of perseverance as a logical extension of the doctrine of predestination. Wallace, 34.

The predestination of some to eternal life carried with it the corollary that others were unconditionally damned. In Calvin's Genevan Church catechism of 1545, there is no mention of reprobation.[12] Calvin found the Scriptures ambiguous concerning those whom God had predestined and avoided speculation on the mysterious ways of God's will. Calvin took the position that Christ died for all and is offered to all but not all receive him; one must be among the elect in order to receive him and be saved. It was among the second generation of Reformed theologians that the idea was introduced that Christ did not die for all men but only for the elect.[13]

Although in the early years of the English Reformation both Lutheran and Reformed influences had been of profound importance, the thought and teachings of the Swiss Reformers eventually gained ascendancy. From the historian's vantage point, it would appear that the preponderant influence and authority was Calvinist; but contemporaries viewed Zurich as a center of reform as significant as Geneva.[14] Even the

---

[12]C.M. Dent, Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford (Oxford: University Press, 1983), 90.

[13]Dent, 100.

[14]Dent, 74.

university city of Heidelberg, capital of the Palatinate, though not to be compared with Geneva and Zurich, did nonetheless exert a direct influence on English theological development.[15] It has been observed that English Protestantism can be called Calvinist only with "some delicacy and difficulty": the influence and significance of Calvinism must not be allowed to obscure the fact that English theologians not only regarded Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr as authorities equal in stature with Calvin, but they "accorded a higher measure of authority to Ambrose, Athanacius, Augustine, Chrysostom and Cyprian, for the apologetics of the Church of England always rested on a patristic foundation."[16] Nonetheless, the doctrine of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church of England was presumed to be generally consistent in matters of grace and faith with the Reformed churches of Europe; and only rarely before the 1620s and the rise to ecclesiastical power of the English Arminian party was

---

[15]Dent, 80.

[16]Patrick Collinson, "England 1558-1640," International Calvinism, ed. Menna Prestwich (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 214.

a Calvinist interpretation of the Church's doctrine challenged.[17]

Carleton's understanding of the doctrine of grace was in the orthodox tradition of Bucer and Martyr who "integrally related predestination, justification, and sanctification to a whole ordo salutis, or `order of salvation'."[18] "The purpose of God," wrote Carleton, "is conducted to his end by such means as God hath set...that is, by Predestination, Vocation and Justification, to Glorification, that is, to the intended end."[19] Anthony Maxey, chaplain to James I, had in a sermon preached before the King found these elements in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 8:30: "Moreover, whom he predestined, them also he called: and whom he called, them also he justified: and whom he justified, them also he glorified." Maxey had likened these elements to the links of a chain "that if you hold fast one lincke, you draw unto you the whole chaine."[20] Carleton, appropriating the image of the

---

[17]Collinson, "England 1558-1640," 213.

[18]Wallace, 7.

[19]Exam, 16-7.

[20]Anthony Maxey, The Golden Chaine of Mans Salvation (London, 1610), sig. A3.

chain, added that it is "so linked together, that it cannot be separated."[21]

Carleton professed a great reluctance to meddle with the matter of predestination because "it is one of the greatest and deepest of Gods Mysteries: We are with reverence to wonder, and with Faith and Humility to follow that which God in his Scriptures hath revealed in this point, and there to stay."[22] It is a statement worthy of a Jacobean bishop whose late King had expressed himself on the matter of predestination at the Hampton Court Conference to the effect that he "wished that the doctrine of predestination might be very tenderly handled, and with great discretion."[23] However, Carleton declared himself emboldened to proceed because of the grave danger to which the Church of England and the nation were exposed through Mountague's corruption of received Church doctrine. Recalling the parable of the sower, Carleton likened England to the fertile ground which has received the

---

[21]Exam, 69.

[22]Exam, 2-3.

[23]Edward Cardwell, A History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the revision of the Book of Common Prayer from 1558 to 1690 (Oxford: University Press, 1849, repr. Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg Press Incorporated, 1966), 181.

Word of God fruitfully, a nation which has freely received great grace, but cautioned:

> This grace, though so great, yet may be lost. For many Nations have had it, that have lost it; Let them that have it make much of it whilest they have it: For who knoweth how soone it may be taken away? And this is one way to loose it, to suffer the Doctrines of our church to be corrupted.[24]

Carleton specifically addressed those aspects of predestinarian theology which Mountague had placed in dispute, unconditional election and the indefectability of the elect, outlining the continuity of the Church's position and carefully noting the authority by which that position had been maintained. Neither the doctrine of unconditional election nor that of the indefectability of the elect differed from the teachings of Martyr and Bucer, men "of best learning and soundness" whose consent and judgment Archbishop Cranmer "craved."[25] The doctrinal controversies of the 1590s at Cambridge were answered by Archbishops John Whitgift and Mathew Hutton with the Lambeth Articles which justified this same doctrine of grace. At the Hampton Court Conference, this same doctrine was again affirmed. Carleton pointed out that the Reformed

---

[24]Exam, 66-7.

[25]Exam, 7.

