













L I V E S  
OF THE  
ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. X.

Reformation Period.

LONDON : PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET



# LIVES

OF THE

# ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

BY

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. F.R.S.

DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

VOLUME X.

REFORMATION PERIOD.

History which may be called just and perfect history is of three kinds, according to the object which it propoundeth or pretendeth to represent; for it either representeth a time, or a person, or an action. The first we call Chronicles, the second Lives, and the third Narratives or Relations. Of these, although Chronicles be the most complete and absolute kind of history, and hath most estimation and glory, yet Lives excellet in profit and use, and Narratives or Relations in verity or sincerity. LORD BACON.



LONDON:

RICHARD BENTLEY & SON, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,

Publishers in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

1875.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

AN APOLOGY is necessary for a delay in the publication of the present volume, and this apology, it is trusted, will be deemed sufficient when it is stated that the delay has been occasioned by the severe indisposition of the author, added to the infirmities increasing upon him as he draws near that time of life, when we are warned that those who are strong enough to reach it will find their strength but labour and sorrow.

He may say in the words of the great and good Dr. Hammond, "It is time for me to be weary, which yet I am unwilling to be, while my labour may be useful."

If this volume is in bulk less than some of its predecessors, the reason is, that it has been considered expedient to devote the next volume, which is nearly ready for the press, to the important life of Archbishop LAUD. The biographies of LAUD and JUXON will bring to a conclusion that period of our history which bears upon the Reformation of the Church, and with those of their successors its modern history will begin.

In the lives of GRINDAL and of WHITGIFT I have not discovered much which bears on their personal history or their domestic relations. I have been obliged, as in other instances, to judge of them chiefly by the public events which they originated, or in which they were engaged. We may say that biography was little studied or thought of in England until the appearance of Peter Heylin's *Cyprianus Anglicus* and Hackett's *Life of Williams*. These, especially the first-named, are works of genius, and are deeply interesting from the light they throw on contemporaneous events and persons. Though they do not bear directly on the history of Archbishop ABBOT, yet, without doing injustice to the Puritan primate, they enable us to understand why he was distrusted by Churchmen.

In the life of WHITGIFT, the wisdom exhibited by that distinguished primate in his attention to the affairs of the Church in Wales has not been sufficiently noticed; for not only Churchmen but the whole Welsh people are, to the present hour, under deep obligation to Archbishop WHITGIFT for the countenance and encouragement rendered by him to the Rev. W. Morgan, afterwards Bishop Morgan, in his translation of the Scriptures into the Welsh language. In the letter of dedication to Queen Elizabeth Bishop Morgan speaks in very strong terms of the assistance he received from the archbishop.

“Quod (opus),” he says, “cum vix essem aggressus, et rei difficultate et impensarum magnitudine pressus, in limine (quod aiunt) succubuissem . . . nisi Reverendus in Christo

Pater Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus ut progrederer effecisset, et adjuvisset liberalitate, auctoritate, et consilio.”

The attention of the author has been called to this subject by the Rev. Thomas Jones Hughes, who, worthy to tread in the steps of Bishop Morgan, is himself engaged in a critical revision of the Welsh version of the New Testament.

The fact is of historical value, as the opinion generally prevails that at the Reformation little or no care was taken of the Church in Wales.



# CONTENTS

OF

## THE TENTH VOLUME.



### BOOK IV.—*continued.*

#### CHAPTER XVII.

##### EDMUND GRINDAL.

Contrast between Parker and Grindal.—St. Bees.—The birthplace of Edmund Grindal.—Position of Grindal's father.—State of Cumberland.—Grindal saves his father's life.—His own life in danger.—Friendship with Sandys.—Probably educated at Furness Abbey.—Enters at Cambridge.—William Grindal tutor to the Lady Elizabeth.—Date of Grindal's matriculation.—He takes his degree.—His ordination.—University visitation.—Disputation on Transubstantiation.—Grindal is appointed Precentor of St. Paul's; Royal chaplain; and Prebendary of Westminster.—Controversy about the Prebend of Kentish Town.—Grindal's friendship with Bucer.—Death of Bucer . . . . . page 1

#### CHAPTER XVIII.

##### GRINDAL IN EXILE.

Policy of Mary's government towards the Reformers.—Remarks on the Reformation under Edward VI. by Burnet, Kennet, and Brewer.—Grindal leaves England for the Continent.—Lutheran intolerance.—Influence of Calvin.—His Institutes.—State of Geneva under Calvin.—Grindal is greatly influenced by the Calvinists.—Settles at Strass-

burg.—Collegiate Institution there.—Grindal's literary pursuits.—He attends Peter Martyr's lectures.—His correspondence with Bishop Ridley.—"Troubles of Frankfort."—Fruitless mediation of Grindal.—Death of Queen Mary.—Grindal returns to England.—In favour with Parker and Queen Elizabeth . . . . . page 17

## CHAPTER XIX.

### GRINDAL BISHOP OF LONDON.

Grindal is appointed a commissioner on the Prayer-book.—Conference at Westminster.—Grindal preaches at St. Paul's.—One of the Royal Visitors.—His scruples of conscience.—Consults Peter Martyr concerning them.—Master of Pembroke Hall.—Protests against the queen's appropriation of ecclesiastical property.—Is present at the consecration of Archbishop Parker.—Consecrated Bishop of London.—Assists at Jewel's consecration.—One of the commissioners appointed to amend the Lectionary and the Calendar and to reform the state of the churches.—Fire at St. Paul's.—Grindal's generosity.—St. Paul's before the Reformation.—Royal Exchange built by Sir Thomas Gresham.—Grindal's Funeral Sermon on the Emperor Ferdinand I.—Treatment of Bonner.—Grindal takes his Doctor's degree.—The Plague in Kent and London.—Prayers and thanksgivings drawn up by Grindal.—His letter to Cecil on this matter.—Convocation of 1562.—Grindal's visitation of his diocese.—Certain suspected persons confided to his care.—His gifts to the queen.—Treatment of Stowe.—His kindness towards certain merchants on the Continent.—His difficult position in regard to the Puritans.—His correspondence with Bullinger.—Separation of certain Puritans from the Church.—Their examination before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.—Reverence to the Eucharist enforced.—Grindal's proceedings against certain Oxford colleges.—Against the Inns of Court . . . . . 35

## CHAPTER XX.

### GRINDAL ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

Parker makes interest to have Grindal appointed to the see of York.—Lord Henry Howard is a candidate for the office.—Letter from the Dean of York to Cecil.—His estimate of Grindal's character.—*Congé d'élire* from the queen.—Grindal's election, and confirmation.—He



recovers certain possessions to the see.—Is feasted by Archbishop Parker.—His account of the state of the Church in the North.—His visitation in 1571.—His injunctions to the clergy and laity of his diocese.—Visitation of York Cathedral.—The queen designs to visit York.—Earthquake in the North.—Grindal's popularity.—His friendship with Spencer.—His share in the Bishops' Bible . . . page 74

## CHAPTER XXI.

## GRINDAL ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

News of Parker's death.—The see is offered to Grindal.—His unwillingness to accept it.—His nomination, election, and confirmation.—Banquet at Lambeth.—Visitation of the Province of Canterbury.—Various enquiries made concerning the services and ceremonies of the Church.—Conformity of the clergy to the Thirty-nine Articles required.—Grindal attempts to reform the Spiritual Courts.—Congratulations from Cambridge.—Terrible earthquake in 1580.—Grindal's directions to the clergy through his archdeacon.—Fanaticism in the universities.—Case of David Thickpenny.—Sect of the *Family of Love*.—Ingratitude of Thickpenny towards the archbishop.—Grindal is threatened with blindness.—He contemplates resignation.—Harshness of the queen towards him.—Controversy between the queen and the primate concerning the "Prophecyings."—Grindal's letter to the queen thereon.—Elizabeth's behaviour to him at court.—Leicester supports him for a time.—Sequestration of the archbishop.—Kindness of Lord Burghley.—Proceedings in the Star Chamber.—Grindal officiates at the consecration of certain bishops.—Convocation of 1580.—He renews his metropolitanical visitation, and appoints Whitgift as his deputy.—His policy in regard to politics.—The queen and Convocation.—Addresses from Convocation and from the bishops of the Southern province for Grindal's restoration.—The queen takes no notice of them.—Restoration of the archbishop.—His letter of submission to the queen.—His many infirmities.—His resignation and pension from the queen.—He wishes to retain the archbishopric until Michaelmas.—Refusal of the queen.—Value of the archbishopric.—Elizabeth wishes to nominate Whitgift.—He refuses during Grindal's lifetime . . . 81

## CHAPTER XXII.

## DOMESTIC LIFE.

Grindal's horticultural tastes.—His present of grapes to the queen.—False report of the plague in his household.—Offence at court occasioned thereby.—Grindal's vindication of himself.—His controversy with Bishop Sandys.—His wish to do the queen due honour at York.—His friendship with Spenser.—His misfortunes described in the "Shepherd's Calender."—Grindal's "Dialogue between Custom and Verity."—His doctrine of the Real Presence.—List of his works.—His kindness to foreigners and to many English divines.—His patronage of the art of music.—His gifts to various schools and colleges.—His improvement of and care for his episcopal residences.—His will and testament.—He retires to Croydon.—His death, July 6, 1583.—His effigy in Croydon church.—Various portraits of Grindal. page 107

## CHAPTER XXIII.

## JOHN WHITGIFT.—EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION.

Family of Whitgift settled in Lincolnshire.—Probable date of Whitgift's birth, 1530.—His education at St. Anthony's School, London.—Lodged with his aunt in St. Paul's Churchyard.—Her negligence and intolerant conduct towards him.—He returns home.—Matriculates at Cambridge.—In favour with Ridley.—Fellow of Peter House.—His illness.—Kindness of Dr. Perne, the master.—Whitgift's alarm at Pole's university visitation.—Dr. Perne promises him protection.—Whitgift delays his ordination until Elizabeth's accession.—Rector of Teversham.—His University preferments.—In favour with the queen.—Ecclesiastical preferments.—Dean of Lincoln.—Vice-Chancellor.—Appointed to the see of Worcester.—His universal popularity.—Triumphal procession to his diocese 121

## CHAPTER XXIV.

## WHITGIFT'S PUBLIC LIFE.

Whitgift's election to Worcester.—Consecrated by Archbishop Grindal.—Appointed Vice-President of Wales.—The queen gives him the patronage of the prebends and the nomination of magistrates in his

diocese.—He refuses the Lord Chancellorship.—Recommends Sir C. Hatton.—Translated to Canterbury.—Enthroned in person.—Writes to the queen concerning church property.—Draws up certain articles for the regulation of the Church.—Seminary priests.—Designed assassination of the queen by them.—Policy of the government towards them.—Puritanical violence towards Whitgift.—Works of Martin Mar-prelate.—Whitgift's generous conduct towards the libellers.—His controversy with Cartwright.—Cartwright's influence in the university.—His attack on the Church.—Whitgift as Vice-Chancellor silences him.—Cartwright's "Admonition to Parliament."—Whitgift's answer thereto.—Their reconciliation.—Evil consequences of Cartwright's writings.—Controversy between Hooker and Travers.—Whitgift's friendship with Hooker.—The "Lambeth Articles" are condemned by the queen and by Burghley.—Whitgift yields to their decision . . . . . page 129

## CHAPTER XXV.

## WHITGIFT'S DOMESTIC LIFE.

Paule's description of Whitgift.—His love of teaching.—His hospitality.—Makes peace between Sir J. Russell and Sir H. Berkeley.—Recovers church lands.—Whitgift as a disciplinarian.—Grandeur of his retinue.—First journey into Kent.—Hospital at Croydon.—His literary works.—Munificence.—The queen's last days.—Whitgift visits her on her death-bed.—His prayer for her.—Her death, March 24, 1603.—Popular grief shown at her funeral.—James proclaimed King of England . . . . . 162

## CHAPTER XXVI.

## CONCLUSION OF WHITGIFT'S LIFE.

King James receives the news of the queen's death.—Whitgift's alarm concerning the king's religious views.—James found to be a churchman at heart.—Millenary petition.—Whitgift confers with the king.—Coronation of James I.—Hampton Court conference.—Whitgift takes cold on the water.—His last illness.—The king visits him.—His death, February 29, 1604.—His funeral, March 27.—Calumnies against Queen Elizabeth.—Shakespeare's testimony to her merits . . . . . 177

## CHAPTER XXVII.

## RICHARD BANCROFT.—EARLY LIFE AND FIRST PREFERMENTS.

His birthplace and parentage.—University career.—Eminent as a tutor.—His preferments.—In favour with Sir C. Hatton.—Prebendal appointments.—Sermon at St. Paul's Cross, 1588.—His policy towards the Seculars and Jesuits.—Recommended by Whitgift to the queen's notice.—His conduct in the cases of Martin Mar-prelate, Cartwright and Penry.—Second sermon at St. Paul's Cross.—Appointed Bishop of London through Whitgift's interest, 1590.—Election and consecration . . . . . page 190

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

## BANCROFT BISHOP OF LONDON.

Bancroft's embassy to Embden.—Millenary petition.—Hampton Court Conference.—Alterations in the Prayer-book.—Whitgift's death.—Royal proclamation.—New translation of the Bible.—Parliament of 1604.—Meeting of Convocation.—Compilation of a Book of Canons.—Bancroft's nomination to the archbishopric . . . . . 199

## CHAPTER XXIX.

## BANCROFT ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Strong measures of the new archbishop.—Letter to his suffragans.—Subscription required to the three articles of the 36th Canon.—Proceedings in the Star Chamber.—Treatment of the Puritans.—Gunpowder Plot.—New oath of allegiance.—Blackwell's abhorrence of the plot.—Articuli Cleri.—State of the Church of Scotland.—Dunbar and Abbot sent to Scotland.—Illegal assembly at Aberdeen.—Members thereof summoned before the king.—Restoration of the Church in Scotland.—Difficulties about the consecration of certain Scotch bishops.—Bancroft's share in the discussion.—Consecration of the bishops.—High Court of Commission.—Bancroft's reforms at Cambridge.—The pope condemns the oath of allegiance.—Paolo Sarpi.—Reformation of the Channel Islands.—James Van Harmin.—Foundation of Chelsea College.—Cowell's interpreter.—The king

directs an inquiry into abuses.—Bancroft's letter to his suffragans.—Overall's Convocation Book.—Bancroft's death.—His will.—His character . . . . . page 221

## CHAPTER XXX.

GEORGE ABBOT.—EARLY LIFE AND CAREER TILL HIS EPISCOPATE.

His character.—Puritanical views.—His birth.—Parentage.—His mother's dream.—Its influence on his career.—Educated at Guildford Grammar School.—University career.—Dean of Winchester, 1599.—Vice-Chancellor.—Consulted regarding the cross in Cheapside.—His decision.—Conduct in the like case at Oxford.—His theology attacked by Laud.—Laud's defence of Apostolical succession.—Views of Abbot and his party.—His "Visibility of the Church."—Share in the translation of the Bible.—Opposes Laud's B.D. degree.—Supports Dr. Airey's censure of Laud's sermon, 1606.—Overall's "Convocation Book."—The king's remonstrance thereon to Abbot.—Death of the Earl of Dorset.—Abbot is appointed chaplain to the Earl of Dunbar.—Episcopacy established in Scotland.—Abbot's conduct as regards the Gowrie conspiracy.—Elected to the see of Coventry and Lichfield . . . . . 244

## CHAPTER XXXI.

THE PRIMACY OF ABBOT UNTIL THE INCIDENT OF BRAMZIL PARK.

Abbot is translated to the see of London.—His nomination to the archbishopric.—The appointment generally unpopular.—His use of the High Commission Court.—James's Arminian controversies.—Henry, Prince of Wales.—Espouses the Puritan cause.—His sickness and death.—Popular grief thereat.—Abbot's attendance at his deathbed.—Marriage of the Princess Elizabeth.—Cruel persecutions by James and Abbot.—Legget and Wightman burnt to death.—Abbot protests against the alienation of the Charter House funds.—His firmness in the divorce case of Lady Essex.—The king's anger thereat.—James's dislike to the Puritan Sabbath.—Publication of the "Book of Sports." Abbot opposes it.—The Irish articles.—Channel Islands required to conform to the Church.—The king refuses to support the Elector Palatine.—Abbot urges a contrary course . . . . . 258

## CHAPTER XXXII.

ABBOT'S PRIMACY FROM THE INCIDENT OF BRAMZIL PARK TO HIS DEATH.

Vacancy of four bishoprics.—Abbot opposes Laud's nomination.—Incident of Bramzil Park.—Question as to Abbot's consequent irregularity.—Commission appointed for full inquiry.—Restitution of the archbishop.—Abbot opposes the proposed Spanish match.—Marriage articles drawn up.—Marriage treaty broken off.—Moket's "*Politia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*."—Death of Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury.—Abbot attempts university reforms.—Doctrines of Paræus condemned.—James's "*Directions concerning Preachers*."—The Archbishop of Spalato.—Marriage treaty between Charles and Henrietta Maria.—Illness and death of the king, 1625.—Laud's influence with Charles.—Help sent to the Elector Palatine.—Arrival of the queen.—Plague in London.—Coronation of Charles.—Abbot's unpopularity at court.—He censures Montague and Sibthorpe.—Suspended for a time.—Restored to favour.—Character and death.—Munificence . . . . . page 278

# SUCCESSION

OF

## ARCHBISHOPS AND CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

Archbishops	Conse- cration	Consecrators	Acces- sion	Death	Contemporary Sovereigns
Edmund Grindal	1559	{ Matthew William Chichester John Hereford John Bedford }	1575	1583	Elizabeth
John Whitgift	1577	{ Edmund John London Robert Winchester Richard Chichester }	1583	1604	{ Elizabeth James I.
Richard Bancroft	1597	{ John John Rochester Anthony St. David's Richard Bangor Anthony Chichester }	1604	1610	James I.
George Abbot	1609	{ Richard Lancelot Ely Richard Rochester }	1611	1633	{ James I. Charles I.

TABLE  
OF  
CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

	England	Scotland	Germany	France	Pope	Spain
1575	Elizabeth	James VI.	Maximilian II.	Henry III.	Gregory XIII.	Philip II.
1576			Rudolf II.		Sixtus V.	
1585				Henry IV.	Urban VII.	
1589					Gregory XIV.	
1590					Clement VIII.	Philip III.
1591						
1592						
1598	James I.				Leo XI.	
1603					Paul V.	
1605				Louis XIII.		
1605						
1610						
1612			Matthias			
1619			Ferdinand II.			
1621					Gregory XV.	Philip IV.
1623					Urban VIII.	
1625	Charles I.	Charles I.				



# LIVES

OF THE

## ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

---

---

### BOOK IV.—*continued.*

---

#### CHAPTER XVII.

##### EDMUND GRINDAL.

Contrast between Parker and Grindal.—St. Bees.—The birthplace of Edmund Grindal.—Position of Grindal's father.—State of Cumberland.—Grindal saves his father's life.—His own life in danger.—Friendship with Sandys.—Probably educated at Furness Abbey.—Enters at Cambridge.—William Grindal tutor to the Lady Elizabeth.—Date of Grindal's matriculation.—He takes his degree.—His ordination.—University visitation.—Disputation on Transubstantiation.—Grindal is appointed Precentor of St. Paul's; Royal Chaplain; and Prebendary of Westminster.—Controversy about the Prebend of Kentish Town.—Grindal's friendship with Bucer.—Death of Bucer.

THE official career of Edmund Grindal ran, for many years, so nearly parallel with that of Matthew Parker, that, as far as facts are concerned, we may regard Grindal's

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

*Authorities.*—Strype's Historical and Biographical Works. Grindal's Remains, edited by Rev. William Nicholson. Richardson's Godwin. Burnet. Le Neve, edited by Sir T. Duffus Hardy. Sir

Introductory.

CHAP.  
XVII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

biography merely in the light of an appendix or supplement to that of Parker. At the same time, the contrast exhibited in the respective characters of the two eminent prelates suggests a train of thought, which cannot fail to be both instructive and amusing to all who are able to distinguish between the office of an historian, or a philosophical biographer, and that of a mere annalist.

Compari-  
son  
between  
Parker and  
Grindal.

In their principles the two primates were very nearly united. Both of them understood it to be the distinctive duty of an English Prelate, carrying on a Reformation, not to create a new sect, or to contend for its establishment, but to correct the abuses that from time to time might have crept into the old Catholic Church established by Augustine, and whose existence had been preserved by a long continuance of prelates. What we should now describe as the continuity of the Catholic Church in England, they well understood: they were to call attention to the traditions of that Church, and then invite the people to act like the good Bereans of old, in searching the Scriptures to see whether these things were so. The Church speaks as St. Paul to the Bereans: let the Scriptures show that what the Church says is correct. They who thus regarded the Catholic Church were often perplexed to know how to deal with the Protestant sects abroad. By agreeing with them, they risked the sacrifice of their own principles; whereas by adhering to our principles we have been gradually alienated from foreign Protestants.

John Haynes. Newcourt. Rymer. Machyn's Diary. Ellis's Letters. Cardwell's Documentary Annals. Neale's Puritans. Life of Cartwright. Nichol's Progresses of Queen Elizabeth. Granger. Hayne's State Papers. Murdin's State Papers. Gorham's Gleanings. Heylin's Hist. Churton's Nowell. Wright's Elizabeth. Drake's Eboracum. Hasted's Kent.

Parker was considerate and kind to individuals, and became more so as he advanced in years; but he was unwilling to concede any principle in favour of their views. Grindal, on the other hand, was desirous of making concessions whenever it was possible to make them, and in so acting he was frequently involved in inconsistencies. Parker, availing himself of the toleration permitted in the first years of Mary's government, remained in England, and had few sympathies with the foreigners. Grindal, however, having fled the country, was at one period of his life too much under the influence of foreign friendship or intrigue.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

St. Bees, or as it is sometimes called St. Begh, had the honour of being the native place of Edmund Grindal, although, strictly speaking, he was born in the village of Hensingham, about three miles distant from St. Bees proper, and a mile south of Whitehaven.\* Through the industry of the great Leeds antiquary, Ralph Thoresby, the residence of William Grindal, Edmund's father, was pointed out to Strype in the early part of the eighteenth century. St. Bees has of late years been restored to a certain amount of celebrity, by the establishment of a quasi Collegiate Institution, patronised by some of the bishops in the Northern Province. But long before this, St. Bees was eminent as a place of devotion and education. For its very name it is indebted to a certain Irish virgin, St. Bega, who in the middle of the seventh century

St. Bees,  
the birth-  
place of  
Grindal.

St. Bega.

When Bega sought of yore the Cumbrian coast,  
Tempestuous winds her holy errand crossed :

\* See Remains, p. 256.

CHAP.  
XVII.Edmund  
Grindal.1575-6—  
1583.

She knelt in prayer,—the waves their wrath appease ;  
And from her vows well weighed in Heaven's decrees,  
Rose where she touched the strand the Chantry of St. Bees.\*

This religious house was, according to Nicholson and Burns, destroyed by the Danes. But from the same authority we learn that soon after the Norman Conquest it was restored by William de Meschines, brother of the first Earl of Cumberland. It was consecrated a cell to the Abbey of St. Mary at York, and became the residence of a Prior and six Benedictine monks :

Who with the ploughshare clove the barren moors,  
And to green meadows changed the swampy shores ?  
Thinned the rank woods ; and for the cheerful grange  
Made room,—where wolf and boar were used to range ?  
Who taught and showed by deeds that gentle chains  
Should bend the vassal to his lord's domains ?  
—The thoughtful monks, intent their God to please,  
For Christ's dear sake, by human sympathies,  
Raised for the bosom of thy Church St. Bees.

But all availed not : by a mandate given  
Through lawless will the brotherhood was driven  
Forth from their cell ; their ancient house laid low  
In Reformation's sweeping overflow.\*

There is no doubt that the birth of Edmund Grindal took place about the year 1519, but neither the day nor the month when that event occurred has been discovered.

His father, William Grindal, was not a man of wealth,† but he ranked with the gentry of the county. I thought at one time that he might have been what is called in

\* The quotations are made from a beautiful little poem, "St. Bees," by Wordsworth, published in the fifth volume of his collected Works. For the legendary lore the reader may be referred to Alban Butler, for the historical to Nicholson and Burns.

† Ridley's Works, 331.

Edmund's  
birth.  
1519.

His father,  
William  
Grindal.

the north a statesman, in the south a yeoman—that is, a farmer cultivating his own hereditary property; but this perhaps could not be, as William Grindal held his property on lease. To the leasehold property Edmund made additions when he became a man of wealth; and these, as he was childless himself, he settled on his brother Robert. On Robert's premature death the property devolved upon one of Edmund's nieces, through whose imprudence and the bad conduct of her husband it was nearly lost to the family, and was considerably impaired. Edmund's great object, early entertained and never lost sight of, was to remedy the evils resulting from the dissolution of the monastery, not by restoring the monastic system, but by re-establishing the grammar schools. The measures he adopted in furtherance of this design will come under notice hereafter; we would only remark generally, that Grindal and Parker were united in their conviction that the business of a true reformer is to build up, as well as to pull down; not only to remove incrustations from the surface, but to restore and strengthen neglected foundations.

The state of the country at the time of Grindal's boyhood was, indeed, anything but satisfactory. St. Bees was situated among the hills in the southern part of the county of Cumberland, in an angle of the county called Copland or Cowpland—the word cope being used by the inhabitants to signify a hill. Of Cowpland Grindal himself states in one of his letters, that it was “the ignorantest part in religion and most oppressed of covetous landlords of any one part of this realm.”\* Grindal's own attachment to the place may perhaps be attributed in part to the popularity he acquired, in after years, in defending the oppressed and in vindicating their rights.

\* See Remains, p. 257.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

State of  
Cumber-  
land at  
this time.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Two events of his boyhood are on record. While yet a boy he was travelling with his father when, in coming to a river, the waters had swollen, and the only passage across the stream was by a bridge, which Edmund perceived to be too rotten to be able to resist the sudden force of the stream now pressing upon it. The boy, seeing his father about to trust his whole weight to the bridge, rushed forward, and just as the bridge was sinking into the deep abyss of the waters which lay between the two high banks, he pulled him back, and ever after kept that day as a festival on which he saved his father from a sudden death.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
saves his  
father's  
life.

His own  
danger.

On another occasion, when wandering by the river's side,

Nescio quid meditans <sup>nugarum</sup> et totus in illis,

he heard the twang of a bowstring, and immediately after an arrow struck against his breast, and would have penetrated had it not been prevented by the intervention of a book which he carried in his bosom.

Friendship  
with  
Sandys.

Grindal was fortunate in the friendship he formed with Edwin Sandys, who was destined afterwards to be his successor in the sees, first of London and then of York. It is said by Strype, and by biographers who are satisfied with his authority, that Sandys was himself a native of St. Bees, and that he was three or four years older than Grindal; but it is asserted by Mr. Eyre, the learned editor of Sandys' Sermons, published under the auspices of the Parker Society, that the two friends were born in the same year, and that the birth-place of Sandys was Hawkshead, in the part of Lancashire called Furness Fells.\* This was an aristocratic connexion, for the family of Sandys was descended from the ancient

Edwin  
Sandys.

\* Eyre, Biog. Notice, 1.

Barons of Kendal ; and was residing, at the period under consideration, at Eastwaite Hall. As this family were the feudatories of Furness Abbey, where, even at this time, a school was maintained, highly distinguished as a place of education, there is great plausibility in the conjecture of the biographers that to the monks of Furness Sandys was indebted for his primary education, and that he was attended thither by his friend Grindal. After the statement made by Grindal himself of the ignorance prevalent at St. Bees, it is thus that we account for the high character which was at once assigned to him upon his becoming a member of the University of Cambridge.

He found at the university some eminent scholars who had already given distinction to the family name. We cannot indeed directly trace their relation to Edmund : but when we hear of James Grindal, and another whose Christian name is not mentioned ; and that when Edmund was consecrated to the see of London, he gave them appointments in his household, and made one of them, at least, a dignitary of the Church—we may regard as probable the conjectures which connect them with the family of St. Bees. Another, William Grindal, was a marked man, who, if he had lived, would probably have obtained the preferments which were afterwards conferred upon Edmund. William Grindal was the dear and intimate friend, pupil, and colleague of Roger Ascham. Through the recommendation of Sir John Cheke, Ascham became a tutor to Edward VI. ; and when Ascham was absent from court, the instruction of the prince devolved upon William Grindal, who dwelt with Ascham and shared his studies. He appears, however, to have been more frequently and regularly employed in directing the studies of the Lady Elizabeth ; and to the precepts of his friend, Ascham did not hesitate to assert that the Princess

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—

Grindal  
probably  
educated  
at Furness  
Abbey.

Matricu-  
lates at  
Cam-  
bridge.

William  
Grindal.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

State of  
the Uni-  
versity.

was deeply indebted.\* He was unfortunately cut off in the prime of life in the year 1548, when he fell a victim to the plague. His character was thus described: "Mores, ingenium, memoriam, judicium tale habuit, quale vix cuiquam in Anglia contingit."

The university at this time was in a deplorable condition; but under the least favourable circumstances there has always been a certain class of reading men, distinguished from the body of undergraduates, and forming, as it were, a literary aristocracy. This is an aristocracy open to the poor as well as to the rich, provided that they are distinguished for their genius and industry; and as industry is absolutely necessary to enable the poor to support themselves, this state of things is so far favourable to that class of students that they soon become men of distinction. When fit men are sought for important places—which, at a revolutionary period, must be the case—the circumstances just mentioned become favourable to their selection from the lower orders, and their rise to eminence.

Edmund Grindal matriculated at Magdalen College, and migrated first to Christ's College, and then to Pembroke Hall. In 1537-8 he took his bachelor's degree, and soon after was elected fellow of his college.† He had the advantage of having for the master of his college the celebrated Dr. Ridley. The master, when he became Bishop of London, did not forget the merits of Grindal, who in 1541 had commenced M.A. On July 4, 1544, offering his fellowship for his title, he was ordained by John Bird, Lord Bishop of Chester. He still remained at the university, of which in 1548-9 he became senior proctor. In the same year he was appointed Lady Margaret's Preacher, and president or vice-master of his college,

B.A.  
1537-8.

Fellow of  
Pembroke  
Hall.

M.A.  
1541.

Ordained,  
1544.

Senior  
Proctor,  
1548-9.

Lady  
Margaret's  
Preacher.

\* Ascham, Ep. § 7.

† Reg. Acad.



having previously taken the degree of B.D. He is frequently described in the Acts of the university as “ Assistens Vice-Cancellarii in judiciis ” (the vice-chancellor’s assistant in matters judiciary). He evidently had studied the law.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

This was a memorable year in the history of Grindal. Soon after the accession of Edward VI. a commission was appointed to hold a royal visitation of Cambridge, with full powers to reform the university and the colleges. Dr. Ridley, now Bishop of Rochester, was one of the commissioners, and took a prominent part in the proceedings. He was ably supported by Sir William Paget, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir John Cheke, together with the Diocesan, Thomas Goodrich, Bishop of Ely. A commission consisting of more competent, moderate, and learned men, all of them more or less distinguished in literary or political circles, it would have been difficult to form. A considerable time elapsed before their plans could be matured; and although their appointment was dated November 11, 1548, it was not until May 1549 that they arrived at Cambridge.

University  
Visitation,  
1549.

On Sunday, May 5, the members of the university were summoned before the visitors in St. Mary’s Church; all the commissioners being present except the Bishop of Ely, who was detained by his episcopal duties till the Monday morning. After the service, performed we presume according to the ancient Ritual,\* a sermon was

\* The first Act of Uniformity required conformity to the revised Prayer-Book on June 9, 1549. The book itself was published in March 1568-9, but three months were allowed, to enable the clergy to understand the changes proposed. That the book thus published, was regarded as substantially identical with the former services, is shown by the fact that, in after days, Cranmer offered to prove that the order of services set out in the reign of Edward VI. was the same as had been used in the Church of England, for the space of fifteen hundred years

CHAP.  
XVII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

preached by the Bishop of Rochester. Of this sermon I do not find a copy in Ridley's Works.

At the conclusion of the service, the commission was opened in King's College Chapel, where the proctors and the heads of houses delivered up, first the statute book of the university, and then the statutes of their several colleges. All were required on oath to renounce allegiance to the pope, and to acknowledge the king in all cases and over all persons civil as well as ecclesiastical to be supreme. The new statutes signed by the king and subscribed by the council were delivered to the vice-chancellor by Sir John Cheke. The Bishop of Rochester again addressed the assembly, exhorting them to renounce papistry and superstition, and expressing the readiness of the visitors to pay attention to any suggestions that might be offered with the view of reforming abuses.\* The commissioners dined with the vice-chancellor, Dr. Bill, at St. John's College.

The attendance of Grindal, as the senior proctor, upon the commissioners was merely official, and we are not, therefore, required to enter into details further than to say that ample employment was given to the officials; for the new regulations descended from the most important matters relating to university legislation to the conduct, and even to the apparel, of the students.

On June 20 a grand disputation was held in the schools on the subject of the Eucharist. This subject at that period involved, or we should rather say absorbed,

past. Jeremy Taylor, vii. 292. There would be no objection therefore to have the unreformed service used at the visitation.

\* This exhortation is in some accounts given to the Bishop of Ely; but if it were delivered on the Sunday after the service, this could not have been the case, as the Bishop of Ely did not join the conference till the Monday.

Disputa-  
tion on  
Transub-  
stantia-  
tion,  
June 20,  
1549.

the dogma of transubstantiation, and upon this dogma opinions in the university were much divided. It was a proud testimony to the character of Grindal when he, still a young man, was appointed one of the disputants. Although there was nothing brilliant in Grindal's character, yet on this, as on other occasions, he exhibited that calmness of judgment, and soundness of learning, for which he was distinguished in all the transactions of his life.

CHAP.  
XVII.

---

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.  
Grindal  
one of the  
disputants.

The conclusions to be discussed were as follows :

1. That transubstantiation could not be proved by the plain and manifest words of Scripture ; and
2. That it could not therefore be necessarily collected, nor yet confirmed, by the consent of the ancient fathers for <sup>a</sup>three thousand years past.

Of this disputation, displaying, as it did, more learning and good temper than was usual among disputants of the age, a minute account is given by Foxe. The historian was, without doubt, supplied with information by Grindal himself.\* Dr. Glyn, Dr. Langdale, Dr. Sedgwick, Dr. Young, and Mr. Parker of Trinity College, all of them good scholars and able men, advocated the cause of transubstantiation ; and were opposed by Mr. Perne, Mr. Guest, Mr. Pilkington, and Mr. Grindal. At the same time, through the admirable management of Bishop Ridley, everything was done decently and in order, and indecorous disputation was avoided.

It would occupy too much space to present the reader with a full report of the part taken by Grindal in the

\* See Grindal's "Remains," 195, and Lamb's Collection of Letters, Statutes, Notes, &c., Introduction, xxvi. xxvii. and p. 114-115. We know that Grindal, when in exile, communicated to Foxe an account of the events in which he was concerned before he left England. The account given by Foxe is in a style superior to that which the Martyrologist adopts when he tells his story in his own way. See also Fuller's Cambridge, 243 ; and Ridley's Works (Parker Society), 171.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Ridley's  
judgment.

discussion. He is accurate in his statements, clear in his argument, and logical in his conclusions; but he fell far short of his opponent in sagacity and learning.

After a discussion which lasted three days, the Bishop of Rochester gave judgment. He began by asserting that the judgment of divines must be based first on the authority, majesty, and verity of Holy Scripture, and then on the testimonies of the ancient Catholic Fathers, "who, after my judgment, do sufficiently declare this matter." He went on to prove, by reference to certain texts of Scripture and to certain passages adduced from "the ancient Fathers, a thousand years past," that neither by the Bible nor by the Fathers can the figment of transubstantiation be established. He shows that it is contrary to the very nature of a Sacrament—that it tends to the Eutychean heresy, and is inconsistent with a belief in the verity of Christ's Ascension.

It appears from Ridley's correspondence that while he remained at Rochester he occasionally employed Grindal in disputations with the Anabaptists on the one extreme, and with the Papists on the other. On the translation of Ridley to London, the Bishop desired to have Grindal constantly with him. He was appointed, therefore, one of the Bishop of London's chaplains. He was, in this capacity, associated with men eminent for their piety, their learning, and their judicious support of the principles of the English Reformation. He was still employed in private conferences on religion at the houses of Sir William Cecil and Sir Richard Morysin.

On August 24, 1551, Grindal was collated by the Bishop to the precentorship of St. Paul's; and in the December following he was appointed one of the royal chaplains, with a salary of 40*l.* a year. In June 1552 he received a licence to preach in any parish

Grindal's  
prefer-  
ments.

Precentor  
of St.  
Paul's,  
Royal  
Chaplain.

within the province of Canterbury; and on July 28 in the same year he was installed a Prebendary of Westminster.

At this period of our history a royal chaplain was not a merely honorary appointment. In number the chaplains were not fewer than six, of whom two were always to be in waiting upon the king; while the other four were sent to different parts of the kingdom, especially into parishes in which the incumbent was unable to preach; to instruct the people in the principles of true religion and in the duty of obedience to their prince,—a point on which, when the king was a child, there was much difference of opinion. How highly the chaplains were esteemed may be gathered from the fact that before the Articles were accepted by the two Convocations, they were submitted to the judgment of their brethren of the Chapel Royal. It is probable that through their frequent intercourse with the sovereign they obtained an influence and power which excited the jealousy of the bishops; for a new appointment of chaplains was not made during the last thirty years of Elizabeth's reign.

On this account it probably was, that when the Bishop of London desired to make a permanent provision for his chaplain, he was prevented from accomplishing his wish by the members of the council. They wished to keep the preferment, so to say, in the market; and we regret to record that, although on political grounds they advocated the principles of the Reformation, yet they adhered to the worst practices of preceding generations when the question arose of enriching themselves and their dependants by the misappropriation of ecclesiastical property and the goods of the Church. As illustrative of the principles of the time, and of the corruption of a

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Proposed  
salaries  
for the  
Bishop's  
chaplains.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Contro-  
versy  
about the  
Prebend of  
Kentish  
Town.

court professing the principles of the Reformation, we will enter into some details upon this subject.

The prebend of Kentish Town was about to be vacant.\* The Bishop of London intended to collate his chaplain to it; but he was frustrated by the manœuvres of the court, from which we except, of course, the well-intentioned child by whom the throne was occupied. It was thought at one time to forestall the Bishop by the resignation of the incumbent; but he maintained his own, and only consented to give assurance to the council that he would not collate to the prebend without first giving notice of the vacancy to the king. On the death of Layton, the incumbent, the notice according to promise was given, and the council wrote to the bishop to stay the collation, and to demand the stall for a clerk of the council. When the Bishop refused to give heed to the injunction, and when the council remembered his constant fairness, they despaired of making a provision for their friend; but they were determined to insult and annoy the Bishop, and they obtained letters from the king, requiring the Bishop to stay proceedings. The Royal boy, not knowing what he did, or the profaneness of which he was guilty, was persuaded to alienate the income of the stall, and actually to appropriate it to the maintenance of his stable and the support of his grooms.

Edward  
VI. gives  
income of  
the stall  
to the  
main-  
tenance of  
his stable.

This was strange conduct on the part of those zealous reformers, and it roused the honest indignation of Bishop Ridley. That brave prelate gave utterance to

\* According to Newcourt the prebend of Kentish Town was also stiled Kentissetune or Caulters, or sometimes Kentillers. The prebendary had the tenth stall on the right side of the choir; and the corps of his prebend lay in the parish of St. Pancras. Newcourt, Repertorium, 169.

his feelings of indignation in a letter addressed to Sir John Cheke. This letter he desired to have shown to his other friends at Cambridge, and asked whether, when reprobating the conduct of many of our dignified clergy before the Reformation, they could hear without reprobation of conduct so disgraceful as this? "Is this," he asks, "the fruit of the Gospel? Speak, Master Cheke, speak, for God's sake, in God's cause, unto whomsoever and all you think may do any good withal."

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Bishop  
Ridley's  
letter to  
Sir John  
Cheke.

Cheke interfered, not, indeed, to obtain the stall for Grindal, but to save it from degradation, by securing the appointment for the Bishop's other chaplain—a more able, if not a better man—John Bradford, who died a martyr for his opinions.

Cheke  
prevents  
the pro-  
fanation.

Of Grindal's university career we have not more to narrate, beyond the honourable fact that, when he was yet a young man, only thirty-two years of age, he was admitted to an intimacy with Martin Bucer, a foreign reformer, the sweet piety of whose heart brought him many friends. On some of the most important controversies in the English Church Grindal was consulted by Bucer. He attended Bucer in his last illness; and when that reformer was buried at St. Mary's Church in Cambridge, Grindal supported the hearse.

Grindal's  
friendship  
with  
Bucer.

When warned of his danger, and exhorted to arm himself against the assaults of Satan, Bucer replied that he had nothing to do with the devil, he being wholly in Christ. "God forbid," he said, "that I should not now have experience of the secret consolations of Christ!" And he added, "Cast me not off, oh my God, in my old age when my strength faileth me!" "Ille, Ille regit," he exclaimed, "et moderatur omnia!" ("The Lord, the Lord only ruleth and disposeth of all things!")

Bucer's  
death.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Designed  
for a  
bishopric  
in the  
north of  
England.

He spake, and meekly gave up the ghost.\*

Of Grindal the report prevailed that, young as he was, he was designed for a bishopric. It was even said that Ridley was to be translated to Durham, and that Grindal was to succeed him in the diocese of London. But for these reports there appears to have been no solid foundation. What was conjectured as possible was reported as probable, and what was possible and probable found credit with those who believe without enquiry.

\* The exact date of Bucer's death is not known: according to Martin Crusius he died in February 1551. Pars 3, Annal. Suev. lib. xi. cap. 25. *Pentaleon de Viris illustribus Germaniæ*, produced in April of that year. According to Dr. Perne he died March 10, 1550. Erasmus Middleton leaves the question in doubt.



## CHAPTER XVIII.

## GRINDAL IN EXILE.

Policy of Mary's government towards the Reformers.—Remarks on the Reformation under Edward VI. by Burnet, Kennet, and Brewer.—Grindal leaves England for the Continent.—Lutheran intolerance.—Influence of Calvin.—His Institutes.—State of Geneva under Calvin.—Grindal is greatly influenced by the Calvinists.—Settles at Strassburg.—Collegiate Institution there.—Grindal's literary pursuits.—He attends Peter Martyr's lectures.—His correspondence with Bishop Ridley.—'Troubles of Frankfort.'—Fruitless mediation of Grindal.—Death of Queen Mary.—Grindal returns to England.—In favour with Parker and Queen Elizabeth.

It does not appear that Grindal took any active part in the revolutionary movement which had for its object the placing of the Lady Jane upon the throne vacated by the death of Edward VI.

We have had occasion before to remark, that the object of Queen Mary's government was not, in the first instance, to have recourse to severe and extreme measures. There was no desire to persecute—the wish was rather to alarm discontented subjects, and having done so; to facilitate their removal to the Continent; peaceful and quiet men they would permit to remain in the country, if left undisturbed themselves, they did not seek to create a disturbance among others. Matthew Parker remained, not quite unmolested, for he was suspected of being ready to intrigue against the government, if an opportunity to intrigue should present itself; but Roger Ascham was not

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Policy of  
Mary's  
govern-  
ment.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

only unmolested—he was actually received into favour, and notwithstanding his devotion to the cause of the Reformation, he was even employed by Bishop Gardyner and treated as a friend.

Nevertheless, England was scarcely a safe place of abode for a chaplain of Bishop Ridley, who had without doubt committed himself to the side of the Lady Jane ; and unwilling as Grindal was to leave his friends and fellow-students, there was not much in the existing state of affairs to induce a theologian, especially a man of Grindal's disposition and temperament, to remain in England.

If the Reformation under Edward VI. was not a failure, it certainly was not a success. Certain profligate noblemen, most active in the cause, maintained the Reformation in words ; but, to all appearance, over their hearts religion had no salutary influence. With the spoils of a plundered church they had filled their coffers ; but for the fruits of the Spirit we have too often to look in vain among the Protestants as well as among the Papists.

Of so much boasting are men frequently guilty when they refer to this age, that it becomes important, if we would judge aright of Grindal's character, to have regard to the circumstances under which he was placed.

Even Burnet cannot deny that the Church was brought into jeopardy by the malpractices of many among the nobility who were the most zealous in upholding the cause of the Reformation. He confesses that their fraudulent proceedings, combined with a great laxity of morals spreading fearfully among the people, gave the enemies of the Reformation too great a handle against them. "The open lewdness," he says, "in which many lived without shame or remorse gave great occasion to their adversaries to say they were in the right to assert Justification

Burnet's  
character  
of Ed-  
ward's  
Reforma-  
tion.

by Faith without works—since they were as to every good work reprobate. Their gross and insatiable scrambling after the goods and wealth that had been dedicated with good design, though to superstitious uses, without applying any part of it to the promoting of the Gospel, the instructing of the youth, and relieving the poor, made all people conclude it was for robbery, and not for reformation, that their zeal made them so active.”\*

CHAP.  
XVIII.  
Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

To the same effect we may refer to the work of a Prelate far superior in ecclesiastical and historical knowledge to Burnet. The following passage is to be found in Bishop Kennet’s treatise entitled ‘The Impropriation of Vicarages’ :—“The irregular and immoral lives of many of the professors of the Gospel gave their enemies real advantages to say they ran away from confession, penance, fasting, and prayer, only that they might lie under no restraint, but indulge themselves in a licentious and dissolute course of life. By these things, which were but too visible in some of the more eminent among them, the people were much alienated from them. Some of the clergy that promoted the Reformation were not without very visible blemishes ; some indiscretions, both in their marriages and in their behaviour, contributed not a little to raise a general aversion from them. It is true there were great and shining lights among them ; but they were few in comparison with the many bad.”

Bishop  
Kennet  
on the  
Reforma-  
tion.

Professor Brewer † does not hesitate to remark that “the generality of men are too much misled by Foxe in forming anything like a fair and just estimate of the reigns of King Edward and his successor. No king ever lived in this nation, except perhaps Henry VIII., whose reign was more disastrous to the cause of true religion, and conse-

Professor  
Brewer.

\* Burnet, iii. 216.

† Brewer, Notes on Fuller, Book viii. p. 150.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Reaction-  
ary effect  
of persecu-  
tion.

quently to the Church, than was the reign of Edward VI. As Bishop Burnet states, men were fast falling away from the truth altogether, or turning back to their ancient professions and opinions. It was the fires which were lighted in Smithfield which brought men again, if not to soberer feelings, yet at least to greater caution. Persecution, whilst it purged the Reformation to a great extent of those who had supported it merely because it allowed a greater laxity than Romanism, threw a halo round those who suffered, a feeling of pity and respect for them, and of veneration for those opinions for which they suffered, which a milder policy had never produced. Without any such intention, Queen Mary did far more for the Reformation than either of her immediate predecessors."

Though Grindal was at this time by no means a wealthy man, yet we gather from various circumstances, that he was not dependent upon the Church for support, and that he could both maintain himself in foreign parts and at the same time render some assistance to his friends.

He determined to expatriate himself, and he left England for the Continent in the course of the year 1553. He does not seem to have been obliged like some of the other exiles to support himself by tuition, by applying to some of the learned printers for employment, or by becoming corrector of the press. But he intended to translate some of the German works which were more talked of than read; for he did what very few of his contemporaries thought of doing,—he became a student of the German language. The early English reformers had been the adherents of Martin Luther; and they therefore and their followers, when driven into exile, expected to receive from the Germans the hospitality which had not been withheld from expatriated Germans when they sought refuge in England.

Grindal  
leaves  
England  
for the  
Continent.

But this was not their sole resource; for towards the close of King Edward's reign Calvinism had been gradually gaining ground;\* and had absorbed the sympathies of many in all classes of Protestantism. The English reformers were sadly disappointed by the conduct of the Lutherans: and by the course into which they were forced, the English Church was also seriously damaged. The Lutherans reminded the exiles that the devil had martyrs as well as God; and as the devil's martyrs these exiles were spurned from most of the churches of Germany, and they were thus obliged to seek protection from the Calvinists. Cranmer, with his usual vacillation, having first abetted the Lutheran view of the Divine Presence in the Eucharist, eventually forsook it, and hence the hostility to his name became the greater. The English reformers were therefore most of them driven to seek protection from the Calvinists. The reader who desires to become acquainted with the uncontrollable temper of Calvin, and with the remonstrances addressed to him with too little success by Melanchthon and the real friends of the Reformation, will do well to consult Dyer upon the subject.† To the same authority we may also refer if we desire to see how equally violent Calvin could be in the expression of his feelings when he was engaged in controversy with Luther and the Lutherans. It seems strange that the two founders of new sects, each disclaiming the preten-

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Lutheran  
intoler-  
ance.

Calvin's  
violence  
of temper.

\* When the word Calvinist first became general in England, in the sense in which it is now employed, Archbishop Laurence, who has studied the subject, says, "I have not been able precisely to ascertain. Fox does not use it. Evidently, however, in 1585, if not before, it was applied by Saunders to Cranmer, who, in the Book of Martyrs, is termed a Zuinglian, and not a Calvinist."—Archbishop Laurence, Bampton Lectures, p. 237.

† Melanchthon protested against the intolerant violence of his party.

CHAP.  
XVIII.Edmund  
Grindal.1575-6—  
1583.

sions of the Church to infallibility, should expect a deference to their authority, which implied an individual infallibility, not only as bearing upon their immediate followers, but as relating also to the decisions of those among their opponents whom they regarded as capable of forming an opinion.

Calvin's  
Institutes,  
third edi-  
tion, 1539.

When our countrymen, however, were brought by circumstances under the influence of Calvin, we are not surprised if, while they deplored his intolerance, they were fascinated by his genius and learning. The third edition of his *Institutes* had been published in 1539; and the charm of his style, the profundity of his remarks, together with his intimate acquaintance with Scripture, rendered it influential wherever it was read. Among those who had ability to study it, it was widely and generally circulated. Notwithstanding the defects of the treatise, and the actual omission of some important doctrines, especially those relating to the day of judgment, if not to eschatology in general—of theological students we may venture to say, that few will cease from the perusal of his writings when once they have begun it, until they have mastered the subject of which he treats. Whether, when they have mastered Calvin's system, they will become really profound divines is another question. They who read it wisely will remember that there is only one book which is perfect—the Holy Bible; and they will not forget that if Calvin's *Institutes* be a wonderful work, considering the age of the author when he transmitted it to press, there are other wiser and more learned authors for the interpretation of Scripture, whom they must feel it to be their duty also to consult. We may make our meaning intelligible by referring to Milton. The author of 'Paradise Lost' is one of the greatest poets the world has ever known; but we should not send a student to

Milton for instruction on a theological difficulty. The fascination of Calvin's book consists, to a great extent, in his having systematised the doctrine of which he writes; and it is comparatively easy to the mind, while avoiding a dispute, to understand a system. Calvin's care it was to be systematical. The Catholic or Churchman, therefore, was not that kind of guide which it is the pleasure of a Calvinist to possess. Consequently, many became, and still become, Calvinists in order that they may thus obtain a leader capable of supplying them with an answer, whose object is to overcome the difficulties which beset their ways, or the adversaries who perplex them.

As a Christian philosopher, Grindal was not desirous, by addicting himself *jurare in verba magistri*, to save himself from the trouble of thought. The power of Calvin's intellect, his vigour, his clearness, his accuracy, his genius, Grindal could highly, and therefore justly, appreciate. Any statement advanced by the learned doctor, Grindal could receive with the deference due to a master mind; and he would weigh in the balance of the sanctuary, after thought and prayer, all that he was not prepared to accept merely on the ground of its being the assertion of one who, though profound in Scriptural knowledge, and logical in his deductions from the facts conceded in discussion, was by no means free from error, and whose judgment was sometimes, not to say frequently, tainted with prejudice and warped by faction. Grindal, as the representative of the English Reformation, was willing to give due attention to the traditions of the Catholic Church, the Church being to him the authority which Luther or Calvin had become to others, and he was as a reformer preparing himself to carry out his principles still further, by bringing the traditions of the Church to the test of

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Fascina-  
tion of  
Calvin's  
writings.

Grindal's  
deference  
to Calvin,  
modified  
by the  
Catholic  
principles  
retained in  
the Angli-  
can Refor-  
mation.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Scripture; rejecting what was medieval, and accepting what was primitive.

Under these circumstances we understand why Grindal did not seek a settlement in Geneva. He would weigh well what Calvin advanced, but a Calvinist, in the strict sense of the word, he refused to become. Maintaining his independence, he would freely discourse with Calvin on the great facts of revelation when he met him in society; but being a man of high station in the schools and the court of his native land, he required to be treated as an equal; and he desired, in terms of equality, to maintain his own opinions and the principles of the Reformation of his country.

Then again,—Geneva was not the place in which the calm and philosophic mind of Grindal could find the peace and comfort which he had looked forward to enjoying when he left his native land, an expectation to enjoy which had been one object of his expatriation. We have seen how miserably the peace of society had been violated in England by those who, even if they had a sincere regard for the reformation of religion, sought in the first instance to enrich themselves by the spoils of the Establishment. Very different expectations had been excited in his mind by the description which came to England of the state of affairs in Geneva, where Calvin ruled a despot in church and state. On this subject the partisans of Calvin are sometimes heard to speak at the present time; and even to admit what they would fain deny, if the case were not too plain to admit of a denial.

That Calvin had to deal with perverse and corrupt people in Geneva cannot be denied; but as his learned biographer remarks, it may be more than doubted whether he took the best method of reforming them. “The respect and submission exacted by Calvin far exceeded

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Reasons  
why  
Grindal  
does not  
settle in  
Geneva.

Calvin's  
intoler-  
ance.



that claimed by other spiritual guides, and was anything but compatible with the meekness and humility inculcated by the Gospel. The most trifling slights and insults, such as most men would have overlooked with contempt, Calvin pursued with bitterness and acrimony. The Registers of Geneva abound with instances, which grew more frequent and more severe as his power became more consolidated. In 1551 we find Berthelier excommunicated by the consistory because he would not allow that he had done wrong in asserting that he was as good a man as Calvin. Three men who had laughed during a sermon of his were imprisoned for three days and condemned to ask pardon of the consistory. Such proceedings are very numerous, and in the two years 1558 and 1559 alone, 414 of them are recorded! To impugn Calvin's doctrine, or the proceedings of the consistory, endangered life. . . . Calvin carried this system almost to a pitch of blasphemy; so that he sometimes dared to justify the harshest and most unchristian-like conduct and words by the example of the apostles and even of Christ himself.\*

The result was as might have been expected. A recent Genevese writer has remarked: "To those who imagine that Calvin did nothing but good, I could produce our registers, covered with records of illegitimate children, which were exposed in all parts of the town and country; hideous trials for obscenity; wills, in which fathers and mothers accuse their children not only of errors but of crimes; agreements before notaries between young women and their lovers, in which the latter, even in the presence of the parents of their paramours, make them an allowance for the education of their illegitimate offspring; I could instance multitudes of

CH AP.  
XV III.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

State of  
Geneva  
under Cal-  
vin.

\* Dyer's Life of Calvin, pp. 143, 144.

CHAP.  
XVIII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

forced marriages, in which the delinquents were conducted from the prison to the church; mothers who abandoned their children to the hospital, while they themselves lived in abundance with a second husband; bundles of lawsuits between brothers; heaps of secret negotiations; men and women burnt for witchcraft; sentences of death in frightful numbers; and all these things among the generation nurtured by the mystic manna of Calvin.” \*

Grindal  
and the  
Calvinists.

To these historical facts I refer, because on the gradual formation of the character and principles of Grindal, they exercised an influence not the less powerful from the fact of his not always recollecting how they had become imbibed. If his principles had been fully established at the period of King Edward's death, he would probably, as was the case with Parker, have remained in England. He was fully convinced that the Papists were in error wherever they differed from the English reformers. He was equally certain that a Reformation was required; but in what particulars it would consist, and to what extent it was to be carried, his mind was not made up. By intercourse first with Lutherans and then with Calvinists, he desired to obtain the needed information, and to decide on his future conduct. Repelled by the Lutherans, he soon fell under the influence of the Calvinists, and showed the weakness of his character, by deferring much more than was necessary to the opinions of men who, however learned, had not adopted the principles which swayed the English reformers, when they distinguished between the Church instituted by our Lord and the various sects which looked for their foundation to man. Afterwards, when he returned to England, he was partially restored to right

Their  
influence  
over him.

\* Galiffe, *Notices Généalogiques*, tom. iii. Preface (quoted by Dyer, p. 153).

principles; but he still kept up a correspondence with some of his foreign friends. To this correspondence we shall hereafter have occasion to trace the vacillation of character that prevented a good, learned, and pious man from becoming a judicious leader of others, and a wise ruler of the Church.

While the learned writings of John Calvin, proving him to be one of the most powerful thinkers of that or of any other age, attracted the learned to Geneva that they might converse with one by whose writings they had profited so much, Grindal soon discovered that the despotic temper and tyrannical government of Calvin rendered the city in which, in point of fact, he was little less than the pope, anything but an agreeable place of residence or of legislation. He saw his compatriots arriving in troops at Geneva, and thence, after a brief sojourn, he saw them depart. They were scattered in small parties throughout the different towns of France and Switzerland. Here they formed libraries, to which men of learning had easy access; and here those among the exiles who had to earn their livelihood by their literary pursuits, found pleasure in their intercourse with the many learned printers of that age, who, by employing them at the press or in correcting the press, enabled them to support their families in respectability and comfort. Grindal took up his abode at Strassburg, its central position rendering an intercourse possible between his German and Helvetian friends. Here the chaplain of Bishop Ridley was secure of a friendly welcome, and here old friends were already assembled to hold out to him the right hand of fellowship. Among these we may mention Sir John Cheke, Sir Anthony Cook, Sir Richard Morison, Sir Peter Carew, and Sir Thomas Roth, in addition to such divines as Jewel and Nowell. Here, too, he found the playmate of his

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1588.

Employ-  
ment of  
the exiles.

Grindal  
settles at  
Strass-  
burg.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

boyhood, the friend of his youth, the associate of his studies,—Edwin Sandys.

In many, perhaps in most, of these towns, the refugees formed a sort of collegiate establishment. This was especially the case at Strassburg. Here a hall was formed on the model of the colleges in the English universities. Here lectures were given, which employed the most advanced in years and instructed the young. It was a drawback that the lectures had to be given, and social intercourse carried on, by recourse to the dead languages. But this, which, according to modern feeling, might be regarded as a mistake, had the advantage of binding the English together, and of keeping up that national spirit which it was an object with their foreign friends to destroy. The foreigners would have regarded the foreign sects as forming, when classed together, the Catholic Church of Christ. This was a lowering of the English national character; and to such a proceeding our reformers were unwilling to succumb, although they too often yielded a precedence to the learned men of the Continent, to whom they were bound by the strong ties of gratitude. The English members of these different colleges also upheld the national feeling by the visits which, from time to time, they were accustomed to pay to their brethren.

During the early part of Mary's reign her death was probably not considered imminent; but the accounts the refugees received from time to time of the state of public feeling in their own country must have given rise to an opinion that a counter-revolution was impending. Frequent intercourse was therefore desirable that they might decide upon the course which, under these circumstances, it might be expedient for them to pursue. But we are surprised to find how frequently among those whose

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Collegiate  
Institu-  
tion at  
Strassburg.

Unsettled  
state of  
England.

interest it was to live at peace with one another, angry feelings were excited and violent controversies arose.

Although Grindal was distinguished by his zeal for the Reformation, yet he was more suitably engaged, in accordance with his own taste, when he was employed in literary pursuits and studies. At this time, he assisted Foxe, the martyrologist, in obtaining information relative to the sufferings of our early reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. It had been well for Foxe, and for the cause he fanatically supported, if he had always remained under Grindal's influence; he would not then have persevered in that misstatement of facts in which, when he ceased to be a correspondent of Grindal, he too frequently indulged. When Grindal was at Strassburg he found his chief pleasure in attending the lectures there delivered by Peter Martyr on the Book of Judges and on Aristotle's Ethics. Peter Martyr had begun the reading of these lectures while he was yet in England, where they had been extremely popular. The continuance of them at Strassburg gave much satisfaction to his friends. They were delivered, day by day, orally, and they were then translated by Jewel. They thus afforded to the homeless exiles a subject of common discourse and friendly discussion. Among the less learned men who frequented the combination room in the collegiate institution at Strassburg, Grindal defended the cause of the English Reformation, and also corresponded with his old patron and friend Bishop Ridley, the illustrious bishop being at this time confined to an English prison. It was with Ridley's approbation that Grindal had left England. It had appeared to Ridley that one who had taken an active part like himself in all the proceedings of the Reformation, should bear testimony to his sincerity by his patient endurance of persecution: he

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal's  
literary  
pursuits.

Peter  
Martyr's  
lectures.

Correspon-  
dence  
between  
Grindal  
and  
Ridley.

CHAP.  
XVIII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

had not, however, thought it necessary that a young man, like Grindal, should sacrifice a life which, if preserved, might be of great service in the cause of God and of His Church. Grindal's letter to Ridley showed his gratitude, and expressed a hope that the bishop might even yet be permitted to labour in the good cause. Ridley on the other hand had only to make his wishes known, and Grindal was ready to obey. In writing to Grindal, he had especial reference to the troubles in which Grindal was involved in the city of Frankfort; for of exiles the poet says:—

Scarcely have they met,  
Partners in faith, and brothers in distress,  
Free to pour forth their common thankfulness,  
But Hope declines. Their union is beset  
With speculative notions rashly sown,  
Whence thickly-sprouting growth of poisonous weeds;  
Their forms are broken staves—their passions, steeds  
That master them.

Having had occasion in the life of Archbishop Parker to touch upon the 'Troubles of Frankfort,' it will not be necessary, at the present time, to enter more fully into the controversies which then and there took place. A small party of the English refugees had repaired to Frankfort, seeking for protection from the magistrates of that city; it was well situated for communication with England, and at the same time with the English congregations scattered over that part of the Continent. Here they took up their abode, and sought permission for the free exercise of their religion. The magistrates of Frankfort thus solicited had granted the use of one of their churches, on condition that the English would conform to the French service. Communication was immediately opened with Strassburg and Zürich, and other

Troubles  
of Frank-  
fort.

places, which were the resort of the English refugees. By the people of Frankfort, John Knox was chosen as their minister; and he in an address to Calvin complained of the bigoted attachment of the English to the ancient Liturgy of their church, especially to the Reformed Prayer-book, as it was called, of Edward VI., which, with the ceremonies attached to it, had been published in 1552. He was supported by a very learned but prejudiced man who was nearly connected by marriage with John Calvin, and by whom the Prayer-book was violently and irrationally attacked. To this person, Whittingham by name, was attributed 'A brief Discours of the Troubles beggone at Frankfort in the year 1554.' It was afterwards published in the second volume of a collection of tracts called Phoenix. This, the basis of all the historical facts of the transaction, is so one-sided a production, that in giving an account of the proceedings at Frankfort much must be left, by those who have only this work to guide them, to historical conjecture. A small minority appear to have taken alarm at the various alterations in the Prayer-book, made to conform as nearly as possible with some of the practices of Geneva, and they appealed to their brethren in the other towns. From the various settlements on the Continent divines were sent, and from Strassburg Grindal went as a missionary of peace, in the hope that his conciliatory manners and kind disposition might gradually reconcile all differences. Grindal, however, soon found that his labour was in vain, although the use of the Prayer-book was partially re-established by Dr. Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely, a man of more decided character.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Fruitless  
mediation  
of Grindal,

From an attack on the Book of Common Prayer, the rebels proceeded to an attack upon the discipline of the Church. Robert Horne, Dean of Durham, and afterwards

CHAP.  
XVIII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.and of  
Dean  
Horne.

Bishop of Winchester, was at that time their pastor. When Horne returned to England, he was regarded as taking too low a view both of the discipline and of the ceremonial of the Church: he was willing to sacrifice much for conciliation; consequently we may feel confident that when he failed in effecting a reconciliation between the contending parties, the blame did not rest with him, and that the opposition to the Church had proceeded to great extremes.

The violent, intolerant, and we may say un-Christian bitterness, with which Calvin and his faction heaped abuse on the Church of England and her Prayer-book we need not repeat; it is sufficient to say here, that Grindal, though withdrawing from the controversy, was induced by his friends Sandys and Cox occasionally to correspond with the exiles at Frankfort,\* and to bring them to a right understanding, though he henceforth remained for the most part a quiet student at Strassburg.

Queen  
Mary's  
ill health.

While Grindal was at Strassburg, reports reached Germany and Switzerland of the bad state of Queen Mary's health. The unfeeling conduct of her husband towards her was rendering her condition extremely

\* It had been my intention to write a more detailed history of the troubles of Frankfort, but I have been obliged to desist for want of materials. The 'Brieff Discours' is so entirely one-sided that it requires to be corrected by contemporary documents. In 1846 this book was reprinted by John Petherham of London. This work must be compared with Fuller's Church History, with Dyer's Life of Calvin, with Strype's Memorials, and with Jeremy Collier. It is generally stated that in the 'Troubles of Frankfort' we may trace the origin of English Dissent; but this could hardly have been the case, for the Dissentients at Frankfort had no desire to leave the Church: they may rather be spoken of as the founders of what has subsequently been called the 'Evangelical Party.' They wished to retain the offices, emoluments, and honours of the Church, but to force the Church to adopt their own theological views.



precarious ; but it was certainly with anything but feelings of grief that the English heard of the approaching death of their sovereign. At length the news arrived, that by her death on November 17, 1558, the English were released from her misgovernment and persecutions.

We may suspect that Grindal was in no haste to return to England ; for we find him, Sandys, and Nowell lingering at Frankfort, and not arriving in England until the day of Queen Elizabeth's coronation, which took place on the fifteenth of January. It is probable that these three eminent men had revisited Frankfort, in the hope that at such a crisis as the present they might bring the opposing parties to a good understanding. Nowell was associated with the other two, being himself much more inclined than they to the principles of Calvin, though determined to conform, when conformity was required, with the English Church.

The placability and kind disposition of Grindal always made him a welcome visitor. He was respected and beloved by those even who were opposed to him ; and it was so evident that he had no private ends to serve, that all parties were ready to receive him with consideration and kindness.

When he arrived in England he was cordially welcomed by all, and especially by Parker. To Parker, who had hitherto refused the archbishopric, was confided by the queen and Cecil the chief management of ecclesiastical affairs ; and he evidently, hoped that, in engaging the services of a man who had displayed such discretion, such sound judgment, such kind feeling as Grindal had done at Frankfort, he should find in him a coadjutor, adviser, and friend.

To Cecil <sup>Grindal</sup> ~~Calvin~~ commended himself by his habits of

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
revisits  
Frankfort.  
1558-9.

Grindal's  
return to  
England.  
1558-9.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

His popu-  
larity with  
the queen  
and Cecil.

business ; and the queen delighted in a courtier who was eminently distinguished for his own learning, and for his appreciation of her own character, as the patron of literature, and as one who retained her love of study till a late period of life.

## CHAPTER XIX.

## GRINDAL BISHOP OF LONDON.

Grindal is appointed a commissioner on the Prayer-book.—Conference at Westminster.—Grindal preaches at St. Paul's.—One of the Royal Visitors.—His scruples of conscience.—Consults Peter Martyr concerning them.—Master of Pembroke Hall.—Protests against the queen's appropriation of ecclesiastical property.—Is present at the consecration of Archbishop Parker.—Consecrated Bishop of London.—Assists at Jewel's consecration.—One of the commissioners appointed to amend the Lectionary and the Calendar and to reform the state of the churches.—Fire at St. Paul's.—Grindal's generosity.—St. Paul's before the Reformation.—Royal Exchange built by Sir Thomas Gresham.—Grindal's Funeral Sermon on the Emperor Ferdinand I.—Treatment of Bonner.—Grindal takes his Doctor's degree.—The Plague in Kent and London.—Prayers and thanksgivings drawn up by Grindal.—His letter to Cecil on this matter.—Convocation of 1562.—Grindal's visitation of his diocese.—Certain suspected persons confided to his care.—His gifts to the queen.—Treatment of Stowe.—His kindness towards certain merchants on the Continent.—His difficult position in regard to the Puritans.—His correspondence with Bullinger.—Separation of certain Puritans from the Church.—Their examination before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.—Reverence to the Eucharist enforced.—Grindal's proceedings against certain Oxford colleges.—Against the Inns of Court.

EDMUND GRINDAL, having arrived in London on the 15th of January, 1558-9, was immediately employed in preparing a further revision of the old Catholic Liturgy, to be laid before Parliament, now summoned to meet. It was a third Prayer-book such as is now in use. Grindal

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

CHAP.  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.Grindal  
is em-  
ployed in  
further re-  
visions of  
the  
Liturgy.

was not immediately appointed to any public office ; but it was impossible to dispense with the services of a man who had been the friend and adviser of Bishop Ridley. By Ridley his sagacity had been recognised, while his practical wisdom in all public affairs was indisputable. Parker, now Archbishop elect of Canterbury, required such a coadjutor as he expected to find in Grindal. Grindal was not indeed all that the archbishop expected to find him—he was too yielding and vacillating, too willing to yield to what the people would accept, rather than to enforce what the Church might demand. Nevertheless, at the beginning of his career, when Parker was confined to the sick room, the activity of Grindal did him great service.

One of the  
commis-  
sioners  
on the  
Prayer-  
book.

Grindal was one of the commissioners who were accustomed to meet in Cannon Row, Westminster, at the house of Sir Thomas Smith, of whom mention has been made in the life of Parker. He was there associated with Coxe, Sandys, Whitehead, and Pilkington, who, with himself, had been exiles ; and also with Parker, May, and Sir Thomas Smith himself, who had remained in England during the reign of Queen Mary, by whom a toleration was extended towards them to which justice is not always done. The chaplain and intimate friend of Bishop Ridley must have been well acquainted with the reasons and methods used by King Edward's government in reforming, by enlarging or curtailing, the Book of Common Prayer, and his opinion had considerable weight and influence.\*

Of the conference between these divines, which took

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 33. The original papers laid before this Commission are extant among the Petyt MSS. in the Inner Temple Library. To the biographer of Grindal they are the more valuable, since they contain several comments and suggestions in his own handwriting.

place in Cannon Row, it is unnecessary to speak more fully, as upon this subject we enlarged in the life of Archbishop Parker in the passage to which I have referred. Parker too was, at this time, in a bad state of health, and much therefore of the business of the commission devolved upon Grindal, though he acted under Parker's direction and advice. We will content ourselves with remarking that Grindal manifested a sound Church principle when, in answer to a proposal made by his friend Dr. Sandys for extensive alterations, and among them a canon prohibiting women from administering private baptism to infants in danger of their lives, he let this proposal lie aside by remarking "Potest fieri in Synodo;" the holding of a synod having been already decided.

A conference was held at Westminster between the two parties at that time dividing the Church, before the Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon and a large assembly of the nobility and gentry, and Grindal, as a theologian of unquestionable ability, was invited to take an active part in the discussions which ensued.\* At length, that labour was finished, and on the 12th of May, 1559, the Book of Prayer, brought by frequent revisions to its present form, was introduced into the Queen's Chapel. On the Wednesday following it was used at St. Paul's, when Grindal was appointed to be the preacher—a delicate duty, but well performed. He had also to address the court and privy council, and the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London, attending the service. He was indeed a popular preacher, and he was invited to act in that capacity on several public occasions.

When a mixed commission of the clergy and the laity

\* For an account of the conference see Strype, 'Annals,' p. 128, 137; and Cardwell's 'History of Congresses,' 56-92.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Conference  
held at  
West-  
minster.

Grindal  
preaches at  
St. Paul's  
after the  
revision of  
the  
Prayer-  
book.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
one of the  
Royal  
Visitors.

was appointed to visit the whole realm, Grindal was appointed to act upon it, and became an active member of the body. The object of these visitations was to ascertain how far the Reformation had been carried, to deliver the queen's injunctions, to examine the registers and to see that they were duly kept, and to have a return made of the persons either condemned or imprisoned for religion during the late queen's reign. The visitors were to restore the ejected clergy, to administer the oaths of supremacy, and to enjoin the use of the reformed Service-book. In one respect the result of the enquiry was satisfactory; for among all the clergy of England only 189 refused to accept the mandate of the visitors. The fact is that the secular clergy obeyed the mandate in silence. On Trinity Sunday the sermon at Paul's Cross was preached by Dean Horne, afterwards Bishop of Winchester; and on the following Tuesday the French ambassador, together with his attendants, were present at the English service in Her Majesty's Chapel.

Dean  
Horne  
preaches  
at St.  
Paul's  
Cross.

Grindal's  
corre-  
spondence  
with  
foreign  
reformers.

During this period Grindal's principles had been, in some measure, shaken by his intercourse with foreign reformers. Among the Zürich letters some are found addressed by him to Bullinger and to Peter Martyr. From these letters it would appear that he entertained scruples about some of the ceremonials retained in the Church of England, especially in what related to the attire, or, as it was called, the habits, of the clergy. He could not for some time reconcile himself to the crucifix as it appeared in the queen's chapel, and which was, of course, imitated elsewhere, although it was to be seen in all or most of the German or the Lutheran churches. Neither could he approve of the use of wafer bread which prevailed greatly in our churches, until the extreme measures enforcing ultra-Protestantism were

forced upon us at the Great Rebellion. On consulting his foreign friends, he was advised to rank these things among the things indifferent, so that he might prevent the bishoprics from being conferred upon men of principles decidedly opposed to those of Grindal and his friends. But still he seems to have hesitated about accepting a bishopric for some time, and was contented, as a remuneration for his labours, with the Mastership of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge—a post which he accepted, and in 1562 resigned, having then been consecrated, and finding the duties of the Mastership incompatible with those of the Bishopric.

CHAP  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.Master of  
Pembroke  
Hall.

Grindal was more honourably employed, though without success, when he united with the other dignitaries of the Church in protesting against that appropriation of ecclesiastical property which, by a misconstruction of an act of Parliament, the queen claimed as connected with her prerogative. Courting popularity among the middle classes of society, Elizabeth was always endeavouring to obtain money, not by a legitimate appeal to Parliament, but sometimes by laudable economy, or more frequently by having recourse to the coffers of the Church. The Church was robbed by the queen in order that she might enrich her courtiers. By permitting the clergy to marry, their requirements at the same time increased, and higher emoluments were evidently needed; this difficulty was met by throwing impediments in the way of their marriage, though the marriages were still allowed. Into this subject it is the less necessary to enter at length, because, though Grindal acted with his brethren, he did not take a prominent part in the proceedings. He boldly told the queen however, in a letter addressed to her on this subject, that “at this day, in mine opinion, where one church is able to yield sufficient living for a

Appropriation of  
ecclesiastical  
property by  
the queen.Grindal's  
protest  
against it.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

learned preacher, there are at the least seven churches unable to do the same : and in many parishes of your realm where there be seven or eight hundred souls, (the more is the pity,) there are not eight pounds a year reserved for a minister.” \*

Fees and offerings which had formerly been made by the laity to the curates of their parishes were now discontinued. Oblations made at shrines, the profits arising from pilgrimages, mortuaries, and personal tithes (the latter being the tenth of all men's clear gains), had heretofore formed a considerable source of income to the clergy, but were now discontinued, while the government did not interpose to supply the deficiency. Puritans were purchasing the goodwill of courtiers by encouraging them to attack the Church ; and the courtiers having purchased the goodwill of many who ought to have been the defenders of the Church, proceeded in their spoliation. The queen and too many of her privy council were willing to tolerate the iniquity ; nor can we deny the fact that some among the higher orders of the clergy were not unwilling, for certain considerations, to tolerate the alienation of that property, the use of which was allowed to them, but which did not belong to themselves. These, however, contended that they were only acting in self-defence. As in certain other cases, Grindal fought the battle, but retreated into obscurity before it was either lost or won. The queen and the court denied that these transactions were simple acts of spoliation. Elizabeth took away the bishops' lands, but she gave them instead, tithes and impropriations. The result was, that while the Church was robbed of its own, it became unpopular with the country in general. The people disliked to pay the

Misconduct  
of the  
clergy with  
respect to  
church  
property.

\* Remains, p. 383.



tithes, but they would have submitted without a murmur, and would not even have objected, to a continuation of the payment of rents and fines which had existed from time immemorial.

Grindal's mind was evidently perplexed; and instead of being, as Parker expected, his adviser, he was unable to comprehend the advice which Parker, long experienced in the ways of the world, was prepared to give. On the Apostolical succession the continuity of the Church depended. The Church was founded by our Blessed Lord Himself; and through the Apostolical succession it was distinguished from those sects which had a mere human foundation.

But Grindal, while on the Continent, could not assert, yet feared to deny, that the sects there instituted could be regarded as a branch of the Church. In England, as we have seen all along, the object was merely to obliterate abuses from the Catholic Church which had come down to us from the days of Augustine. On the Continent they who called themselves reformers were erecting new institutions. Grindal shrank from censuring his foreign friends, while at the same time he wished to co-operate with his friends in England. He was evidently more afraid of appearing proud to his foreign friends, than of assuming the character of a zealous churchman, such as the Church of England now especially required and had a right to expect. It was therefore without any feelings of excitement that he accepted an invitation to Lambeth House on December 17, to witness the consecration of his friend and patron Dr. Parker.

So much had been said and written about the ceremonies of the Church, and the habits of the officiating clergy, that Grindal probably wished to see for himself the extent to which the ceremonials were carried. At

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal is  
present at  
Arch-  
bishop  
Parker's  
consecra-  
tion, Dec.  
17, 1559.

CHAP.  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.He is con-  
secrated  
Bishop of  
London, St.  
Thomas's  
Day, Dec.  
21, 1559.Use of  
wafer  
bread.The  
crucifix.

all events he was satisfied with what he saw and heard ; for on the Thursday afterwards, being St. Thomas's Day, he was himself consecrated Bishop of London. This important act took place in the archbishop's chapel at Lambeth. Grindal was at that time forty years of age ; and the late Bishop of London, Bishop Blomfield, informed me, that of all the bishops of that see, Grindal was the youngest, except Bishop Blomfield himself. On the 23rd of the same month he was enthroned by proxy in his cathedral, and in the following year, March 21, he was restored to the temporalities. On January 21 he assisted at certain consecrations, including that of his friend John Jewel. With the use of unleavened bread in the communion, he seems to have been satisfied, Peter Martyr having informed him that no contention on the subject existed on the Continent. There, as in the existing Church of England, unleavened bread was generally used.\* With respect to the crucifix, Peter Martyr was not so decided in giving his opinion. In his jealousy of Lutheranism he was fearful that the English Church would adopt the Augsburg Confession, and so become more alienated from Calvinism. From this calamity, which would have been in fact the overthrow of the Church, England was saved by the very circumstance adduced by the Calvinists to prejudice Grindal against the Lutherans, and which convinced him and those who thought with him, that the use of the crucifix was not confined exclusively to the Church of Rome.

It is certain that Grindal was consecrated in the episcopal dress, although he ceased to wear it whenever he possibly could.

He was one of the commission appointed in 1560 to

\* The order for the use of wafer bread is to be found in the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, and was enforced by Archbishop Parker.

Grindal  
conforms  
to the  
episcopal  
habit.

change the daily lessons of the Church and to make a new calendar in the Prayer-book.

The commissioners were authorised, at the same time, to adopt measures for adorning the chancels and for keeping the body of the churches clean and in good repair. They also had to regulate the Latin form of the Book of Common Prayer which collegiate churches had been permitted to use.

When St Paul's Cathedral was almost destroyed by fire in 1561, the Bishop of London showed his benevolence as well as his zeal in raising a sum for its restoration. "Out of his private resources and his family estate Grindal paid 720*l.*—an immense sum for the period." \* The beneficed clergy of London were required to give a twentieth part of their promotions, and each of the unbeneficed clergy had to pay at least 2*s.* 6*d.* This reverence to St. Paul's is connected with what has been before asserted—that a proclamation was issued by the queen, to be enforced by the Royal visitors, for the reverend uses of all churches and churchyards. This was, in fact, a compromise. Before the Reformation, the nave of St. Paul's Cathedral was used as an Exchange or Bourse in which people were walking, talking, hearing the news, and transacting business of all kinds. This abuse Grindal desired to prevent by the authority of a Royal injunction; a proposal to which the queen could not consent; but by giving to the visitors the powers that have just been mentioned, she effected the object without causing offence. If a bishop felt zeal on the subject, he thus had power to act; but an interference on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities would have created a popular disturbance, and it was left to the discretion of the spiritual authorities to decide as to action or abstinence from

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

One of the  
commis-  
sion ap-  
pointed to  
amend  
the Calen-  
dar and  
Lection-  
ary.

Fire at St.  
Paul's,  
1561.

Grindal's  
generosity  
in re-  
storing it.

St. Paul's  
before the  
Reforma-  
tion.

\* Sir John Heywood's 'Annals of Elizabeth.'

CHAP.  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.1575-6—  
1583.

action in this particular. The conduct complained of was indeed merely the abuse of a principle at that time generally recognised. A cathedral was not regarded simply as a great church—it was the palace of the King of Kings; and there whatever pertained to the Divine Service was without scruple performed. In one part of the church the chancellor of the bishop could hold a Court of Justice, in another part the Convocation might be seen sitting, while again in the nave various processions were formed. Such being the principle, it was easy for godless men, using the name of God, to maintain that whatever a Christian man did was done in the name and by the authority of Christ our Lord. This gross misapplication of the principle could only be met by the practical wisdom of such a man as Sir Thomas Gresham, who emptied St. Paul's of the buyers and sellers by providing for them a more convenient habitation in the noble Exchange which he erected at his own expense. We have since then fallen into the opposite extreme; and instead of using our cathedrals for the purposes of education, and of all religious meetings pertaining to the Church, we confine their use to that of places of worship. While men were walking about the nave, the service in former times was continually going on in the chancel, into which the man of business would sometimes stray, and he who came to mock remained to pray. For public ceremonials the cathedral was easily prepared, for such ceremonials were so frequent that the materials were always near at hand. Of these ceremonials one of the most extraordinary as concerns the history of Grindal, in our estimation, is that which was connected with the funeral of the Emperor Ferdinand on October 3, 1564. The Emperor Ferdinand I., a younger brother of Charles V., was born in 1503, and was married to Anne,

Royal Exchange  
built by  
Sir Thomas  
Gresham.