Churches of Europe concurred with the position of the English Church on the doctrine of grace and, concerning the doctrine of unconditional election, uniformity of doctrine extended beyond the Reformed Churches. "I will adde also, the same is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, as Bellarmine delivereth it."[26]

Carleton made only a brief reference to the Synod of Dort to defend the "diligence and industry of his brethern gathered" there.[27] He noted that those who participated were there at the behest of the King; that they proceeded in the manner in which his Majesty had directed them in his instructions to them; and that their service at Dort as representatives of the Church of England received upon its conclusion his Majesty's approbation. However, Carleton did not look to the canons of Dort for his authority in defining the orthodox doctrine of grace, although two years earlier, in a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, he had urged that the canons be adopted by Convocation.[28] Neither did he cite the authority of John Calvin whose name is almost synonymous with the doctrine of

---

[26]Exam, 22.

[27]Exam, 46.

[28]PRO SP 14/164.

predestination.[29] Consistently, Carleton turned to the ancient Fathers of the Church, for whose authority he reserved his greatest respect, and most particularly he turned to St. Augustine.

> The learned Bishops who were employed in the Reformation of our Church, in the beginning of Queene Elizabeths Raigne, or in King Edwards time, did so much honour S. Augustine, that in the collecting of the Articles and Homilyes, and other things in that Reformation, they had an especiall respect unto S. Augustines Doctrines.[30]

Misconceptions concerning the doctrine of grace had arisen in the time of St. Augustine and it was Augustine who had clarified the disputed points of doctrine.[31] Carleton wrote that it was as if Augustine "had beene raised up, and reserved by God to

---

[29]"As for Calvin, his name and doctrines are made odious, but why, I know not. If he hath written some things amisse, as who writing so much, hath not slipped in many things? yet a charitable construction would helpe in many things: And admit, he hath some things which cannot be excused; yet, if we consider the ancient Fathers, how often they have slipped and erred, we might be more moderate in censuring of others." Exam, 97.

[30]Exam, 78-9.

[31]In the early fifth century, Pelagius taught that grace is given to men in respect of their merits. St. Augustine argued that salvation depends on the will and purpose of God alone. Pelagius denied that it depends on God's will alone, though he did not deny the will of God; he argued instead that God's will had respect to merits foreseen and, therefore, grace is given to men in respect of their merits.

doe this service to the Church, (as no doubt he was.)."[32] Only the Scriptures are cited by Carleton with more frequency than St. Augustine.

Carleton first addressed the doctrine of unconditional election which held that salvation was by grace alone, apart from any human merit. For the Reformed theologian, unconditional election was a logical extension of the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Justification was a gift from God, freely given. Therefore, election had to be unconditional, not in respect of man's merits, his faith or his actions; otherwise, justification would not be gratuitous. English Protestant writers and polemicists had long attacked as Pelagian any deviation from their complex of ideas about gratuitous grace and accused the Church of Rome of advocating a Pelagian works-righteousness by introducing human merit into God's purposes.[33] In his opening attack on respective election, Carleton declared that the Pelagian heresy had attempted to "pull downe the power of God, and to set up the power of Man;" it sought to deface God's grace by making predestination dependent not upon God's

---

[32]Exam, 78.

[33]Wallace, 13.

will but upon man; it attempted to remove the grace of salvation "from Gods good will and purpose, and place it in mans merits;" it raised that question of "whether that the fountaine of grace be in God, or in Man."[34]

However, Carleton censured not only those who taught the respective decree of election as wandering too far from received orthodoxy, he faulted as well those who, in an attempt to correct this error, taught "that Predestination is a separation betweene men and men, as they were found even in the Masse of mankinde uncorrupt, before the Creation, and the fall of Man.[35] Carleton reasserted the position argued by the English delegation at the Synod of Dort, that the subject of predestination is mankind after the fall; the Synod had finally concurred in this more moderate view, though not without a major debate with the more extreme supralapsarian position which held that the divine decrees concerning election preceded the fall of man. However, Carleton did not cite the canons of Dort for his authority, but St. Augustine and the Scriptures. "Saint Augustine was cleere in this, that Gods purpose of Predestination presupposed the fall of Mankinde, and

---

[34]Exam, 12.

[35]Exam, 15.

the corrupt masse of mankinde in sinne."[36] He quoted from St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, 1:4: "As he hath chosen us in Christ, before the foundations of the World." If predestination is in Christ, then the counsel of God had respect to the corruption of mankind; man's benefit in Christ is not for man in the state of innocence, but for man in a state of sin.

Carleton, further quoting from St. Paul, cited his letter to the Romans, 9:15: "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." Carleton made the argument that predestination does not look upon mankind uncorrupt and innocent but upon man corrupt; that election is a matter of God showing "mercy where he will: But mercy doth presuppose misery, and a sinnefull estate in man."[37] From this he inferred that "between Predestination and reprobation, amongst many other, this is one difference, that all men for sinne have deserved reprobation, but no man could deserve mercy to be delivered by predestination."[38] All who receive mercy are taken out of the corrupt state of mankind and the rest are left in their sin. "These wee call men

---

[36]Exam, 15.

[37]Exam, 16.

[38]Exam, 17-8.

reprobate that are left in their sinnes; and in the end justly condemned for sin."[39]

This raised the question why some men are elected and some not and Carleton's response was that "no cause can bee given, but the will of God."[40] He cited the seventeenth Article of Religion, "Of predestination and election," which begins:

> Predestination to lyfe, is the everlastyng purpose of God, wherby (before the foundations of the world were layd) he hath constantly decreed by his councell secrete to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christe out of mankynde, and to bryng them by Christe to everlastyng salvation, as vessels made to honour.[41]

Carleton especially marked the phrase "the everlasting purpose of God" and noted that the article goes on to say that "they be justified freely;" he concluded that "if freely, then without consideration of anything fore-seene in man."[42] Whether the Scriptures call it the will of God, the purpose of God or the good

---

[39]Exam, 18.