Celebration of the  
funeral of  
the Emperor  
Ferdinand at  
St. Paul's.  
1564.

sister to Lewis, King of Bohemia, in 1521. Three years afterwards he was elected King of the Romans, and succeeded to the Empire upon the abdication of his brother in 1558. Dying at Vienna, July 26, 1564, he was buried at Prague.\* According to the custom in different nations, the funeral of the emperor was celebrated by the queen's command at St. Paul's Church on October 3. A magnificent hearse was erected in the choir, which itself was hung in black, with the escutcheons of his arms of sundry sorts.

The Archbishop of Canterbury attended, accompanied, as of yore, by the Bishop of Rochester, who acted also as High Almoner of the queen. The Dean of St. Paul's and the members of the Chapter were conducted to their several stalls; there was a numerous attendance of the nobility. The sermon was preached, as we have before remarked, by Bishop Grindal; it has been preserved, and is published with his other remains. It is an interesting document, as Grindal was certainly one of the first preachers of his age. He took his text from St. Matthew xxiv.: "Therefore be ye also ready, for the Lord will come at an hour which ye think not on." Having applied the text generally to his audience, warning them of the uncertainty of life, he gives a brief history of the Emperor, who was, he says, created Archduke of Austria on the death of his grandfather,—“the only Archduke of the world, so far as I have read or heard;” he was said to be not so much addicted to the Roman religion as some persons have supposed. His remarks upon this subject are worthy of notice at a period like the present, when one of our Royal Family has just allied himself to a Christian lady who has been educated according to the forms of the Greek Church. Grindal observes of the

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Sermon  
preached  
by  
Grindal.

\* 'Modern Universal History,' vol. xi. 'Grindal's Remains,' p. 3.

CHAP.  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Emperor Ferdinand, "It will be objected, peradventure, that this prince, thus commended, dissented from us in religion; and an answer therein required. I answer, that the matter of religion is a matter of great weight indeed, and such a matter we must commend unto God only. Let us, whom God in His mercy hath lightened with the bright beams of His Gospel, render unto Him most hearty thanks for the same." He then concludes with an eloquent exhortation to his audience to prepare themselves for the inevitable hour.\*

Bishop Grindal had much to depress and more to annoy him about that time. The Duke of Somerset, the celebrated reformer in the reign of Edward VI., having pulled down sundry parish churches for the erection of Somerset House—on the one hand the bishop had to contend against the court, which retained possession of Somerset's robbery, and on the other hand he had to listen to the complaints of the people robbed of their churches and their parochial rights. With respect to the latter he obtained accommodation for the injured parties by an agreement with the Master of the Savoy. He was also put to inconvenience by an attempt of his predecessor Bonner to obtain restitution of the see now occupied by Grindal. Bonner was himself treated with consideration and kindness, and seems in the end to have been contented with his situation. His refusing the oath of supremacy, though he had sworn to it under two former kings, rendered it impossible for him to obtain his forfeited see; and he soon learnt that it was for his advantage to be regarded as a prisoner within the precincts of the Queen's Bench, where he was defended from the rage

\* The whole sermon may be found in 'Grindal's Remains' (p. 3) and is well worthy of perusal.

and violence of persons to whom, by the persecution of their kindred, he had rendered himself obnoxious.

It was not considered necessary, at that time, when an ecclesiastic was consecrated to a bishopric, to confer upon him the degree of Doctor in Divinity. It was an university honour, to be conferred, not on ecclesiastical rank, but rather on intellectual merit. Grindal, however, could demand his Doctor's degree, and to that degree he proceeded on the 10th of April, 1564. It was probably thought that his degree would have conduced to the sustentation of his character as an author; for about this time he was much engaged in literary pursuits. He took his degree just before the publication of his sermon at the Emperor's funeral. He probably desired to give weight to a work on which he was engaged by the wish of the archbishop and the command of the government. In the year 1563 the plague broke out with great vehemence in Kent. It soon extended to London and other places of the kingdom, having originated with the army just returned from Newhaven or Havre de Grace. Grindal drew up and published a form of prayer and fasting suitable to the occasion; and on the abatement or suppression of the plague he prepared suitable forms of thanksgiving. In the life of Parker it has been remarked that, although the archbishop accepted the form, probably having no time to compose one himself, he thought the prayers too long; and certainly they were defective in that conciseness, terseness, and sacred rhythm for which all ancient liturgies are distinguished.

It would appear that Grindal had better notions when treating the subject theoretically than when he was actually engaged in the duty he had undertaken to perform. His letter upon the subject, addressed to Cecil,

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
takes his  
Doctor's  
degree,  
April 10,  
1564.

Appear-  
ance of the  
plague in  
Kent and  
London.

Prayers  
and  
thanks-  
giving.  
drawn up  
by Grin-  
dal.

CHAP.  
XIX.

is so worthy of perusal that I am tempted to present it to the reader. It is as follows :—

Edmund  
Grindal.1575-6—  
1583.Grindal's  
letter to  
Cecil.

" July 30, 1563.

" I had somewhat thought of some preparations for common prayer, &c., afore I received your letters, and had written to Mr. Dean of Paul's to write an homily meet for the time, which he hath done; but I meant it then for mine own cure. Now, upon your admonition, by help of Mr. Dean, who was luckily with me at the receipt of your letters, I have proceeded further, and send you herewith a copy of that which is done.

" After ye have considered it, if ye think so good, it may be sent speedily to my lord of Canterbury by one of Jugg's men, and so returned to the printer.

" 1. It is to be considered by you, in what form the fast is to be authorised, whether by proclamation, or by way of injunction, or otherwise; for it must needs pass from the queen's majesty.

" 2. Item, Whether any penalty is to be prescribed to the violators thereof, or no.

" 3. Item, Whether ye will have it general through the realm, or but in this province.

" 4. Item, To add, diminish, or amend the form and circumstances of fast devised here.

" The last week I sent order to London for exhortations of diligent coming to their parish churches on these days, and also for private prayer and abstinence: but some are offended that we have not general assemblies, as we did in the time of unseasonable weather; which I think not meet for fear of spreading the infection. If it seem so to you, it were not amiss that an admonition were annexed, that in cities infected general concourses be forborne; and moderate assemblies, as of those that be



of one parish, to meet at their parish churches, to be more commendable.

“The sentences or psalm which ye wished to be revised are not altogether ready; they shall be finished this night.

“The homily is also not fair written; but of that ye cannot doubt, knowing the author.

“If this fast be concluded, I doubt not but the court will give good example. I could also wish a good portion of that which should be spared hereby in weekly provision should be bestowed in the back lanes and alleys of London, and amongst the poor strangers; for these are the sorest visited.

“If ye send any order to my lord of Canterbury, if the messenger come by me, I shall deliver him the homily and the sentences; or else send them to you to-morrow morning. God keep you!

“From Fulham, 30 Julii, 1563.

“Yours in Christ,

“EDM. LONDON.

“To the Honourable Sir William Cecil, Knight,  
Secretary to the Queen’s Majesty.” \*

In the Synod of 1562 the Bishop of London took an active part in one of the most important convocations held during the Reformation period. At this synod, in addition to many important decisions on points of discipline and government, the Thirty-nine Articles were passed, together with the Second Book of Homilies. Some objectionable regulations were made with respect to the vestments of the clergy and the decoration of the sacred building, and the removal of organs and “curious singing” was decreed, together with “that superfluous ringing of bells at All-Hallowtide and on All Saints’ Day.” No

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Convoca-  
tion, 1562.

Convoca-  
tion of  
1562.

\* Remains, p. 258.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

peal was to be sounded above the space of one hour after the death of any person, and at the interment about half-an-hour. All peculiar jurisdiction was to be extinguished, and the whole jurisdiction of the churches in every diocese was to be restored to the bishop of that diocese. This enactment was not carried into effect till our own time; and indeed the same observation may be made with respect to any enactment except to such as related to the Articles and Homilies. Grindal does not seem himself to have advanced anything requiring special observation—he had, in fact, two objects in view: to support his friend and benefactor the archbishop from the unjust and cruel assaults of the Puritans; and, on the other hand, to have laboured for the conciliation of the Puritans by unjustifiable concessions, to some of which allusion has just been made. It happened to him as it generally happens to men of a vacillating and inconsistent turn of mind, that though personally esteemed, he offended all parties, and acted like the politician who, instead of looking primarily if not exclusively to the truth as it is in Jesus, desired simply the promotion of peace. The Puritans were always intruding on his good nature, and no prelate was more praised by them. At the same time we observe that there was certainly no prelate whose kind and gentle disposition was more annoyed by their systematic opposition to his doing what they considered to be inconsistent with his principles and profession.

Grindal de-  
signed for  
the Arch-  
bishopric  
of York.

Although Archbishop Parker retained a personal attachment to his friend, yet he did not hesitate to declare that he wanted a supporter in the diocese of London, more firm in his character and more decided in his mode of action than he found in Grindal. The diocese of York remained vacant for some time, owing,

it may be presumed, to the desire of Parker to obtain a translation for his friend: at all events, he admitted that this was an event which he greatly desired. But before we follow Grindal to York, we must revert to the most important event of his episcopate—his diocesan visitation. This event took place in 1561. In the afternoon of the 1st November he preached at St. Paul's Cathedral before the lord mayor, aldermen, and all the crafts of London, in their liveries, with fourscore men who carried torches. It was thus that the Corporation thought fit to do him honour. This was at the conclusion of his visitation at the cathedral, which had opened on the 17th of the preceding April. In the forenoon of that day, the dean, Alexander Noel, and the several dignitaries of the church, with the lesser canons and vicars choral, repaired to the great chamber of the bishop's palace in their surplices, and here they were received by his lordship arrayed in his episcopal habit—namely, a rochet and chimere. After some discourse with him they followed him to the cathedral, which he entered by the west door. The doors being thrown open, a procession took place into the choir. Here the bishop was seated in the dean's stall, and the ministers sang the suffrages or litany. The bishop, after the names of the clergy of the cathedral had been called over, delivered a discourse in English, declaring the causes of his visitation. Those who had neglected attendance without excuse were denounced as contumacious. Before this time the minor canons had been accustomed to have a common ordinary. Those who had availed themselves of the permission of the Church to marry, now complained of the hardship of having to leave their wives and families to act in accordance with this regulation; but it was found by ordinances of the dean, formerly made, that

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

His  
visitation  
of 1561.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

married canons should not be bound to be present at the common table. They were permitted to have their meals at home, and they were supplied with “convenient victuals.” The bishop then proceeded to visit the various churches in the city of London, beginning at St. Bridget’s on Monday, April 21st, and holding his fourth session at St. Magnus the Martyr on the 24th of April. From the city of London he went to Essex, Hertfordshire, and to other parts of Middlesex. The visitation of the diocese occupied sixteen sessions. The hardships of travel were great in those days compared with what they now are; but he was able to return to London in the space of twelve days. In rectifying the abuses which had come to light, he was obliged to call in the assistance of Huyck, his vicar in spirituals. The visitation was resumed on the 6th October, and Dr. Huyck, acting by the bishop’s authority, admonished the prebendaries and other members of the Church that they should every one attend diligently and daily the divinity lecture delivered at St. Paul’s; that they should be personally present in the choir of the said church in the time of divine service; and that they should make provision that their cures, if they had any, should be served by others; that they should communicate on the festival of our Lord’s Nativity; and that the vergers should be diligent in keeping order in the church, applying, if any difficulty occurred, to the mayor of London to assist them in enforcing discipline. Again in April, 1562, the bishop came personally to his cathedral, and again committed it to his vicar general. The visitation was not dissolved till the 16th of November, when the bishop was himself present.

Besides his attendance on the spiritual duties of his diocese, the Bishop of London was also employed in his judicial capacity, and thus was led to take part in the

secular affairs of the realm. One of these judicial proceedings is worthy of notice, namely, the commission which on the 31st of January was issued to him and others by the government to examine into the alleged marriage between Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, and the Lady Katharine Grey.\* To Grindal also was confided the custody of certain persons suspected of disloyalty to the government, and of avowing a desire to restore the superstitions of Romanism. Among these were Dr. John Feckenham, sometime Abbot of Westminster; Dr. Watson, the deprived Bishop of Lincoln; and Dr. Marshall, sometime Dean of Christchurch, Oxford. It is not necessary to seek for or to recite the names of all these persons; but when mention is made of the imprisonment of certain parties on the score of religion, it should be remembered, as has been before pointed out, that the chief hardship to which they were subjected was the being confined within certain limits. They who were condemned to the limits of this imprisonment enjoyed the comforts of life, even to the conversation of learned men, without being liable to any expense.

Grindal, like some of his predecessors, kept a good house at Fulham, and took much interest in his garden. His vines were so excellent that he was accustomed each year to send the first fruit of his grapes to the queen. The queen, it is well known, expected more expensive gifts from her courtiers. We shall not have occasion to mention these more in detail, but we find Grindal at different periods discharging his duty in this respect. In 1561, for instance, his new-year's gift to the queen consisted of twenty pounds in demi-sovereigns. These were enfolded in a red satin purse. He received in return a gilt cup with a cover, weighing 28 oz.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Certain  
suspected  
persons  
are  
confided  
to  
Grindal's  
custody.

Grindal's  
presents to  
the queen.

\* See Vol. iv. (New Series), p. 467.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Inconsist-  
ency of  
Grindal's  
character.

His  
treatment  
of Stowe.

His kind-  
ness to  
foreigners.

The inconsistencies of the bishop became more and more apparent as the difficulties of his position increased. On the one hand churchmen complained of his laxity; and his want of discipline was such that at length he received an admonition from the government requiring him to be more exact in the performance of his duty as a governor of the Church. At another time we find him unjustifiably stern in the discharge of his episcopal functions, panic-stricken by the course pursued by some of the Papists, who aimed at effecting a counter-revolution. One of the most arbitrary proceedings, occasioned to a certain extent by this alarm, was the treatment of the celebrated John Stowe, chronicler. We should have supposed that Stowe would have conciliated the feelings of a man of literature; but, on the contrary, we find that his study was ransacked by Grindal's orders for the purpose of discovering books supposed to be tainted by Popery. That some such books should be found is only what we should have expected; the proper conclusion to be drawn from the fact being that the laborious and estimable collector who could boast of the patronage first of Archbishop Parker, then of Archbishop Whitgift, was a diligent enquirer after truth, from whatsoever side the truth presented itself to his mind. At the same time Grindal was not forgetful of the kindness he had received while he was himself an exile. His attention to those who had rendered him assistance extended beyond the reach of individuals, and displayed itself towards whole classes of society. Some of our merchants who had settled at Antwerp and other places under the dominion of Spain, were provoked by the repeated exactions and ill-usage on the part of the Spaniards. They thought, therefore, of leaving the Spanish territory and of repairing to Embden, as the most convenient place for the free exer-

cise of religion and for carrying on their business. They made Grindal their friend, and he readily acted as their mediator with Queen Elizabeth. He received the agent appointed by the Count and Countess of East Friesland; he helped them to settle their affairs; and he had the pleasure of soon seeing the merchants who had assisted him in Queen Mary's reign, forming a new settlement under the protection of her sister.

Grindal was in a difficult position. In private he sympathised to a very considerable extent with the Puritans, but in public he had frequently to proceed against them in order to do his duty as an ecclesiastical magistrate by the queen and the archbishop. This circumstance probably rendered him doubly obnoxious to the Puritan party. In private he conversed with them as one whose views scarcely differed from their own, but against the Puritans as a party he sided with their opponents; and the consequence was that they regarded him as hypocritical and insincere. The violence of the Puritans had evidently alarmed the hierarchy; and while the latter agreed with the court on the desirability of enforcing the ecclesiastical laws, they were afraid to act till orders came from head-quarters complaining of their laxity. What may be said of the hierarchy at this time, and to a certain extent at the present day, may be asserted of the bishops in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. They on the one hand desired to reform the Church, making as little alteration in the inherited forms and ceremonies as was possible, consistent with Scriptural principles. The Puritans on the other hand wished to overthrow the Church and establish a sect to be conducted on the principles of John Calvin. The archbishop and the queen at length perceived that, if the Church was to be

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

His con-  
duct to-  
wards the  
Puritans.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Parker  
calls upon  
Grindal for  
more con-  
formity  
in his  
diocese.

retained, they must proceed to decided action and assert the truth, instead of seeking to conciliate the Separatists.

The archbishop transmitted to his suffragans the letters he received from the queen and her advisers. These letters bore hardly upon Grindal, for in the diocese of London the neglect complained of was most prevalent. There were many in his diocese who refused to wear the surplice, the tippet, and the square cap, denouncing them as the emblems of superstition and Popery; and not a few declined to use the other ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. The archbishop felt that the misconduct of the London clergy would lead to the misbehaviour of the clergy in the other dioceses, and he therefore became more and more urgent in calling upon the Bishop of London to exert himself—the more so because the bishop was slow in his proceedings.

Grindal became less reluctant to act when he observed the ignorance and the obstinacy displayed by many who in their opposition were most inconsiderate and violent. Of these clergy, some were sequestered, others suspended, and a few deprived. The sword now used cut both ways. What was demanded was conformity, and the chief nonconformists were Papists.\* The latter, to avoid imprisonment, frequently proceeded to foreign parts; the Puritans, being now many in number, remained at home, hoping by a consistent opposition to oust the

\* Nonconformists. The Roman Catholics seceding from the Church in England are justly styled nonconformists: their ministers are regularly ordained clergy, who are not called to submit to any ceremony when they think proper to conform to the rites of the English Church. For Protestant dissenting ministers to assume the title of nonconformists is contrary to all Church principle. They are not ordained clergy, and could not therefore conform if they would: before they could conform they would have to be ordained.



orthodox and to assume their places. The point Grindal wished to establish was, that, even if he admitted them to be in the right in standing opposed to the ceremonials of the Church, in the observance of those ceremonials there would be no violation of principle, and that for the sake of expediency, obedience should be rendered to the ecclesiastical authorities.

During his exile Grindal had formed a friendship, to the detriment of his principles, with some of the leading Protestant sectarians, especially with those who were more or less under the influence of John Calvin. Their opinions had considerable weight with him; and as they professed to be extreme Protestants, he hoped and expected that an expression of their opinions would bring the majority of their admirers in England to pursue the same course as he had himself taken. He corresponded therefore with Bullinger and other foreign theologians. It would be amusing, if it were not humiliating, to see how quietly these foreign theologians assume a superiority over our English divines. They condemned the Church in England when an attempt was made to reform it, simply because the accordance between the Church and their sects was found to be slight. We shall give the following quotation from a letter written by Bullinger to Bishops Grindal and Horne, which will show how grossly the English Reformation was misrepresented to the foreigners, and how impossible it would have been, with a due regard to the peace of the country, to act on their suggestions.

“ We have now heard, though we hope the report is false, that it is required of ministers either to subscribe to some new articles, or to relinquish their office. And the articles are said to be of this kind; that the measured chanting in churches is to be retained, and in a foreign

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal's  
friendship  
with  
foreign  
sectarians.

Bullinger's  
letter to  
Bishops  
Grindal  
and Horne,  
1566.

CHAP.  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

language, together with the sound of organs; and that in cases of necessity women may and ought to baptize infants in private houses: that the minister also ought to ask the infant presented for baptism the questions that were formerly proposed to the catechumens; that the ministers too, who perform the office of baptism, must use breathings, exorcisms, the sign of the cross, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers, and other things of this kind; that ministers are to teach, that in the receiving of the Lord's supper kneeling is necessary (which has an appearance of adoration), and that the bread is not to be broken in common, but that a small morsel is to be placed by the minister in the mouth of every communicant; and that the mode of spiritual feeding, and of the presence of the body of Christ in the holy supper, is not to be explained, but to be left undetermined. It is stated, moreover, that as formerly all things were to be had at Rome for money, so now there are the same things for sale in the court of the metropolitan; namely, pluralities of livings, licences for non-residence, for eating meat on days forbidden and during Lent, and the like, for which no permission is granted without being paid for: that the wives too of the clergy are removed apart from their husbands (as if the living together of man and wife were a thing impure), just as was formerly the practice among the priests of Antichrist. They say, moreover, that no one is allowed to speak against any of these things either in public or private; and what is more, that ministers, if they wish to continue the exercise of their ministry in the churches, are under the necessity of remaining silent under these grievances: so that all the power of church government or authority rests solely with the bishops, and no pastor is allowed to deliver his opinion in ecclesiastical affairs of this kind.

“ If these things are true, they will indeed occasion exceeding grief, not only to us, but to all godly persons. And we pray the Lord to efface these blemishes from the holy Church of Christ which is in England, and to prevent any of the bishops from dismissing from his office any pastor who shall refuse either his assent to, or approval of, articles of this kind. And although we entertain the most entire persuasion concerning your piety and sincerity, that, if any of these things are now in use (for we can scarcely believe that things so gross exist among you), you are only tolerating and conniving at them until the opportune assembling of the great council of the realm, when fit and prudent measures may be taken for the abolition of superstition; and if there be any who pervert that letter of ours for the purpose of confirming any abuses, yet you yourselves are not of the number of such persons; nevertheless, we exhort your reverences by the Lord Jesus that, if the case be as is reported, you will consult with your episcopal brethren and other holy and prudent men touching the amendment and purification of these and similar superstitions.”\*

It may be interesting to read an account of the state of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation, as we find it in the ‘Zürich Letters.’ It is not necessary to refute the errors; they are self-evident and often absurdly untrue.

*The State of the Church of England as described by  
Percival Wiburn.*

“ 1. The English clergy consist, partly of the parish priests, who still retain their former office, and partly of ministers lately ordered and admitted by some bishop

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—

1583.

Account of  
the Church  
of Eng-  
land.

\* ‘Zürich Letters,’ 1st series, p. 358.

CHAP.  
XIX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

there, at his pleasure; but a certain form of ordering ministers by the bishop is drawn up by public authority.

“ 2. The different orders of the clergy are still retained, as formerly in the papacy; namely, two archbishops, one of whom is primate; after them are the bishops; then deans and archdeacons; and last of all, rectors, vicars, curates, &c.

“ 3. Whoever desires to serve a church there must previously obtain licence in writing from the lord bishop or his deputy.

“ 4. No pastor is at liberty to expound the scriptures to his people without an express appointment to that office by the bishop.

“ 5. Few persons there are called to the ministry of the word by reason of any talents bestowed upon them; great numbers offer themselves; whence it comes to pass that not very many are found qualified for this function.

“ 6. No one is admitted to any ecclesiastical function, unless he acknowledge the queen to be the supreme head of the Church of England upon earth. There is no great difficulty raised about any other points of doctrine, provided the party is willing to obey the laws and statutes of the realm.

“ 7. Ministers now protest and promise that they will observe and maintain the laws of their country, as being good (as they are called) and wholesome, as well in matters external and political, as in the rites and ceremonies of the church, and all things which are there customary and in use; and this too they must attest by their manual subscription.

“ 8. It is provided by the laws that no one shall impugn the English liturgy either by word or writing; and that no minister, by whatever name he may be called, may use in public any other mode or form either in the

prayers or administration of the sacraments than what is there described.

“ 9. This book of prayers is filled with many absurdities (to say no worse of them) and silly superfluities, and seems entirely to be composed after the model and in the manner of the papists ; the grosser superstitions, however, being taken away.

“ 10. The greater part of the Canon law is still in force there, and all ecclesiastical censures are principally taken from it.

“ 11. Excommunication there depends upon the decision of a single individual, to wit, the bishop, his chancellor, the archdeacon, commissary, official, or any judge of the ecclesiastical court ; and is for the most part inflicted for mere trifles, such as pecuniary matters and other suits of that nature.

“ 12. The sentence of excommunication pronounced by the judge is forwarded to some pastor, who is required to read and pronounce it publicly in his church, before a full congregation.

“ 13. The party excommunicated, when the judge is so inclined, and often too against his will, is absolved in private, and without any trouble, for a sum of money.

“ 14. The marriage of priests was counted unlawful in the times of queen Mary, and was also forbidden by a public statute of the realm, which is also in force at this day ; although, by permission of queen Elizabeth, clergymen may have their wives, provided only they marry by the advice and assent of the bishop and two justices of the peace, as they call them.

“ 15. The lords bishops are forbidden to have their wives with them in their palaces ; as also are the deans, canons, presbyters, and other ministers of the Church, within colleges, or the precincts of cathedral churches.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6--  
1583.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

“16. Many difficulties have to be encountered in respect to marriage and divorce, because the popish laws are retained there as heretofore.

“17. In case of adultery even clergymen are not very severely punished; and it is compounded for by other parties with a sum of money, with the assent of the ecclesiastical judges, by whom the penalty is imposed. Some parties, clothed in a linen garment, acknowledge and deprecate their crime in the public congregation; and indeed the whole matter is altogether determined at the pleasure of the ecclesiastical judge.

“18. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the primate of all England, besides his episcopal court, has also his principal courts of Arches and Audience, as they call them, where ecclesiastical causes are determined. He has also the Court of Faculties, where, on the payment beforehand of a pretty large sum of money, licences are obtained for non-residence, plurality of benefices, dispensations for forbidden meats on the third, fifth, and sixth holiday, the vigils of the saints, Lent, and the ember days at the four seasons; for almost all these are seasons of abstinence from flesh: from hence, too, are obtained dispensations for solemnising marriage at prohibited seasons; and that even boys, and others not in holy orders, may be capable of holding ecclesiastical preferment; with many other things of this kind.

“19. Every bishop has his court for matters ecclesiastical, as has also every archdeacon, in which, as things are at present, there preside for the most part papists or despisers of all religion; and the other officers employed in these courts are of the same character: the consequence of which is, that religion itself is exposed to ridicule, the ministers of Christ are everywhere despised with impunity, loaded with abuse, and even sometimes beaten.

“20. Besides the impropriations of benefices, there are also advowsons, by which, while the place is yet occupied, the next vacancies of the livings are gratuitously presented to others by the patrons, or else sold by them at a price agreed upon; for this too is permitted by the laws of the country. And the power of patronage still remains there, and institution, as it is called, and induction, as in the time of popery.

“21. Many festivals are retained there, consecrated in the name of saints, with their vigils as formerly; perambulations on rogation-days; singing in parts in the churches, and with organs; the tolling of bells at funerals, and on the vigils of saints, and especially on that of the feast of All Saints, when it continues during the whole night.

“22. By the queen’s command, all persons, both men

*p. 62. l. 19. for the third, fifth, and sixth  
holiday, read Tuesday, Thursday and Friday*

the clergy, still remains in England, and prayers are said in the place accustomed in time of popery, unless the bishop should order it otherwise.

“24. Baptism is administered in time of necessity, as they call it, as is also the Lord’s supper, to the sick in private houses; and the administration of private baptism is allowed even to women.

“25. In the administration of baptism the infants are addressed respecting their renouncing the devil, the world, and the flesh; as also respecting their confession of faith; answer to all which things is made by the sponsors in their name.

“26. The party baptized is signed with the sign of the

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

“16. Many difficulties have to be encountered in respect to marriage and divorce, because the popish laws are retained there as heretofore.

“17. In case of adultery even clergymen are not very severely punished; and it is compounded for by other parties with a sum of money, with the assent of the ecclesiastical judges, by whom the penalty is imposed. Some parties, clothed in a linen garment, acknowledge and deprecate their crime in the public congregation; and indeed the whole matter is altogether determined at the pleasure of the ecclesiastical judge.

“18. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the primate of all England, besides his episcopal court, has also his principal courts of Arches and Audience, as they call them, where ecclesiastical causes are determined. He has also the payment beforehand

vights of the seasons; for almost all these are seasons of abstinence from flesh: from hence, too, are obtained dispensations for solemnising marriage at prohibited seasons; and that even boys, and others not in holy orders, may be capable of holding ecclesiastical preferment; with many other things of this kind.

“19. Every bishop has his court for matters ecclesiastical, as has also every archdeacon, in which, as things are at present, there preside for the most part papists or despisers of all religion; and the other officers employed in these courts are of the same character: the consequence of which is, that religion itself is exposed to ridicule, the ministers of Christ are everywhere despised with impunity, loaded with abuse, and even sometimes beaten.



“ 20. Besides the impropriations of benefices, there are also advowsons, by which, while the place is yet occupied, the next vacancies of the livings are gratuitously presented to others by the patrons, or else sold by them at a price agreed upon; for this too is permitted by the laws of the country. And the power of patronage still remains there, and institution, as it is called, and induction, as in the time of popery.

“ 21. Many festivals are retained there, consecrated in the name of saints, with their vigils as formerly; perambulations on rogation-days; singing in parts in the churches, and with organs; the tolling of bells at funerals, and on the vigils of saints, and especially on that of the feast of All Saints, when it continues during the whole night.

“ 22. By the queen’s command, all persons, both men and women, must reverently bow themselves in the churches at the name of Jesus.

“ 23. That space which we call the chancel, by which in churches the laity are separated by the presbyter from the clergy, still remains in England; and prayers are said in the place accustomed in time of popery, unless the bishop should order it otherwise.

“ 24. Baptism is administered in time of necessity, as they call it, as is also the Lord’s supper, to the sick in private houses; and the administration of private baptism is allowed even to women.

“ 25. In the administration of baptism the infants are addressed respecting their renouncing the devil, the world, and the flesh; as also respecting their confession of faith; answer to all which things is made by the sponsors in their name.

“ 26. The party baptized is signed with the sign of the

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed of the cross of Christ.

“ 27. The confirmation too of boys and girls is there in use, and the purification of women after child-birth, which they call the thanksgiving.

“ 28. In the administration of the [Lord’s] supper, for the greater reverence of the sacrament, little round unleavened cakes are re-introduced by the queen, which had heretofore been removed by the public laws of the realm, for the taking away superstition. Everyone too is obliged to communicate at the Lord’s supper on his bended knees.

“ 29. In every church throughout England during prayers the minister must wear a linen garment, which we call a surplice. And in the larger churches, at the administration of the Lord’s supper, the chief minister must wear a silk garment, which they call a cope; and two other ministers, formerly called the deacon and arch-deacon, must assist him to read the epistle and gospel.

“ 30. The queen’s majesty, with the advice of the archbishop of Canterbury, may order, change, and remove anything in that church at her pleasure.

“ 31. In their external dress the ministers of the word are at this time obliged to conform themselves to that of the popish priests. The square cap is imposed upon all, together with a gown as long and loose as conveniently may be; and to some also is added a silk hood.”\*

When a great struggle is in progress between two parties on great questions, the immediate battle is often fought on points apparently the most trivial. The real contest throughout Queen Elizabeth’s reign was whether the Church of England should remain Catholic with the abolition of certain errors introduced during the lapse of ages,

\* ‘Zürich Letters’ (2nd Series), p. 358.

or whether it should be converted, under the pretext of reform, to a mere Protestant sect, such as Calvin had established at Geneva, and his followers had propagated in different parts of the Continent. But in England the immediate controversy was brought to bear on the habits or ecclesiastical dress of the clergy, together with the ancient ceremonies which had not been abused for the purposes of superstition, and which the majority of the people desired to retain. The Catholics in our Church were desirous to retain as a proof of their Catholicism all the old habiliments, as well as the ancient rites, which could be purged from Popish superstition. Opposed to them appeared the Ultra-Protestants, whose object it was to abolish every feature of Catholicism in our Church, retaining at the same time the Church property, which they regarded as an endowment conferred by the State on one particular sect, to which, from the love of filthy lucre, they extended their support. It is on this ground that we have asserted that the contest about the ecclesiastical habits, the Sacraments, and Church ceremonies was of more importance than it appears to be to persons of superficial mind, with little or no observation.

Grindal and Horne determined to maintain their position in the Church, even though observances were forced upon them to which they did not concede their full approbation: hence the inconsistencies which made them sometimes unduly severe, and at other times disgracefully lax. In a letter to Bullinger they remark:—

“The sum of our controversy is this. We hold that the ministers of the church of England may adopt without impiety the distinction of habits now prescribed by public authority, both in the administration of divine worship, and for common use; especially when it is proposed to them as a matter of indifference, and when the

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Con-  
troversy  
concerning  
the dress  
of the  
clergy.

Letter to  
Bullinger  
from  
Bishops  
Grindal  
and  
Horne.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

use of the habits is enjoined only for the sake of order and due obedience to the laws. And all feeling of superstitious worship, and of the necessity [of these habits] as far as making it a matter of conscience, may be removed, rejected, and utterly condemned, both by the terms of the laws themselves, and the diligent preaching of purer doctrine. They contend on the other hand, that these habits are not on any account now to be reckoned among things indifferent, but that they are impious, papistical, and idolatrous; and therefore that all pious persons ought rather with one consent to retire from the ministry, than to serve the church with these rags of popery, as they call them; even though we have the most entire liberty of preaching the most pure doctrine, and likewise of exposing, laying open, and condemning, by means of sound instruction, errors and abuses of every kind, whether as to ceremonies, or doctrine, or the sacraments, or moral duties. We cannot accept this crude advice of theirs, as neither ought we to be passive under the violent appeals by which they are unceasingly in the pulpit disturbing the peace of the church, and bringing the whole of our religion into danger. For by their outcries of this kind, we have, alas! too severely experienced that the mind of the queen, otherwise inclined to favour religion, has been much irritated; and we know for a certain fact, that the minds of some of the nobility, to say nothing of others, diseased, weak, and vacillating, have been wounded, debilitated, and alienated by them. And who will venture to doubt but that the papists will lay hold of this opportunity to send forth and vomit their most pestilent poison against the gospel of Jesus Christ and all who profess it, encouraged by the hope that an opportunity is now afforded them of recovering the Helen that has been stolen from them? But if we were to acquiesce

in the inconsiderate advice of our brethren, and all unite our strength illegally to attack the habits by law established, to destroy and abolish them altogether, or else all lay down our offices at once; verily we should have a papistical, or at least a Lutherano-papistical ministry, or none at all. But, honoured brethren in Christ, we call Almighty God to witness, that this dissension has not been occasioned by any fault of ours, nor is it owing to us that vestments of this kind have not been altogether done away with: so far from it, that we most solemnly make oath that we have hitherto laboured with all earnestness, fidelity, and diligence, to effect what our brethren require, and what we ourselves wish. But now we are brought into such straits, what is to be done (we leave you to conjecture, who are prudent, and sagacious in foreseeing the impending dangers of the churches), but that since we cannot do what we would, we should do in the Lord what we can?

“ We have hitherto then explained the matter in dispute, and which occasions so much disagreement among us, according to the real state of the case. Hear now what we have yet further to communicate. That report, if indeed it may be called such (for we know and commend your prudence and moderation), respecting the acceptance, subscription, and approbation of these new articles which you enumerate, is altogether a falsehood. Nor are those parties more to be depended upon who either in their written letters, or verbally in your presence, have under this pretext endeavoured to blind your eyes, and to brand us with a calumnious accusation. For almost all these articles are falsely imputed to us; very few indeed are acknowledged by us; and not one of them is obtruded upon the brethren for their subscription. We do not assert that the chanting in churches, together with the

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

organ, is to be retained; but we disapprove of it, as we ought to do. The church of England, too, has entirely given up the use of [prayers in] a foreign tongue, breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers, and other things of that kind, which, by the act of parliament, are never to be restored. We entirely agree that women neither can nor ought to baptize infants upon any account whatever. In the receiving of the Lord's supper, the laws require, custom sanctions, and our Anglo-Louvaine calumniators in their reckless writings bear us witness, that we break the bread in common to every communicant, not putting it into his mouth, but placing it in the hand: they testify also to our explanation of the manner of the spiritual feeding and presence of the body of Christ in the holy supper. The wives of the clergy are not separated from their husbands; they live together, and their marriage is esteemed honourable by all (the papists always excepted). Lastly, that railing accusation of theirs is equally false, that the whole management of church government is in the hands of the bishops; although we do not deny but that a precedence is allowed them. For ecclesiastical matters of this sort are usually deliberated upon in the convocation, which is called together by royal edict, at the same time as the parliament, as they call it, of the whole kingdom is held. The bishops are present, and also certain of the more learned of the clergy of the whole province, whose number is three times as great as that of the bishops. These deliberate by themselves upon ecclesiastical affairs apart from the bishops, and nothing is determined or decided in convocation without the common consent and approbation of both parties, or at least of a majority. So far are we from not allowing the clergy to give their opinion in ecclesiastical matters of this kind.

We receive, it is true, or rather tolerate, until the Lord shall give us better times, the interrogations to infants, and the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the Lord's supper; also the royal court of faculties, or, as they call it, of the metropolitan. We publicly profess, and diligently teach, that questions of this kind are not very suitable to be proposed to infants, notwithstanding they seem to be borrowed from Augustine.

“We do not defend the signing with the sign of the cross the forehead of the infant already baptized, although the minister declares in set terms that the child is signed with the [sign of the] cross, only ‘in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed of the faith of Christ crucified;’ and though it seems to have been borrowed from the primitive church. We allow of kneeling at the receiving of the Lord's supper, because it is so appointed by law; the same explanation, however, or rather caution, that the very authors of the kneeling, most holy men and constant martyrs of Jesus Christ, adopted, being most diligently declared, published, and impressed upon the people. It is in these terms:—‘Whereas it is ordained in the book of prayers, that the communicants should receive the holy communion kneeling; yet we declare that this ought not so to be understood as if any adoration is or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine, or to any real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood there existing. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were horrible idolatry, to be abhorred of all Christians; and, as to the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of the true natural body of Christ to be at one and the same time in more places than one.’”\*

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

\* Zürich Letters, 1st Series, pp. 175, 181.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

From this correspondence we learn that although Grindal tolerated, yet he did not approve of chanting in churches, together with the use of the organ. He did not understand, as Catholics generally did, that in private, they prayed to God as children opening their hearts to their heavenly Father; that in their families they approached God as their Master; while in public worship they were subjects rendering homage to their King amidst a splendid ceremonial, from which superstitious practices were excluded. With respect to the adoption of prayers in a foreign tongue, breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers, and other things of that kind, these, he maintained, were already renounced. In like manner, he objected to the baptism of infants by women; though he did not actually refuse to tolerate a custom which had existed from time immemorial, which continued until the reign of James I. It was indeed strange to hear this practice called in question by the advocates of lay baptism.

Grindal denied what the Anglo-Louvain calumniators asserted of the English reformers, that they put the consecrated element into the mouth of the communicant, instead of placing it in the hand. He did not approve of the cross in baptism, but, as in other cases, he observed the ceremony because it was an ecclesiastical appointment and not worthy of condemnation.

We are not surprised, that the Puritans should seek to force further concessions from those prelates whose opinions accorded with those of Grindal and of the lukewarm Anglicans. A weak and vacillating policy challenges opposition. The lighted tapers here mentioned are those that, in former times, were used in baptism: it is clear that there was no reference to candles on the altar, for they, together with the crucifix and cross, would certainly



have been noticed, to conciliate the feelings of foreign Protestants, if any injunction had existed to prohibit their use.

In 1567, Grindal found a party among the Puritans prepared for an open rupture. They separated from the Church, formed distinct congregations, and rejected the Book of Common Prayer.

The government, alarmed at this act of rebellion, called upon Grindal and the other ecclesiastical commissioners to notice and prohibit these transactions. On one occasion upwards of a hundred of these dissenters met in Plummer's Hall under pretence of a wedding; but this excuse being thought too slender, about fifteen of them were committed to custody. The next day seven of them were summoned before the Bishop of London, the Lord Mayor, the Dean of Westminster, and other commissioners. In the course of their examination they objected to the form of the consecrated bread: their cavil was because the bread given consisted of wafer-cakes, which custom continued for a long time after the Reformation. The Puritans, however, objected that this was a near approach to the Roman Communion. The Bishop of London thought to silence them, by reminding them that the church of Geneva, for whose practices they expressed so great a regard, received the communion in wafer cakes. When, instead of promising to abstain from their meetings, they showed a determination to maintain their sentiments and their schism, some of them were remanded to prison, but they soon received a discharge.\*

Amid the general depreciation of sacred ordinances and sacraments, Grindal supported Archbishop Parker in seeking to secure reverence in the celebration of the Eucharist, and we must do the government the justice to

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Separation  
of certain  
Puritans  
from the  
Church,  
1567.

Reverence  
to the  
Eucharist  
enforced.

\* Collier's Church History, vol. vi. p. 443.

CHAP.  
XIX.

say, that this was certainly one great object with the queen and her councillors.

In 1568, Grindal was provoked to some harsh proceedings in the university of Oxford. The queen, by a statute of her prerogative, appointed as president of Corpus an ultra-Protestant named Cole. The fellows of the college, maintaining their privileges, refused to admit him, and elected a man of the name of Harrison. Harrison had, at one time, communicated with Rome, and his election, therefore, brought the college under suspicion of being popishly affected. Similar charges were laid against New College, and its distinguished nursery St. Mary's Winton College, near Winchester, where some of the greatest divines and statesmen have received their education. The Bishop of Winchester, himself puritanically inclined, instituted a visitation of these colleges, and made Cole president, although to give him possession he had to break through the gates of the house, which the fellows had closed against him. The bishop, exasperated, appealed to the Ecclesiastical Commission; and his letter of complaint was transmitted by the archbishop to the Bishop of London. To the disgrace of Bishop Grindal, that prelate wrote at the bottom of the letter the following words: "My Lords, I like this letter very well, and think as the writer, if by some extraordinary ready [means] that house and school be not purged, those godly foundations shall be but a nursery of adders' brood to poison the Church of Christ."\* Even supposing the charges to be true, he who was lenient towards the one extreme, ought not, as a just ruler, to have been violent, if not unjust, against the opposite extreme.

At this very time, Grindal was using his influence

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 197.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.  
Grindal's  
conduct  
towards  
certain col-  
leges at  
Oxford sus-  
pected of  
Popery.

with the government to obtain the liberation of certain Puritans who had been thrown into prison for holding conventicles. In doing this he was acting a praiseworthy part; for these poor men differed only from Grindal in being more consistent. They acted upon the principle which he admitted. He, under the advice of foreign Protestants, tolerated for a while what he thought to be wrong, under the notion that in process of time he would become sufficiently strong to remove what he thought to be errors of the Church: but here again we find his liberality to be one-sided. The inns of court were suspected of being more inclined to the practice of Popery than to the theories of Puritanism, and we find Grindal, who would be so tolerant to Puritans, urging Secretary Cecil to command the benchers that in calling men to the bar they should reject the adversaries of "true religion." Who was to decide what "true religion" at that time was? The character was denied to the Church of England by both Puritans and Papists; and in urging his way, Grindal could not fail to receive wounds from either side. As the Puritans had assembled at Plummer's Hall, so those who desired the restoration of certain Popish rites which the Church of England had rejected, had a gathering at Bath. They complained of the leniency shown to the Puritans, and Bishop Grindal himself is said to have felt deeply their ingratitude.

CHAP.  
XIX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
frees  
certain  
Puritans.

His intolerant conduct towards the Inns of Court.

## CHAPTER XX.

## GRINDAL ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

Parker makes interest to have Grindal appointed to the see of York.—Lord Henry Howard is a candidate for the office.—Letter from the Dean of York to Cecil.—His estimate of Grindal's character.—*Congé d'élire* from the queen.—Grindal's election, and confirmation.—He recovers certain possessions to the see.—Is feasted by Archbishop Parker.—His account of the state of the Church in the North.—His visitation in 1571.—His injunctions to the clergy and laity of his diocese.—Visitation of York Cathedral.—The queen designs to visit York.—Earthquake in the North.—Grindal's popularity.—His friendship with Spencer.—His share in the Bishops' Bible.

CHAP.  
XX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Parker  
makes  
interest to  
have  
Grindal  
appointed  
to the see  
of York.

GRINDAL was heartily tired of his position as Bishop of London; and Archbishop Parker felt that he should have more regard for his friend if he were removed to a greater distance. He made interest with the queen through Cecil, to have Grindal removed to the see of York, which had been vacant ever since June, 1568, by the death of Archbishop Young. There were many candidates for the office, and among them appeared the Lord Henry Howard, brother to the Duke of Norfolk—a fact worthy to be noticed, since some modern historians are found to speak with contempt of the ecclesiastical preferences of this age. Certainly neither prelate nor primate had that magnificence of power which had prevailed during the preceding centuries; but still the personage who ranked third in the House of Lords was not a man to be looked down upon in that age or in this. When the see was first vacant, Dr. Matthew Hutton, Dean of York

informed Cecil that the province stood in need of an able pastor, showing what qualifications he that was to be sent among them ought to have—viz. that he should be a teacher, because the country was ignorant; a virtuous and godly man, because the country was given to sift such a man's life; a stout and courageous man in God's cause, because the country otherwise would abuse him; and yet a sober and discreet man, lest too much rigorousness should harden the hearts of some that by fair means might be mollified; such a bishop, in short, as was both learned himself and also loved learning, that that rude and blind country might be furnished with learned preachers. Such a man, he said, was the Bishop of London known to be; and therefore it was his wish that Grindal should be translated to York.\*

The dean was not wrong in the estimate he formed of Grindal's character. Grindal was firm in the maintenance of his principles when once his principles were decidedly formed, although in the formation of them he was deliberate and slow. He was a conscientious man, and so afraid of doing wrong, that he often omitted to do what was right. Archbishop Parker said "that he liked well the removal of Grindal, for he reckoned him not resolute and severe enough for the government of London, since many of the ministers and people thereof, notwithstanding all his pains, still leaned to their former prejudices against all measures of reform." It is evident, however, that some time went by before the queen's mind could be finally settled upon the matter. By the original instrument in vellum of the Dean and Chapter of York, the *congé d'élire* addressed to them to choose a pastor for their church, bore date at Windsor on the 1st April, 1570. They, in their letters to the queen (April 11th), declare

CHAP.  
XX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6  
1583.

The Dean  
of York's  
opinion of  
Grindal.

Grindal's  
election,  
April  
1570.

\* Strype's Epistle dedicatory to the Life of Archbishop Grindal.

CHAP.  
XX.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.His con-  
firmation  
at Canter-  
bury, May  
22.

their election of Grindal to be the archbishop of the province. Although, as has been said, the vacancy had taken place in 1568, the royal assent was not given until the 16th May, 1570. Grindal was confirmed in the cathedral church of Canterbury the 22nd May, under circumstances described in the life of Archbishop Parker.\* On the 6th June following the temporalities of the see were restored. Grindal succeeded in recovering to his see a house in Battersea, in Surrey, formerly appertaining to the Archbishop of York. Four score acres of land were attached to the building, and the whole establishment was useful for the archbishops when they came to Parliament or Convocation, or when they were required to give attendance at the royal court.

The Puritan notion of turning the Lord's Day from a feast to a fast, and calling it the Sabbath, was not at that time customary. When Archbishop Grindal, the Primate of England, waited upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of all England, the latter entertained him with a splendid feast on Trinity Sunday. The two archbishops and the three other bishops attendant at the time received the Holy Communion, a spiritual feast, in the morning. In the evening the shops were shut, business was laid aside, and creature comforts were added to the morning celebration. The body was feasted, the mind was instructed by the sermon, and the spirit was raised through the rites of the Church to participate in the joys of Heaven. In Yorkshire the new archbishop found some few of the gentry disposed towards completing the Reformation, but not so the commonalty. We have a description from the pen of the archbishop himself, who describes the state of the Church in the north when he undertook to preside over it. "I am in-

Parker  
entertains  
Grindal at  
Canter-  
bury,  
on Trinity  
Sunday.State of  
Yorkshire  
at this  
time.

\* Vol. iv. (New Series), p. 444.

formed," he says, "that the greatest part of our gentlemen are not well affected to godly religion, and that among the people there are many remnants of the old. They keep holydays and fasts abrogated: they offer money, eggs, &c., at the burial of their dead: they pray on beads, &c.; so as this seemeth to be, as it were, another church, rather than a member of the rest. And for the little experience I have of this people, methinketh I see in them three evil qualities; which are, great ignorance, much dulness to conceive better instructions, and great stiffness to retain their wonted errors. I will labour, as much as I can, to cure every of these, committing the success to God."\* Perhaps his grace would have done better to have waited till he knew more of the character of the Yorkshiremen before he thus addressed Mr. Secretary Cecil. Demesne land being here under less restraint than in London, he was able more effectually to propagate the principles of the Reformation, and apparently with considerable success. We infer this from a letter he wrote to Zanchius, from which, however, nothing of importance can be transcribed that has not been before advanced. Grindal always seems to have desired to act on synodal authority, and he took an early opportunity after his appointment to hold a visitation, which took place in the year 1571. The Archbishop of Canterbury transmitted to the Archbishop of York a copy of the Canons of Discipline, drawn up for the observance of the southern province. To these canons by some oversight the queen's authority was not obtained, and Grindal was afraid lest he should incur the perils of Præmunire, if he enforced them before he obtained the royal permission. He fell back therefore upon the authority which he possessed through the common law of the Church, as an

CHAP.  
XX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583!

Grindal's  
first visita-  
tion as  
arch-  
bishop,  
1571.

\* Remains, p. 325.

CHAP.  
XX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

The arch-  
bishop's in-  
junctions.

archbishop and metropolitan. He held his visitation, and in the charge he delivered, he inserted and enforced the articles in question.\* They are interesting as showing indirectly the condition of the Church at this period. The clergy were directed in the administration of the Communion not to put the consecrated bread into the people's mouths, but into their hands; the priests are likewise forbidden to use any ceremonies or gestures not appointed by the Book of Common Prayer; they were to refuse to marry any persons who were not perfect in the Catechism; all who sought the Holy Communion were required to repeat the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and they were not to be under the age of fourteen. The Holy Communion was to be received three times a year in addition to Ash Wednesday. There is something extremely remarkable, and I have not seen it accounted for, in the fact that the days appointed for the compulsory reception of the Holy Communion were not the festivals of the highest celebrity, but common Sundays. It was to be received on one of the two Sundays before Easter, on one of the two Sundays before Whitsuntide, and on one of the two Sundays before Christmas.

Grindal's propensity to Ultra-Protestantism was shown, among other things, by his abolition of stone altars. At burials any ceremonies which implied a belief in purgatory, together with all yearly commemorations of the dead, were forbidden. The ministers were not permitted to make any pause between the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion. They were to go through the whole service without break or intermission. No persons were allowed to wear beads, or to pray upon them, in Latin or English. They were

\* Collier, vi. 501.



not to burn any candle on the Feast of Purification, or to make the sign of the cross when at any time they entered the church.

On October 10, 1572, the archbishop held a visitation at the cathedral church of York, which was the beginning of his provincial visitations. He visited the cathedral again in 1575. In the regulations which he made for his cathedral, his diocese, and his province, the archæologist will read with interest what then took place, inferring the existence of certain ceremonials which by authority were then set aside. Through carelessness, Grindal was sometimes induced to take a sectarian view of his position, and instead of enquiring what was the ancient custom, to obtain information as to what was enjoined by modern legislation. In forming a new sect nothing may be observed but what is commanded: in reforming an old church, on the contrary, all things must remain as they were, unless express direction be given for their abolition or alteration.

In 1574 a report reached York that the queen would visit that city and be the archbishop's guest. Grindal communicated with the Archbishop of Canterbury as to the measures he ought to adopt to give her majesty a loyal reception. This drew forth a letter from Parker, who gave a description of what had occurred when he himself entertained the queen at Canterbury. Of this an account is given in the life of Parker.\* Grindal's conduct was praiseworthy in procuring for his diocese and province learned men for the cathedrals, and good preachers in the various large towns.

On February 26, about five o'clock at night, there was an earthquake in Yorkshire, Nottingham, and some other of the northern counties. No great harm was done,

CHAP.  
XX.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

His visita-  
tion of  
York  
Cathedral,  
1572.

The  
queen's  
intention  
to visit  
York,  
1574.

Earth-  
quake in  
the North,  
Feb. 26,  
1574.

\* Vol. iv. (New Series), p. 570.

CHAP.  
XX.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

but by reason of the concussion a general alarm prevailed among the people. It was feared that some public calamity might follow. In Archbishop Cranmer's time an earthquake took place at Croydon, and not long after King Edward died. Grindal evidently viewed the event superstitiously, and feared lest it might augur some evil to the queen. But Archbishop Parker only made the pious remark, that as to that prognostic, *It is the Lord: let Him do what is good in His eyes.*

By the encouragement of learning, and by saving from ruin certain charitable foundations, intended for the entertainment and relief of poor travellers, as well as by his general learning and courtesy to all who approached him, Grindal made himself deservedly popular in the north of England. He had the high honour of being permitted to regard Spenser as one of his friends, and by that illustrious poet his virtues have been recorded, and he himself was celebrated, as we shall hereafter show, by the name of Algrind. He had taken an active part while Bishop of London in the formation of what is known as the Bishops' Bible, and he probably when at York completed that history of the work that he had undertaken.

Grindal's  
share in  
the  
Bishops'  
Bible.

## CHAPTER XXI.

## GRINDAL ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

News of Parker's death.—The see is offered to Grindal.—His unwillingness to accept it.—His nomination, election, and confirmation.—Banquet at Lambeth.—Visitation of the Province of Canterbury.—Various enquiries made concerning the services and ceremonies of the Church.—Conformity of the clergy to the Thirty-nine Articles required.—Grindal attempts to reform the Spiritual Courts.—Congratulations from Cambridge.—Terrible earthquake in 1580.—Grindal's directions to the clergy through his archdeacon.—Fanaticism in the universities.—Case of David Thickpenny.—Sect of the *Family of Love*.—Ingratitude of Thickpenny towards the archbishop.—Grindal is threatened with blindness.—He contemplates resignation.—Harshness of the queen towards him.—Controversy between the queen and the primate concerning the 'Prophesyings.'—Grindal's letter to the queen thereon.—Elizabeth's behaviour to him at Court.—Leicester supports him for a time.—Sequestration of the archbishop.—Kindness of Lord Burghley.—Proceedings in the Star Chamber.—Grindal officiates at the consecration of certain bishops.—Convocation of 1580.—He renews his metropolitanical visitation, and appoints Whitgift as his deputy.—His policy in regard to politics.—The queen and Convocation.—Addresses from Convocation and from the bishops of the Southern province for Grindal's restoration.—The queen takes no notice of them.—Restoration of the archbishop.—His letter of submission to the queen.—His many infirmities.—His resignation and pension from the queen.—He wishes to retain the archbishopric until Michaelmas.—Refusal of the queen.—Value of the archbishopric.—Elizabeth wishes to nominate Whitgift.—He refuses during Grindal's lifetime.

CHAP.  
XXI.

In the year 1575, the news reached York of the death of Grindal's dear and honoured friend Archbishop Parker.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

CHAP.  
XXI.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.The see of  
Canter-  
bury  
vacant by  
Arch-  
bishop  
Parker's  
death,  
August  
1575.Elizabeth's  
policy in  
regard to  
Grindal's  
appoint-  
ment.

It was a serious loss, and especially to Grindal, who required that the many virtues of his gentle and kindly nature, tending to weakness of character, should be supported by the strong arm and vigorous character of Parker. For nearly six months the see of Canterbury remained vacant. The queen, applying the income of the archbishopric during the vacancy of the see to her own purposes, was by no means in haste to appoint a successor to her old friend. The queen's character evidently at this time underwent a change. She certainly appears to have been less determined to uphold the Catholic cause, and was evidently less scrupulous in the misapplication of the property of the Church. The Puritans also appear to have won their way with Cecil. At all events the queen was willing that the vacant see should be occupied by a character less firm and consistent than that for which Parker had been distinguished. Grindal was a courteous man, and his appointment was certain to be popular; the queen having confidence in herself that she would be able to compel to submission the two great parties into which the Church was divided, the Papists and the Puritans. It was determined therefore to offer the episcopate to Grindal; and though Grindal evidently demurred to the appointment, those were days in which it was not safe to refuse a royal offer. Besides the other reasons already mentioned, Cecil, now Lord Treasurer Burghley, desired the appointment of Grindal, if it were only to keep out an objectionable man. At a time when he had many opponents at court, he was glad to obtain a support and a friend in the new archbishop.

Grindal was the more unwilling to accept the high honour to which he was nominated, from a consciousness of his inability to discharge the duties with that determination and vigour which the times required. The

queen's wishes upon the subject had been communicated to the archbishop by the lord treasurer at Bishopthorpe. Fifteen days elapsed before Grindal could make up his mind and yield to the royal will. The archbishop at length stated that, after many conflicts within himself, he had sought to regard her majesty's express wishes in the light of a Divine vocation, beseeching the Almighty to assist him with His grace, if that weighty charge were laid upon him, to the sustaining whereof he found great insufficiency in himself.\* We may infer that his prayer was heard; for although his conclusions were not precisely those which we can commend, he henceforth showed a determination of character and a strength of principle for the possession of which he had not hitherto received credit. His nomination took place at the end of November, 1575-6, and on the 10th of January following he was elected by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury. He was confirmed on the 15th of February, the royal assent having been given the day before. For some reason or other the enthronization feast was again omitted at Canterbury. The age had become more refined, and the jovialities of the Canterbury feasts were not in accordance with its tastes. Grindal, therefore, preferred giving a splendid banquet at Lambeth, which was attended by a large concourse of the nobility and gentry, whose convenience probably had been consulted when the banquet was given so near the metropolis itself.

Archbishop Grindal entered at once and vigorously upon the high duties of his calling. He prepared immediately for a metropolitanical visitation in the province of Canterbury, and the preparatory articles addressed to the ordinaries have been preserved.† It may be interesting

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
accepts the  
arch-  
bishopic.

His  
nomina-  
tion, elec-  
tion, and confirma-  
tion,  
1575-6.

Banquet at  
Lambeth.

Grindal's  
visitation  
of the  
Province of  
Canter-  
bury.

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 283.

† They may be seen in Grindal's Remains, p. 157, and in Card-

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Enquiries  
made by  
the arch-  
bishop.

to notice some of the enquiries made by the primate. Enquiry was made whether the officiating minister in the several churches or chapels sang or said the common prayer distinctly and reverently without any kind of alteration; whether on Wednesdays and Fridays, not being holy days, the Litany was duly used; whether in each church or chapel the Book of Common Prayer, with the new calendar and a psalter, was provided for the parish; and whether a copy of the English Bible, in the largest volume, the two tomes of the Homilies, the Paraphrases of Erasmus translated into English, the table of the Ten Commandments, a convenient pulpit well placed, a comely and decent table standing upon a frame for the Holy Communion, with a fair linen cloth to lay upon the same, and some covering of silk buckram, or other such like, a fair and comely communion cup of silver, and a cover of silver for the same, which might serve for the ministration of the communion bread, were duly provided; likewise a decent large surplice with sleeves, a sure coffer with large lock and keys for the keeping of the register book, and a strong chest or box for the alms of the poor.

It was required that the Commination service should be used at divers times in the year, and that altars should be taken down and clean removed, together with the rood lofts. The churches and chapels, with the chancels thereof, were to be duly and sufficiently repaired; and the books introduced by the Romanists, and tending to the purposes of superstition, were to be utterly defaced, rent, and abolished. Enquiry was further made whether

well's Documentary Annals. It has been doubted whether the injunctions were subsequently put into force, as he was placed under sequestration before his visitation was completed. The articles are taken from a printed copy in the Cambridge University Library.

the parson, vicar, curate, or minister wore a cope, and whether he had recourse to gestures, rites, or ceremonies not appointed by the Book of Common Prayer—such as crossing or breathing over the sacramental bread and wine, or showing the same to the people to be worshipped or adored. It was asked whether, in the ministration of the sacrament of baptism, any oil and chrism, tapers, spittle, or any other Popish ceremony were adopted. Regulations were to be made with reference to the ringing or knolling of the bells on Sundays or holydays. Monthly or quarterly sermons were to be preached or provided for; and in the absence of a sermon, the Homilies were to be duly read.

The clergy were required to conform to the Thirty-nine Articles agreed upon by the clergy in the Convocation held in 1562. The rest of the articles had reference chiefly to the enforcement of minor details and the regulation of discipline.

In the visitation of other cathedrals the same principles were propounded, though applied to meet the altered circumstances of the case.

The fact that these articles, instead of being published by the Puritans, were for a long time concealed, leads to the supposition that the Puritans had discovered that, notwithstanding his kindly manner, Grindal had learned while at York the necessity of subjecting them to the discipline of the Church: that discipline was indeed, at this time, impugned by the Puritans, who, having passed from a condemnation of the ceremonials of the Church, now attacked episcopacy itself. Of this we shall hear more hereafter.

They raised an outcry against the ceremonies of baptism, and those observed in the churching of women. Offence was taken at organs and at church music as practised in the cathedrals.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
attempts  
the reform  
of the  
spiritual  
courts.

Archbishop Grindal, while he gave proofs of his intention of upholding the discipline of the Church, was, as we shall presently see, most anxious to remedy those evils which in the progress of reformation had not as yet been removed. Like several of his immediate predecessors he directed his attention to the reform of the spiritual courts, such as the Court of Arches, the Court of Audience, the Court of Faculties, and the Prerogative Court. But his reforms were not completed; and the abuses continued till the nineteenth century, when they were removed by persons who entertained no very friendly feeling towards the Church.

Congratu-  
lations  
from Cam-  
bridge.

The Archbishop was cheered and encouraged by receiving a gratifying address of congratulation from the fellows and other official personages of Pembroke Hall. It was penned in Latin; and expressed the gratitude of the college for some advantages lately conferred upon it, especially for an endowment of their college from the foundation of the school at St. Bees, for which that school was indebted to the munificence of the Primate. They expressed their pleasure at the affectionate manner in which, during the height of his honour, he was accustomed to speak of their house. They gloried in the honour incidentally conferred upon them, when the head of their house became Primate of all England; they pointed to the history of various sees which had been filled by dignitaries who had been educated at their college; and they prayed that the Divine blessing might rest on its future labours. The original letter in Latin, addressed to Grindal on his advancement to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, has been preserved, and may be found in Strype.\*

The remaining years of Grindal's life were full of

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 606.



trouble to himself, and he was obliged rather to suffer in the Church's cause than to benefit it any further by his labours. He shared with his countrymen the alarm which was occasioned in 1580 by another earthquake which then occurred, more terrible than any of those to which we have hitherto called the attention of the reader. He had appointed Dr. Redman his Archdeacon, and through him he addressed the clergy of every degree in his diocese and province. They were to exhort their parishioners to resort devoutly to their parish churches every Wednesday and Friday, and there, in addition to the other services of the day, they were to hear a sermon or a homily on fasting and repentance. They who did this of their own accord without constraint of law were admonished to spare, on these days, one meal at least to be dedicated to the relief of the poor. The master of every household was to convene his family every night to make humble prayer to Almighty God that He would show mercy to those who had justly deserved His anger.

With the reformation of the universities, and especially of his own University of Cambridge, he had soon after considerable work, and also in adopting measures against the recusants. The two extreme parties—the Puritans on the one hand, inflamed by fanatical preachers, and the Papists on the other hand, roused to insubordination and rebellion by the Seminary priests of Rome—were, from opposite quarters, and with different weapons, attacking the Church. Of this subject, however, it is not necessary, in the life of Grindal, to give a detailed account, for in the life of Whitgift these difficulties will come prominently forward, uniting in them the cases of Grindal as Bishop of London and as Archbishop of York. I may refer to the proceedings against a clergyman of the diocese of

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

The earth-  
quake in  
1580.

Grindal's  
exhorta-  
tions to his  
clergy.

Fanati-  
cism in the  
Univer-  
sity of  
Cam-  
bridge.

CHAP.  
XXI.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.Proceed-  
ings  
against one  
David  
Thick-  
penny.

Chichester, not only because the case is one of peculiar interest to the writer of these pages, but because they refer to a course of proceeding to which we are no longer accustomed or exposed. One David Thickpenny was the curate of Bighthelmstone, now Brighton, in the county of Sussex, in the diocese of Chichester. He had been inhibited from the performance of his sacred office by his diocesan, in compliance with the orders of his ecclesiastical superior, because he was supposed to have given reason to suspect that he was a schismatic of the *Family of Love*; a sect which, originating with Henry Nicolas, a mercer of Delft in 1540, was introduced into England in 1541. From his diocesan he appealed to the Lords of Council, and by them the case was referred to the metropolitan. When Thickpenny was convened before the archbishop, the Bishop of Chichester was present. He affirmed that Thickpenny had indeed been inhibited by him, but he maintained that for the inhibition just cause had been given. It was suspected on good grounds that Thickpenny was a favourer of certain heretics known as the *Family of Love*. The party accused openly declared that he was not connected with that sect—that in short he abhorred them. Against such an accusation as that brought against him by the Bishop of Chichester he was ready to purge himself, and submit to the order of reformation of the archbishop. His grace having heard the Bishop of Chichester, found that the bishop could bring no objection against Thickpenny by proof. He simply asserted his own unfounded suspicion as matter of fact. So that while the accused man denied the truth of the charge and offered to substantiate his protest by oath, the bishop had really very little to adduce against him, and the archbishop therefore moved him to restore Thickpenny to his forfeited cure. This the bishop refused to do,

Sect of the  
*Family of  
Love.*

whereupon the archbishop drew up a form, according to which Thickpenny should tender his submission to his bishop. He also warned him of the duty of submission to his ordinary and to the regulations of the Church. Thickpenny signed the Thirty-nine Articles; and when he had obeyed these injunctions, the bishop was required by a final order, issued on the 25th March, that within twenty days following David Thickpenny might be admitted to service and cure at Brighthelmstone. The archbishop acted without due consideration: he ought assuredly to have supported his own suffragan when exercising the discipline of the Church against a delinquent member of his own diocese.

Thickpenny showed his ingratitude by involving the archbishop in yet greater difficulties. Going to Brighthelmstone on the 1st April, he interrupted divine service that he might falsely declare that the appeal to the archbishop had been received by his grace, and that judgment was given against the Bishop of Chichester.\*

There were private reasons which may have influenced Grindal in regarding with satisfaction his translation to the see of Canterbury. The journeys of the northern metropolitan from York must have been not only wearisome, but attended by danger to a person who was beginning to feel, as Grindal did, the stealthy progress of certain internal complaints which, if they admitted of alleviation, were soon pronounced to be incurable, increasing with his advancing years. Yet journeys to London it was absolutely necessary that the Archbishop of York should sometimes take; for although he held his convocation at York, he had to attend the debates in Parliament, to render homage to the queen in her court, and to take share occasionally in the commissions which had relation

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Ingrati-  
tude of  
Thick-  
penny  
towards  
the arch-  
bishop.

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 292-6.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

to both provinces. It was at this time that coaches were introduced. But they were such ungainly vehicles, that he would still have to take his journeys on horseback or on a litter. In the shorter journeys, however, when he had only to move in his own diocese, and could act by commission in the distant places, he could avail himself of this new invention for the purposes of locomotion.

Archbishop Grindal was now looking forward to a season of repose in his old age. Some of the chief ecclesiastical concerns having been settled, he had friends in London who would assist in quelling the rebellious proceedings of Papists and Puritans. He was permitted to regard the queen as his friend, and to her support he looked as to a tower of strength.

In all these expectations, however, Grindal was doomed to suffer disappointment. His medical friends discovered a disease in his eyes, and were obliged ere long to admit that they could hardly hope to save him from entire blindness. To a man of refined tastes, who sought for the recreation he needed in literary and horticultural pursuits, this intelligence was sufficiently painful. He contemplated a resignation of his see; and by Lord Burghley and the queen it was gradually admitted that his retirement would be desirable. From the business of his high office he could not be saved, and he was frequently consulted by those who sought advice which, by a little exertion on their part, they might have been prepared to give. But what pained him most was the alienation of the queen from her ancient servant, and this soon passed into positive dislike.

His physical sufferings, though they could not be cured, might nevertheless be mitigated; but the anger of the queen, when once aroused, was not easily appeased. Elizabeth never forgave opposition to her power or to

Grindal at  
first sup-  
ported by  
the queen  
and her  
ministers.

Threat-  
ened with  
blindness.

Harshness  
of the  
queen.

her wishes. To Grindal's sensitive nature the continued and ever-increasing enmity of the queen was truly painful, exposing him to much distress of mind. His misunderstanding with her majesty, however, brought out his true character : and showed that when he could gratify his sovereign without a renunciation of his principles, he was content, though at the sacrifice of his own convenience, to do so. He made it manifest to those who were capable of being persuaded, that he refused to permit the divine to be merged into the mere courtier, or, in deference to the usurpations of the sovereign, to sacrifice the divine right of his episcopal office. This he maintained against his foreign correspondents as well as against some leading members of the Privy Council at home. There were several points on which a difference between the queen and the primate arose, and on which it is needless to dwell. Elizabeth, like many persons of a selfish nature, felt a kind of selfish pleasure in receiving adulation for the wealth or power she conferred on her flatterers ; being at the same time determined to retain a percentage upon what she bestowed or promised. She regarded the Church as the treasury from which, without taxing the people, her officers and servants might be paid. We have seen how that Grindal, on his first return to England, united with many of the bishops in protesting against these iniquitous proceedings, according to which she, who ought to have been the protector of the Church, was, so far as the Church itself was concerned, guilty of robbery and wrong. Endless disputes arose on this subject, and by these altercations the queen suffered her mind to be irritated, and even her angry passions to be roused.

Passing over these subjects, we will direct the reader's attention to the great controversy between the sovereign

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Firmness  
of the  
arch-  
bishop.

CHAP.  
XXI.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.Contro-  
versy be-  
tween the  
queen and  
the arch-  
bishop con-  
cerning the  
"prophesy-  
ings."

and the primate, which places the character of Grindal in a higher point of view than that which is usually taken.

Some of the worst troubles to which the archbishop was exposed originated in a certain religious exercise known in history as "prophesyings;" and which began when Parker was archbishop. Parker brought his strong mind first of all to see the evils incident to the exercise, and then to oppose it. To his vigorous intellect the queen very frequently deferred, although even he would not press the queen too far. The "prophesyings" were patronised by several of the bishops, and we, who live in the nineteenth century, find it difficult to understand in what the objection to these exercises consisted. In various places, the clergy would meet together for the purpose of indulging in a mutual exposition of Scripture, and of discussing together certain practical or difficult texts. One of the clergy was appointed to preside, and to sum up the substance of what had been debated. They called him the Moderator, and this perhaps was the first ground for suspicion or offence, for it was a title familiar to the ears of Presbyterians, but scarcely heard of in the Church. Grindal and several others of the bishops, on the other hand, took only a theological view of the subject. They could not understand what evil would result from a sifting of the grounds of their faith. They thought, on the contrary, that much good would ensue from the habitual argumentation which these discussions encouraged. The Reformation had been adopted by many as a mere party question, and the prelates wished it to be seen that much was to be said in favour of those reformations which the advancement of the age undoubtedly required. Without denying this, Archbishop Parker at once perceived, and the queen was soon made to understand, that the better educated clergy would

The  
queen and  
Parker's  
dislike to  
them.

bend the less educated to their will, and that it was easy to pass from theological discussion to political debate. Parker was aware, that he could not suppress these meetings without the aid of the queen, by whom however they were thoroughly disliked. Archbishop Parker addressed a remonstrance, therefore, to several of the bishops, and among them to Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich. Instead of obeying his metropolitan, Parkhurst remonstrated with him, and in his remonstrance he was supported by some of Her Majesty's Council.\* A desire was entertained by the courtiers and an attempt made to reverse what the archbishop had done; but Parker was not a man to be easily daunted, while, at the same time, he knew the different characters with whom he had to deal. He wrote a remonstrance and an admonition to Parkhurst; he caused it to be known that he was acting by the queen's command, and wished to be informed who they were by whom her majesty's orders were disregarded. This brought the controversy to an end, so far as Parker was concerned. No one had the courage to send in his name, and during Parker's episcopate the "prophesyings" were put down. At the same time it must have been painful for Parker so to act; for we find, in opposition to him the name of Coxe as well as Sandys, and the names of other men who he deservedly respected; but he never let private considerations over-rule his sense of public duty.

We may well be surprised to discover that Grindal could in such a case as this act with more determination than Parker; but it was not so much in determination and courage that Parker failed; he was rather influenced by the fear of leaving in the hands of his opponents, weapons which they would have used for the overthrow of the discipline of the Church as well as of

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Parker  
suppresses  
these  
meetings.

Contro-  
versy be-  
tween the  
queen and  
Grindal  
concerning  
the "pro-  
phesy-  
ings."

\* Strype's Annals, ii. 219, 322.

CHAP.  
XXI.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6--  
1583.

his principles. The queen demanded of the archbishop the suppression of the "prophesyings." Grindal remonstrated, by establishing more stringent rules and a stricter discipline. With respect to the direction of these assemblies, he thought that the evils might be corrected and the abuses guarded against. The queen, who evidently expected that Grindal would have yielded to her wishes under all circumstances, would here have no middle course, and required the "prophesyings" to be discontinued. Her orders were the more offensive since she required, that if there was not a sermon, a homily should be read; and against this course the Puritans, from the first publication of the two books of homilies, had protested. To the mandate of the queen Grindal boldly refused compliance. He insisted on his own rights as metropolitan, regarding them to be as sacred as any prerogatives of the crown. The queen, however, was not to be trifled with, and the archbishop was sequestered for the space of five years, the object being to prevent his grace from holding a Convocation, which, at that time, he was able to do by his own authority, without first obtaining the consent of the crown, unless the crown deprived him of the power of exercising his metropolitan jurisdiction.

Sequestra-  
tion of  
the arch-  
bishopric  
of Canter-  
bury,  
1577.Grindal's  
letter to  
the queen,  
December  
20, 1576.

The correspondence between the archbishop and the queen on this occasion is of such length that I cannot give it *in extenso*; but the following letter is so becoming on the part of a christian bishop to write to a sovereign professing christianity, that I cannot but present it to the reader with a slight abbreviation:—

“Bear with me, I beseech you, madam, if I choose rather to offend your earthly majesty than to offend the heavenly majesty of God. And now, being sorry that I



have been so long and tedious to your majesty, I will draw to an end, most humbly praying the same, well to consider these two short petitions following.

“The first is that you would refer all these ecclesiastical matters which touch religion, or the doctrine and discipline of the Church, unto the bishops and divines of your realm, according to the example of all godly Christian emperors and princes of all ages. For indeed, they are things to be judged (as an ancient father writeth) *in ecclesiâ, seu synodo, non in palatio*, i.e. ‘in the Church, or a synod, not in a palace.’ When your Majesty hath questions of the laws of your realm, you do not decide the same in your court, but send them to your judges to be determined. Likewise, for doubts in matters of doctrine or discipline of the Church, the ordinary way is to refer the decision of the same to the bishops and other head ministers of the Church.

“Ambrose to Theodosius useth these words: *Si de causis pecuniariis comites tuos consulis, quanto magis in causa religionis sacerdotes Domini æquum est consulas?*—i.e. ‘If in matters of money you consult with your earls, how much more is it fit that you consult with the Lord’s priests in the cause of religion?’ And likewise the same father to the good emperor Valentinianus,—*Si de fide conferendum, sacerdotum debet esse ista collatio; sicut factum est sub Constantino augustæ memoriæ principe; qui nullas leges ante præmisit, sed liberum dedit iudicium sacerdotibus*—i.e. ‘If we confer about faith, the conference ought to be left to the priests; as it was done under Constantine, a prince of most honourable memory; who set forth no laws, before he had left them to the free judgment of the priests.’ And the same father saith that Constantius the Emperor, son to the said Constantine the Great, began well, by reason he fol-

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

lowed his father's steps at the first; but ended ill, because he took upon him *de fide intra palatium judicare* —i.e. 'To judge of faith within the palace' (for so be the words of Ambrose), and thereby fell into Arianism: a terrible example!

"The said Ambrose, so much commended in all histories for a godly bishop, goeth yet farther, and writeth to the same emperor in this form: *Si docendus est episcopus a laico, quid sequetur? Laicus ergo disputet, et episcopus audiat; episcopus discat a laico. At certe, si vel scripturarum seriem divinarum, vel vetera tempora retractemus, quis est qui abnuat, in causa fidei, in causa, inquam, fidei, episcopus solere de imperatoribus Christianis, non imperatores de episcopis judicare?* — i.e. 'If a bishop be to be taught by a layman, what follows? Let the layman then dispute, and the bishop hear: let the bishop learn of the layman. But certainly, if we have recourse either to the order of the holy scriptures, or to ancient times, who is there that can deny, that in the cause of faith, I say, in the cause of faith, bishops were wont to judge concerning Christian emperors, not emperors of bishops?' Would to God your Majesty would follow this ordinary course! You should procure to yourself much more quietness of mind, better please God, avoid many offences, and the Church should be more peaceably and quietly governed, much to your comfort, and the commodity of your realm.

"The second petition I have to make to your majesty is this; that, when you deal in matters of faith and religion, or matters that touch the Church of Christ, which is His spouse, bought with so dear a price, you would not use to pronounce so resolutely and peremptorily, *quasi ex auctoritate*, as ye may do in civil and extern matters; but always remember that in God's causes

the will of God (and not the will of any earthly creature) is to take place. It is the antichristian voice of the pope, *Sic volo, sic jubeo; stet pro ratione voluntas*—i.e. ‘So I will have it; so I command; let my will stand for a reason.’ In God’s matters all princes ought to bow their sceptres to the Son of God, and to ask counsel at His mouth, what they ought to do. David exhorteth all kings and rulers to *serve God with fear and trembling*.

“Remember, madam, that you are a mortal creature. ‘Look not only (as was said to Theodosius) upon the purple and princely array wherewith ye are apparelled, but consider withal, what is that that is covered therewith. Is it not flesh and blood? Is it not dust and ashes? Is it not a corruptible body, which must return to his earth again, God knows how soon?’ Must you not also one day appear *ante tremendum tribunal Crucifixi, ut recipias ibi, prout gesseris in corpore, sive bonum sive malum?*—i.e. ‘before the fearful judgment-seat of the Crucified, to receive there according as you have done in the body, whether it be good or evil?’

“And although ye are a mighty prince, yet remember that He which dwelleth in heaven is mightier. He is, as the Psalmist saith, *terribilis, et is qui aufert spiritum principum, terribilis super omnes reges terræ*—i.e. ‘terrible, and He Who taketh away the spirit of princes, and is terrible above all the kings of the earth.’

“Wherefore I do beseech you, madam, *in visceribus Christi*, when you deal in these religious causes, set the majesty of God beyond your eyes, laying all earthly majesty aside; determine with yourself to obey His voice, and with all humility say unto Him, *Non mea, sed tua voluntas fiat*—i.e. ‘Not mine, but Thy will be done.’ God hath blessed you with great felicity in your reign, now many years; beware you do not impute the same to

CHAP.  
XXI.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

your own deserts or policy, but give God the glory. And as to instruments and means, impute your said felicity, first, to the goodness of the cause which ye have set forth; I mean, Christ's true religion; and, secondly, to the sighs and groanings of the godly in their fervent prayer to God for you, which have hitherto, as it were, tied and bound the hands of God, that He could not pour out His plagues upon you and your people, most justly deserved.

“Take heed, that ye never once think of declining from God, lest that be verified of you which is written of Ozeas [Joash], who continued a prince of good and godly government for many years together; and afterwards, *cum roboratus esset* (saith the text), *elevatum est cor ejus in interitum suum, et neglexit Dominum*—i.e. ‘When he was strengthened, his heart was lifted up to his destruction, and he regarded not the Lord.’ Ye have done many things well, but except ye persevere to the end, ye cannot be blessed. For if ye turn from God, then God will turn away His merciful countenance from you. And what remaineth then to be looked for, but only a terrible expectation of God's judgments, *and an heaping up wrath against the day of wrath!*

“But I trust in God your majesty will always humble yourself under His mighty hand, and go forward in the zealous setting forth of God's true religion, always yielding due obedience and reverence to the word of God, the only rule of faith and religion. And if ye do so, although God hath just cause many ways to be angry with you and us for our unfaithfulness, yet I doubt nothing, but that for His own name's sake, and for His own glory's sake, He will still hold His merciful hand over us, shield and protect us under the shadow of His wings, as He hath done hitherto.

“I beseech God our heavenly Father plentifully to pour His *principal spirit* upon you, and always to direct your heart in His holy fear. Amen.”\*

I have presented this letter to the reader, that he may judge for himself of the determination with which Archbishop Grindal could be roused to act when an attempt was made to depreciate the authority which pertained to him as metropolitan. A variety of letters between the queen, the lords of the Star Chamber, and Lord Burghley are in existence, but it is sufficient here to say that Grindal, until quite the close of his life, when he consented to make a qualified submission to the queen, maintained his firmness, and showed how impossible it was to compel him to act against his principles.

When the archbishop was at court, the queen attacked him personally upon the subject, and complained that the number of preachers in several dioceses was already too great. She probably only gave way to her temper, by giving the licence to her tongue to utter what she could not really believe to be true; but her speech was circulated among the Puritans, and is used as one of the arguments for calumniating her character. Elizabeth was so far in the wrong, that Leicester as well as Burghley ventured, as far as they dared, to support the cause of the archbishop, though the patronage of Leicester was not of long continuance. The archbishop felt deeply the insult offered to the Church; but, though he was ready to correct any abuses in the conduct of the “prophesyings,” he positively refused to suppress them, and the queen thought fit to transmit the case to the Star Chamber. She issued her orders to the other bishops, requiring them to put down the “prophesyings” in their several dioceses; but the archbishop himself was

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Leicester's  
temporary  
patronage  
of the  
Church  
cause.

Proceed-  
ings in the  
Star  
Chamber.

\* Strype's Grindal, pp. 570-574; Remains, pp. 387-390.