[40]Exam, 18.

[41]Edward Cardwell, Synodalia (Oxford: University Press, 1852, repr. Farnborough, Hants., England: Gregg International Publishers Ltd, 1966), 96.

[42]Exam, 19.

pleasure of God, "these words suffice to sober mindes to expresse this Doctrine."[43]

In his citation of the Articles of Religion, Carleton called upon the authority of what came most nearly to being the credal statement of the Church of England. Drawn up in 1551-2 under the supervision of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, the Articles were an attempt to give to the English Church an authorized definition of faith. They were decisively Protestant, affirming justification by faith, the sinfulness of man and his dependency on the gift of grace in order to turn to God. However, they had a certain flexibility, due to what was left out more than to what was put in, and reflected a sensibility to the differences that might genuinely be entertained concerning some doctrines and an appreciation that not all the demands of religion were equally necessary to salvation.

The seventeenth article is demonstrative of this lack of precision, making no specific mention of reprobation. After proclaiming the predestination to life for those whom God has chosen in Christ, the article considers the unspeakable comfort of

---

[43]Exam, 23.

predestination which confirms faith and kindles love of God. In his revision of the original article, Archbishop Parker had added the words "in Christ" to the phrase "those whom he has chosen [in Christe] out of mankinde" and in doing so made the death of Christ the locus of man's salvation rather than the arbitrary act of God's will. The article notes the despair of those lacking the spirit of Christ but implies that their downfall is caused by their sin. Finally, the seventeenth article admonishes that "we receave Gods promises in such wyse, as they be generally set foorth to us in holy scripture." In the latter part of the sixteenth century, Richard Hooker and John Overall made much of the word "generally," arguing that it implied that Christ and his grace as preached in the Gospel were for all men, universally.[44] While Carleton was aware that the notion of universal grace was accepted by a number of his fellow bishops, he believed that it was not consistent with the received orthodoxy of the Church.

The belief that predestination depends only on the will of God, even if it is the will of God in Christ, Carleton recognized to be a difficult aspect of the

---

[44]Porter, 337.

doctrine of unconditional election. However, he reminded his reader that the will of God is absolute, independent and respects nothing but itself; for if God's will were other than absolute, there must be something to move God's will, but no man can "know the cause of Gods will."[45] Confirmation of the irresistability of God's will raised the question of human freewill. It has been suggested that "for many people in the early seventeenth century the basic issue as between Protestantism and Catholicism was that of divine determinism versus human freewill."[46] It would appear that freewill was beginning to find expression and become an issue within the Protestant community as well. Carleton replied to the question of whether freewill may resist the will of God by conceding that the unregenerate may resist it and do resist it daily. But of "them that are called according to Gods purpose," the "power of God doth so order the will of man, that the will of man cannot but bee willing to receive this grace;" "grace worketh, converteth nature

---

[45]Exam, 24.

[46]Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution," 128.

& healeth it: nature is wrought upon, converted and healed."[47]

In considering the determination of God's will, Carleton posed a simple question: "what doth determine Gods purpose? whether his owne will, or mans Freewill?"[48] To take the second position is to return to the old heresy of the Pelagians, to confess that the grace of God is given according to man's merits. Carleton broke off his argument, declaring, "We need no Pelagians to helpe us herein. This man [Richard Mountague] hath more dishonored our Church, and slandered our Doctrines, then ever did any member of our Church." These were harsh words for the bishop to employ and his conviction of the necessity of right doctrine for the preservation of the nation's covenant with God may explain them. He expressed concern for Mountague as well. "This is plaine dealing without malice," Carleton wrote. "For if he were not plainely

---

[47]Exam, 29. While Carleton and Overall differed on the matter of the universality of God's grace, the understanding of the two was in agreement concerning the position of the Church on the relation of the will of God and human freewill.

[48]Exam, 32.

told of his errours, how could he see them and redresse them? as our hope is he will."[49]

If Mountague's arguments were simply about the respective decree of reprobation, agreement could be found with orthodox doctrine. "For this ground we take with Saint Augustine, that Predestination and Reprobation do respect sinne....If sinne bee the cause of condemnation and reprobation, then no man can finde any cause in himselfe why he should not be condemned & reprobate."[50] Carleton maintained that even the greatest saints that ever lived could find no cause in themselves why they should not be condemend and reprobate; but, he continued, like an echo of the seventeenth article, "I say in themselves: for if they looke out of themselves upon Christ, then they find an high and only cause, the will of God in Christ."[51] He concluded that there may be a cause of condemnation in addition to the will of God, but concurring with the will of God.

Election was another matter entirely. Carleton quoted from Mountague's text that "S. Peter was not

---

[49]Exam, 34.

[50]Exam, 38-9.

[51]Exam, 40.

called, saved, and glorified without consideration, or regard of his Faith, Obedience, and Repentence."[52] Carleton granted that St. Peter was not saved and glorified without consideration of his faith, obedience and repentence. "Salvation and glorification are in the nature of a reward...[and] may be said to respect these good workes that went before."[53] But as for the call of St. Peter, Carleton condemned as Pelagian heresy the idea that St. Peter was called respective of his faith, obedience and repentence; he declared that the Church of England taught "with the Scriptures, and with the most Orthodoxe Ancient Church, that St. Peter was predestinated and called unto Faith, Obedience, and Repentence."[54] Faith, obedience and repentence were the effects of his calling, not the cause; they came after his calling, not before. Carleton dismissed as nonsense that a subsequent grace can be the cause of a precedent grace; this is "to set the effect before the cause" and its only purpose can be "to dazle the

---

[52]Exam, 41.