CHAP.  
XXI.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.Burghley's  
kindness  
towards  
Grindal.

ordered by the lords of the Star Chamber to confine himself to his own house, and he was sequestered for six months. Towards the latter end of November, when the six months were nearly expired, the lord treasurer sent a private and very kind message by Goodman, Dean of Westminster, to the sequestered archbishop. He gave him information as to the manner in which the Star Chamber would proceed against him, and offered suggestions as to how he should demean himself with respect to the offence he had given to the queen. His advice Grindal would not entirely accept, nor would he humble himself before the queen to the extent required. He did not think that he had done amiss, and he would not ask pardon, for to have asked pardon would have implied that he had committed a fault deserving of censure; neither did he present himself personally before the lords of the Star Chamber, but he commissioned Sir Walter Mildway to appear in his behalf, and to make as much of a submission as he thought to be consistent with the position of an archbishop of the Church of God. What he said did not satisfy the queen; he was not restored to his liberty, nor, as yet, to the exercise of his jurisdiction. As he felt, however, that without the support of the queen, he could not in those perilous times uphold the cause of the Church, he was therefore willing to resign his archbishopric, being the more inclined to do so because there was now no doubt that he would soon entirely lose his sight. There was evidently an inclination on the part of some of his opponents, and probably of the queen herself, to add insult to injury; as we find that in the January following they evidently thought of depriving him of his see instead of permitting him to resign it in a manner honourable to himself, and consistent with the canons of the Church. Grindal had now by his suf-

Grindal  
wishes to  
resign the  
arch-  
bishopric.

ferings become popular among churchmen, and they not only expressed their sympathy with him, but urged upon the court how much the insult offered to the archbishop would prove to the joy of Papists and to their encouragement. His opponents, too, found it impossible to prove that the conduct of the archbishop could legally or canonically subject him to deprivation; they perceived how such a measure would cause disgust in the Church generally, and it was determined to proceed more mildly, so that they were content to continue him under a sequestration *ab officio*.

It is difficult to ascertain the precise nature of his sequestration, as we find that during this time he officiated at the consecration of the Bishops of Exeter, Winchester, Lichfield, and Coventry: moreover, when in 1580 a Convocation was holden, though, owing to his infirmities, he did not personally attend, he took upon himself the principal part in the arrangement and conduct of its transactions. He drew up a scheme for preserving the authority of the Spiritual Courts with reference to excommunications; and he laid before Convocation a new form of penance, better calculated than the one which had hitherto been used, to punish the offender or to compel him to amend his conduct. He also renewed the metropolitanical visitation, which had been one of the first steps of reform which he took upon his appointment to the primacy. He seems to have determined to show that although he was willing to defer to the queen in all that related to state affairs, yet that there were many points on which an archbishop could act independently of the civil authority. When, through the circumstances of sequestration, he was obliged to do by deputy much that he would have wished to do in his own person, Grindal would not give unnecessary offence: he appointed as his

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

He officiates at the consecration of certain bishops, 1580.

Convocation, 1580.

Metropolitanical visitation continued, 1580.

Appoints Whitgift as his deputy.

CHAP.  
XXI.

deputy, Whitgift, Bishop of Worcester, who was in high favour at the court and with the queen.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Archbishop Grindal followed the example of his immediate predecessor, an example which his successor also followed, in not permitting himself to be involved in the world of politics. But to every rule exception must be made; and we may remark that during the occupancy of the see of Canterbury, some political events occurred to which we may probably trace the origin of that long course of unkindness and ill-temper which the queen showed towards the metropolitan. She vented her spleen on the weaker vessel.

The queen  
and Convo-  
cation.

Although the queen did not consult the Convocation on State affairs, the members of that body still retained the privilege, which from time immemorial they had possessed, of granting or of withholding a subsidy, and Elizabeth did not desire to be involved in any controversy with the clergy which might not conduce to the enrichment of her treasury. She did not consider it prudent to persevere in the opinion that she had at one time formed of depriving Grindal of his see. Although it is difficult to enter into the details of the royal politics at this time, yet it seems evident that a partial and short-lived reconciliation did take place between the queen and the archbishop. At all events, she received hints from various quarters that the hearts of her most loyal subjects were inclined to uphold the metropolitan in the assertion of his rights, and a debate arose in Convocation as to the best mode of approaching the crown on behalf of the metropolitan.

It was determined, at first, to decline entering upon any public business, or the grant of a subsidy, until the sequestration was taken off and the archbishop restored. But a fear of unnecessarily offending the queen prevailed



among the majority, and in order to secure unanimity it was resolved to approach her with a humble address for the archbishop's restitution. This address was drawn up in Latin by John Matthews, Dean of Christ Church; the Latin language being probably chosen as a compliment to the queen, as implying her familiarity with that language, which was generally adopted in the public documents of the age.\*

A letter to the same purpose was addressed to the queen by the bishops of the province of Canterbury. They earnestly implored her majesty to restore the archbishop to the full exercise of his authority. Of these addresses, the queen, it appears, did not condescend to take any notice. That an address was delivered by members of Convocation is certain, but Dr. Heylin, who has gone through the Acts of Convocation, says that he does not find it as an act of the corporate body. The queen, therefore, in all probability thought she was exonerated from noticing it.† The history both of the archbishop and of the Church, in all that relates to this period, is so complicated, that we are unable to produce a regular narrative.

It would appear that in the year 1582 the archbishop was to a certain extent at least restored to the exercise of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This is inferred from the circumstance that from this date the customary writs and instruments run in the archbishop's own name, without the names of his officials.

The poor archbishop was at this time afflicted with blindness, and all hope of recovery had vanished before the end of the year.

Although he did not by any action stultify his former proceedings, he thought he might express his sorrow for

\* Fuller's Church History, book 9, p. 428.

† Ibid., p. 220.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Address to  
the queen  
for the  
restitution  
of the  
arch-  
bishop.

Letter to  
the queen  
by the  
bishops of  
the pro-  
vince of  
Canter-  
bury.

Restora-  
tion of the  
arch-  
bishop,  
1582.

CHAP,  
XXI.

having offended her majesty, which, of all worldly calamities, was regarded by him as one of the greatest. Although he had refused to execute the queen's commands by reason of a scruple of conscience, when he thought that the exercises she wished to suppress were calculated, after proper reform, to effect much good to the Church; he formed a milder opinion of the course pursued by the queen when he received information that some of his own suffragans had asserted that in their respective dioceses more harm than good was done by the "prophesyings."

He besought her majesty not to suppose that his opposition to her wishes originated in an obstinate and disobedient disposition; but that all he desired was that she might perceive how, through good management, good results had followed from these exercises both in his own diocese and in the dioceses of those among his brethren who followed his example.\*

In writing thus, the archbishop was offering an apology for the queen rather than for himself. He merely conceded the point; but, while acting in accordance with the dictates of his conscience, he lamented greatly that he had given cause of offence.

While thus harassed in mind the blind old man was tortured by the colic and other inward complaints. Under similar maladies the lord treasurer himself suffered, and the two old men who had fought the fight of faith together in the days of their youth were now, in the midst of their sufferings, receiving support from the Saviour they loved and had endeavoured to serve. Grindal had long pined for resignation, and in January 1582 the queen sent Piers, Bishop of Sarum, and her almoner, to signify to the archbishop her pleasure that

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 403; Remains, p. 400.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal's  
letter of  
submission  
to the  
queen.

Grindal's  
infirmities.

Grindal  
resigns and  
receives a  
pension,  
1582.

on his resignation he should have an honourable pension for life.

Throughout his life Grindal was wont to pay reasonable attention to his worldly concerns; and while now signifying to the lord treasurer his readiness to resign, he hoped that he might be permitted to retain the archbishopric until the following Michaelmas, when the audit of the see was kept for the whole year. He also petitioned that he might retain the house at Croydon for his residence, together with a portion of land attached to it. He showed that, from time immemorial, one house at least of those belonging to the see might be assigned to a bishop on his resignation. For this statement he was able to quote authorities, for, like his predecessor, Archbishop Parker, he had been a student of the early history of the Church over which he was called to preside. Though the queen felt herself bound to accede to this request, yet with that littleness of mind which sometimes obscured her high qualifications, she yielded only a partial assent. After what had lately occurred in Convocation, and the commiseration generally expressed for the poor archbishop's sufferings, she was afraid of exciting a commotion; and though she permitted him to resign his see, she declared her will that the resignation should take place on Lady Day. The pension was to be settled by the lord treasurer, who urged it upon the queen that it ought to be great and honourable, although it would for the present be burdensome to his successor. He had estimated the value of the archbishop's possessions, and found them to be above 2,780*l.* a year, according to the rate of the Book of First Fruits. When we multiply this by ten, a large income is given to the archbishopric. Burghley proposed that Grindal should have seven or eight hundred pounds a year by way of

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal  
petitions to  
retain the  
arch-  
bishopric  
until  
Michael-  
mas.

The queen  
refuses the  
chief part  
of his  
request.

Value of  
the arch-  
bishop's in-  
come.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Whitgift  
declines  
the pri-  
macy in  
Grindal's  
lifetime.

pension, which during the short period of Grindal's life might be considered sufficient. Still there must have been some impediment to the completion of this work, for we find in April 1583 that the archbishop, deeply depressed by his bodily ailments, and weary of the burden that was laid upon him, again entreated the lord treasurer to accomplish the object of his resignation. It has been thought that the delay was occasioned by the inability of the queen to make up her mind as to the appointment of a successor to Grindal, whenever his resignation should be effected and his wish accomplished; but so far as Elizabeth was concerned she seems to have experienced no difficulty in this respect. She determined to nominate Whitgift; but he, looking to the history of the Church, declined to enter upon the see so long as Grindal was alive. He was kind, however, in rendering assistance to Grindal, who had retired entirely to private life, and who acted on that wise principle in which old age finds comfort: *oportet aliquod temp<sup>or</sup>is spatium inter negotia vitæ terminem intercedere.*

And here, before we enter into the consideration of his private life and his studies, we will, for a season, leave the poor blind old man, his body exposed to increasing pain, and his mind fixed where true joys only are to be found. A beam of comfort

Out of another world did gently break  
And whisper a sweet tale  
Of better things;  
A calm awaiting seemed to be  
O'er leaf and wave;  
A calm underswell so silently,  
For calmness of the grave  
Unrepining.

## CHAPTER XXII.

## DOMESTIC LIFE.

Grindal's horticultural tastes.—His present of grapes to the queen.—False report of the plague in his household.—Offence at court occasioned thereby.—Grindal's vindication of himself.—His controversy with Bishop Sandys.—His wish to do the queen due honour at York.—His friendship with Spenser.—His misfortunes described in the 'Shepherd's Calender.'—Grindal's 'Dialogue between Custom and Verity.'—His doctrine of the Real Presence.—List of his works.—His kindness to foreigners and to many English divines.—His patronage of the art of music.—His gifts to various schools and colleges.—His improvement of and care for his episcopal residences.—His will and testament.—He retires to Croydon.—His death, July 6, 1583.—His effigy in Croydon church.—Various portraits of Grindal.

OF the private life of the archbishop we have hitherto had little to say. He has had few biographers, and we have had to gather our private facts from general history and from instances casually related. Henceforth, however, we are by degrees admitted into an insight into his domestic concerns, and private employments and pleasures.

Grindal's blindness, a grievous calamity to any one, was peculiarly so to him, for his was a refined mind, and he found especial pleasure in observing the various interesting objects of nature. He was inclined to be a florist, if not a botanist; and it is evident that he must have found peculiar enjoyment in all that related to horticulture in an age which was, in all respects, an age of

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal's  
horticultu-  
ral tastes.

CHAP.  
XXII.Edmund  
Grindal.1575-6—  
1583.His present  
of grapes  
to the  
queen,  
1569.False re-  
port of the  
plague in  
his house-  
hold.Grindal's  
vindica-  
tion in a  
letter to  
Cecil.

advancement. When he was Bishop of London, he was celebrated for his grapes at Fulham, which he cultivated with great care, and he sent an annual present of them to the queen. How dangerous it was in those days to indulge even in an act of kindness, may be seen from what happened on one of these occasions. The season being backward, he was obliged to delay the transmission of the grapes. Eight days passed in September, and they were not yet fitted to become a royal present. In a postscript of a letter to Cecil, Grindal mentioned this circumstance; but withal expressed a hope, that in the following week the queen's majesty would have the grapes. Grindal sent them by one of his servants as soon as they were ripe. A report was immediately raised that one of his household lay dead of the plague, and that three more were sick. Great indignation was expressed at the danger to which the queen and her court were exposed. Had there been any foundation for this false report, it would have fared ill with the poor prelate. He thought it necessary to vindicate himself, which he did in a letter to Cecil:—

“I hear that some fault is found with me abroad, for sending my servant lately to the court with grapes, seeing one died in my house of the plague (as they say) and three more are sick. The truth is, one died in my house the 19th of this month, who had laid but three days; but he had gone abroad languishing above twenty days before that, being troubled with a flux; and thinking to bear it out, took cold, and so ended his life. But I thank God there is none sick in my house; neither would I so far have overseen myself, as to have sent to her majesty, if I had not been most assured that my man's sickness was not of the plague; and if I suspected

any such thing now, I would not keep my household together, as I do. Thus much I thought good also to signify unto you. God keep you.

“Yours in Christ,

“EDM. LONDON.

“From Fulham : September 20th, 1569.

“To the Honourable Sir William Cecil, knight, secretary to the queen’s majesty.” \*

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Although Archbishop Grindal was a man of mild temper and of easy access, he was nevertheless very sturdy in maintaining his own rights; and we are sorry to find him engaged in a controversy on dilapidations with his old friend Sandys, who succeeded Grindal in London when the latter was translated to York. He was also, as we have seen in the life of Parker, determined to maintain the rank, dignity, and status of the hierarchy. His misunderstanding with the queen, within a year of his translation to Canterbury, prevented him from giving those splendid entertainments in which Parker and Whitgift delighted, as a means of showing their gratitude to her majesty; but when the queen designed, in one of her progresses, to visit him at York, he was so anxious to have all things done with proper splendour that he entered into a correspondence on the subject with Parker, which has been duly noticed in the life of that primate.†

His controversy on dilapidations with Sandys.

Grindal may be distinguished from his immediate predecessor and from his successor by his attention to the niceties of polite literature. They were all three learned divines, deeply read in the “Fathers;” but in addition to patristic studies, we find Grindal regarded as the friend of Spenser, and as one to whom Spenser looked for the conso-

Grindal’s friendship with Edmund Spenser.

\* Remains, p. 312.

† See above, p. 79, Vol. iv. (New Series), p. 570.

CHAP.  
XXIIEdmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.Mentioned  
in the  
"Shep-  
heard's  
Calender."

lations of friendship. The great poet, as his manner was, gave to him a new name, reversing the syllables of Grindal, and speaking of him as "Algrind." In the 'Shepherd's Calender' for May, Spenser, speaking of pastors, observes:—

But shepherds (as Algrind used to say)  
Mought not live ylike men of the laye.

The quotation implies the existence of much social intercourse and conversation. And again, in the "Shepherd's Calender" for July:—

Such one he was (as I have heard  
Old Algrind often sayne)  
That whilome was the first shepheard,  
And lived with little gayne.

Again:—

Sike one (sayd Algrind) Moses was,  
That sawe his Maker's face.

In this eclogue the elevation and misfortunes of Grindal are described—the eclogue being a pastoral dialogue allegorically commending meek and lowly pastors. One of the shepherds inquires who Algrind is:—

Rut say mee, what is Algrind, hee  
That is so oft bynempt?

To whom the following reply is given:—

Hee is a shepheard great in 'gree  
But hath bene long ypent:  
One day hee sat upon a hill,  
As now thou wouldest mee;  
But I am taught, by Algrinds ill  
To love the lowe degree;  
For sitting so with bared scalp;  
An eagle sored hye,  
That, weening his white head was chalke,  
A shell-fish downe let flye;

His mis-  
fortunes  
described  
therein.



She weend the shell-fish to have broke,  
 But therewith bruzd his brayne ;  
 So now, astonied with the stroke,  
 Hee lyes in lingring payne.

CHAP.  
 XXII.

Edmund  
 Grindal.  
 1575-6—  
 1583.

It is supposed that the eagle has reference to Queen Elizabeth.

Grindal may be regarded rather as a patron of literature than as an author. What works he wrote and published were professional. He delighted to read the poetry of Spenser ; but he devoted all the powers of his own mind to the affairs of his diocese.

I am about to present the reader with a list of Grindal's works ; I am indebted for that list to the learned editor of 'Grindal's Remains,' who generally gives the authorities on which he relies ; and, for what I suppose may be called a revision of the list, to the learned editor of the 'Athenæ Cantabrigiensis,' which work may be placed among the foremost of its kind. The only other book that I have attentively gone through besides those already quoted, as presenting us with the facts connected with Grindal's life, is that which was one of the earliest of his publications on his return to England — "A Fruitful Dialogue between Custom and Verity, declaring these words of Christ, 'This is my Body.'" I may mention in passing that Grindal had the pen of a ready writer, and that whenever Parker desired to produce an early and accurate statement on the controversies of the day, he applied to Grindal.

The perusal of this little work by any who would really know the state of feeling in the Church on some important doctrines at this period of its history, will amply recompense them for the time spent in the study of it. It was published by Foxe, and is an imaginary 'Dialogue between Custom and Truth.'

Grindal's  
 'Dialogue  
 between  
 Custom  
 and  
 Truth.'

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

A short *précis* of the “Dialogue” is given with his usual ability and impartiality by Mr. Perry in his “Historical Considerations.”\*

Custom having expressed surprise that Verity had not heard the speeches daily made against the sacrament of the altar, denying it to be the real body of Christ; Verity pleads as an excuse that he had only returned of late to this country, and he expresses a desire for information. Custom having cited the text “This is my Body,” as expressing the Real Presence, Verity suggests that the meaning of these words, as they were understood by the Church and the old Fathers, should be ascertained and given. It is evident that Verity must here mean to speak in a Catholic sense. Custom alleges that Christ has not a body so gross and fleshly as Verity thinks, but a spiritual and ghostly body; without repugnance, therefore, it may be in many places at one and the same time. Verity puts this syllogism. No body being real, natural, and organical, and not spiritual, can be in many places at once; Christ’s body in the sacrament was in the hands and the mouths of the apostles at one and the same time, which were many places—*ergo*, Christ’s body in the sacrament was not a real, natural, and organical body, but a spiritual body. He afterwards argues against the real, that is the carnal, Presence, in the case of unworthy receivers, summing up his position with these words: “Thus by the word of God, by reason, and by the old Fathers it is plain, that sinful men eat not the body of Christ.” From the whole tract it is evident that Grindal held a real objective Presence, though he denied the truth of the alleged Roman theory, which asserted the absence of the *substance* of the bread and wine as distinguished from their *accidence*, which were held to remain. As the *res sacramenti* is, according to

Grindal’s  
doctrine of  
the Real  
Presence.

\* See also Remains, p. 39.

Grindal, spiritual not organical, it can only be matter for spiritual manducation; but this being an act of *lively* faith which the wicked have not, Christ's body cannot therefore be eaten by the wicked. He was combating, in conjunction with other English divines, the carnal Presence, then popularly held, and then, too, *imputed* to transubstantiation.

CHAP.  
XXII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Before the publication of this Dialogue between Custom and Truth, Grindal published a copy of the Disputation on the Lord's Supper, held at Cambridge in 1549. As regards his other works, some I have already quoted, and the others I have not had the opportunity of reading. The following list will probably be found to be correct:—

3. Notes and Suggestions respecting the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer. MS. Potyt.
4. Articles Ministered to John Helle, Parson of St. Olave's, Silver Street, relative to John Apleforte, Curate of Newington. January 3, 1561-2. MS. in State Paper Office.
5. Brief Rehearsal of the Matter which gave Occasion of the Words that were between Lady Radcliffe and the Bishop of London, relative to Green's Wife. MS. in State Paper Office.
6. Report of the Conversation between him and Lady Radcliffe, on the Terrace at the Court, relative to Green's Wife. March 5, 1561-2. MS. in State Paper Office.
7. Brevis quædam formula revocationis Hadriano Hamstedio per reverendum Episcopum Londinensem oblata, ultima Julii, anno MDLXII.
8. Animadversiones in justii Velsii Normam.
9. A Fourme to be used in Common Prayer twyse aweke, and also an Order of Publique Fast, to be used every Wednesday in the weeke, duryng this Time of Mortalitie, and other Afflictions wherwith the Realm at this present is visited. Set forth by the Queene's Majestie's special commandment, expressed in her Letters hereafter following in the next page. xxx Julii, 1563. London, 4to., 1563.
10. A Form of Meditation, very meete to be daylye used of London.

CHAP.  
XXII.

Householders in their Houses, in this Dangerous and Contagious Time. Set forth according to the Order in the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

London,  
(Jugge and  
Cawood)  
4to., n. ed.

11. A Short Fourme of Thankesgeving to God for ceassing the Contagious Sicknesse of the Plague, to be used in Common Prayer, on Sundayes, Wednesdayes, and Fridayes, instead of the Common Prayers, used in the Time of Mortalitie. Set forth by the Byshop of London, to be used in the Citie of London, and the rest of his Diocese, and in other places at the discretion of the ordinary Ministers of the Churches.

12. Admonition to be read by Ministers [in his diocese] to the People [touching the infection]. March 4, 1653-4.

London,  
4to., 1564.  
A translation  
into  
Latin ap-  
peared the  
same year.

13. A Sermon at the Funeral Solemnie of the Most High and Mighty Prince Ferdinandus, the late Emperour of most famous memorye, holden in the Cathedral Church of Saint Paule in London the third day of October, 1564.

London,  
4to., 1565.

14. A Short Forme of Thankesgiving to God for the Delyverie of the Isle of Malta from the Invasion and long Siege thereof by the great Armie of the Turkes both by Sea and Lande, and for other sundrie Victories lately obtained by the Christians against the saide Turkes, to be used in the Common Prayer within the Province of Canterburie, on Sundayes, Wednesdayes, and Fridayes, for the space of six weeks ensuinge the receipt hereof.

15. Examination of certain Londoners before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, June 20, 1567.

16. Judicium de Antonio Corrano, Junii 5, 1567.

MS. in  
State  
Paper  
Office.

17. Notes relative to the Mode of Electing a Bishop of Oxford. August 1567.

MS. in  
State  
Paper  
Office.

18. The Talke between the Bishop of London and Master Pattinson, who had been Suspended for Preaching without a Cure, and had in his Sermons called the Bishop a Traitor and Antichrist. [About September 1567.]

19. Articles inquired of in the Search for the Number of Strangers within the City of London, and about the same in the Months of November and December Anno Domini 1567.

In the  
Bishops'  
Bible.

20. Translation of the Books of the Minor Prophets.

21. Articles commanded and enjoined to be put in Execution within the Archdeaconry of York by the Archdeacon of the same

or his Official with speed and effect. Dec. 26, 1570. (It seems that similar articles were sent to the other archdeacons of his diocese and to the Bishop of Man.)

22. Injunctions given by the Moste Reverende Father in Christe, Edmonde, by the Providence of God Archbishop of Yorke, Prymate of Englande, and Metropolitane, in his Metropolitall Visitation of the Province of Yorke, as well to the Clergye as to the Laytye of the same Province. Anno Domini 1571.

23. Injunctions by Moste Reverende Father in Christ, Edmunde, by the Providence of God Archbyshop of Yorke, Primate of Englande and Metropolitane, unto the Deane and Chapter of the Cathedrall Church of Yorke, in his Metropolitall Visitations begun in the Chapter House of the saide Cathedrall Church the xvth day of Maye, anno Domini 1571. Continued and proroged from daye to daye, and tyme to tyme, until this present, being the tenth of October, in the year of our Lord a thousand fivye hundrede seventy and two.

24. Answer to Objections for the Restitution of a Portion of the Temporalities of the See of Canterbury. [About February 1575-6].

25. Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury and the other Bishops, and the whole Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in the Convocation or Synod, holden at Westminster by prorogation, in the year of our Lord God, after the Computation of the Church of England MDLXXV, touching the Admission of apt and fit Persons to the Ministry, and establishing of Good Order in the Church.

26. A Fourme of Prayer with Thankesgevyng to be used every Yeere, the 17 of November, beyng the day of the Queenes Majesties Entrie to her Raigne.

27. Articles to be inquired of in the Metropolitall Visitation of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund, by divine sufferance Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitane, in all and singular Cathedral and Collegiate Churches within his Province of Canterbury.

28 Injunctions given to the Dean and Chapter of the

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

MS. in  
State  
Paper  
Office.

London,  
4to. 1575.

London,  
4to. [1576]  
1578.

There are  
metrical  
anthems  
appended  
to the  
edition of  
1578.

London,  
4to. 1576.

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

Cathedral Church of Bangor and others of the Clergy of that Diocese, by the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan in his Metropolitanical Visitation of the said Diocese of Bangor, 25 Feb. 1576-7.

29. Orders for Reformation of Abuses about the Learned Exercises and Conferences among the Ministers of the Church.

30. Articles to be enquired of, within the Province of Canterbury, in the Metropolitanall Visitation of the Most Reverend father in God, Edmonde, Archbishop of Canturburie, Primate of all England, and Metropolitane. In the xvijth year of the reign of our most gracious Sovereign Ladie Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queen of Englande, France and Irelande, defender of the fayth, etc.

31. Declaration concerning the Estate at Battersea belonging to the Archbishop of Yorke. 1579.

32. Decree touching a Controversy in Merton College, Oxford, 22 April 1580.

33. Brief of Defence and Answer to the Articles of Dilapidations presented against him by the Bishop of London. [About April 1580.]

34. Articles of Inquiry for Recusants, 30 May, 1581.

35. Opinions and Directions concerning Excommunication and Penance.

36. Account of the Court of Faculties.

37. Statutes and Ordinances made and published by the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund, by the providence of God Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, for the better Government and Ordering of his Free Grammar School in Kirkby Beacock *alias* Saint Beghes, in the county of Cumberland; and of the Land Revenues and Goods thereto belonging, the 3rd day of July, Anno Domini 1583.

38. Letters, Latin and English. (The number is considerable, and most of them appear to have been printed.)

We have made a considerable number of extracts from Grindal's correspondence with foreign theologians. We can hardly say that his principles came out of that cor-

London,  
1576.

MS. in  
State  
Paper  
Office.

Partly  
printed in  
Charity  
Reports,  
iii. App.  
pp. 24-27.

respondence uninjured. To his foreign friends, Grindal, by his position and superior attainments, might, without any violation of his humility, have dogmatized, whereas he too frequently deferred to their opinions. He always felt most grateful to those who showed him kindness during his exile, and he exercised a generous patronage in the case of theological attainments and learning, during his career in England. In proof of this we have only to mention the names of Alexander Nowell, of Miles Coverdale, of William Redman, of John Whitgift, of John Young (afterwards Bishop of Rochester), and of Matthew Hutton (afterwards Archbishop of York), who were all of them more or less indebted for their advancement in life to the kind offices of Archbishop Grindal. To his country friends in the neighbourhood of Croydon he was a kind neighbour, bringing to them from time to time presents from London, when intercourse with the metropolis, even at a short distance, was not frequent. He was a great patron of music, an art which was now raised to a perfection not hitherto reached, and which has scarcely been, so far as sacred music is concerned, subsequently surpassed. His patronage extended to Bird, to Morley, to Tallis, and to Tye. He here set an example to his royal mistress which she did not follow. The economy of Elizabeth was praiseworthy, but her parsimony must be censured when, while professing to be a patroness of musical science, she permitted such men as Doctors Bull and Dowland to seek their livelihood in foreign parts. Grindal's income was large, and he must have had some private resources; nevertheless he died poor. This must be attributed to his munificence. In 1561 he contributed largely, as we have before observed,\* to the restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral, when damaged by

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

Grindal's  
kindness to  
foreigners  
and to  
many En-  
glish Di-  
vines.

His pa-  
tronage of  
the art of  
music.

His gene-  
ral munifi-  
cence.

\* See above, p. 42.

CHAP.  
XXII.Edmund  
Grindal.1575-6—  
1583.His gifts to  
various  
schools  
and  
colleges.

fire. He was at that time Bishop of London, and while collecting subscriptions from others he himself gave no less than 7,206*l*.

In 1565 he granted to the chapel of Highgate the premises thereto adjoining, and two and a half acres of land, for the better maintenance of the free school at that place. An inscription which used to be on the school attributed the grant to Bishop Sandys, but this seems an error. Under letters-patent from Queen Elizabeth, dated April 24, 1583, he founded and endowed a free grammar school at St. Bees. To Pembroke Hall, he gave 40*s*. per annum for the Greek lecturer, likewise stipends for a fellow and two scholars. He also obtained a licence for the college to hold lands in mortmain. To Magdalen College he gave 5*l*. per annum for a scholarship. To Christ's College a standing cup value 13*l*. 6*s*. 8*d*. To the erection of the chapel of Corpus Christi College he contributed 20*l*. At Queen's College, Oxford, he founded and endowed a fellowship and two scholarships. On June 24, 1583, he gave 50*l*. to be laid out in land, for the use of the little almshouse at Croydon. He expended, while Bishop of London, considerable sums in the repair and improvement of London-house, and the episcopal residences at Fulham and Hadlam, and when Archbishop of York, succeeded in recovering for the use of that see, Battersea-house and eighty acres of land pertaining thereto.

His im-  
provement  
of and care  
for his  
episcopal  
residences.His will  
and testa-  
ment.

His will was dated May 8, 1583, and in it he ratified a gift made in a former will, of the tithes in Ashwell, which he bequeathed to Pembroke Hall. To the queen he left Stephen's Greek Testament; he wished it to be a proof of his duty and affection to her highness, and he prayed God long to continue her a blessing to the Church. This record is valuable as showing his placability, and we wish



that the queen had found some way of expressing her own appreciation of his generous conduct. He left to Bishop Whitgift a gold ring with a sapphire; and in short, there were few, if any, of his distinguished contemporaries that he did not thus remember in his last moments. To Queen's College, Oxford, he left a nest of bowls and a cover, with 40*l.*, together with certain books, with the sum of 10*l.* towards the claspings, bossing, and chaining the same. To the mayor and citizens of Canterbury he left 100*l.* to be expended in providing materials for work for the poor. For the poor of Lambeth and Croydon he left 10*l.* to each parish, and the sum of 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* for the relief of those who resided in the most distressed part of St. Bees, to which parish church he bequeathed a communion cup with a cover of double gilt, and his fairest Bible, of the translation appointed to be read in the Church. Suitable legacies were left to the various members of his family and household, special grants being made for the education of their children and other objects, at the discretion of his executors.\*

The archbishop retired to Croydon, where he was left undisturbed. The queen's better feelings may have prompted her to permit the poor blind old man to die in peace, or she may have listened to the solicitations of his friend Burleigh. Grindal had excited the commiseration and respect of all parties, and even his opponents had ceased to torment him.

The citizens of London were not surprised when, on July 6, 1583, the great bell of St. Paul's announced to the Church of England that its good and kind archbishop had passed from this world of care and woe, to repose for ever in peace and happiness, in the arms of his blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. According to his own

CHAP.  
XXII.

Edmund  
Grindal.

1575-6—  
1583.

He retires  
to Croy-  
don.

His death,  
July 6,  
1583.

\* Remains, p. 458.

CHAP.  
XXII.Edmund  
Grindal.  
1575-6—  
1583.

desire, he was buried in Croydon Church. A monument was erected on the south side of the altar, against the wall, where his effigy in stone is to be seen lying at full length, slightly elevated from the ground.

His hands are in the attitude of prayer; the pupils of his eyes are so executed as to denote his blindness; his face is represented as that of a comely man; his beard is long, black, and somewhat forked and curling; he is vested in his doctor's robes. Beneath his effigy, on one side, are these words:—

Præsulis eximii ter postquam est auctus honore,  
Pervigilique greges rexit moderamine sacros;  
Confectum senio durisque laboribus, ecce,  
Transtulit in placidam mors exoptata quietem.

Mortua marmoreo conduntur membra sepulchro;  
Sed mens sancta viget, fama perennis erit.  
Nam studia et musæ, quas magnis censibus auxit.  
GRINDALLI, nomen tempus in omne ferent.\*

Of Archbishop Grindal there are portraits in the palaces at Lambeth and Fulham; in the University library and in Pembroke Hall, Cambridge; also engravings by S. Pass, Vertue, Vandergucht, and J. Fittler.

\* Strype's Grindal, p. 430.

## CHAPTER XXIII.\*

## JOHN WHITGIFT.—EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION.

Family of Whitgift settled in Lincolnshire.—Probable date of Whitgift's birth, 1530.—His education at St. Anthony's School, London.—Lodged with his aunt in St. Paul's Churchyard.—Her negligence and intolerant conduct towards him.—He returns home.—Matriculates at Cambridge.—In favour with Ridley.—Fellow of Peter House.—His illness.—Kindness of Dr. Perne, the master.—Whitgift's alarm at Pole's university visitation.—Dr. Perne promises him protection.—Whitgift delays his ordination until Elizabeth's accession.—Rector of Teversham.—His University preferments.—In favour with the queen.—Ecclesiastical preferments.—Dean of Lincoln.—Vice-Chancellor.—Appointed to the See of Worcester.—His universal popularity.—Triumphal procession to his diocese.

THE family of Whitgift was one of great respectability, the elder branch of which had long been settled in Yorkshire. Its members were eminent in that middle class of society, which the sound policy of Henry VII.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

\* *Authorities.*—Paule's Life of Whitgift and Walton's Life of Hooker (Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, vol. iii. third edition). Cardwell's Conferences and other works. Ducarel's Croydon and Lambeth. Collier's Ecclesiastical History. Strype's Works. Soames' Elizabethan History. Machyn's Diary. The Fœdera. Sir John Haynes' Burghley Papers. Neale's Puritans. Brook's Cartwright. Whitgift's Works (published by Parker Society). Wilkins's Concilia. Fuller's Worthies. Fuller's Characteristics. Heylin's History of Presbyterians. Middleton's Evangelical Biography. Hallam's Constitutional History. Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses. Churton's Nowell. Wright's Elizabeth. Hasted's Kent. Le Neve, edited by Sir T. Duffus Hardy. Rapin's History of England. Kennet's History of England. Memoirs of Sir Robert Carey. Lamb's Collection of Letters.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Family of  
Whitgift  
settled in  
Lincoln-  
shire.

Probable  
date of  
Whitgift's  
birth—  
1530.

Whitgift is  
educated  
at St.  
Anthony's  
School,  
London.

and of his grand-daughter Elizabeth had raised as a barrier against the almost regal assumption of power on the part of the barons. It was now growing into a commercial aristocracy, encouraging foreign trade and domestic industry, and forming a class of learned men prepared, in behalf of their country, to avail themselves of the revival of literature. A branch of the family of Whitgift settled in the 16th century at Great Grimsby in Lincolnshire. Henry, the father of the archbishop, was a merchant on whose industry fortune smiled. His wife was Anne Dynewell. John was born in the year 1530; unless we take the date 1533 given by Francis Thynne, which, nevertheless, appears to be contradicted by Whitgift, who in the year 1590 speaks of himself as sixty years old.

The literary turn and general good conduct of John Whitgift attracted the notice of his uncle Robert, who was abbot of the neighbouring monastery of Wellow—a monastery consisting of Black Canons of the order of St. Augustine.

Persuaded by his brother Robert, Henry Whitgift determined to give a learned education to his son John, and he accordingly sent him to St. Anthony's school in London; a school already distinguished on account of the scholars who had received their education there: among other names we may mention those of Sir Thomas More and Archbishop Heath. Although these men, and others their associates, suffered on account of their continued loyalty to the Church of Rome, when Romanists were subjected to persecution, yet at the beginning of their career they admitted that the Church required reform, and for a short time they coincided in spirit with the reformers.

Henry, the merchant, had doubtless a view to economy

when he fixed on a residence for John during the time of his studying at St. Anthony's. The youth was lodged with his aunt, the wife of Michael Shaller, the verger of St. Paul's Cathedral, who lived in St. Paul's Churchyard.

The parents of John Whitgift expected that their son would receive from so near a relation the attention and comforts to which he had been accustomed at home ; but instead of meeting with this attention, his aunt, with criminal carelessness, made him the bedfellow of a youth afflicted by the plague, and circumstances ensued which rendered it almost miraculous that John Whitgift escaped that deadly disease.

Whitgift's uncle, Abbot Robert, though not an avowed reformer, did not hesitate to assert, that he had read the Sacred Scriptures repeatedly, and found them strongly opposed to all the peculiarities of the Romish system. He thought, and taught his nephew to think, that a reformation was required, but in what that reformation ought to consist he did not venture to decide. On the other hand John found in his aunt the most unreasoning and bigoted devotee of the Romish system and the ancient ceremonials of the Church. After many disagreements she almost turned him out of her house for refusing to attend early mass at the Cathedral.

John Whitgift had now no choice but to return to his father's house in Great Grimsby, where he was cordially received by all the family, more especially by his uncle Robert. Finding that, in spite of all his difficulties, his nephew had made good progress in "grammar learning," Robert now persuaded Henry Whitgift to pursue the course he had begun, and to send his son to the University of Cambridge. In the year 1548-9 John Whitgift matriculated at Queen's College ; and soon afterwards migrated to Pembroke Hall. He had for his

CHAP.  
XXIII

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Lodged  
with his  
aunt in  
St. Paul's  
Church-  
yard.

Her negli-  
gence  
towards  
him.

Her  
intolerant  
conduct  
drives him  
home.

Matricu-  
lates at  
Cam-  
bridge.  
1548-9.

CHAP.  
XXIII.John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.In favour  
with  
Ridley.Fellow of  
Peter  
House,  
1555.Takes his  
Master's  
degree,  
1557.Tolerant  
conduct of  
Dr. Perne,  
master of  
Peter  
House.His kind-  
ness  
during  
Whitgift's  
illness.

tutor the celebrated John Bradford, who was a wise and consistent supporter of the Reformation, in the cause of which he ultimately died a martyr.

Whitgift had evidently the power of making friendships; and when by John Bradford and by Edmund Grindal, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, he was recommended to Nicolas Ridley, at that time Master of Pembroke Hall, he found in that dignitary a generous patron, and a cordial friend, who ascertained his wishes and supplied his wants. Through Ridley's interest Whitgift was elected scholar of that house, and rose to be Bible clerk. When Ridley became Bishop of London, he appointed Whitgift to be one of his chaplains. These appointments were the more important to him because about this time his father's fortune had been greatly diminished through heavy losses at sea. In May 1555, he was chosen a fellow of Peter House, Dr. Perne being at that time master of the college.

In 1557 Whitgift took his master's degree. Dr. Perne appears to have been a large-minded, generous, kind-hearted man. At this time he was not prepared himself to denounce the Romish customs of our Church, but was contented if his pupils would live together in brotherly love, and in due subordination to the authorities. He took care that the industrious and sober-minded should not be disturbed in their pursuit of learning.

No difference of opinion prevented the master from showing the greatest kindness and attention to John Whitgift, when the young man, who was one of his most promising pupils, was seriously sick. He had him conveyed to a house near the college; and there Dr. Perne hired a nurse to take care of him, and was frequent in his personal visits. He stated that he would himself be responsible for all the expenses incurred by the nurse if

Whitgift should not be restored to health, and the disease should end fatally.

Whitgift had scarcely recovered from his sickness when he took alarm at hearing that a visitation of the university was to be carried on under the auspices of Cardinal Pole. He had not avowed himself a member of any theological faction, but it was well known that, like his uncle, he was disposed to a reformation of the Church, and that it could not in his opinion be long delayed. That it was the duty of those in authority in Church or State to remove those errors whose existence was acknowledged he did not deny, but rather calmly and steadily asserted. Many of Whitgift's friends were preparing to quit the country, and it was suspected that he himself intended to follow their example, going either to Strassburg or Frankfurt, or to one of the Swiss towns.

Severe as were the measures adopted by Queen Mary to put to silence those whom she regarded as heretics, they were not resorted to at the beginning of her reign. The account of these severities has at all times been much exaggerated. The law against heretics was fearfully cruel, and cruelly was it enforced, but not until heresy was confounded with treason, and the schismatic regarded as a rebel. We may refer especially to the kind and generous treatment received by Roger Ascham and other reformers of his school. So long as they remained silent they were unmolested; they were not persecuted until they sought to rouse the angry passions of men already impassioned.

Being unwilling that the country should be deprived of the services of a young man so promising as John Whitgift, Dr. Perne undertook to screen him from the commissioners if he would remain at the university and quietly pursue his studies until more settled times should

CHAP.  
XXIII.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Whitgift's  
alarm at  
Pole's  
university  
visitation.

Many of  
his friends  
leave  
England.

Dr. Perne  
promises  
to protect  
Whitgift.

CHAP.  
XXIII.John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.Whitgift  
delays  
his ordi-  
nation  
until  
Eliza-  
beth's  
accession.Living of  
Teversham con-  
ferred on  
him by  
Bishop  
Coxe.Lady  
Margaret's  
Professor  
of Divi-  
nity, 1563.Master of  
Pembroke  
Hall,and of  
Trinity  
College.

come. Dr. Perne felt sure that in promising protection to Whitgift he was not making a promise he would be unable to fulfil, and Whitgift remained in England.

How Whitgift passed his time during the reign of Queen Mary, it is not easy to surmise. It was well known that he was a student of theology, but it was not till 1560 that he received Holy Orders, when about thirty years of age. That his ordination took place soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, we may rest assured by the fact of his preaching, at that time, a university sermon in St. Mary's Church; and if before this time he had been somewhat timid, he now discoursed boldly from Romans i. 16: 'I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.'