[53]Exam, 42.

[54]Exam, 44.

ignorant with Words without Understanding."[55] Again, Carleton cited the seventeenth article:

> They, which be indued with such an excellent benefit of God, be called according to Gods purpose by his Spirit, working in due season, they through grace obey their calling, they are justified freely, they be made the sonnes of God by adoption, they be made like the image of his onely begotten Sonne Jesus Christ, they walke religiously in good workes, and at length by Gods mercy they attaine to everlasting felicity.[56]

The calling is according to God's purpose and "justification, obedience, walking religiously in good workes, these things are declared in the Article to follow the calling as effects thereof."[57] The calling is not according to the effects or in consideration of the effects, but the effects are according to the calling and in consideration and regard of the calling.

Of Mountague's other contention, that the justified may fall from grace totally and finally, Carleton declared, "This the Orthodoxe Church hath alwayes denied. The Arminians who admit no other Predestination but conditionall, affirm it; & none but Pelagians and Arminians."[58] The possible loss of

---

[55]Exam, 54.

[56]Exam, 61.

[57]Exam, 61.

[58]Exam, 68.

justifying faith and the limits to assurance of salvation were theological issues within the broader context of predestinarian doctrine and touched upon the nature of grace as well as upon human freewill. These same issues fed the debates of the 1590s when a theology of grace which questioned the absolute immutability of God's decress was being advanced in some quarters of the English Church. Cambridge was the scene of most of the controversy which centered on the `desperate presumption' of spiritual security and the possibility of the predestined to fall from grace.[59]

In a sermon at Cambridge in 1595, William Barrett preached that there was no certain assurance given by faith, but that perseverance in grace was dependent upon the efforts of the individual. Further, he held that the "Calvinist exegesis of election, justifying faith, and Christian assurance entailed a `desperate presumption.'"[60] The result of the ensuing turmoil provoked by Barrett's sermon was the Lambeth Articles,

---

[59]It has been suggested that Cambridge was just one of a number of places in Europe in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to resume the age-old debate over the relationship between the freewill of man and the grace of God; "about what has been called the `optimism' or the `pessimism' of grace." Porter, 284.

[60]Quoted in Porter, 335.

promulgated among the faculty at Cambridge in the same year by the archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, with the full concurrance of the archbishop of York, Mathew Hutton, as an accurate statement of the doctrinal position of the Church of England.[61] The principles of unconditional election and of the indefectability of the elect were clearly enunciated. Although the Lambeth Articles reasserted the central insights of Calvin's thought, it was an earlier style of Calvinism, a Calvinism in which predestination is approached as predestination to life, implying that election alone is grounded in the will of God and that reprobation has its roots in the sinfulness of man. Only being implied, it could be interpreted either way.[62] The primate agreed with Barrett that the certainty of one's salvation is not of the same order as the certainty of revealed doctrine; however, the Lambeth Articles did give a more precise reading to the Articles of Religion.[63]

---

[61]In a letter to Whitgift, Hutton wrote, "I do not think that we dissent anything at all from St. Augustine." Quoted in Peter Lake, Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church (Cambridge: University Press, 1982), 223.

[62]Lake, Moderate Puritans, 224.

[63]Lake, Moderate Puritans, 221.

The Lambeth Articles were never sanctioned by Queen Elizabeth nor by her successor, James I, though at the Hampton Court Conference the Articles occasioned a discussion of the question of assurance. John Overall, then dean of St. Paul's, argued that those who committed grievous sin became subject to God's wrath and guilty of damnation until they repented. King James I was in full agreement with Overall, concluding that "such is the necessity of repentence...that, without it, there could not be either reconciliation with God or remission of...sins."[64] Overall's emphasis on the importance of repentance as a condition of Christian assurance was consonant with the sixteenth Article of Religion.

> After we have receaved the holy ghost, we may depart from grace geven, and fall into sinne, and by the grace of god (we may) aryse agayne and amende our lyves. And therefore, they are to be condemned, whiche say they can no more sinne as long as they lyve here, or denie the place of forgevenesse to suche as truely repent.[65]

The article reflected the conviction of the learned bishops of King Edward's time that "the assurance of

---

[64]Cardwell, History of Conferences, 186.

[65]Cardwell, Synodalia, 95-6.

faith and hope is dependent upon true repentence and amendment of life."[66]

Carleton addressed the complicated question of the fall from grace by stating at the outset that no man can come to eternal life without the gift from God of perseverance to the end. After quoting First Peter, 1:3, that those whom God has begotten to an immortal inheritance "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation," he asked rhetorically: "For what is this power of God that keepeth us through faith to the end, but the grace of perseverance to the end?"[67] Carleton allowed that some portion of common graces "afforded unto hypocrits and wavering Christians" may fail, that charity may fail and faith my fail; but he declared that "the purpose of God cannot fail: and those graces that proceed from Gods purpose never fail them to whom they are so given."[68] Again, he cited St. Augustine: "For no man can be said to have had perseverance, but he that persevereth to the end: Therefore this is such a grace which many may have, but

---

[66]Porter, 332.

[67]Exam, 72.