When Whitgift had made known his readiness to take employment in the Church, the ecclesiastical authorities showed an equal readiness to employ him. Dr. Richard Coxe, a judicious and munificent patron of deserving young men, conferred upon him in the year 1560 the rectory of Teversham, in Cambridgeshire; and in the year 1563 Whitgift having taken his B.D. degree, was admitted Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity; the university marking its approbation of his nomination to the high office by an increase of the professor's salary. Whitgift now gave full proof of his having become entirely separated from the popish faction, by the text he adopted in his first official address: *Papa est ille Antichristus.*

Being President of Peter House, he had the honour in 1567 to be elected Master of Pembroke Hall; and the court uniting with the university in bearing testimony to his high character, he was, three years after, advanced to the Mastership of Trinity College. He had now become D.D., and his former patron, the Bishop of Ely, collated him to a prebend in his cathedral.

The professorship he soon after resigned, being



desirous to devote himself to the compilation of a new code of canons for the university, to which labour he confined himself, and devoted all the powers of his mind.

His fame extending from the university to the court, he was commanded to preach before the queen, and by his sermons and conversation he so won her majesty's esteem, that with a facetiousness in which she often indulged with condescension, though not always with good taste, she punned upon his name and called him her 'White-gift,' and determined to make his fortune for him. She felt that in the firmness of character and presence of mind exhibited by Whitgift a contrast was presented to the whole character of Grindal; and regardless too often of the means she adopted to further her objects, she proposed, as we have already had occasion to state,\* to deprive Grindal of the primacy, and to confer that high office upon Whitgift. This proposal Whitgift could not for a moment entertain. He was, nevertheless, made one of her chaplains, and brought into frequent communication with her.

The Bishop of Ely having, as before mentioned, conferred a prebend upon him, he was duly elected by the clergy of that diocese as their proctor in convocation; and Archbishop Parker, willing to show his appreciation of Whitgift's disinterestedness, nominated him to preach the usual Latin sermon before the two houses. With the consent of the primate and of the queen, he was elected by the lower house in 1572 to act as their prolocutor.

In 1573 Whitgift became Dean of Lincoln, and was elected for a second time vice-chancellor of his university, where he had still some work to complete.

For ten years Whitgift had devoted his services to the university, and having completed his work there, he was

CHAP.  
XXIII.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

In great  
favour  
with the  
queen.

Her wish  
to appoint  
him pri-  
mate in  
Grindal's  
place.

Elected  
proctor in  
Convoca-  
tion,

and  
prolocutor.

Appointed  
Dean of  
Lincoln.

\* See above, p. 106.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

John  
Whitgift.

1583 —  
1603-4.

no longer reluctant to accept higher preferment. Accordingly when in 1576 he was offered the Bishopric of Worcester, he did not say *Nolo Episcopari*. His acceptance of the bishopric gave great satisfaction to his friends, and congratulations poured in from all classes of society. The poor had benefited by his enlarged charities, the university by his munificence; and in his conversation the learned few had found both instruction and pleasure. The discipline of the age was severe even to cruelty; and from an enforcement of the laws when they required to be enforced, Whitgift did not shrink; but many instances may be adduced of his readiness to relax the discipline, when such relaxation might be tolerated without danger to the public interest. His patriotism assuredly was neither warped by prejudice nor tainted by faction. We are not surprised, therefore, when we hear that at Cambridge, St. Mary's Church was crowded by sympathizing auditors when he preached his farewell sermon; or that everyone who could purchase or borrow a horse joined in the cavalcade which attended his Lordship, like a triumphal procession, during the first stage of his journey to Worcester. As he drew near to Worcester, another multitude went forth to welcome with their cheers a dignitary whose disinterestedness had won for him the adoration of all Churchmen; and who, in refusing to accept the primacy during Grindal's lifetime, showed a courage much to be applauded, since in doing so he resisted the wish of a sovereign whose wish was in general regarded as law.

His triumphal procession and reception at Worcester, 1576.

CHAPTER XXIV.

WHITGIFT'S PUBLIC LIFE.

Whitgift's election to Worcester.—Consecrated by Archbishop Grindal.—Appointed Vice-President of Wales.—The queen gives him the patronage of the prebends and the nomination of magistrates in his diocese.—He refuses the Lord Chancellorship.—Recommends Sir C. Hatton.—Translated to Canterbury.—Enthroned in person.—Writes to the queen concerning church property.—Draws up certain articles for the regulation of the Church.—Seminary priests.—Designed assassination of the queen by them.—Policy of the government towards them.—Puritanical violence towards Whitgift.—Works of Martin Mar-prelate.—Whitgift's generous conduct towards the libellers.—His controversy with Cartwright.—Cartwright's influence in the university.—His attack on the Church.—Whitgift as Vice-Chancellor silences him.—Cartwright's 'Admonition to Parliament.'—Whitgift's answer thereto.—Their reconciliation.—Evil consequences of Cartwright's writings.—Controversy between Hooker and Travers.—Whitgift's friendship with Hooker.—The 'Lambeth Articles' are condemned by the queen and by Burghley.—Whitgift yields to their decision.

OF WHITGIFT'S history during his episcopate at Worcester there is not much to be said, or rather we shall reserve for another chapter what we may have to produce in regard to his conduct, as distinguished from the ordinary routine of the episcopal duties common to every see.

There seems to have been one rule which he steadily observed—What his hand found to do, that he did with his might. He did not pause for the occurrence of important events; in small things as well as in great he was at his work. From time to time new offices involving fresh duties were proposed to him, but, here again, it seems to have been a rule with him not to undertake

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Whitgift  
Bishop of  
Worcester.  
1577.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

His elec-  
tion,  
confirma-  
tion, and  
consecra-  
tion.

Appointed  
Vice-  
President  
of Wales.

The queen  
gives him  
the patron-  
age of the  
Prebends  
of Wor-  
cester,

and the  
nomina-  
tion of  
Justices of  
the Peace.

any labours beyond those which bore upon his profession or those which the episcopate entailed upon him.

He was elected by the Dean and Chapter of Worcester on April 4, 1577, and was confirmed at the church of St. Mary-le Bow, in Cheapside, on April 16. His friend Archbishop Grindal consecrated him at Lambeth on April 21, assisted by the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Chichester. In the May following the temporalities of the see were restored to him.

Soon after his election to the See of Worcester, Bishop Whitgift was appointed Vice-President of Wales, in the absence of Sir Henry Sydney, Lord President, then created Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

The prebends in his cathedral were then, as they are now, in the gift of the crown; but Elizabeth signified her favour towards Whitgift by placing these preferments at his disposal. We may add that her confidence in Whitgift's wisdom and integrity was such that she also placed in his hands the nomination of the justices of the peace for Worcestershire and Warwickshire.

Although Whitgift accepted the nomination of the justices, yet it is evident that he perceived that there was an incompatibility in holding together secular and ecclesiastical offices. It had led to the neglect of their spiritual duties by the dignitaries of the Church before the Reformation, and it appeared to Whitgift that, from the same mistaken conduct, similar errors would result. There were indeed advantages, and Archbishop Laud was desirous, at a later period of the Church's history, of making an attempt to unite the two classes of duty, the domestic and the foreign; but the experience of Whitgift led him to conclude that the disadvantages preponderated over the advantages. He became Archbishop of Canterbury. The office of Lord High Chancellor became vacant by the death of Sir Thomas Bromley, and Eliza-

Refuses  
the Chan-  
cellorship.

beth was desirous of appointing Archbishop Whitgift to succeed him. But Whitgift refusing the high honour for himself, recommended to the royal patronage his friend Sir Christopher Hatton; and in Hatton's appointment he found the greatest comfort and support. He had in Hatton a friend at court, ever ready to oppose the machinations of his enemies, who were numerous and powerful. For the same purpose he recommended him to the University of Oxford, as their chancellor, a position which, when it was offered to himself, he had declined. He found in Hatton a wise adviser and a faithful friend.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.  
for him-  
self;  
recom-  
mends Sir  
C. Hatton.

On July 6, 1583, the death of Archbishop Grindal was announced. The queen deferred the appointment of his successor as long as with decency she could, for the income during the sequestration of the revenues passed into the royal coffers. But Whitgift was not a man to permit the delay to be unreasonably long, and on August 14 following, the *congé d'élire* was addressed to the chapter, and the Bishop of Worcester was elected on the 23rd of the same month. On September 23 he was confirmed at Lambeth, and on October 7 he was put in possession of the temporalities.

He is  
translated  
to Canter-  
bury, 1583.

Election  
and con-  
firmation.

Of Whitgift, it may be said that his tastes were simple so far as he was personally concerned. When he was at home he did not indulge in luxurious living, but he delighted in splendour and display on great and fitting occasions. The good people of Canterbury rejoiced exceedingly to hear that he would be enthroned in person, and they were not a little pleased to find that there was to be on this occasion an approach to the ancient hospitality with which the enthronization of the primates had been observed with splendour nowhere surpassed. Cranmer, Parker, and Grindal, for reasons not assigned, but probably on account of their comparative poverty, had

His en-  
throniza-  
tion in  
person.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

avoided the expense by being enthroned by proxy. Whitgift, the son of a wealthy merchant, was a man of private fortune, and he was willing to expend upon the Church what appeared to be necessary to conduct with becoming grandeur the splendour of the high office to which he had been elected. As a bishop he could not be too humble in his style of living, and his wants were comparatively few; but he did not forget that he was also a lord of parliament, and he determined that the spiritual aristocracy should not be trampled upon by the temporal peers, who, under the leading of Leicester, desired, before all things, to lower them in the eyes of the public. Different ages have different tastes. In our own age an affectation of humility is encouraged, whereas, even in the last century, men desired to uphold what they called the dignity of the Church, by a magnificence of display which would in the present age give offence.

The Reformation gave a great amount of power to the queen over the Church lands. During the vacancy of any preferment she claimed a right to appropriate the income to her own purposes, and she forced the clergy to exchange their lands with the crown, the crown being certain in every exchange to make the best of the bargain. Out of this property the Earl of Leicester manœuvred to obtain considerable grants, and the clergy too often connived at his robbery and wrong, themselves receiving a compensation, inadequate so far as the Church was concerned, but at the same time sufficient to offer a temptation to individuals.

It is due to the archbishop to submit to the reader's perusal the letter which, with much humility, and at the same time with reverence and firmness, he addressed to her majesty. The quotation is long, but it may be regarded as a specimen of Whitgift's style of writing; and therefore no apology can be required for its insertion in this place.

Misappli-  
cation of  
Church  
property.

Whitgift's  
letter to  
the queen.

“ I beseech your majesty to hear me with patience, and to believe me that yours and the Church’s safety are dearer to me than my life, but my conscience dearer than both ; and therefore give me leave to do my duty, and to tell you that princes are deputed nursing-fathers of the Church, and owe it a protection ; and therefore God forbid that you should be so much as passive in her ruins, when you may prevent it ; or that I should behold it without horror and detestation, or should forbear to tell your majesty of the sin and danger of sacrilege. And, though you and myself were born in an age of frailties, when the primitive piety and care of the Church’s lands and immunities are much decayed, yet, madam, let me beg that you would first consider that there are such sins as profaneness and sacrilege ; and that, if there were not, they could not have names in Holy Writ, and particularly in the New Testament. And I beseech you to consider that, though our Saviour said He ‘judged no man’—and to testify it would not judge nor divide the inheritance betwixt the two brethren, nor would judge the woman taken in adultery—yet in this point of the Church’s rights He was so zealous that He made Himself both the accuser, and the judge, and the executioner too, to punish these sins ; witnessed, in that He Himself made the whip to drive the profaners out of the temple, overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and drove them out of it. And I beseech you to consider, that it was St. Paul that said to those Christians of his time that were offended with idolatry, yet committed sacrilege : ‘Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?’ supposing, I think, sacrilege the greater sin. This may occasion your majesty to consider that there is such a sin as sacrilege ; and, to incline you to prevent the curse that will follow it, I beseech you also to consider that Constantine the first Christian emperor, and Helena his

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

mother, that King Edgar, and Edward the Confessor, and indeed many other of your predecessors, and many private Christians, have also given to God, and to His Church, much land, and many immunities, which they might have given to those of their own families, and did not ; but gave them for ever as an absolute right and sacrifice to God ; and with these immunities and lands they have entailed a curse upon the alienators of them : God prevent your majesty from being liable to that curse, which will cleave unto Church-lands as the leprosy to the Jews.

“ And, to make you that are trusted with their preservation the better to understand the danger of it, I beseech you, forget not that, to prevent these curses, the Church’s lands and power have been also endeavoured to be preserved (as far as human reason and the law of this nation have been able to preserve them) by an immediate and most sacred obligation on the consciences of the princes of this realm. For they that consult *Magna Charta* shall find that, as all your predecessors were at their coronation, so you also were sworn before all the nobility and bishops then present, and in the presence of God, and in His stead to him that anointed you, ‘ to maintain the Church-lands, and the rights belonging to it ; ’ and this you yourself have testified openly to God at the holy altar, by laying your hands on the Bible then lying upon it. And not only *Magna Charta*, but many modern statutes, have denounced a curse upon those that break *Magna Charta*, a curse like the leprosy that was entailed on the Jews ; for, as that, so these curses have and will cleave to the very stones of those buildings that have been consecrated to God ; and the father’s sin of sacrilege hath and will prove to be entailed on his son and family. And now, madam, what account can be given for the breach of this oath at the last great day, either by your



majesty, or by me, if it be wilfully or but negligently violated, I know not. And therefore, good madam, let not the late lord's exceptions against the failings of some few clergymen prevail with you to punish posterity for the errors of this present age; let particular men suffer for their particular errors, but let God and His Church have their inheritance; and, though I pretend not to prophesy, yet I beg posterity to take notice of what is already become visible in many families; that Church-land added to an ancient and just inheritance hath proved like a moth fretting a garment, and secretly consumed both, or like the eagle that stole a coal from the altar, and thereby set her nest on fire, which consumed both her young eagles, and herself that stole it. And, though I shall forbear to speak reproachfully of your father, yet I beg you to take notice that a part of the Church's rights, added to the vast treasure left him by his father, hath been conceived to bring an unavoidable consumption upon both, notwithstanding all his diligence to preserve them. And consider that, after the violation of those laws, to which he had sworn in *Magna Charta*, God did so far deny him his restraining grace, that, as king Saul after he was forsaken of God fell from one sin to another, so he, till at last he fell into greater sins than I am willing to mention.

“Madam, religion is the foundation and cement of human societies; and when they that serve at God's altar shall be exposed to poverty, then religion itself will be exposed to scorn, and become contemptible; as you may already observe it to be in too many poor vicarages in this nation. And therefore, as you are by a late act or acts of parliament entrusted with a great power to preserve or waste the Church's lands, yet dispose of them, for Jesus' sake, as you have promised to men, and vowed to

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

God, that is, as the donors intended : let neither falsehood nor flattery beguile you to do otherwise ; but put a stop to God's and the Levite's portion, I beseech you, and to the approaching ruins of His Church, as you expect comfort at the last great day ; for kings must be judged. Pardon this affectionate plainness, my most dear sovereign, and let me beg to be still continued in your favour ; and the Lord shall continue you in His.\* \*

The exact date of this letter cannot be accurately fixed ; but from internal evidence we may conclude that it was written before Whitgift's translation to Canterbury. If this is the case, it is another proof of the courage, the determination, and the disinterestedness of conduct and character, for which Bishop Whitgift was distinguished. At the risk of losing all chance of preferment Whitgift nobly performed his duty, and did what he ought to do, and what Elizabeth would not always tolerate. But in this instance the remonstrance was kindly viewed by the queen. When once Elizabeth was persuaded that she was addressed by an honest man, the straightforwardness of her own character displayed itself, and she knew how to do him justice. Whitgift was also gratified by the addresses he received from his fellow-countrymen, and especially from the heads of the University of Cambridge, where he had laboured so long and so successfully.

The archbishop began his new career with the alacrity and zeal to be expected from our knowledge of his character ; while at the same time, from our acquaintance with the history of the age during which he was called upon to preside over the Church of England, we are not surprised to find that he had difficulties to encounter, and difficulties the precise nature of which it is not easy to understand.

\* Whitgift's Works, vol. iii. p. xiii.

Strype, when writing of the year 1583, states that "in the month of September, divers good articles were drawn up and agreed upon by himself [Whitgift] and the rest of the Bishops of his province, and signed by them. Which the Queen also allowed of, and gave her royal assent unto, to give them the greater authority."\* He then gives, as from 'Regist. Whitgift, fol. 97,' twelve articles signed by nine bishops, viz. 'Jo. Cant.,' 'Jo. London,' 'Jo. Sarum,' 'Ed. Petriburgh,' 'Tho. Lincoln,' 'Edm. Norwich,' 'Jo. Roffen.,' 'Tho. Exon.,' 'Marmad. Meneven.' It may be mentioned here that Wilkins and Cardwell supply them with some unimportant verbal differences, but they both date them a year later, viz. 1584—all agreeing that it was at the beginning of his primacy. No date is given to these articles in the Lambeth Register, but they follow a series of documents ranging from 1583 to 1584; nor are any signatures attached to the articles; and so the question arises—whence did Strype obtain the signatures? Had he access to the original draft or to some other copy of it?

Strype goes on to state† that "the Archbishop and the Bishop of London soon after, upon a review of these articles, and the addition of three more (viz. against the printing and publishing of books and pamphlets without licence from the Archbishop or Bishop; against granting dispensations to persons absent; and for writs to go forth, *de excommunicato capiendo*, upon the *significavit*), set them forth (having got the Queen's allowance thereunto) for all persons concerned to take notice of, at their own perils, being resolved to put them in force." For this statement Strype gives no authority, and these additional articles do not appear to be recorded in the Lambeth Register.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

The  
articles for  
the regula-  
tion of the  
Church.

\* Strype's Life of Whitgift, vol. i. p. 228, 8vo. ed., Oxford, 1822.

† Ib. p. 232.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

It is yet further affirmed by Strype,\* “And in the next month [viz. October]† the Archbishop issued out his letters to the Bishops and other Ordinaries of his province, for their diligent putting in execution the above specified articles: the copy of his letter is extant to the Bishop of London, dated from Lambhith, wherein these articles are recommended to his care. And certain directions about the first article were subjoined to the same letter. The Bishops were enjoined in the same letter to certify him about certain particulars for his better knowledge and understanding of the present state of the Church and the Clergy thereof.” Then follows the letter, beginning, “After our hearty commendations unto your lordship. Where, of late, by advice,” &c., and ending “From my house at Lambhith, this 19th of October, 1583.” In the margin Strype puts “His letter. Regist. Whitgift;” but the original varies considerably from Strype’s copy.

Now there is in the Record Office an unpublished paper ‡ containing sixteen articles (or fifteen, if the last two be reckoned as one, as seems meant): twelve of these correspond to the twelve given by Strype (except that the fifth has after the word “Advertisements” the words “that is cloke with sleeves, square capp, gowne, tippet,” &c., instead of the words “and her majesty’s injunctions *anno primo*,” which follow the word “Advertisements” in the 4th article as printed by Strype): the other three (viz. Nos. 2, 12, and 15) agree with Strype’s description of the ‘three more’ which he mentions, but does not quote; eight of the articles have explanatory marginal notes; and the document is thus indorsed: “Octob. 1583. Articles presented to hir mat<sup>y</sup> by y<sup>e</sup> Archb of Cant<sup>eb</sup> and y<sup>e</sup> Bish

\* Strype’s Life of Whitgift, vol i. p. 233, 8vo. ed., Oxford, 1822.

† The dates in brackets are Strype’s own.

‡ State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, 1583, vol. clxiii. No. 31.

of Sar in the names of thēselves and y<sup>e</sup> BB of Lōdon Rochist<sup>r</sup> Lȳcoln Peterb Glocest<sup>r</sup> At S<sup>t</sup> James.” This indorsement has one name, the Bishop of Gloucester, which is not attached to the twelve articles ; but does not contain three of the names which are appended to them, viz. ‘Edm. Norwich,’ ‘Tho. Exon.,’ and ‘Marmad. Meneven.’

A comparison of the two documents raises the question, Is not this state paper the original set of articles presented to the queen for her sanction? If it be, then it would seem that her majesty rejected the three to which Strype says she gave her “allowance.” and made the alteration above noticed in the fifth, apparently adopting the following suggestion in the marginal note to it : “The last wordes viz. cloak with sleeves &c. may be leafte out y<sup>f</sup> it bee thought good. But the article is warranted both by the advertisements sett out by her ma<sup>ties</sup> authoritie & also by the q’s injunctions *anno primo* Elizab.”

There is among the Petyt MSS., in the library of the Inner Temple, a third document which seems to answer the question just asked. No. 538, vol. 52, contains a copy of the *twelve* articles as given by Strype from the Lambeth Register, and also the *signatures* which he furnishes, but which are not in that register. The Petyt MS. is entitled (fol. 5, *dorso*) “Articles agreed upon by the bishops exhibited to her ma<sup>tie</sup> Anno Domini 1583, September.” Directly after the signatures (fol. 7) occurs the following : “Articles sent from the Lords of the Counsell ult<sup>o</sup> Novembris 1583. It was also further ordered that the Archbishop of Canterburie should be spoken withall upon the pointes followinge.” These “pointes” are the *ten* Articles which are mentioned by Strype \* beginning thus, “1. A general examination,” &c. These *ten* articles are also entered in the Lambeth Register, fol. 91.

\* Life of Whitgift, vol. i. p. 238.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

As Strype often quotes the Petyt MSS., it seems very likely that he obtained the signatures to the *twelve* articles from the MS. just quoted, though he gives the *Whitgift Register* as his authority for these articles as well as for the *ten* above mentioned: this is the more probable from the fact that Strype says\* “that on the last day of November, it was ordered by the Council, that the Archbishop should be spoke withal upon these several points following,” *i.e.* the *ten* articles—a statement which, apparently, he took from the Petyt MS., or from the *original* of that document, to which possibly he might also have had access. But, if so, it strengthens the doubt of the accuracy of Strype’s statement,† that after the *twelve* articles were allowed by the queen, “three more” had also her “allowance,” and that “in the next month (*viz.* October) the Archbishop issued out his letters . . . for putting in execution the above specified articles;” it is not indeed clear whether he means the *twelve* or the *fifteen* articles, though apparently he refers to the *fifteen*.

The existence of the State Paper of October 1583 in the Record Office may imply that the *fifteen* articles which it contains were not sanctioned by the queen, and consequently that it was not returned to the archbishop. Perhaps the contemporary records of the Privy Council might have cleared up the difficulty, but, unfortunately, the Council Register from June 26, 1582, to February 19, 1586, is missing.

There is one other piece of evidence which must be noticed in connexion with this subject, namely, a small treatise written in 1583 called ‘The Copie of a Letter written by a Gentleman in the Countrey unto a Londoner, touching an answer to the Archb. Articles:’ it occurs in ‘A Parte of a Register’ published in 1590. The

\* Life of Whitgift, vol. i. p. 238.

† *Ib.* p. 232.

writer had seen the whole *fifteen* articles in some form, for he opposes them all, though there is nothing to indicate whether he was cognizant of the State Paper with its marginal notes, or had access to some other copy of the articles: he begins his letter thus:—"You wished greatly, (beloued in the Lorde), that one loving the trueth, and not placed in the ministerie, would yeele sounde reasons why the articles lately crepte abroade, frō the Archb. of *Canturburie* and Bi. of *London*, might by her Maiesties authoritie be rejected as matters friuolous and unworthie her Roiall assente, that so execution pretended against diuers godlie Pastours and Preachers, if it were possible, might graciouslie be stayed."\* Strype refers to this letter, and says, "It bore date November the 6th, 1583." †

In the absence of other evidence the case in its present form would appear to lead to the following conclusions:—That (1) in September 1583 the *twelve* articles agreed upon by the bishops were presented for the queen's sanction; that (2) in October an altered draft was submitted, containing the *three* additional articles; that (3) Whitgift prepared his letter of October 19 to be issued with the articles when they were approved by the queen; that (4) meanwhile the proceedings of the bishops had transpired, and all the *fifteen* articles were attacked, as is shown by the letter of November 6 from "a Gentleman in the Countrey;" that (5) consequently from this, or from some other cause, only the *twelve* articles were allowed, and "sent from the Lords of the Counsell ult<sup>mo</sup> Nouembris 1583;" and that (6) then Whitgift sent them to the bishops (through the Dean of the Province) accompanied by his already prepared letter to the Bishop of London:

\* A Parte of a Register, p. 132.

† Life of Whitgift, vol. i. p. 235.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.  
Tolerant  
conduct of  
Arch-  
bishop  
Whitgift.

Thus resolute did the archbishop present himself to his clergy ; but as he advanced in life, they discovered what we are pleased to record, that, although he was determined to uphold the law, and as far as possible to prevent illegal practices, he became more placable in his temper, and we find him frequently, as in the case of Cartwright, holding out the right hand of fellowship to men whom he once opposed, not noticing their irregularities if they discharged their duties without disturbing the public peace, or rendering impossible a mild enforcement of the ecclesiastical laws.

The severe measures occasionally adopted by the government of Elizabeth were chiefly resorted to from motives of self-defence. It was well known that many of the foreign powers, under the influence of the pope and Philip II. of Spain, had prepared an army of Jesuits and Roman priests, ready, if opportunity should occur, to enter England and effect a revolution of the state, by the assassination of the sovereign.

The conduct of the government in dealing with these men was undoubtedly blameworthy, but the measures they adopted were evidently designed to enable the guilty, upon their detection, to retrace their steps, and to avoid the punishment which was their due. We censure the conduct of the government because they punished for one offence men who were guilty of another. In the early days of the Reformation, the Regulars of the Church of Rome almost to a man fled the country ; a few remained to officiate in families which we should now call *Ultramontane*, and in many old houses we find lurking places and apartments built expressly for their concealment, but they were so few in number that to notice them is unnecessary.

Of the clergy, comparatively few in number refused

Policy of  
the go-  
vernment  
towards  
them.



to accede to the Reformation, and still held correspondence with Rome: these were all of them secular priests, and were under the direction of one of their own number elected by themselves, and not nominated by the Roman authorities. They were gradually merging into the Church of the country, and it was felt at Rome that if stronger measures were not immediately adopted, all Roman influence would soon be extinct in England.

In this statement we have the origin of the Seminary Priests, of whom we read so much at this period of English history. Among the foreign seminaries we may speak of Douay as one of the first and most famous. It was founded in 1569; and the expenses were discharged by Philip II., King of Spain. A very distinguished Englishman soon appeared at its head, Dr. William Allen. He was a man who, although fanatical, was of deep and earnest piety, ready to make any sacrifice which his religion might demand, without carefully examining whether his means were as righteous as his ends, those ends, relating to assassination and rebellion, being in themselves iniquitous. He was descended from an ancient family in Lancashire, and, having matriculated at Oriel College, Oxford, became in 1566 Principal of St. Mary's Hall. On the death of Queen Mary he fled to Louvain, and here, by his tirades against the Church of England, he thoroughly alarmed his fellow-countrymen. He was so unwelcome to the Seculars, that he determined to rally the party of Regulars. His zeal or fanaticism was rewarded in Rome by a cardinal's hat.

In the year 1579 the Regulars placed themselves under a leader very different in character from Cardinal Allen. William Parsons or Persons, a Jesuit, was made rector of a seminary at Rome: this seminary was closely connected with another founded at Valladolid by King

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1582—  
1603-4.

Origin of  
Seminary  
Priests.

William  
Allen,  
head of the  
Seminary  
Priests at  
Douay.

Seminaries  
founded in  
Italy,  
France,  
Spain, and  
Flanders.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Philip in 1589, and another at Seville established in 1593. By the same prince was founded the seminary of S. Omer in Artois in 1596. In the next century similar institutions were established at Madrid, Liége, and Ghent; but the most active against England were the two colleges of Douay and Rome. From them were sent forth many priests of the Regular party into England, with those objects in view which we have already mentioned. We are not surprised then, when we find the government greatly alarmed whenever a person known to sustain this character landed in our country. Some of them, when apprehended, did not hesitate to confess that the murder of the queen was with them a primary object. But this, though confessed by some, was denied by many, and how were these many to be treated? They might be accused of treason; but if they were, how was the proof of their intended crime to be obtained? What the government did was this—they passed severe laws against all who did not strictly observe the regulations of the Church of England to the minutest detail: these laws were certainly not enacted against those who were living quietly in the land; but if a Jesuit, or Seminary priest arrived in England, the ministers of Elizabeth well knew what he had come for, and their difficulties would indeed have been great if it had not been for the courage of the queen, who enabled them to proceed at their leisure and with caution. The government, as we have said, was quite aware that the Seminarists had come to murder the queen, but they could not prove it; yet, on the other hand, they could prove this, that the Seminary priests had not observed some of the regulations which bore upon the discipline of the English Church. For the neglect of this discipline they were prosecuted; but even then it was certified to them that if they would

Designed  
assassina-  
tion of the  
queen  
by the  
Seminary  
Priests.

swear not to make any attempt upon the queen's life, they should be pardoned.

The government of Elizabeth is charged by hostile modern historians with extreme severity, and to prove their statement they produce these enactments with reference to the Church; but by persons who take an impartial view of the subject an opposite conclusion may be drawn. We find, for example, Mr. Hallam, one of the greatest authorities who can be produced on such a subject, asserting that any man in Elizabeth's reign might have saved his life by denying the pope's power to depose the queen.\* The ministers of Queen Elizabeth openly declared that no man in her reign suffered for his religion, which is true if we understand the circumstances as just stated. Hence it is that we find Hume and other historians endorsing the statement made by these ministers. Hume, for instance, says:

“The queen's conduct in this particular [religion], making allowance for the prevailing prejudices of the times, could scarcely be accused of severity or imprudence. She established no inquisition into men's bosoms; she imposed no oath of supremacy, except upon those who received trust or emolument from the public; and though the exercise of every religion but the established was prohibited by statute, the violation of this law, by saying mass and receiving the sacrament in private houses, was in many instances connived at.” †

In the same spirit it is remarked by Rapin: “Although some Roman Catholics suffered in her reign, yet none were punished except for conspiring against the queen or the state. . . . The Roman Catholics who lived peace-

\* Constitutional History, vol. i. ch. iii. p. 164 (Fifth Edition).

† History of England, vol. v. ch. xi. p. 223 (London, 1786).

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

ably were tolerated, with some restraint as to the *exercise* of their religion, but with none as to their consciences." \*

These assertions are decidedly opposed to the notions of modern times, when some controversialists are pleased to say that Elizabeth was not less a persecutor than her sister. These circumstances are here noted because it is necessary to show that Whitgift had to contend against a party little known to Grindal, and still less to Parker—that of the Romanists or Papists. The foreign Papists or the Regulars sent in from the various seminaries are, as we have seen, to be distinguished from the Seculars, who were mostly Englishmen who remained in England, and who were loyal to the crown; but the Jesuits and Seminary priests appeared to be implacable, and the queen herself was aware of her danger, which she expected her ministers to avert. In addressing her parliament she on one occasion said, "I know no creature that breatheth whose life standeth hourly in more peril for it than mine own is." †

We are not surprised when we find that Whitgift's pleadings in behalf of the Secular Romish priests did not always meet with the attention they deserved. While he was not permitted to conciliate them, he shared the queen's danger from the Regulars of whom we have just been speaking.

One would have supposed that under these circumstances, Protestants of all shades of opinion would have rallied round him, that through their loyalty he might render the queen secure on her throne. But it was not so: the Puritans were as bitter as ever, though the nature of their demands had now been changed. They desired to over-rule all things, and were the more indig-

\* Histoire d'Angleterre, tom. vi. l. xvii. p. 495.

† D'Ewes' Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth, p. 328.

The queen  
is aware  
of her  
danger.

nant with Whitgift, when he declined to follow the example of Grindal in seeking counsel from the Protestant theologians on the Continent. The English divines were beginning to feel their own strength, and in 1592 we find Bancroft in his Survey of Discipline censuring Beza severely for his daring to interfere with English affairs. When Beza complained, Whitgift excited the anger of the English Puritans by appearing as the defender of Bancroft: the fact was that the Puritans desired now to have everything placed under their domination. Nothing could exceed their malignity when they found that Whitgift would not become one of them, and that he intended to be the ruler of the Church, to preside over which he had been called by the Providence of God.

This gave rise to certain notorious publications which, written by several authors, appeared in the name of one who was styled Martin Mar-prelate. The attacks upon the primate and upon the queen made by this party were perfectly fierce; the works seemed to be written by men who were not restrained by fear of man or God. Infuriated by disappointed hopes, and complaining of the corruption of the government, the works of Martin Mar-prelate consisted of the most coarse, scurrilous, and indecent pasquinades against any who appeared to be their superiors in church or state.

It is not exactly known when the ludicrous *nom de guerre* Martin Mar-prelate was first adopted, although it is generally supposed that the libels originated with a young Welshman of the name of Penry. This unfortunate person suffered himself to be betrayed by his own violence into acts of undoubted illegality; and at length, when his scurrility was brought to bear not only against the primate and his suffragans, but also against the queen and her courtiers, he was, according to the arbitrary

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Whitgift declines to seek counsel from foreign theologians.

Hatred of the Puritans excited against him.

Works of Martin Mar-prelate.

Probably written by one Penry.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

The  
moveable  
printing-  
press.

Its sup-  
pression.

Whitgift's  
generous  
conduct  
towards  
the libel-  
lers.

principles of the age, subjected to that condign punishment which all but his own partisans regarded as fully deserved.

The works were published by means of a moveable press, which the libellers carried with them from place to place. It was first set up at Moulsey, near Kingston-upon-Thames, whence it was conveyed to Faussley in Northamptonshire, from thence to Norton, and afterwards to Coventry. From Warwickshire it was sent to Manchester, where, by the means of the Earl of Derby, it was discovered and suppressed.

It is highly to the credit of Whitgift that he, who suffered most from the libellers, appeared in the Star Chamber, whither they had been summoned, and successfully employed his eloquence and used his interest to deliver those who were found guilty, out of prison, whither they had been condemned, while he caused their fines to be, if not entirely remitted, very greatly mitigated. He was satisfied by the proclamation issued by the government against the obnoxious publications.\* His conduct was not the result of carelessness; for Whitgift was accustomed to pay minute attention to all church matters which were brought for discussion before the council. It was his custom to repair every day at an early hour in the morning to the council table, and after what Fuller calls "An usual appreciation of a good morrow" to the lords, he requested to know if there was any church business to be debated. If no church business was to be brought on, he was accustomed to say, "Then, my lords, there is no need of me," and took his departure—another instance in addition to those already

\* Fuller's Church History, Book ix., § 7, 20 (vol. v. p. 132); Soames's Elizabethan History, p. 370; Paule's Whitgift (Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr. vol. iii. p. 581); Strype's Whitgift, i. 552; iii. 216.

produced of the determination on the part of Whitgift not to mix himself up with the secular concerns of the country. Whether in so doing he acted wisely or not, each reader must decide for himself.

The libellous productions of Martin Mar-prelate had a more powerful effect than is sometimes supposed. A spirit of insubordination and an encouragement of heretical notions reached the University of Cambridge itself, and about the year 1576 involved Whitgift in a controversy which caused him much trouble. The Dissentients found a leader in Thomas Cartwright.

Thomas Cartwright was a controversialist with whom it was an honour to contend. He was born in Hertfordshire, and was a few years younger than Whitgift. Having overcome various difficulties to procure for himself a learned education, he matriculated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where the assiduity with which he applied himself to his studies surprised his contemporaries and won the admiration and praise of his superiors. He allowed himself only five hours for sleep, and to this custom he adhered to the end of his life. Having retired into obscurity as a lawyer's clerk during the reign of Mary, he was enabled through the kindness of his master, who used his interest with Dr. Pilkington, head of St. John's College, to resume his studies in the university on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. He obtained a fellowship first at St. John's and then at Trinity, and in 1567 took his degree of Bachelor of Divinity, being chosen three years afterwards to be Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity. His lectures on the Acts of the Apostles displayed such acuteness of wit and solidity of judgment, that his lecture-room was crowded; and so popular did he become as a preacher in St. Mary's Church, that the very windows were taken out in order that the multitudes

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Contro-  
versy with  
Cart-  
wright,  
1576.

Career of  
Thomas  
Cart-  
wright.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

His attack  
on the  
Church.

might come within the reach of his voice. At this time the character of Cartwright did not appear in a favourable point of view. Having been selected as one of the most distinguished men of the university, to dispute before Queen Elizabeth when in 1564 she visited Cambridge, he was so offended by the queen's want of the attention which he thought due to his merits, and by the favour shown to Master Preston, then of King's College, and afterwards Master of Trinity Hall, who excelled him in eloquence, that his temper became soured, and he thought to annoy the queen by attacking the Church. He availed himself both of the lecture-room and of the pulpit to attack the hierarchy, and to point out, as he supposed, an inconsistency between the principles of the English Reformation and the requirements of Holy Scripture. He railed against the discipline of the Church and the ecclesiastical government; he even travelled to Geneva with a view of introducing the Helvetian discipline into England. He vehemently denounced the episcopal office and the offices subordinate to the bishops; he scoffed at our mode of administering the Sacraments, and had in derision our rites and ceremonies. In this radical movement he was enthusiastically supported not only by the younger scholars of the university, but also by some of the younger preachers, who regarded him as a model of eloquence. Among other ceremonies of the Church, he, like other Puritans, took especial offence against the use of the surplice, and on one occasion when, in violation of the statutes, the young men of Trinity and of St. John's appeared in chapel not properly arrayed, the act of insubordination was attributed to the influence of Cartwright.\*

When it was found that among his supporters might be mentioned some of the most distinguished men of the

\* See vol. iv. (New Series) p. 453.



university, even Archbishop Parker took alarm, and on June 23, 1570, he wrote to the Chancellor of the University, Sir William Cecil, urging him to take some decided measures for silencing Cartwright; and Whitgift being the vice-chancellor, having investigated the subject, enjoined silence upon the offender and all his adherents. He would not permit Cartwright to take his degree of D.D. at the approaching Commencement, and acting with the consent of the wise-headed chancellor he brought the statutes of the university so to bear upon Cartwright and his followers as at length to compel them to silence. Whitgift was of course, as is customary on such occasions, subjected to loud complaints of envy, calumny, persecution, and tyrannical exertion of power. But if we carefully examine the case, we must admit that he only acted statutably according to the discipline of the university, and that he was, as it would appear to him, more sinned against than sinning. At the same time we must admit that Cartwright, thinking the Church to be in error, and the sect to which he was attached a model of church discipline, could hardly be expected to hold his peace; and he again retired to the Continent, there to fortify himself for further party struggles. He left Cambridge when the university was violently agitated by party spirit, the pulpit itself not being free from gross personalities.\*

So great was the popularity of Thomas Cartwright, that his principles soon found supporters in the House of Commons. A new Parliament had met in April 1571; and was impregnated with much religious discontent.

Cartwright being at this time recognised as the chief of the Nonconformists, presented to the House of Commons a book, or, as we should now say, an address, called 'An

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Archbishop  
Parker's  
alarm  
thereat.

Whitgift,  
as Vice-  
Chan-  
cellor,  
silences  
Cart-  
wright.

Cart-  
wright  
retires to  
the Con-  
tinent.

His 'Ad-  
monition  
to Par-  
liament.'

\* Lamb's Collection of Letters, p. 356.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Admonition to Parliament.\* It consisted of two parts, and might be styled two pamphlets. The Admonition certainly did not make a favourable impression on the mind with regard to the religious principles of its advocates; it is said to have breathed a spirit of intolerant, sarcastic, and haughty defiance. Attached to the Admonition was a letter from Beza to the Earl of Leicester, that profligate man being a patron of the Puritans. Another letter was published from Gualter to Bishop Parkhurst, recommending a reformation of church discipline; it contained what was called the "platform of a church."

The object was the overthrow of episcopacy, and the subversion of all such principles of the Church as were not in accordance with the principles of Calvin.

A second Admonition was addressed to Parliament by Cartwright when he returned to England, an answer to which, as well as to the former Admonition, was published by Dr. Whitgift. A fierce war of words ensued. Cartwright, encouraged by Leicester and even by Burghley, prepared to write against the Rhemish translation of the New Testament, but was prohibited by Whitgift from completing the work, which was not published till many years after his death. It is not necessary to pursue this controversy further, especially as it passed from the hands of Whitgift to those of Bishop Aylmer, by whom Cartwright was several times committed to prison.

Whitgift was more wisely employed, until his advancement to the episcopate, by preparing an answer to the Admonition. He was appointed to undertake this office by the archbishop; for although the Admonition was

\* It was printed without an author's name, and though presented by Cartwright, was understood to have been written by Field and Wilcox, who were on that account committed to Newgate.

Parker  
appoints  
Whitgift  
to answer  
the 'Ad-  
monition.'

never presented to Parliament, it was widely circulated throughout the country, and did inconceivable mischief. Whitgift, in preparing his answer, consulted a variety of learned men, and among them Archbishop Parker, together with Cowper, Bishop of Lincoln, and Dr. Perne. A rejoinder was provoked, and Cartwright certainly showed great personal pique, and was guilty, as his opponent pointed out, of certain mistakes for which, we may charitably suppose, his removal from the libraries of the university at a period when libraries were few and far between will account. Whitgift published a defence of his answer in 1574, to which Cartwright rejoined in his second reply in 1575, adding a second part in 1577. Of these Whitgift took no notice; his mind was sufficiently occupied and excited by the duties of those higher offices of the Church to which he had now succeeded.

I cannot but add what it is gratifying to read, that before his death Whitgift had opportunities of showing acts of kindness to his old opponent, and that Cartwright received with gratitude what was generously and kindly intended. It is thought by some, and it is highly probable, that Cartwright's own opinions underwent considerable modification. In the preface to Bishop Morton's 'Episcopacy Justified,' Sir Henry Yelverton observes that Cartwright on his death-bed expressed his regret at the unnecessary troubles he had caused in the Church, by the schism of which he had been the great fomentor. It was at the instance of Archbishop Whitgift, as is asserted by Sir George Paule, that Cartwright obtained his pardon from the queen, and in his letters of acknowledgment to the primate, Yelverton remarks that Cartwright styled him a "Right Reverend Father in God and his Lord the Archbishop's Grace of Canterbury."

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Reconcili-  
ation  
between  
Cart-  
wright and  
Whitgift.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

He often visited the archbishop, who treated him with kindness, and even tolerated his preaching at Warwick upon his promise not to impugn the laws, orders, and government of the Church of England, but as far as in him lay to promote the peace of the Church.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Evil con-  
sequences  
of Cart-  
wright's  
writings.

This redounds more to the credit of Whitgift, as by so doing he incurred the anger of the queen, and some ill-feeling in his own party. The mischief, however, whether intended or not, which was done to the Church, was very great; discontent prevailed through the country, and the Puritans who excited it showed no indulgence except to themselves. The abhorrence of the national hierarchy exhibited by these Puritans was as great as their dislike of popery, and that was boundless; they warned "the lordly lords, the archbishops, bishops, suffragans, deans, doctors, archdeacons, chancellors, and the rest of that proud generation, that their kingdom must down, hold they never so hard, because their tyrannous lordships cannot stand with Christ's kingdom." \* In short, they wished to see England studded with petty oligarchies, half clerical, half lay, like Geneva. They denounced the administration of the Sacraments without preaching: the mere reading of the service was pronounced to be as bad or worse than a stage play. In the Communion Service objection was taken to the use of the word "Introit," which was said to have originated with Pope Calixtus. The prevailing usage of administering in wafer cakes came next under animadversion, and fault was found with the reading of fragments of the Epistle and Gospel, and of the Nicene Creed. In the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism objection was taken to surplices, the interrogatories, the sponsors, the fonts, and the sign of the cross; all which were stigmatised as the super-

\* Soames's Elizabethan History, p. 165.

stitious and wicked institution of a new Sacrament. Complaints were made of the homilies, of lessons from the Apocrypha, of using the term priest, of the ring in matrimony, as if the latter were used as a sacramental sign. Confirmation by the bishop alone, was said to be superstitious; the Burial Service was mentioned as unnecessary, as every Christian, and not ministers only, are concerned in burying the dead; the office, it was alleged, contained devotions for the dead, an inference which was "partially gathered from some of the prayers." Exceptions were taken to the Psalms, which were said to be "tossed in most places like tennis balls." Cathedrals were stigmatized as "popish dens," which, together with the Queen's Chapel by their organs and curious singing, "must be patterns and precedents to the people of all superstitions." The authors of the Admonition add, "We should be long to tell your Honours of Cathedral Churches, the dens aforesaid of all loitering lubbers, where Master Dean, Master Vice-Dean, Master Canons, or Master Prebendaries the greater, Master Petty Canons or Canons the lesser, Master Chancellor of the Church, Master Treasurer or otherwise called Judas the Purse-bearer, the chief chanter, singing men, squeaking choristers, organ-players, gospellers, epistolers, pensioners, readers, vergers, etc., live in great idleness, and have their abiding. If you would know whence all these come, we can easily answer, that they come from the Pope as from out of the Trojan horse's belly, to the distraction of God's kingdom." \*

The controversy with Cartwright occupied several years of Whitgift's life. There are two other contro-

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

\* Soames's Elizabethan Religious History, p. 171; Whitgift's Works, vol. iii. p. 394. It is needless to pursue the subject further, since enough has been said to show the kind of difficulties in which Whitgift at various times of his life was involved.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

versies in which he was personally engaged; in the one he was only partially concerned, while the other did not tend to his credit as a theologian. These disputes however differed rather from those to which the reader's attention has hitherto been called, for the Reformation of the Church had by this time been so far advanced, that it was rather against the misapplication of its principles, than in the establishment of them that Whitgift was concerned.

Of all the writers of that age there is none with whose works the student of history is more intimately acquainted than with those of the judicious Hooker. The reader of history is therefore well acquainted with the generous support which Hooker received from Whitgift in the controversy between him and Travers.\* When Elvie, Master of the Temple, died, an attempt was made by the friends of Travers, who had been Lecturer of the Temple Church, to have him appointed as his successor. Travers, however, had not been ordained; he had been only admitted as a preacher by the Presbyterians of Antwerp; and therefore, although he was a man of competent learning and of winning manners, Whitgift objected to his appointment, and Sandys, Bishop of London, obtained the Mastership for Hooker.† The queen, acting under the influence of the archbishop, refused to nominate Travers unless he first renounced his Presbyterianism. So far from yielding this point, Travers was endeavouring to introduce the Presbyterian government into the Temple, and a book entirely rejecting the doctrine of episcopacy was supposed to have been written by Travers. This was but the beginning of a

\* Walton's Life of Hooker (Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr., vol. iii. p. 468).

† Travers's Supplication to the Council, and Hooker's Answer printed at the end of the Ecclesiastical Polity.

Contro-  
versy  
between  
Hooker  
and  
Travers,  
1595.

quarrel which grew into importance : the result was that Whitgift silenced Travers, and that Travers appealed to the council. For his non-episcopal ordination Travers was suspended, and to justify his suspension we are in possession of Hooker's immortal work. It may be said that with Hooker began the Post-Reformation of Church of England Theology.

Although it is evident that Whitgift inclined moderately to the Calvinism which was rejected by Hooker, still the archbishop proved himself a true and firm friend, and obtained considerable preferment for our great divine. Perhaps it was owing to a suspicion of the archbishop's secret inclination towards Calvinism, that in the year 1595 the Calvinists, who had increased in the University of Cambridge, endeavoured to procure his patronage.

If Whitgift was inclined to doctrinal Calvinism, it was in that moderate shape in which it was afterwards held by Beveridge, without any denial of baptismal regeneration, or of the apostolical succession. The archbishop certainly betrayed a weakness, of which, in the earlier period of his life, he would not have been guilty ; and we owe it to the firmness of the queen and Burghley, to whose opinions Whitgift immediately deferred, that the Church of England escaped at that time the Calvinistic taint.

Like many other eminent divines who took a decided part against the Puritans, Whitgift did not find any very great difficulty in accepting a modified exposition of the doctrinal articles of Calvin's Institutes, so long as those who held them maintained the hierarchical system of the Church, in opposition to the Genevan "platform," as it had become the custom to style the discipline of the Swiss reformer. Whitgift seems to have thought that it would be the part of wisdom to make concessions

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583--  
1603-4.

Whitgift's  
friendship  
for  
Hooker.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

in that direction, in return for a loyal adherence to the discipline of the English Church.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

There was a large party at Cambridge who denounced the opponents of Calvin as persons addicted to popery, and the heads of houses ventured about the year 1595 to censure a divine who denied some points of Calvinistic doctrine, and who had spoken disrespectfully of Calvin, Peter Martyr, and others. Instead of resolutely opposing these theologians, Archbishop Whitgift seems at this time to have thought it expedient to coincide with them. He appointed a committee to meet him at Lambeth House, where they found assembled Dr. Vaughan, the elect of Bangor; Dr. Fletcher, the elect of London; Dr. Tindal, Dean of Ely; and after due discussion they drew up the following nine articles, commonly called the Lambeth Articles :

1. God hath from eternity predestinated certain persons to life, and hath reprobated certain persons unto death.

2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the persons predestinated; but the alone will of God's good pleasure.

3. The predestinate are a predetermined and certain number, which can neither be lessened nor increased.

4. Such as are not predestinated to salvation shall inevitably be condemned on account of their sins.

5. The true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, doth not vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.

6. A true believer, that is, one who is endued with justifying faith, is certified by the full assurance of faith

The  
'Lambeth  
Articles.'



that his sins are forgiven, and that he shall be everlastingly saved by Christ.

7. Saving grace is not allowed, is not imparted, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.

8. No man is able to come to Christ unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to His Son.

9. It is not in the will or power of every man to be saved.\*

These Articles, asserting the most offensive of the Calvinistic positions, were not accepted by the Church, and consequently were of no weight, although they were employed at the time to silence by authority those against whom argument could not prevail. The prelates who drew them up acted, however, without authority, for they were not assembled in a synod. A synod is an assembly of bishops, and some say of presbyters, duly convened. In this instance there was no convention. The meeting was a mere private conference, and the decision was of no more weight than the charge of a bishop delivered without a consultation with his clergy, which is only the expression of a private opinion, it may be even that of an Arian or Sabellian; and which, though it is to be heard with respect, is only to be treated as the opinion of an individual, until the clergy have officially received it as orthodox. The decision of such a conference was to be received with respect, and examined, not with reference to the authority with which it was given, but according to its own merits. There can be no greater proof of the absence of Calvinism from the Thirty-nine Articles, than the fact that the very persons who were condemning

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1588—  
1603-4.

\* Whitgift's Works, vol. iii. p. 612; Strype's Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 280; vol. iii. p. 340; Hardwick's History of Articles.

CHAP.  
XXIV.John  
Whitgift.1583—  
1603-4.The queen  
and  
Burghley  
disapprove  
of the  
Articles.Whitgift  
yields to  
their  
decision.

the orthodox for innovations, were compelled to invent new Articles before they could make our Church Calvinistic. The conduct of the archbishop gave much offence to many pious persons, and especially to Lord Burghley and the queen. To Whittaker and the heads of the party he represented, Burghley granted a conference; the Articles were submitted to his judgment; and although he was oppressed by bodily infirmity, they found that he retained that vigour of mind and that soundness of judgment which empowered him to enter freely into discussion upon the various questions of theology for which his opinion was now demanded. He expressed his general disapprobation of the Articles, and in particular his dislike to that which bore upon the subject of predestination. He submitted the Articles to the judgment of the queen, and by her they were condemned more strongly if possible than by her minister. To the judgment of the queen Whitgift offered no opposition; and instead of forcing them upon the university, he enjoined the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge to use his own discretion with respect to their publication.

The whole affair did not reflect credit upon the conduct and character of Whitgift. He appears to us to have accepted the Articles without due consideration; and when a controversy arose in which the queen took a part, he deserted his followers in a manner which we cannot fail to consider as pusillanimous. The Articles had evidently been drawn up by persons addicted to the supralapsarian hypothesis, and against such Whitgift through life stood opposed, though we must admit that his study of theological questions had not been so deep as is generally supposed.

By reason of his own advancing age, and the queen's desire to quit the world of controversy, more peace awaited the latter part of Whitgift's career than could

have been expected when that career began. It was ordained that he should attend the death bed of the queen, acting towards her with the faithfulness of a pious friend and discharging with sympathy the duties which devolved upon him as a devout priest. We use advisedly the word sympathy, for his own death soon followed that of his royal mistress. They had fought together the battles of the Church, and together they were summoned to render their account to the King of kings and the Lord of lords.

We have in this chapter entered into a brief account of the controversies in which, through no fault of his own, Archbishop Whitgift was involved. His conduct with reference to the Lambeth Articles is the more blameworthy, since from his yielding immediately to the remonstrances of the queen and of Burghley, we may infer that in his mind no principle was invoked or displayed. His mind had softened; something of the instability of old age may have crept upon him; he desired peace, and as introductory to peace he courted popularity. He thought that he might exercise the needful discipline over the university if he conciliated by concession some of its leading men.

We have also narrated the four great controversies which occupied the time of Whitgift both before and after his being raised to the episcopate: these are the distinguishing points in his career. With respect to the ordinary performance of his duties at the university, and afterwards at Worcester and Canterbury, it is unnecessary to enter into minute particulars; for we have only to say that, in addition to the special difficulties to which he was exposed, he performed the usual offices of his respective callings as they would have been performed by any conscientious member of the Church.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

## CHAPTER XXV.

## WHITGIFT'S DOMESTIC LIFE.

Paule's description of Whitgift—His love of teaching—His hospitality—Makes peace between Sir J. Russell and Sir H. Berkeley—Recovers church lands—Whitgift as a disciplinarian—Grandeur of his retinue—First journey into Kent—Hospital at Croydon—His literary works—Munificence—The queen's last days—Whitgift visits her on her death-bed—His prayer for her—Her death, March 24, 1603—Popular grief shown at her funeral—James proclaimed King of England.

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Paule's  
description  
of  
Whitgift.

His love of  
teaching.

WE have a sketch of the character of John Whitgift by a friend and contemporary;\* an advantage not possessed by any of Whitgift's predecessors. Although Sir George Paule had neither the inclination nor the ability to write the life of his friend, he affectionately preserved various anecdotes which were circulated at the time, and throw light upon his character. From him we learn that the archbishop was a man of middle stature, strong and well shaped, of a grave countenance and brown complexion; his hair and his eyes were black, and his beard was neither long nor thick. There are various portraits of Archbishop Whitgift; one of them is engraved in the 'Herologia,' and there are others by R. White, George Vertue, Thomas Trotter, and J. Fittler. He took a peculiar interest in tuition, and he continued the instruction of well-disposed young men, who had boarded with him at Cam-

\* Paule's Whitgift (Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr. vol. iii. p. 553).

bridge, when he was advanced to the episcopate, and even when he had become the Primate of All England. Among the young men of rank to whom this advantage was extended, we may mention the name of one of the greatest men of that or any other age—the celebrated Lord Bacon. The Earls of Worcester and Cumberland, the Lord Zouch, and the Lord Dunboy of Ireland profited by his discipline and instruction, while in them he was heard to say, that “he took great comfort as well for their singular towardliness as for their observance of him, and performance of several good offices towards him, all which, together with the rest of the scholars of that house [Trinity College], he held to their public disputations and exercises, and prayers which he never missed.”\* Such was his procedure during the ten years that he presided over Trinity College, Cambridge: he usually dined and supped in the common hall, that he might have an eye upon his pupils in their relaxations, and that he might teach them to be contented “with a scholar-like college diet.”

In Worcestershire and afterwards in Kent, as well as in London, the nobility and gentry of the county were Whitgift’s frequent guests, and at Christmastide his gates were thrown open, and his halls crowded with hungry strangers, who were courteously received and hospitably entertained.

The guests found a fair stable for their horses, and learned to admire the good and serviceable armoury he possessed. Whitgift’s armed retainers were in number three score. With these he was the first among the nobility who, at the close of Elizabeth’s reign, marched into Essex House and captured Robert Devereux.

While he was yet Bishop of Worcester, he began that princely hospitality which the queen delighted to see dis-

CHAP.

XXV.

John  
Whitgift.1583—  
1603-4.Whitgift’s  
hospita-  
lity.Frequently  
visited by  
the queen.

\* Wordsworth’s *Eccles. Biogr.*, vol. iii. p. 566.

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

played by her bishops; and both while he was Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards when he was primate, she honoured him frequently with her company on the High Festivals of the Church; and towards the close of her life, her majesty was a frequent, though a private, guest at the archiepiscopal palace.

Whitgift was accustomed to preach every Sunday either in his cathedral or in some neighbouring church; and living on terms of intimacy with the gentry of his neighbourhood, he frequently accommodated the differences which in that quarrelsome age would occasionally occur even among those who had lived as friends. A remarkable instance of his determination and success as a peace-maker has been recorded. Deadly feud existed between Sir John Russell and Sir Henry Berkeley; each came armed with many friends and followers to a session at Worcester, and it was feared that bloodshed would ensue. The bishop, therefore, having set a strong watch at the gates, had the litigants brought to the palace, where he compelled them to the number of four or five hundred to deliver their weapons to his servants; and after two hours of threats and persuasions, he induced them to be friends, and they attended him to the town hall, hand in hand, where in perfect amity they did their duty as magistrates of the county, and ever after remained among the chief friends of the bishop.\*

According to the statement of Sir George Paule, the arrival of Whitgift was hailed with enthusiasm by the inhabitants of Worcestershire, and from them he received that support which he stood in need of, when on his translation to the primacy, he succeeded in winning back to the Church a thousand acres of land, by the loss of which the See of Worcester had been impoverished.

\* Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr. vol. iii. p. 570.

Whitgift  
makes  
peace be-  
tween Sir  
John  
Russell  
and Sir  
Henry  
Berkeley

Recovers  
some  
Church  
lands.

Whitgift was a strict disciplinarian, and under Queen Elizabeth's rule his discipline was rendered the stricter. Although he frequently had cause to lament that irritability of temper which was his calamity at one period of his life, nevertheless by his impartial administration of justice he made himself universally respected, and seldom permitted his private feelings to hurry him into severer measures than any particular case required.

The Earl of Salisbury, according to Sir George Paule, observed that there was nothing more to be feared in Whitgift's government, especially towards his latter time, than his mildness and clemency : in saying this, we are to bear in mind the difference in feeling which prevailed in that age and in this ; he lived when toleration was not understood, and he was not to be blamed for doing what was done by all his contemporaries. His sense of justice was strong : he never permitted any of his own family or attendants to further their private requests, nor did he receive petitions in private : he was to be addressed by petitioners themselves, either in his going to the chapel, court, dinner, supper, or at the council court. While he attended to minute points of economy, he kept a " great and bountiful house."

Every third year he went into Kent, when he kept up great state : his attendants were in number upwards of two hundred, and he sometimes entered the city of Canterbury and other large towns with eight hundred or one thousand horse. He did this on most occasions at his own expense, while his courtesy, says a gentleman of the county, and his affability with his tenants, obtained for him great popularity.

At Whitgift's first journey into Kent, it was remarked that one hundred of his own servants were in livery, and at least forty of his gentlemen were adorned with chains

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift,  
1583—  
1603-4.

Whitgift  
as a disciplinarian.

Grandeur  
of his  
retinue.

CHAP.  
XXV.John  
Whitgift.1583—  
1603-4.Whitgift's  
first jour-  
ney into  
Kent.

of gold. A train of five hundred horse awaited his arrival. It so happened that at the same time a representative of the papal court had landed with a view to inform himself of the real state of ecclesiastical things in England: he was perfectly astonished to see the reverence with which an English archbishop was entertained; and the day after being the Lord's Day, he saw the dean, prebendaries, and preachers plainly but decorously adorned with their surplices and scarlet hoods; and when he heard the solemn music, with the voices and organs, the cornets and sackbuts, he was overwhelmed with admiration, and told an English gentleman who had accompanied him "that they were led into great blindness at Rome by our own nation, who made the people there believe that there was not in England either archbishop or bishops, cathedral, or any church or ecclesiastical government, but that all was pulled down to the ground, and that the people heard their ministers in woods and fields, amongst trees and brute beasts; but, for his own part, he protested that unless it were in the pope's chapel, he never saw a more solemn sight, or heard a more heavenly sound."\*

The archbishop delighted in his mansion house at Croydon, especially in the summer time. Thither he might escape from the multiplicity of business in which he was involved; but it became doubly dear to him when he had finished his hospital, dedicated to the Blessed Trinity, in Croydon. It was a decent edifice, built like a college, for a warden, with twenty-eight brothers and sisters under him. Near to it he erected a free school, with a house for a school-master, to whom a good salary was allowed. He very frequently dined at the hospital among

Whitgift's  
hospital  
at Croy-  
don.

\* The English gentleman was Sir Edward Hobby. Wordsworth's *Eccles. Biogr.* vol. iii. p. 608. Compare Hackett's *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pp. 210-212.



his poor brethren as he called them. At Croydon too he was visited by his friends the Earls of Shrewsbury, Worcester, and Cumberland, by the Lord Zouch, and the Bishop of London; and above all he had the comfort of enjoying the society of his dear friend and sovereign Queen Elizabeth, who visited him, as we have before mentioned, without ceremony or restraint, and delighted in his conversation.

The archbishop remained the friend of the unfortunate Earl of Essex so long as he could have confidence in his loyalty; but as soon as that confidence was lost, he took an active part in defending the queen against the insane manœuvres of her ungrateful protégé the earl, into whose history it is not necessary here to enter. The archbishop was now beginning to feel the effects of old age, and saw with affection and grief that the queen herself would soon be removed from her people.

Before we proceed to the last scenes of his life it is necessary that we should advert to his literary labours. If I may judge from those portions of Whitgift's writings which I have had occasion to consult, his defence of the Answer to the Admonition, the extracts from his Determinations and Lectures, and some of his sermons and letters, ought to be read by all who desire an acquaintance with the affairs of the age.

By the editors of the 'Athenæ Cantabrigienses' ninety-one works are mentioned as productions of the indefatigable pen of Archbishop Whitgift: some remain in manuscript, but of their authenticity there can be no doubt. It cannot be expected that the student of history can master all these works, many of them ephemeral and controversial, and of little service now that the passions of men have cooled on the subjects to which they refer. Most readers will be satisfied with the collection of Whitgift's works made, under the direction of the Parker

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

His  
literary  
works.

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

Society, by the Rev. John Ayre, of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, of whose sound judgment it is impossible to speak too highly. Among these publications we have :

1. 'An Answer to a certain Libel, intituled An Admonition to the Parliament. London, 1572.' A second edition with considerable additions appeared in 1573.

2. 'The Defense of the Answer to the Admonition, against the Reply of T. C.' Of this there were at least two impressions, but the date is the same (1574).

3. 'A godlie Sermon preached before the Queenes Majestie at Greneviche the 26 March last past,' London, 1574.

Whitgift left several unpublished works enumerated among the English manuscripts, and a volume of state papers, among which are some of the archbishop's letters. This volume was in the library of Canterbury Cathedral. Besides these there are notes on various parts of Scripture, and certain letters, articles, and injunctions, which, preserved in the British Museum or elsewhere, have many of them been printed by Strype and other antiquarians. A portion of the lectures on the Apocalypse, delivered when Whitgift was Margaret Professor of Divinity, have been printed by Mr. Ayre, and appear to be of considerable value. But the most complete and important works of Archbishop Whitgift are those which relate to the 'Admonition to Parliament,' and the 'Defense of the Answer to that Admonition.' In this work interesting information is to be obtained of the condition of the Church at that age. All Whitgift's powers were called into action by his controversy with Cartwright, and the blunt accuracy of his style stands out in favourable contrast with the writings of his opponent, though in

elegance of expression we must perhaps give precedence to the heretic.\*

We have already mentioned Whitgift's refusal of the chancellorship on Sir Thomas Bromley's death, and his recommendation to the queen of Sir Christopher Hatton.† In Hatton he found through life a friend at court, and of such a friend Whitgift stood in need; for although his friends were many, his enemies were unscrupulous and not a few. When Rector of Teversham, Whitgift, in conjunction with Margaret, widow of Bartholomew Fulnetby, founded a Bible clerkship at Peterhouse, and assisted by the same benevolent lady he dedicated an annual sum to the relief of poor widows in the parish of Clavering in Essex. He gave to Trinity College a piece of plate parcel gilt, and a considerable number of MSS. He also gave a MS. of the Complutensian Bible to Pembroke Hall, and he endowed the city of Canterbury with 100 marks. In short, wherever Whitgift went we find traces of his munificence.

At the close of the century the archbishop began to feel anxiety about the queen's health, and he was considerably annoyed by the encroachment upon the queen's prerogative touching ecclesiastical affairs, a popular cry being raised against her monopolies, a subject to which we shall have hereafter to direct more special attention. In convocation Whitgift addressed his suffragans, exhorting them to a better regulation of their courts. With reference to the clergy he insisted that, as it was neither advisable, nor possible, to dispense with the system of pluralities, it was the first duty of a non-resident clergy-

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Whitgift's  
muni-  
ficence.

\* See Brook's Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Cartwright.

† See above, p. 131.

CHAP.  
XXV.

man to make provision for a fit and proper representative.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

In 1602 we find the queen restored to her usual hilarity of temper. On November 19 she went from Richmond to Whitehall by water. The lord mayor was already on horseback prepared to meet her at Charing Cross after she had landed, attended by a troop of five hundred velvet coats and chains of gold. On the anniversary of the queen's accession there were various entertainments, and we are told that it passed with the ordinary solemnity of preaching, singing, shooting, ringing, and running.\* In a contemporary letter to the Countess of Shrewsbury it is stated that the Bishop of Limerick, Dr. Thornborough, made a dull sermon at Paul's Cross. The queen's fool Garratt distinguished himself, being well disguised, "though not altogether so well mounted, for his horse was no bigger than a good bandog. But he pleased the queen, who gave him an audience, and he made her very merry."

On January 27, 1602-3, the court removed to Richmond, but Sir Robert Carey, the queen's kinsman, arriving at the court in 1602, informed the archbishop that he found the queen very ill disposed, and he continues, "she kept her inner lodging; yet hearing of my arrival, she sent for me. I found her in one of her withdrawing chambers sitting low upon her cushions. She called me to her; I kissed her hand, and told her it was my chiefest happiness to see her in safety and in health, which I hoped might long continue. She took me by the hand, and wrung it hard, and said, 'No, Robin, I am not well;' and then discoursed with me of her indisposition, and that her heart had been sad and heavy for ten or twelve days, and in her discourse she fetched not so few as forty or fifty great sighs. I was grieved at the

The  
queen's  
last days.

\* Nichols's Progresses, p. 600.

first to see her in this plight, for in all my lifetime I never knew her fetch a sigh, but when the queen of Scots was beheaded." \*

The next day she was unable to appear publicly in the chapel, but in a chamber hard by the closet door she heard the service. From that day she grew worse and worse. She could not be persuaded to take sustenance, nor to go to bed. On Wednesday, March 23, at six o'clock in the evening, being speechless, she made signs that she wanted to see the archbishop. He came attended by his chaplains. The queen lay upon her back, with one hand in the bed and the other out. The archbishop kneeled by her side, and examined her first of her faith. She answered his several questions by lifting up her eyes and holding up her hand, an action which affected all who stood by her. The archbishop told her plainly that she was a sinner, and exhorted her to think of her latter end. She had long been a great queen here upon earth, but now she was to yield an account of her stewardship to the King of kings and Lord of lords. Whitgift prayed, using the Visitation Service, and all around joined in the response. He continued long in prayer, till, as Carey expresses it, the old man's knees were weary. He then blessed her, and evidently meant to rise, when the queen made a sign with her hand that he should stay. He did so for half an hour longer, and then, attempting to rise again, she a second time made a sign to him to continue in prayer. With earnest cries to God for her soul's health he prayed for another half hour, and with such earnestness that the queen was evidently deeply affected, and it was late, at dark, before the archbishop retired, when the queen was left with the women who attended her. About two or three on the

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

The Arch-  
bishop  
visits the  
queen.

\* Memoirs of Sir Robert Carey, p. 116.

CHAP.  
XXV.John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

following morning it was reported that the queen had passed to her rest, and the archbishop was closeted with the Lords of the Council.\*

It would seem that a cold caught by the queen during the festivities which we have noticed, was the immediate cause of her illness. She had previously notified her wish that the King of Scotland should be proclaimed her heir. Archbishop Whitgift, in conducting the devotions of the queen shortly before her death, was assisted by Watson, Bishop of Chichester, a man of unquestioned zeal and piety; and although the queen was impatient of the speeches volunteered by some around her, she was always pleased to hear the archbishop and the other bishops when they gave her comfort and counsel to prepare herself God-ward.†

The prayer that was made for her the day before her death is preserved in Whitgift's Register. As there is little doubt that this prayer was the composition of the queen's friend and primate Archbishop Whitgift, we transcribe it for the instruction of the reader.

“Oh most Heavenly Father, and God of all mercy, we most humbly beseech Thee to behold Thy servant our queen with the eyes of pity and compassion. Give unto her the comforts of Thy Holy Spirit, work in her a constant and lively faith; grant unto her true repentance, and restore unto her, if it be Thy will, her former health and strength, both of body and soul. Let not the enemy nor his wicked instruments have any power over her to do her harm. O Lord, punish her not for our offences, neither us in her. Deal not with us, O Lord, as we have

\* Memoirs of Sir Robert Carey, p. 123. Sir Robert Carey's narrative is confirmed and enlarged by an article in the Cottonian MSS. See also Regist. Whitgift (Julius C. 7, 46), iii. 148.

† Strype's Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 466.

Whitgift's  
Prayer for  
the queen.

deserved; but for Thy mercy's sake, and for Thy Christ His sake, forgive us all our sins; and prolong her days, that we may still enjoy her to the glory of Thy Holy Name, and joy of all such as truly fear Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen."\*

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

A short time before the queen's death, when her courtiers were propounding the secular things relating to her kingdom and her successor, Whitgift seeing she had not long to live, exhorted her to fix her mind upon the things above. Being called upon by Sir James Hayward, the queen gave tokens of her belief that the Lord Jesus died not only for the world in general, but also for every believer individually who could feel as she did that He was her own Saviour in any especial manner. At length the great bell of St. Paul's announced the fact that the queen, of whom the people had so long been proud, and under whose government the nation had been raised from a second-rate to a first-rate power in the civilised world, was now no more.

The  
queen's  
death,  
March 24,  
1603.

In her early years the queen was in advance of her people; now the people, educated by her, were in advance of their queen; and from sundry political mistakes, and especially by her seeking to conciliate her courtiers by granting to them certain monopolies, her people had, in the science of political economy, left their queen behind.

In her old age she became weary of life. Without husband, children, or any near kinsfolk, she had none to love, and was beloved by none: she knew that her courtiers, while flattering her, were in correspondence with the King of Scotland, and contended among themselves which should first convey to him the intelligence of her death.

\* Strype's Whitgift, vol. ii., p. 467.

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Her courtiers she had always despised, and frequently persecuted: she never counted on the affection of her nobles; but when, on her appearing in public, the cheers of the people, which had been as music to her soul, began to subside, until at length they became inaudible to her deafened ear, she felt that her occupation was done. She had to bear neglect on the part of many who had cringed for her patronage; her memory began to fail; her second childhood was more friendless than her first; she was reported to the people, by those whose interest it was to defame her, as mad. She was not mad, but that once joyous, buoyant spirit was completely crushed.

Elizabeth of England ended her life of glory on earth on March 24, 1603, a melancholy, disconsolate, forlorn, and miserable old woman. The moment that her death was announced, the dormant affection of the people for their patriot queen was once more raised to enthusiasm. We are informed by Stowe, that on the day of Queen Elizabeth's funeral the city of Westminster was "surcharged with multitudes of all sorts of people, in the streets, houses, windows, leads, and gutters, who came to take part in the obsequies; and when they saw her statue or effigy lying on the coffin set forth in royal robes, having a crown on the head thereof, and the ball and sceptre in either hand, there was such a general sighing and groaning and weeping, as the like had not been seen or known within the memory of man: neither doth any history mention any people, time, or state to make like lamentation for the death of their sovereign."

Well might the melancholy Whitgift exclaim—

*Sic transit gloria mundi.*

The council were justly alarmed when the feelings of the people were thus excited. They began to fear that

Grief of  
the people  
at the  
queen's  
funeral.



the King of Scotland might not receive that amount of deference and respect which was due to the sovereign from the middle class, elevated as that class had been into a kind of aristocracy by the great queen and her grandfather.

CHAP.  
XXV.  
John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

The council assembled in great numbers, and Whitgift was long and frequently closeted with them. To the archbishop it was suggested, and he saw the wisdom of acting on the suggestion, that, sad though his heart was, he should assume a countenance expressive of the pleasure he experienced, in their having secured a worthy successor to so great a sovereign as was she whom they had lost.

They dreaded delay; and within six hours of the queen's death proclamation was made at the court gates, in the open assembly, signifying to the people the death of the queen and the undoubted right of succession on the part of James to the crown of England. About 11 o'clock in the forenoon of the same day the archbishop appeared with others of the council at the west side of the High Cross in Cheapside. The English princes, peers, and prelates being assembled, together with knights and other gentlemen well mounted; proclamation was again made, being most distinctly and audibly read by the late queen's most valued friend Mr. Secretary Cecil; and full of joy they were, the long-feared danger now so clearly prevented, when the people shouted "God save King James!"

James pro-  
claimed  
king of  
England.

The lords and others then went to Sheriff Pemberton's house, and there, after due deliberation, three heralds and a trumpeter were appointed to proclaim King James within the Tower, and care was taken to have notice given of what occurred in London to the justices and magistrates of the counties, and rulers of the towns and cities, who were required to follow the example thus set them by the lords spiritual and temporal, the lord mayor, the alder-

CHAP.  
XXV.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

men, and chief citizens of London. The proclamations concluded with a prayer that God Almighty, King of heaven and earth, would grant the new reign to be long and prosperous to the Universal Church of God, and particularly to the realms and dominions of the English King; and so it ended with "God save King James, God save King James. Amen. Amen."

Whitgift returned now to his own home, and was much engaged in prayer to Almighty God that He would protect His Church, and convert King James into a holy and godly prince. He had much to fear. It was doubtful how far Presbyterianism had gained the ascendancy over the mind of the new king, and what hostile forces would be brought to bear against God's Church in England. He soon discovered that the king, though learned, was a vainglorious man, who had considerable reading, but no genius; and, like too many others among his contemporaries, Whitgift hoped to win him over by flattery. Soon, however, the fact became clear to his mind, that if the king had been educated as a Presbyterian, he was now hostile to that sect; and that as he became better acquainted with the truth, he was prepared to follow the teaching of the Church.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

## CONCLUSION OF WHITGIFT'S LIFE.

King James receives the news of the queen's death.—Whitgift's alarm concerning the king's religious views.—James found to be a churchman at heart.—Millenary petition.—Whitgift confers with the king.—Coronation of James I.—Hampton Court Conference.—Whitgift takes cold on the water.—His last illness.—The king visits him.—His death, February 29, 1604.—His funeral, March 27.—Calumnies against Queen Elizabeth—Shakespeare's testimony to her merits.

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT was distinguished for nothing so much as for the boldness with which he opposed Queen Elizabeth when she followed her father's example in robbing the Church, or when she proceeded to acts of severity which, even in that age when justice was most severe, were unjustifiable. People are sometimes therefore surprised at the fulsome flattery with which Whitgift thought to get influence over the weak-willed and pusillanimous king, James I.; but we must remember "nemo repente fuit turpissimus." Of all crowned heads, or, as in that age would have been said, of all anointed sovereigns, a character less to be respected than that of James I. has not existed; but it was not in this character that he first presented himself to his new subjects.

The whole country seems to have been intoxicated by the thought of good things to come, as James entered the land. His progress from Scotland to the English metropolis was one incessant triumph.

It was not by the bishops or the clergy alone that the

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

new king was overwhelmed by flattery : every statesman and all who held office under the government seemed to vie with each other, in extolling the good points of his character, while they overlooked or refused to notice those faults, which had even already displayed themselves to the eyes of all who had watched his career.

James re-  
ceives the  
news of  
the queen's  
death.

The news of Queen Elizabeth's death was first brought to the eager ears of King James by a layman, Sir Robert Carey, whose account of the queen's last hours has been already given. The Presbyterian party, represented by a Mr. Lewis Pickering, soon confirmed the intelligence, which seemed to announce the ascendancy and triumph of Puritanism. The poor old archbishop knew, that the king had been bred a Presbyterian, and that through his tutor, George Buchanan, he was likely to entertain feelings decidedly hostile to the Church and to its reformation in England.

Whitgift's  
alarm con-  
cerning the  
king's re-  
ligious  
views.

On more occasions than one, James, as the representative of the Puritans, had communicated with the late queen. The archbishop was not likely to know how, in conversation with his private friends, the King of Scotland spoke of his detestation of the thralldom in which he had been held by the despotism and want of loyalty of the Presbyterian teachers. Whitgift did not know that, at one time, King James entertained a notion of flying the country, and settling as a private man, in some land where he would at least have liberty of thought and action. The alarm felt by all true churchmen must not be forgotten, when first it was announced, in an age when toleration was not known, that the English crown had devolved upon a Presbyterian sovereign. By a very slight stretch of the imagination, we can understand the enthusiastic feelings with which the opposite intelligence was gradually dispersed, when it became known that the king was, after all, a churchman at heart, and that with the claims of

The king  
found  
to be a  
church-  
man at  
heart.

the episcopate he was well acquainted. This welcome news probably reached Whitgift through Dr. Neville, Dean of Canterbury, whom the archbishop had despatched into Scotland to offer to the new sovereign the congratulations of the English Church. The news increased as the king passed through the country, and became better acquainted with the character of the Church, and with its difference from the Puritan sect, at the hands of whose ministers the king had in former times feared every day as he went abroad, that he might be exposed to insults which he keenly felt, but which he had not presence of mind to resent with dignity or to repel.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

The great lying petition,—called the Millenary Petition, although only signed by 750 ministers,—was received by King James in a manner which confirmed the archbishop in the good opinion which he had begun to entertain of the new sovereign.

The Mille-  
nary  
Petition.

Whitgift was, nevertheless, doubtful as to the amount of concession King James would feel compelled to make to the Puritans, and, during the summer months, he remained pensive, sad, and apprehensive. The king had required of him an exact account of the state of the Church, which was given; and towards the end of the year Whitgift received a letter from his majesty announcing his intention of “standing by the Church of England,” an assurance joyfully communicated by Whitgift, in a letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury.\*

We need not suppose therefore that Whitgift was an intentional deceiver or a designing flatterer. His mind had been depressed, even while he sought relief from the hand of the Almighty, and now, when his prayer seemed to be

\* Whitgift's Works, vol. iii. p. 620; Strype's Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 484; Appendix to book iv. No. xliii. (vol. iii. p. 391); Brooke's Hist. Religious Liberty, i. 378.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

heard, almost as it were by a miracle, it was impossible for him to restrain his feelings of gratitude to the Giver of all good, or to refrain from a laudation of the sovereign, who was an instrument in the Divine hand of conveying a blessing to a threatened Church. It was an age when men put small restraint on their feelings or upon the expression of them.

Whitgift's  
flattery of  
the king.

When all the world was thus eulogizing the new king, fulsome language no doubt was used, and Whitgift was betrayed into expressions, the greater part of which would have been cancelled, if he had lived to see the end of King James's life. Extravagant eulogy was suffered to escape from the lips of Whitgift, not, as in the case of a flatterer seeking to gain something for himself by his more than loyal expressions, but simply because he was taken by surprise, and was overflowing with gratitude on finding the king far different from what he had expected. Some allowance, too, must be made for the tendency of certain loyal minds to exaggerate the merits, or to invent them where they do not exist, of any sovereign who undertakes to exert his power in favour of the party they uphold. In these days we scarcely hear of anyone making allowance for the faults of George IV.; but those who are old enough to remember his reign, and the dangers to which the monarchy was in his time exposed, will not forget how enthusiastically that sovereign was received, by a large class of the community who had brought themselves to think that the welfare of the monarchy was bound up in his life.

Whitgift  
confers  
with the  
king.

It was not till May 7, 1603, that King James entered the capital of his new dominions. But the archbishop had sought for an earlier opportunity of waiting upon the king, and had obtained an interview with him when he had approached London so near as Theobalds. Having laid before his majesty an account rendered by the bishops to

their metropolitan, he pointed out the existing state of public affairs. They conferred about the future proceedings of the Church, which there was the greater need to do from the continued importunity of the Puritans, by whom it was still attacked, and who assured themselves, though now with less confidence, of the intention of the king to place himself at the head of their faction. Nevertheless, although the archbishop was at length fully satisfied that the king's loyal inclinations were towards the Church, he was filled with anxiety as to what would occur at the ensuing parliament.

The parliament had grown in strength, and it remained to be seen whether the king, though willing to serve the Church, would have strength to do so. It was therefore with anxiety mingled with his joy, that Whitgift retired to Lambeth. There he prepared with alacrity for the coronation, which, as usual, took place in the Collegiate Church of Westminster. It would have been a great point if the coronation of King James could have been conducted on the usual scale of old magnificence, but, unfortunately, at this very time, the plague was raging in London, and marred the pomp of the ceremony.

The solemnity took place gloomily on July 25. The usual ceremonies were observed; but, as Calderwood remarks, "the streets were almost desolate, and the pageants stood without spectators to gaze on them." The coronation, however, as a religious rite, was performed with minute attention to its various details; and, infirm as he was, the venerable primate performed his part with that dignity and decorum for which he had been always distinguished in the discharge of his spiritual functions.

It was agreed, that, to pacify the Puritans, a conference should be held; and that conference, as the "Hampton Court Conference," has obtained an historical importance

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Coronation  
of James I.  
July 25,  
1603.

Hampton  
Court  
Confer-  
ence.  
1604.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

and name.\* It was held in the state apartment or the withdrawing-room of Hampton Court Palace during three days in January 1604. The history of this conference I shall defer till we come to the life of Archbishop Bancroft. Upon him, then Bishop of London, the archbishop devolved the great business of the proceeding. Whitgift's own wise mind was, in doubtful cases, consulted, but he felt that he was too old to undergo the excitement of contentious debate. The archbishop was surrounded by men of learning and vigour of mind, such as could not have been produced in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign ; and he seems, at least on one occasion, by sanctioning the exuberant laudations with which the Episcopal party saluted the king, to have forgotten his usual sedateness of character and steadiness of mind : but here again we must remember that all parties felt that the king's name was a tower of strength, and the unexpected devotion which the king went out of his way to express in the cause of the Church, though it did not do credit to his majesty's good taste, was calculated to fill with joy parties who now appeared, as was probable, to have escaped the miseries of a fierce controversy and a moral persecution.