[68]Exam, 77.

he that hath it, can never loose it."[69] Those who fall away from the Christian faith, Carleton contended, are surely not among the elect, not even when formerly they lived well. Those who once believed and were baptized and lived godly lives and were called the sons of God for the temporary graces they received were so named by those who did not know; but to God, who knew they had not the grace of perseverance, they were not elect.

Concerning those who are predestined to the kingdom of God, Carleton cited St. Augustine who believed that such helping grace is given them, that is, the grace of perseverance, that with it they cannot but persevere. Carleton argued that this same doctrine had been the received doctrine of the Church and had been taught by Saint Ambrose, Saint Gregory and the venerable Bede; and, not only was the soundness of this doctrine verified by the Fathers of the Church, but there was "enough in the Articles of Faith and Religion, to confirm the same truth which hitherto we have proved."[70] Carleton conceded that it was a perseverance with great weakness and that none can

---

[69]Exam, 85.

[70]Exam, 98.

glory in perfection, for there is no perfection; but, he added, one can glory in God, who by the grace of perseverance brings the elect unto the end, and in the work of God, which no power in the world can defeat.

Carleton demonstrated wherein the definition of grace given by the Arminians was conceived in error and, consequently, understood amiss. Grace, he contended, was defined by the Arminians as no more than a moral "swasion," an inclination of the will; "they admit no overbalancing power of God here."[71] Citing St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, Carleton countered that grace is "the power of God, the exceeding greatnesse, and the mightie working of his power."[72] He further argued that the grounds upon which the Arminians based their definition of grace were not from the Scriptures; the Arminians "will make unto themselves their own grounds."[73] If the basis of their definition, "which they so blindly begge," were true, then they might prove their conclusions: that general grace is offered to all men, that the difference rests in man's freewill to accept or reject

---

[71]Exam, 102.

[72]Exam, 105.

[73]Exam, 103.

grace, that grace may be gotten and grace may be lost. But who, asked Carleton, "gave these men authoritie to make a definition contrary to that which the holy Scriptures have delivered?"[74]

Finally, Carleton confronted Mountague's allegation that the predestinarian doctrine of grace was no more than a Puritan notion. In his introduction Carleton had briefly touched upon this charge, insisting that there had always been uniformity of doctrine between the bishops of the Church and the Puritans. He did not hesitate to concede that the Puritans had disquieted the Church about discipline; and had they "embraced any Doctrine which the Church of England denied, they would assuredly have quarrelled about that as well, as they did about the Discipline."[75] He defended the confession of both bishops and Puritans as the same: they have "held the same doctrines without variance."[76] Likewise, discipline had varied among Reformed Churches, that of England at variance with that of Scotland and Geneva; but the confessions of the several Churches had been in

---

[74]Exam, 103.

[75]Exam, 8.

[76]Exam, 121.

harmony, their doctrine had been the same. Carleton questioned the motives of his opponent: "What is your end in this, but to make divisions where there were none?"[77] Why would Mountague take the greatest mysteries of salvation and "make fables, or bubbles now blowen up, and straight vanishing, and others anew upstarting?"[78] Carleton concluded that such opinions "will never get the approbation of any sound Divines in the Church of England."[79]

During the first two decades of the seventeenth century, Carleton's doctrinal disputes had been exclusively with Rome. Within the Church of England he was from time to time at odds over ecclesiastical issues, but never over doctrine. Not until the Synod of Dort is there documentation that he was aware of variances among the English clergy over points of doctrine within the Church. No doubt, he had always known that there were shades of difference, but perhaps there had been little evidence of radical departure from the essential doctrines concerning grace and salvation. Theological divisions within the Jacobean

---

[77]Exam, 121-2.

[78]Exam, 124.

[79]Exam, 128.

Church have been the subject of much recent scholarship and the suggestion has been made that personal and political alliances were often drawn along theological lines.[80] However, when an infirmity kept him from attending Parliament in 1624, Carleton, a thorough-going Calvinist, appointed as his proxy the bishops of London and St. Davids, George Monteigne and William Laud, both of whom have been identified as part of the Durham House group, the center of anti-Calvinist sympathies.[81] This was the same Parliament prior to which Carleton had written to the archbishop of Canterbury expressing grave concern over the false doctrines which were being published as if they were the teachings of the Church of England. Obviously, Carleton was aware that there were doctrinal conflicts stirring, but there remains a question as to how well the Bishop knew the politics and the players.

Carleton's exposition of the common confession of the Church of England concerning the doctrine of grace failed to silence the dissenting voices. Doctrinal division not only continued but intensified, resulting in a polarization of theological positions unknown

---

[80]Fincham and Lake, 191.

[81]Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 106-24.

since the Reformation.[82] James I had died in 1625, the year before An Examination was published, and the Supreme Governorship of the Church passed to his son, Charles I. It gradually became apparent that Charles was favorably inclined towards the Arminian faction. The conference of York House in 1626 confirmed the growing ascendency of the Arminians within the royal circle, as did subsequent episcopal appointments. The Articles of Religion were reissued and prefaced with a royal injunction that all differences, disputes and curious searches be laid aside and that no man print or preach concerning the Articles except in their literal and grammatical sense. The King took Richard Mountague under his personal protection and elevated him in 1628 to the bishopric of Chichester upon the death of George Carleton.

---

[82]Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution," 129.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

In 1642 a pamphlet, entitled B^P Carletons Testimonie concerning the Presbyterian Discipline in the Low-Countries, and Episcopall Government Here in England was printed in London. It was purported to have been the work of George Carleton and was included by Anthony Wood among the bishop's works; currently, it is attributed to Carleton in the Dictionary of National Biography. It was published fourteen years after the death of George Carleton, at a time when the episcopal order was in jeopardy. Although B^P Carleton's Testimonie is an accurate statement of the bishop's defense of the episcopal structure of church government, the authenticity of the brief work is questionable.

Parts of the four page statement on ecclesiastical discipline were taken verbatim from another publication, A Joynt Attestation, avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synod of Dort, which was published in 1626 over the names of the British delegates to the Synod of Dort.[1] An example of the closeness of the two texts follows:

---

[1]See above, 51.

B[P] Carleton's Testimony, 1-3.

I shewed, that by
Christ a Parity
was never instituted
in the Church
that
he ordained 12 Apostles, and
also 70 Disciples; That the
authority of the 12 was above
the other; That the Church
preserved this order left
by our Saviour.
And therefore when the extra-
ordinary authority of the Apostles
ceased, yet their ordinary
authority continued in Bishops
who succeeded them,
who were by the Apostles themselves
left in the
government of the Church to ordaine
Ministers, and to see that they
who were so ordained, should
preach no other doctrine; That in
an inferiour degree the Ministers
that were governed by Bishops, who
succeeded the 70. Disciples;
That this order hath been main-
tained in the Church, from the
time of the Apostles; and herein
I appealed to the judgement of
Antiquity, and to the judgement
of any learned man now living,
and craved herein to be satisfied,
if any man of learning could
speak to the countrary...
To this

there was no answer made by any

whereupon we
conceived that they yeelded
to the truth of the Protestation.

A Joynt Attestation, 10-1.

[He] further shewed that by
our Saviour a parity of Ministers
was never instituted

that
Christ ordained twelve Apostles and
seventy Disciples; that the
authoritie of the twelve was above
the other: that the Church
preserved this order left
by our Saviour.
And therefore when the extra-
ordinary authoritie of the Apostles
ceased, yet their ordinarie
authoritie continued in Bishops,
who succeeded them,
who were by the Apostles themselves
left in the
government of the Church to ordaine
Ministers, and to see that they
who were so ordained, should
preach no other doctrine: that in
an inferiour degree the Ministers,
that were governed by Bishops,
succeeded the 70 Disciples:
that this order hath bin maintained
in the Church from the
time of the Apostles. And herein
he appealed to the judgement of
Antiquity, or
of any learned man now living,

if any could
speak to the contrary, &c...
To this our exception and
allegations
not one word was answered by any
of the Synodiques either
Strangers or Provincialls.
So that herein we may seemed
to have either their consent
implied by silence, or at least
approbation of our just
and necessary performance of our
bounded duty to the Church.

The Attestation was issued with the second edition of George Carleton's An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England; both works were written in response to Richard Mountague's Appello

Caesarem. The Attestation answered Mountague's accusation that the divines who were sent by James I to the Synod of Dort concurred in conclusions of the synod which condemned the discipline of the Church of England. Although the Attestation was published with Bishop Carleton's Examination, it would appear to be the work of Walter Balcanqual, rather than of the bishop. Balcanqual had written regularly to the English ambassador at the Hague, Dudley Carleton, detailed reports concerning all of the sessions of the Synod of Dort from the time that he joined the British delegation in January, 1619 until the synod's conclusion in late April of the same year and he would be the member of the delegation most likely to assume the task of writing in answer to Mountague's misrepresentation of the delegates' performance there.

Balcanqual's authorship of the Attestation is further suggested by the fact that an inconsistency in syntactical usage in the text is one which only Balcanqual would make. Throughout the text, the author uses first person plural in reference to the intentions and actions of the British delegation at the synod, obviously including himself as part of that delegation. However, in one part of the text the author shifts from first person plural to third person plural: he refers

to the delegation as `they' when he records the instructions received by the delegates from the King prior to their departure from England to attend the synod. What makes this disagreement of person significant is that Balcanqual was not a member of the delegation at the time these instructions were given, not receiving his appointment until after the synod was in session. In the paragraph immediately following the relation of the royal instructions, the author returns to the use of first person plural and retains first person plural to the end of the document.

Whether the Attestation was written by Balcanqual or not, it is unlikely that it was the work of Carleton. Included in its narration of the delegates' defense of episcopacy is a flattering portrait of the bishop himself, which does not correspond to Carleton's scrupulous exclusion of himself from his work. Further, the style in which the Attestation is written is not characteristic of the style in which Carleton wrote his other works. It is spare where Carleton was inclined to overabundance. The presentation of its thesis is direct and well-organized, yet includes hardly more than an outline of the nature of the attack by Mountague and of the thread of events at Dort which constitute the author's rebuttal of the attack. In

contrast, the bishop was never brief; his method was to include a multiplicity of quotations from the Scriptures and the Church Fathers and of examples from the history of the early Church in support of his theses, as though the arguments took strength from the very quantity of citations which could be marshalled. Lastly, the author of the Attestation frequently refers to the Church metaphorically as `Mother': `holy Mother,' `reverend Mother,' `our sacred and venerable Mother.' Carleton never referred to the Church in this fashion.

It is obvious that the pamphlet, B^P Carleton's Testimony, is nothing more than a cut-and-paste job, its text lifted almost whole from the Attestation. Since it appears unlikely that the Attestation is the work of George Carleton, it may be concluded that the pamphlet which was derived from it is not from the bishop's pen either.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works of George Carleton

Directions to Know the True Church. London, 1615.

An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England. London, 1626.

Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall. London, 1610.

Life of Bernard Gilpin. London, 1636.

The Madnesse of Astrologers. or An Examination of Sir Christopher Heydons Booke, Intituled A Defence of Judiciarie Astrologie. London, 1624.

An Oration Made at the Hage, before the Prince of Orenge, and the Assembly of the High and Mighty Lords, the States Generall of the United Provinces. London, 1619.

A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy. London, 1627.

Tithes Examined and proved to be due to the Clergie by a divine right. London, 1611.

Other Contemporary Sources

Abbot, George. A Treatise of the Perpetual Visibility and the Succession of the True Church in All Ages. London, 1624.

Andrewes, Lancelot. Of the Right of Tithes. London, 1647.

Aubrey, John. Aubrey's Brief Lives. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.

Bishops Book. See Institution of a Christen Man.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I.

Cardwell, Edward. A History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the revision of the Book of Common Prayer from 1558 to 1690. Oxford: University Press, 1849, repr. Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg Press Incorporated, 1966.

_____ (ed). Synodalia: a collection of Articles of Religion, Canons and Proceedings of Convocation in the Province of Canterbury, 2 vols. Oxford: University Press, republished 1966.

A catalogue of the deputies of the high and mightie States Generall of the United Provinces, And of the divines who are now met in the Nationall Synode, Celebrated in the Cities of Dordrecht in Holland. London, 1618.

Chamberlain, John. The Letters of John Chamberlain, ed Norman Egbert McClure. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939.

The collegiat suffrage of the divines of Great Britaine, concerning the five articles controverted in the Low Countries, Which Suffrage was by them delivered in the Synod of Dort, March 6 anno 1619. London, 1629.

Foster, E.R. (ed.) Proceedings in Parliament 1610. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Fuller, Thomas. The Worthies of England. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1952.

_____. The Church History of Britain. London, 1655.

Gardiner, Samuel R. (ed.). Letters and Other Documents Illustrating the Relations between England and Germany at the Commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Camden Society, vol. 98. Westminster: Nichols, 1868.

_____ (ed.). Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords officially taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, A.D. 1624 and 1626. Camden Society, New Series, vol. 24. Westminster: Nichols, 1879.

Hales, John. "Letters from the Synod of Dort to Sir Dudley Carleton, the English Embassador at the Hague," The Works of John Hales, vol 3. New York: AMS Press, 1971.

--------. Golden Remains, of the ever Memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eaton Colledge, etc. London, 1673.

Institution of a Christen Man. London, 1537.

James I, A Declaration concerning the Proceedings with the States Generall of the United Provinces of the Low Countreys In the cause of D. Conradus Vorstius. The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James, ed. James, bishop of Winchester. London, 1616.

A Joynt Attestation, avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England was not impeached by the Synode of DORT. London, 1626.

The judgement of the Synode holden at Dort, concerning the five articles: as also their sentence touching Conradus Vorstius. Englished out of the Latine copie. London, 1619.

Kenyon, J.P. (ed.) The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688 Documents and Commentary, 2nd edn. Cambridge: University Press, 1986.

Mountague, Richard. Appello Caesarem. London, 1625.

Notestein, Wallace, Frances Helen Relf and Hartley Simpson (eds). Commons Debates for 1621. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.

Schaff, Philip (ed.). The Evangelical Protestant Creeds. The Creeds of Christendom, vol 3. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.

Wood, Anthony. Athenae Oxonienses. London, 1691.

Secondary Works

Adams, Simon. "Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624" Faction and Parliament, ed. Kevin Sharpe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

_____. "Spain or the Netherlands?", Before the English Civil War, ed. Howard Tomlinson. London: Macmillan Press, 1983.

Atkins, Jonathan M. "Calvinist Bishops, Church Unity, and the Rise of Arminianism," Albion xviii (1986): 411-28.

Babbage, Stuart Barton. Puritanism and Richard Bancroft. London: SPCK, 1962.

Cargill Thompson, W.D.J. "A Reconsideration of Richard Bancroft's Paul's Cross Sermon of 9 February 1588/9," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 20 (1969): 253-66.

Collinson, Patrick. The Elizabethan Puritan Movement. London: Methuen, 1982.

_____. "England and International Calvinism 1558-1640," International Calvinism 1541-1715, ed. Menna Prestwick. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

_____. Godly People Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.

_____. "The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference," Before the English Civil War, ed. Howard Tomlinson. London: Macmillan Press, 1983.

_____. The Religion of Protestants. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Cressy, David. "The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England," Journal of British Studies 29 (Jan 1990): 31-52.

Cross, Claire. Church and People 1450-1660. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1976.

Curry, Patrick. Prophecy and Power: Astrology in Early Modern England. Princeton: University Press, 1989.

Curtis, Mark. "The Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath," History xlvi (1961): 1-16.

Davies, Horton. Worship and Theology in England, vol 2. Princeton: University Press, 1975.

Dent, C.M. Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford. Oxford: University Press, 1983.

Dictionary of National Biography, s. v. "Carleton, George" by William Richard Wood Stephens.

Evans, Eric J. The Contentious Tithe The tithe problem and English agriculture, 1750-1850. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake. "The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I", Journal of British Studies 24 (April 1985): 169-207.

_____. "Prelacy and Politics: Archbishop Abbot's Defence of Protestant Orthodoxy", Historical Research 61 (February 1988): 36-64.

Fletcher, Anthony. A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660. London: Longman, 1975.

Foster, Andrew. "The function of a bishop: the career of Richard Neile, 1562-1640", Continuity and Change Personnel and administration of the Church of England 1500-1642, eds Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal. Leicester: University Press, 1976.

Foster, Joseph. Alumni Oxonienses, vol 1. Nendeln/ Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1968.

Gardiner, Samuel R. History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642. Reprint, New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965.

Grayson, Christopher. "James I and the Religious Crisis in the United Provinces 1613-19", Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750, ed. Derek Baker. Studies in Church History Subsidia. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.

Heal, Felicity and Rosemary O'Day (eds). Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I. Problems in Focus Series. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1977.

Hill, Christopher. Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

_____. Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Hirst, Derek. Authority and Conflict England, 1603-1658. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Holland, S. M. "George Abbot: `The Wanted Archbishop'", Church History 56 (June 1987): 172-187.

Huizinga, Johan H. Dutch Civilization in the Seventeenth Century. London: Collins, 1968.

Huntley, Frank Livingstone. Bishop Joseph Hall 1574-1656: A biographical and critical study. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer Ltd, 1979.

Jones, J.R. Britain and Europe in the Seventeenth Century. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1966.

Kain, Roger J.P. and Hugh C. Prince. The Tithe Surveys of England and Wales. Cambridge: University Press, 1985.

Kautz, Arthur P. "The Selection of Jacobean Bishops", Early Stuart Studies: Essays in Honor of David Harris Willson, ed. Howard S. Reinmuth. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1970.

Kendall, R. T. Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649. Oxford: University Press, 1979.

Kennedy, D. E. "The Jacobean Episcopate", Historical Journal v (1962): 175-181.

Lake, Peter. Anglicans and Puritans? London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.

_____. "Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635", Past and Present no. 114 (1987): 32-76.

_____. "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match", Historical Journal 25 (1982): 805-825.

_____. "Presbyterianism, the Idea of a National Church and the Argument from Divine Right", Protestantism and the National Church in the Sixteenth Century, eds Peter Lake and Maria Dowling. London: Croom Helom, 1987.

_____. "The Significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 31 (1980): 161-178.

Lambert, Sheila. "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship", Past and Present no. 124 (1989): 36-68.

_____. "Committees, Religion, and Parliamentary Encroachment on Royal Authority in Early Stuart England," English Historical Review 105 (Jan 1990): 60-95.

Lamont, William M. Godly Rule Politics and Religion, 1603-60. London: Macmillan, 1969.

_____. "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered", Past and Present no. 107 (May 1985): 227-231.

Lee, Maurice. Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters. New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1972.

Lockyer, Roger. Buckingham The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592-1628. London: Longman, 1981.

Macauley, John S. "Richard Mountague 1575-1641." Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1966.

Marcombe, David. "Bernard Gilpin: Anatomy of an Elizabethan Legend", Northern History xvi (1980): 20-39.

Parker, Geoffrey. The Thirty Years War. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Parker, Kenneth L. The English Sabbath. Cambridge: Univesity Press, 1988.

Patterson, W.B. "King James I and the Protestant Cause in the Crisis of 1618-22", Religion and National Identity, ed. S. Mews. Studies in Church History vol 18. Oxford: University Press, 1982.

_____. "King James I's Call for an Ecumenical Council", Councils and Assemblies, eds G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker. Studies in Church History, vol 7. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.

Peter, Robert. "John Hales and the Synod of Dort", Councils and Assemblies, eds G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker. Studies in Church History, vol 7. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.

Platt, John. "Eirenical Anglicans at the Synod of Dort", Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750, ed. Derek Baker. Studies in Church History Subsidia. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.

Porter, H.C. Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

Rogan, John. "King James's Bishops", University of Durham Journal xlviii (1956): 93-9.

Russell, Conrad. "Arguments for Religious Unity in England, 1530-1650", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 18 (October 1967): 201-26.

_____. "Parliamentary History in Perspective, 1604-1629", History 61 (February 1976): 1-27.

_____. Parliaments and English Politics 1621-1629 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Schwartz, Hillel. "Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624-1629", Journal of British Studies, 12 (May 1973): 41-68.

Shriver, Frederick. "Orthodoxy and diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius affair", English Historical Review, 85 (July 1970): 449-474.

Sommerville, J.P. "The Royal Supremacy and Episcopacy `Jure Divino', 1603-1640", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 34 (1983), 548-58.

Sommerville, M.R. "Richard Hooker and his Contemporaries on Episcopacy: an Elizabethan Consensus", Journal of Ecclesiastical History 35 (1984), 177-87.

Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. Archbishop Laud. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1940.

_____. Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays. Chicago: University Press, 1988.

_____. Historical Essays. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1957.

Tyacke, Nicholas. Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, 1590-1640. Oxford: University Press, 1987.

_____ and Peter White. "Debate: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered", Past and Present 115 (May 1987): 201-29.

_____. "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution", Origins of the English Civil War, ed. Conrad Russell. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Usher, Roland G. The Reconstruction of the English Church. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1910.

Wallace, Dewey D. Puritans and Predestination Grace in English Protestant Theology 1525-1695. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

White, Peter. "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered", Past and Present no. 101 (November 1983): 34-54.

Wiener, Carol. "The Beleaguered Isle. A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", Past and Present, 51 (May 1971): 27-62.