The Puritans were of course as much exasperated as the Churchmen were exhilarated. Deferring, however, the further consideration of this subject, we have now only to repeat the remark that Whitgift's labours were not brought to a conclusion : if he had triumphed over the king, it did not follow that he would have equal success with the parliament, in which the Puritans, now embittered by their disappointment, were the strong party. The

\* The account of the conference was written by Barlow, Dean of Chester. The Puritans accused the writer of partiality, but without just cause. It is printed in the first volume of the *Phoenix*. See also Strype's *Whitgift*, Appendix to book iv. No. xlv. (vol. iii. p. 402). The Puritan party had their historian in Patrick Galloway, a Scotsman.



archbishop on this account convened a meeting of the bishops to consult with him at the Bishop of London's house, Fulham, and there to decide upon the course to be pursued.

Although the day was extremely cold—a raw day in February—the archbishop went as usual in his barge, and had, as was generally the case with him, his barge-cloth tied to the top of the bales. The wind blew so sharply, that several of the young gentlemen, shaking with cold, asked him to have the cloth let down; but to this he would by no means consent, for the water being rough, he desired to see his way. Being now seventy-three years of age, Whitgift felt the cold very severely, and complained in the night of a pain in his head. He was removed to Lambeth, but on the Lord's Day following, being the first Sunday in Lent, he crossed over by water to the court at Whitehall, and there, both before and after service, he entered into conversation with the Bishop of London, the king joining them on his way from the chapel.

The primate stayed long at the court, and was fasting. When he went from his majesty into the Council Chamber to dinner, he was taken by a dead palsy. His right side was benumbed and he was bereaved of speech. His dearest friends, the lord chancellor, the lord treasurer, and the Bishop of London, removed him by the aid of the king's servants into the lord treasurer's chambers, and afterwards by barge to his own house at Lambeth.

The dangerous nature of the lord primate's illness could not be doubted; and he showed signs of satisfaction when he received a notice from the king that he would visit him and administer in every way he possibly could to his comfort, saying that “he would beg him of God in his prayer, which if he could obtain he should

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

Whitgift  
takes cold  
on the  
water.

His last  
illness.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

think it one of the greatest temporal blessings that could be given him in this kingdom." \*

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.  
The king  
visits him.

The king sat by his bedside, and the archbishop attempted to speak to him in Latin; but neither the king nor any of those who attended him, understood what he said, except his last words, "Pro ecclesia Dei," "Pro ecclesia Dei."

With hands lifted up again and again, he reiterated "Pro ecclesia Dei;" the king, to whom he had often spoken of his duty as a nursing father of the Church, was visibly affected, and remained long by his bedside.

After his majesty's departure, the archbishop lost all power of speech, but he made signs that he desired to have ink and paper. His request was complied with, and a pen was put into his hand, but from his hand it immediately fell, and he perceived his impotency to write as well as to speak; having three or four times made the attempt, he breathed a sigh and again lay down.

On the Wednesday following, being the last day of February 1604, just as the clock struck eight, Archbishop Whitgift breathed a deep sigh, and "quietly like a lamb he entered into his rest, the faithful servant of the Lord Jesus Christ." The bell of St. Paul's solemnly boomed along the river, announcing the fact to the Church.

Certain modern writers, whose names I forbear to mention, are severe in their condemnation of Whitgift for exacting conformity when first he succeeded to the primacy. They do not make allowance for the difficulties under which he was placed. They hate him because he was a devoted father of the Church of England, which is also an object of their determined dislike. That he was straightforward in his policy and resolute in his principles even Neal, the historian of the Puritans, admits;

\* Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr. vol. iii. p. 619.

Whitgift's  
death,  
Feb. 29,  
1604.

and that historian adds: "He regarded not the intercession of courtiers, but was steady to the laws."\* By his strictness, when first appointed to his office, he rendered that lenity possible, with which, when peace and quietness were preserved, he delighted to act, and of which we have an example in his treatment of Cartwright.

He was magnificent in his style of living and noble in his charities.

As became a nobleman, he trained soldiers on his various estates, for the defence of his country against foreign foes and enemies at home; but, at the same time, his house was full of scholars educated, at his expense, for the pulpit, and prepared to serve God in the Church.

"No part of his character," says Collier, "was without its proper commendation. He had learning, courage, and temper suitable to his station. His public motions were easy, but not without vigour; and it was his custom to do a great deal of business without much appearance of effort and struggle." †

The funeral of Archbishop Whitgift was solemnised at Croydon, March 27, 1604. The Earl of Worcester and Lord Zouch attended the hearse, and carried the banners, and the Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Babington, preached a funeral sermon which made a great impression. "Thus this good man," says Wilson, a contemporary writer of Puritan views, "expired in David's fulness of days, leaving a name like sweet perfume behind him." ‡

I would here enter into a digression to do justice to one of whom England is rightly proud—Whitgift's royal mistress, Queen Elizabeth.

\* Neal, i. 405.

† Collier, Eccles. Hist. vol. vii., p. 304.

‡ Wilson's Life of James I. p. 8.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

Calumnies  
against  
Queen  
Elizabeth.

Not only Whitgift, but also Parker and Bancroft, were the personal friends of the queen; and if she took a dislike to Grindal it was chiefly on account of his want of vigour of mind and firmness of purpose. Were we only to refer to the fact, that it was by the advice of these three great primates that she always professed to be directed, and on which she generally relied, we should have a refutation of the falsehoods which are now circulated against a sovereign who was, even long after her death, not only the glory of England but also the admiration of the civilised world. But the scandals and libels of her age are maliciously republished, and, if such gossip is to be accounted authoritative, who is safe? Not even the most virtuous of men, or the female whose character is spotless. Whatever were the sins of Queen Elizabeth,—and who is there without sin?—they must have been secret sins, for all the writers who have shed lustre on the Elizabethan era—poets, historians, divines, philosophers and statesmen—while perhaps lamenting the frivolities which occasionally produced a smile among her contemporaries—bear incessant testimony to the power of her mind and the excellence of her character.

Most of the indecent stories, upon which persons of stern morality delight to dwell, are to be traced to the scandalous chronicles forwarded by foreign ambassadors to their courts, or to the libels which were circulated by the Jesuits and by the seminary priests. With reference to the scandals circulated in foreign courts, we have the testimony of Catherine de' Medici herself that they were not believed; and the still stronger testimony of one of the ambassadors, Mauvissiere. This eminent man had been so much in England, and was in such confidential correspondence with Mary Queen of Scots, and also in diplomatic intercourse with the enemies of Elizabeth,

he was at the same time so familiar at her court, and with her nobles and favourites, that he must have known all that could be known on this subject. So convinced was he of the untruth of these defaming stories, that he has left us this honourable and decisive testimony: "If some persons have wished to tax her memory with having amorous attachments, I will say with truth that they are inventions forged by the malevolent, and from the cabinets of ambassadors, to avert from an alliance with her, those to whom it would have been useful." This was written by him in his private Memoirs when he could have had no possible motive to misstate the truth.

As for the principle on which the Jesuits acted, it is clearly, though unintentionally, revealed to us by Cardinal Allen. Speaking of the queen, he said that she was a caitiff under the curse of God and of the Holy Church, given up to a reprobate sense, and *therefore* her open enormities and secret sins must needs be great and most <sup>not numerable</sup> memorable. He might have added that as sins must needs exist, though they cannot be discovered, they may be imagined. Thus the inventions of a prurient mind have been stated as historical facts.

Cardinal Allen is foremost in mentioning the vilest calumnies against the queen's character, unless we make an exception in the case of Sanders, of the worth of whose veracity we may judge, when we find him gravely asserting that in the English Liturgy, in place of the old prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary, prayers are offered to Elizabeth herself.

A chivalrous writer in 'Fraser's Magazine' traces the stories against Queen Elizabeth, which are stereotyped for the use of all historians — male or female — to their source, and proves them to rest upon the authority of a countess who at least on one occasion made

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.

1583—  
1603-4.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

John  
Whitgift.  
1583—  
1603-4.

a public confession of lying; of an ambassador whose secretary ran away from him that he might not be forced to lie; of a groom who was pilloried for lying; of another whose words were so shocking that the magistrates were ashamed to write them down; of a Scotch courtier who was, on the whole, rather proud of his success in lying; of two murderers; of Cardinal Allen and of Sanders, of whom we have already spoken.

Whether it be more reasonable to give credit to the assertion of persons, known to be libellers in the age when they wrote, or to suppose that all England held of noble and renowned, in every rank of life and in every department of literature, during the most celebrated epoch of our country's history, were flatterers, sycophants, and caitiffs worse than Elizabeth herself, may admit of serious doubt. But it is not doubtful that England applauded—as believing them to express the truth—the words of England's greatest son, when in the public theatre he made Cranmer utter that superlatively beautiful passage in which reference is made to the maiden queen.

Shake-  
spere's tes-  
timony to  
her merits.

This royal infant, (Heaven still move about her!)  
Though in her cradle, yet now promises  
Upon this land a thousand, thousand blessings,  
Which time shall bring to ripeness: she shall be  
(But few now living can behold that goodness,)  
A pattern to all princes living with her,  
And all that shall succeed. Sheba was never  
More covetous of wisdom, and fair virtue,  
Than this pure soul shall be: all princely graces,  
That mould up such a mighty piece as this is,  
With all the virtues that attend the good,  
Shall still be doubled on her; truth shall nurse her,  
Holy and heavenly thoughts still counsel her;  
She shall be lov'd and fear'd; her own shall bless her;

Her foes shake like a field of beaten corn,  
 And hang their heads with sorrow : good grows with her.  
 In her days, every man shall eat in safety  
 Under his own vine, what he plants ; and sing  
 The merry songs of peace to all his neighbours.  
 God shall be truly known ; and those about her  
 From her shall read the perfect ways of honour,  
 And by those claim their greatness, not by blood.\*

CHAP.  
 XXVI.

John  
 Whitgift.  
 1583—  
 1603-4.

For many years the good queen had been accustomed to look to Whitgift for counsel and advice, both in things temporal and in things spiritual, showing, by her choice of such an adviser, that she at least knew and appreciated good in others. By the appointment of Whitgift as one of her executors, Elizabeth gave a last testimony of her appreciation of his merits, and of her continued confidence in his integrity and good judgment.

The aged archbishop only lived twelve months to lament the loss of her whom he had for twenty years so faithfully and loyally served. Though that one year was filled with events fraught with importance to the Church, yet Whitgift, worn out with infirmity, was content to leave the more active portion of his work in the hands of one whom he had long ago selected as a worthy coadjutor, and who, as he foresaw, was destined to succeed him in the primacy—Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London.

\* Shakespere (Henry viii. act v. scene iv). I agree with most of the commentators in the opinion that the compliment to James I. was not written by Shakespeare. He had retired from public life when it appeared. Stevens is probably right when he attributes it to Ben Jonson.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

## RICHARD BANCROFT.—EARLY LIFE AND FIRST PREFERMENTS.

His birthplace and parentage—University career—Eminent as a tutor—His preferments—In favour with Sir C. Hatton—Prebendal appointments—Sermon at St. Paul's Cross, 1588—His policy towards the Seculars and Jesuits—Recommended by Whitgift to the queen's notice—His conduct in the cases of Martin Marprelate, Cartwright and Penry—Second sermon at St. Paul's Cross—Appointed Bishop of London through Whitgift's interest, 1590—Election and consecration.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.  
Bancroft's  
birthplace.

RICHARD BANCROFT was born at Farnworth in Lancashire, in 1544. Although Farnworth is now an active manufacturing town, it formed then a quiet and pleasant retirement to the family which welcomed Richard's birth. Its chief merit and advantage to such a family was the excellence of its grammar school. In this school Bancroft was submitted to some severe discipline, such as his irritable temper may have required; he did not, however, complain, but availed himself of the foundation there laid, by a master of sound scholarship and learning. John Bancroft, his father, is described simply as a gentleman, which shows that he was not engaged in a profession or

His  
parentage.

*Authorities.*—Strype's Whitgift and Annals. Neal's Puritans. Collier's Ecclesiastical History. Fuller's Church History. Nicoll's Royal Progresses. Sparrow's Hampton Court Conference. Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses. Newcourt's Repertorium. Cardwell's Conferences and Synodalia. Le Neve's Fasti Ecclesiæ. Camden. Rapin. Calderwood. Ware's History of Irish Bishops. Bishop Barlow's Sum and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court in "Phœnix." Archbishop Wake's State of the Church. Cardwell's Documentary Annals.



trade, but lived probably on his own independent means. On the mother's side, as well as on the father's, the family was one of eminent respectability; Bancroft's mother being the niece of Dr. Hugh Curwyn, Archbishop of Dublin.\*

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Richard Bancroft matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and remained there as an undergraduate until he attained his bachelor's degree in 1556-7. He then migrated to Jesus College, where he was admitted a fellow commoner. In 1570 he took his master's degree, but if we may give credit to Dr. Sherman's manuscript history of Jesus College, Bancroft did not obtain, and distinguished as he was for his learning, probably did not seek to obtain, a fellowship. A man who could afford to support

University  
career.

\* Some difficulty attends the history of Hugh Curwyn. He was advanced to the Archiepiscopal See of Dublin by Queen Mary in 1555,

*Bancroft's birthplace was not the Farnworth here alluded to, and near Bolton, but Farnworth near Prescott.*

*See Notes & Queries, 5<sup>th</sup> Ser. VII. 81.*

stituted Keeper of the Great Seal of Ireland in 1559. Sir James Ware asserts that by way of retirement Curwyn was translated to Oxford, but only remained there one year, when he died at Swinbrook near Burford. "It is observable," says Ware, "that Le Neve in his *Fasti* asserts that neither in the grant of the royal assent to this prelate to the see of Oxford nor in that of his restitution to the temporalities, any notice is taken of his having been Archbishop of Dublin" (Ware's *Hist. of Ireland*, p. 353). With these perplexities we are not immediately concerned, since it is quite clear that he held an appointment in Oxford, and this accounts for Bancroft's early connection with that University. Curwyn's name, as given by Le Neve, is spelt Coren, Curen, and Curren. Sir James Ware says the original name of the family was Culwen, and we are told that it was first changed by Sir Christopher D. Culwen.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

## RICHARD BANCROFT.—EARLY LIFE AND FIRST PREFERMENTS.

His birthplace and parentage—University career—Eminent as a tutor—His preferments—In favour with Sir C. Hatton—Prebendal appointments—Sermon at St. Paul's Cross, 1588—His policy towards the Seculars and Jesuits—Recommended by Whitgift to the queen's notice—His conduct in the cases of Martin Marprelate, Cartwright and Penry—Second sermon at St. Paul's Cross—Appointed Bishop of London through Whitgift's interest, 1590—Election and consecration.

His birth in Lancashire.

complain, but availed himself of the foundation there laid, by a master of sound scholarship and learning. John Bancroft, his father, is described simply as a gentleman, which shows that he was not engaged in a profession or

His  
parentage.

*Authorities.*—Strype's Whitgift and Annals. Neal's Puritans. Collier's Ecclesiastical History. Fuller's Church History. Nicoll's Royal Progresses. Sparrow's Hampton Court Conference. Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses. Newcourt's Repertorium. Cardwell's Conferences and Synodalia. Le Neve's Fasti Ecclesiæ. Camden. Rapin. Calderwood. Ware's History of Irish Bishops. Bishop Barlow's Sum and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court in "Phœnix." Archbishop Wake's State of the Church. Cardwell's Documentary Annals.

trade, but lived probably on his own independent means. On the mother's side, as well as on the father's, the family was one of eminent respectability; Bancroft's mother being the niece of Dr. Hugh Curwyn, Archbishop of Dublin.\*

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Richard Bancroft matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and remained there as an undergraduate until he attained his bachelor's degree in 1556-7. He then migrated to Jesus College, where he was admitted a fellow commoner. In 1570 he took his master's degree, but if we may give credit to Dr. Sherman's manuscript history of Jesus College, Bancroft did not obtain, and distinguished as he was for his learning, probably did not seek to obtain, a fellowship. A man who could afford to support

University  
career.

\* Some difficulty attends the history of Hugh Curwyn. He was advanced to the Archiepiscopal See of Dublin by Queen Mary in 1555, having been Dean of Hereford in 1541, and afterwards Archdeacon of Oxford, according to Sir James Ware, but Wood, the Oxford antiquary, regards this statement as incorrect, and tells us that the Archdeacon of Oxford was not Hugh Curwyn, but Richard. He was at this time chaplain to Queen Mary and evidently a zealous Papist. He was consecrated at St. Paul's, by English bishops, but was so much in favour with Queen Mary that he received the temporalities as Archbishop elect of Dublin previously to his consecration. He was also Chancellor of Ireland, where he remained for twelve years, filling various offices. On Mary's death he was taken into favour by Queen Elizabeth and was constituted Keeper of the Great Seal of Ireland in 1559. Sir James Ware asserts that by way of retirement Curwyn was translated to Oxford, but only remained there one year, when he died at Swinbrook near Burford. "It is observable," says Ware, "that Le Neve in his *Fasti* asserts that neither in the grant of the royal assent to this prelate to the see of Oxford nor in that of his restitution to the temporalities, any notice is taken of his having been Archbishop of Dublin" (Ware's *Hist. of Ireland*, p. 353). With these perplexities we are not immediately concerned, since it is quite clear that he held an appointment in Oxford, and this accounts for Bancroft's early connection with that University. Curwyn's name, as given by Le Neve, is spelt Coren, Curen, and Curren. Sir James Ware says the original name of the family was Culwen, and we are told that it was first changed by Sir Christopher D. Culwen.

CHAP.  
XXVII.Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

himself on his own resources, as a fellow commoner, may have thought that it would be an act of injustice to deprive the needy scholars, who required pecuniary aid, of the endowments intended for their support, by appropriating them to himself. We may venture upon this suggestion, because Bancroft formed an exception to the general rule, then painfully common in both universities, of eminent clergymen accumulating preferments and enriching themselves and their families by a robbery of the Church. Though declining the emoluments of the office, Bancroft did not shrink from the duties at that time common to all who held office in the colleges: he became eminent as a tutor. It was thus that attention was called to his merits by his ecclesiastical superiors, and by a government whose eye rested upon everything. It was reported, indeed, of Bancroft that soon after his migration to Jesus College he accepted a prebend of Dublin, but on this fact a doubt is thrown by Le Neve. No mention assuredly is made of it by Dr. Sherman or by other biographers. The mistake is probably due to the fact that his uncle Dr. Hugh Curwyn had been Archbishop of Dublin. That prelate, however, was translated to Oxford, in the year 1567, and lived too short a time after his preferment to be of any service to Bancroft. Whether he obtained a prebend or not at this period, it is certain that Bancroft had already established a high character for himself, independently of family interest.

Soon after his ordination Bancroft attracted the notice of the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Richard Cox, who appointed him to be his chaplain in 1575, and conferred upon him the living of Teversham.

Distinguished for his eloquence, Bancroft was appointed university preacher in 1576; he took his B.D. degree in 1580. The following year, when the queen

Bancroft's  
eminence  
as a tutor.Rector of  
Teversham,  
1575.University  
preacher.

intended to translate Aylmer, Bishop of London, to the see of Worcester and to direct the election of Richard Bancroft, the archbishop's chaplain, as his successor, this scheme, for some reason or other not assigned, came to nothing. Bancroft seems to have been passed over, as far as preferment was concerned, until, in 1584, he was nominated by the executors of Henry, Earl of Southampton, to the rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

He took his doctor's degree in 1585, and in the same year he was presented by the queen to the office of Treasurer of St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

Treasurer  
of S. Paul's.

From this time his promotion was rapid. He was commended by Archbishop Whitgift to the notice of his friend, Sir Christopher Hatton, a man who is much to be respected, but who has been ludicrously misrepresented, because, though the head of the law, he was, at the same time, a courtier in high favour with Elizabeth. When Sir Christopher Hatton was made lord keeper he selected Bancroft to be his chaplain. The chaplain was remunerated, not by a salary, but by a rectory, which, in this instance, was that of Cottingham, Northamptonshire.

In favour  
with Sir C.  
Hatton.

On February 25, 1589, Bancroft was made a prebendary of St. Paul's, and in 1592 he was appointed to a stall in Westminster Abbey.

Prebendal  
appoint-  
ments.

Two years afterwards he obtained a canonry in Canterbury Cathedral. This increase of secondary preferments added to his income, but at the same time increased his responsibilities, and he would gladly have accumulated them in some one office, although, at that time, a cry against pluralities was seldom raised. In those days people did not enquire as to the disposal of the income of an incumbent, provided that they were diligently served by duly qualified persons, whether those persons were the possessors of the income, or their substitutes.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Batteley, in his edition of ‘Somner’s Canterbury,’ speaks of Bancroft as a prebendary of Durham, but neither Browne Willis nor Le Neve can find his name in the list of prebendaries. Before he received his preferments, and perhaps as the cause of them, Bancroft had become exceedingly popular among the orthodox Churchmen, as distinguished from the Puritans, by a sermon which he preached at St. Paul’s Cross.

Sermon at  
St. Paul’s  
Cross.  
1588.

This sermon was afterwards prefixed to a publication of Archbishop Bancroft, entitled ‘Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.’ He took for his text 1 St. John iv. 1.

His fame was already great as a preacher; and a sermon at “Paul’s Cross” by any well-known divine was sure to meet with that kind of attention which in these days would be paid to a leading article in the “Times.” It was of the Puritans that the government at this time stood most in alarm, and of the Puritans Bancroft spoke in terms of reprobation. He alluded to their intemperate language against the bishops, and attributed to the evil principles that rankled in their hearts, their insubordination and tendency to mutiny. He condemned their prevailing vice of avarice, and lamented that filthy lucre was frequently their object when calling for a further reformation of the Church.

His rebuke  
of Puritan  
conduct.

He asserted, without fear of contradiction, that the plunder of bishoprics and the seizing of the endowments of cathedrals was the principal cause of nonconformity and schism in the Church. He made a strong appeal to the laity, especially to the humbler classes of society, not to permit themselves to be robbed and wronged by the Puritans, whose object was to enrich themselves with the spoils of the Church which they cruelly assailed. “Why do you not push for redress of these grievances,” he exclaimed, “and revive the practice of the apostles’

Their robbery of the  
Church.

times? To attempt something of this kind would be charity to your wealthy neighbours, no less than to yourselves. For these bulky estates of the Puritans do but pamper their pride, abate their zeal, and check their progress in virtue."

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

To the wealthier part of his audience Dr. Bancroft now put the question whether they liked this doctrine or not; if they did not they must certainly be careful not to urge against the clergy a course of conduct which they refused to exercise for themselves. Having rebuked the Puritans for their covetousness, he proceeded to show that from the time of the Apostles down to the time of Calvin, no traces of the Puritan scheme could be found in the Church. Dr. Bancroft enlarged on that reform of the ancient services of the Catholic Church in England which is presented to us in the Book of Common Prayer. He mentioned how the Prayer Book had been received by the parliaments and convocations of this realm; how Archbishop Cranmer caused those to be burnt who refused to accept its doctrines, and how he supported it against the Papists and Anabaptists. He maintained the superiority, by Divine right, of Episcopacy over Presbyterianism, and warned his audience of the danger to which they would expose themselves by establishing Presbyterianism instead of the Church.\*

Eulogy  
of the  
Prayer  
Book.

Divine  
right of  
Episco-  
pacy.

This sermon, which was delivered with a power of learning and a strength of argument unusual in those times, made a deep impression on the minds of those who heard, received, and discussed it.

Bancroft was accustomed to take an enlarged view of the various subjects brought under his notice. We have already mentioned that between the secular Romish priests and the Jesuits a great controversy existed: the

The  
Seculars  
and the  
Jesuits.

\* Collier, Eccles. Hist. vol. vii. p. 80.

CHAP.  
XXVII.Richard  
Bancroft,  
1604-10.

former were contented to live quietly as good subjects, provided they were not molested in the performance of their religious duties; the Jesuits and seminary priests, on the contrary, were desirous of creating a disturbance in the land, and of effecting a revolution which was to begin with the assassination of the queen. Unwise politicians confounded the two classes, and treated each with the same severity. Bancroft, on the other hand, saw that by dividing the enemy the queen would secure the safety of her throne. The Seculars addressed him and stated their loyalty in unequivocal terms; Bancroft believed them, and if his policy had been adopted, the country would have been saved not a little trouble, and some disgrace.

Bancroft's  
policy to-  
wards  
them.

The merits of Bancroft, the powers of his mind, and the firmness of his principles were at length recognised. He had no lack of a friend at court, for the archbishop made an elaborate statement of his merits. Whitgift pointed out his university distinctions, and showed that for four-and-twenty years he had been a painful preacher of the Gospel, opposed equally to the false pretensions of Popery and to the sects and innovations of the Presbyterian faction.

Whitgift  
recom-  
mends  
Bancroft to  
the queen.

Of Martin Mar-Prelate and his associates we have had occasion already to speak. It was by the sagacity of Bancroft and by his diligent search, that the press and books of Martin Mar-Prelate were detected, and he it was who gave instruction to her Majesty's Council, learned in the law, when the agents of Martin were brought into the Star Chamber.

His  
conduct in  
the case of  
Martin  
Mar-  
Prelate.

By Bancroft it was that the clandestine proceedings of Cartwright and his accomplices, the secret establishment of their discipline in most shires of the realm, their classes, their decrees, and their writings, were exposed to public detestation.

In the cases  
of Cart-  
wright  
and Penry.

It was by his diligence that Penry's seditious writings



were intercepted, as they came out of Scotland, and delivered to the lord keeper.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

By a letter written by Bancroft at the command of the lord keeper, to whom it was addressed, her Majesty was made thoroughly acquainted with the condition of the Church; how it then stood and how far the factious Puritans had impeached her Highness's authority and government.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Whitgift made special reference to another sermon—besides the one which we have already mentioned. It was preached at St. Paul's Cross in 1587, and was afterwards printed by the desire of the lord keeper and lord treasurer, and is said to have done much "to abate the edge of faction." Whitgift also referred to two books published by Bancroft, which caused a great sensation at the time; the "Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline," from which we learn much of the history of the Puritans, and to which we are indebted for many of the statements already given; and "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings published within this Land of Britain, under Pretence of Reformation and for the Presbyterian Discipline;" and he finally put the queen in mind of the assistance which he had received from Bancroft during the preceding nine or ten years, in which, by his zeal on behalf of the Church, he had incurred the hatred of all heretics.\*

Second  
sermon at  
Paul's  
Cross,  
1587.

His able  
assistance  
of Arch-  
bishop  
Whitgift  
for nine  
years.

While preferment had been heaped upon others, many of them his juniors, Bancroft himself remained unnoticed by those who had the bestowal of the preferments of the Church. From what has been already said, we may judge that Bancroft's abstinence from all seeking of preferment, may have been the cause of his power in the

His scant  
prefer-  
ment.

\* The books here referred to, I, at one time, possessed; but, having lost them, and being unable to borrow them, I am chiefly indebted to Collier for the reference to them here made.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Richard  
Bancroft.

1604-10.

court of Queen Elizabeth. His words had weight with the queen, but he was not ambitious and did not push his own claims.

According to the statement of Archbishop Whitgift, Bancroft had conducted himself with discretion and kindness as well as with zeal; it is the more important to notice this, as the opposite has been so often stated and believed. At length the time came when Bancroft was admitted as a member of the episcopate. In 1597, the see of London being now vacant by the death of Richard Fletcher, Bancroft; through the interest of the Archbishop, Whitgift, and of the Lord Treasurer, Cecil, was nominated his successor. He was unanimously elected by the Dean and Chapter on November 17, and confirmed at Lambeth on Monday, December 10.\*

Soon after his consecration he expended a thousand pounds on his house in London, which is to be noted, because he was unjustly accused of penuriousness by the many persons who have misrepresented and maligned him.

\* Le Neve, p. 77.

Bancroft  
appointed  
Bishop of  
London,  
1597.

His elec-  
tion and  
consecra-  
tion.

Rebuilds  
his house  
in London.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

## BANCROFT BISHOP OF LONDON.

Bancroft's embassy to Embden—Millenary petition—Hampton Court Conference—Alterations in the Prayer-Book—Whitgift's death—Royal proclamation—New translation of the Bible—Parliament of 1604—Meeting of Convocation—Compilation of a Book of Canons—Bancroft's nomination to the archbishopric.

ELIZABETH still adhered, though not so frequently as her ancestors, to the practice of employing the bishops in secular offices; and the Bishop of London was in 1600 sent to Embden, to put an end to the differences between the English and the Danes. But this was evidently not the work for which Bancroft was qualified, and the embassy had no effect. We may also mention as a failure, Bancroft's endeavour to make a distinction between the Secular priests and the Jesuits of the Romish Church, which we have mentioned before. The Seculars were loyal to the crown, and were gradually conforming to the Church; the Jesuits were the genuine disciples of the pope, hostile to the Church and the crown, and ready not only to oppose the government but to assassinate the queen. It is impossible to say how far this policy of the Bishop of London succeeded; I suspect that it did succeed to a greater extent than is generally supposed. There was always in this country a large body of loyal Romanists, and even at the present hour a distinction is made by the Romanists themselves, between the more moderate of their body and the Ultramontanes.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft  
1604-10.

Bancroft  
sent to  
Embden.

CHAP. XXVIII.  
Richard Bancroft. 1604-10.

In the concluding years of Whitgift's life, we have already touched upon the history of Bancroft. We know that he was present at the death of the great queen, and that he shared in Whitgift's alarms at the accession of James. Both these prelates, and particularly Bancroft, seem to have lost their presence of mind, and to have been hurried into an unreasoning enthusiasm when they found that James was so different from what they had been led to expect, and that he approached them as a friend instead of a foe.

The Millenary Petition.

King James appeared to pursue the even tenour of his way, though pelted with books and pamphlets and especially insulted by the Millenary Petition, in which 753 persons, calling themselves a thousand ministers of the Church of England, addressed themselves to his reasoning powers and to his prejudices. The petition is of some historical value, as it shows us to a certain extent, what the objections of the Ultra-Protestants at this time were against the practices as well as the doctrines of the Church of England. They objected to the use of the cross, to the interrogatories addressed to infants in baptism, and to confirmation, regarding them as things superfluous; to the use of the cap and surplice; to the use of the terms priest and absolution; and to the use of the ring in marriage. Bowing at the holy name of Jesus, the reading in Church of any but the Canonical Scriptures, pluralities, and lay administrations in the Ecclesiastical Courts were also strongly objected to. The petitioners desired a conference between the Puritan and the non-Puritanical clergy.\* To such a conference Queen Elizabeth had wisely objected; but when it was proposed to King James, he rejoiced in the opportunity afforded him of showing off his learning to the bishops, and his wit to the Puritans; and he appointed

\* Collier, vii. 267.

January 14, 1604, for a conference to be held at Hampton Court.\*

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

The king had arrived in the neighbourhood of London in the highest possible spirits; the gaols were opened in every town through which he passed, and his progress from Scotland to the metropolis was one continued pageant. The nobility, the gentry, and the prelates of the Church vied with each other in rendering their homage to King James, and the clergy were not slow to perceive that when the Puritans approached him they were courteously but not cordially received.

The object of the Hampton Court Conference seems to have been the pacification of all parties. The king hoped to show that nothing could be said against the regulations, doctrine, and order of the Church, and while he was willing to yield in a few non-essential points, he expected everybody to defer to the royal mandate.

Hampton  
Court Con-  
ference.  
1604.

So far, however, as the Puritans were concerned, little good came of the conference. Nevertheless, many points bearing upon the discipline of the Church of England were so wisely settled that to the present hour deference is paid to the decision of the Hampton Court Conference.

When the bishops arrived at Hampton Court, where the king was then residing, they found he was waiting to receive them in the chief room of the palace. The English Church has never, before or since, exhibited such a phalanx of sound Churchmen as met on this occasion. Archbishop Whitgift, whose death was soon to follow,

\* Of this Conference an account is given in a work entitled "The Sum and Substance of the Conference held at Hampton Court," by William Barlow, D.D., Dean of Chester, printed in 1604, reprinted in "The Phoenix," 1717. See also Collier's Church Hist., vol. vii. p. 271; Cardwell's Documentary Annals. ii. 56; Strype's Whitgift, iii. 392-408; (Appendices xlv.-xlvi.;) Conference at Hampton Court; Nichols' Progresses of King James, vol i. p. 311; Fuller's Church Hist. Book x. § i. 20 (vol. iii. p. 172)

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Disputants  
on the side  
of the  
Church.

added to the assembly the weight of his personal character. He was there, ever ready to give the aid of his experience and wisdom, but avoiding any very active part in the discussion, a course which his growing infirmities seemed to render necessary. After him the Bishop of London, Dr. Bancroft—who had zealously asserted the divine right of Episcopacy—took the lead. He was a man of high principle and of a kind heart, but when excited by discussion was hot, eager, and impetuous. Matthew, Bishop of Durham, an elegant Latin scholar; Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, a clear nervous writer, and a theologian of great learning, and one of the revisers of the translation of the Bible which soon after took place; Babington of Worcester, Rudd of St. David's, Watson of Chichester, Robinson of Carlisle, and Dove of Peterborough, were there, all men of much learning and power. There were present also Montagu, to whom the king had committed the editorship of his works, and who was afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, and of Winchester, and who was now Dean of the Chapels Royal; Andrewes, at that time Dean of Westminster, the most profound scholar, the most erudite theologian, the most popular preacher; Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, whose name is perhaps the most familiar to us, as we are indebted to him for the questions and answers upon the Sacraments in our Church Catechism; Barlow, Dean of Chester, the chronicler of the conference; the Deans of Christ Church, Worcester, and Windsor; Dr. Field, afterwards Dean of Gloucester, and author of the celebrated treatise "Of the Church;" and Dr. King, Archdeacon of Nottingham, afterwards Bishop of London, and reputed the best speaker in the Star Chamber in his time.

Among the Puritans, Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Sparkes, from Oxford, and Mr. Chatterton and Mr. Knewstubbs,

On the side  
of the  
Puritans.

from Cambridge, represented the learning and talent of that sect. They appeared as the spokesmen of the more moderate of those who signed the Millenary Petition. Whether awed by the presence of royalty or impressed by the array of learning which they saw before them, the representatives of the Puritans, by the admission of the Puritan party itself, did not maintain the reputation which they had achieved among their own people.\*

The conference was held in a withdrawing room within the privy chamber, and all the privy council were admitted as auditors. The first day's work was unwisely conducted with closed doors by the king and the bishops. It was natural, therefore, for the Puritans to suppose that they were devising measures hostile to their party. On the second day the Puritans were admitted, but were only ridiculed by the king and bullied into silence. On the third day they were summoned merely to hear what had been determined upon, without even the form of their consent being asked. In defence of such a mode of procedure, it may be just to remark, that the Presbyterian education of the king rendered it necessary for him to obtain information as to certain points of the doctrine and traditional practices of the Church, before being present at the general conference.

The king, therefore, stated that this first meeting was called to satisfy himself on certain points of ritual and doctrine. All parties agreed, indeed, in praising the conduct of King James during the early part of the conference. He liked to show off before learned men the powers of an intellect by no means naturally weak, and was now acting under the restraint of the presence of the wisest prelates and ministers of his kingdom. He was able for a time to

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Treatment  
of the  
Puritans.

The king's  
speech.

\* Neal, ii. 29. Dr. Montagu did not hesitate to assert that the doctors argued so weakly that all wondered that they had not more to say.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.

1604-10.

deny himself the luxury of those silly remarks and childish freaks in which he sometimes indulged. His conduct of affairs on this occasion naturally made a great impression in his favour in the minds of men who had trembled for the arrival among them of a Scotch Presbyterian, and who had been hitherto looked upon as likely to be the losers by the change of monarchs. "We were dismissed," says Barlow, "after three hours and more spent; which were soon gone, so admirably both for understanding, and speech, and judgment did his Majesty handle all those points, sending us away not with contentment only, but with astonishment."\*

The Church party was sometimes betrayed into an amount of flattery of which it offends us to make report; but when we consider the subject seriously, we must remember that they had been raised from the depths of despair to the highest hopes.

The subjects on which the king desired information were "Confirmation, Absolution, Private Baptism, and Lay Excommunication." It is very clear that he had already got up his subject, but he desired to exhibit himself to his divines as an original thinker and a deep philosopher. It was agreed, at the first day's conference, that instead of permitting nurses to baptize sick children, a curate or lawful minister should be sent for to officiate. With respect to Confirmation, in order to mark clearly that it was not a part of the Sacrament of Baptism, it should be called an examination with a confirmation.

In the rubric before the general absolution, the words "remission of sins" were to be inserted, and certain changes were to be made in the law with regard to excommunication.

\* Barlow's account of Hampton Court Conference in "The Phoenix," vol. i. p. 147.



But to give a full account of this synod—as it may be called—is no part of my present duty ; I must confine myself chiefly to the part taken in it by Bishop Bancroft himself.

In this first day's conference Bishop Bancroft was actively engaged ; being prompted from time to time by the aged invalid, Archbishop Whitgift. He it was who produced the testimony of the fathers, and the practice of the Primitive Church in support of the rite of Confirmation. He maintained it to be a part of the doctrines expressly mentioned in Hebrews vi. 2. In an *argumentum ad hominem* he reminded his Majesty that in this sense the passage was expounded by that distinguished foreigner, John Calvin, who had expressed a wish that wherever the rite had been suppressed it might on primitive principles be revived. On the point of absolution Archbishop Whitgift cleared the Church of England from anything that the king might suppose to approach to superstition, and in proof of this he pointed to the forms of confession and absolution in the morning and evening services. Here the Bishop of London stepped forward, and informed the king that in the Communion office there was another and peculiar form of absolution, and in the Visitation of the Sick there was yet another more *personal* form of absolution appointed. He again showed his acquaintance with foreign theologians, who, though sectarians and the founders of sects, were regarded by the Puritans as Reformers.

Without referring to them as authorities, he stated as a matter of fact, that the general confession and absolution which had always been observed in the Church, were retained in the confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Saxony ; the form being read, the king liked it extremely, and called it an Apostolical Ordinance.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Part taken  
in the con-  
ference by  
Bishop  
Bancroft.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

On the subject of lay baptism, both the archbishop and the Bishop of London contended in its favour, but contended in vain. The learning of Bancroft was conspicuous. He appealed to the custom of Tertullian and St. Ambrose, and then enlarged on the Holy Scriptures. The king and a majority of his bishops were resolute against the practice of lay baptism, and required the presence of a lawful minister, where he could be obtained.

After this first private meeting, the conference was adjourned till the Monday following. Both parties now assembled and were addressed by King James in a pithy speech, in which he expressed himself ready to hear at large, what the four opponents of conformity had to advance. He paid them the compliment of saying, that he understood them to be the most grave, learned, and modest of those who objected to the present state of things. This did not satisfy the Bishop of London, who, learned and amiable as he was, suffered from a temper which he sometimes found it impossible to control, even when in the highest society, and surrounded by circumstances which ought to have imposed restraint upon him.\*

Kneeling before the king,† he humbly moved his Majesty, that the ancient canon “schismatici contra episcopos non sunt audiendi” might be remembered. Bancroft, however, soon recovered his temper, and the words addressed by him to Dr. Reynolds, seem to have been meant as a pleasantry. “I conclude,” he says, “that you are of Mr. Cartwright’s mind, who affirmed that we ought in ceremonies rather to conform to the Turks than to the

\* Nichols’ Progresses, i. p. 314.

† By kneeling, referred to by other contemporary authors, was probably merely meant that bending of the knee which a bow or a courtesy, more than usually profound, seems to imply. Such is still the case in the courts of princes, the genuflection being perhaps less marked.

James’s  
second  
speech.Bancroft’s  
petition  
against  
the  
Puritans.

Papists ; if this were not the case, why do you come here in your Turkey gowns instead of your academical robes.”

To explain this, we must notice that, to mark their contempt of ceremonies, the Puritans had made their appearance in their dressing gowns. That in so doing they exhibited very bad taste no one will deny, but it must be admitted that Bancroft displayed equally bad taste in noticing the fact. It showed, however, some knowledge of human nature in Bancroft, as in such low jokes the king took pleasure ; although it does not always follow that a man who himself indulges jocosity in feeling or in words, is willing to applaud in others what he expects to draw forth praise when uttered by himself. James was evidently irritated against Bancroft at the time.

The bishop then petitioned that if any of the Non-conformists had subscribed to the Communion Book, and had since exhibited a remonstrance against it, they might be dealt with in accordance with the ancient principle in which it was decreed that no man should plead against his own act of subscription. The king passed by the objection, and desired the bishop to answer the charges which had been brought against the Church, or else to permit Dr. Reynolds to proceed. Bancroft, thus re-proved, admitted and corrected his error ; he returned to his theology where he was always great and sound, and with extreme good sense, and very much to the point, he answered the Calvinistic objections to our 16th Article. James, now pleased with the logical eloquence of Bancroft, desired that the doctrine of predestination should be tenderly handled, having himself experienced in his Scottish life the kind of handling it might receive. With respect to predestination the bishop called it a desperate doctrine to say “if I shall be saved I *shall* be saved.” Hence he took occasion to acquaint his Majesty with

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.

1604-10.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

the doctrine of the Church on this important subject. He defended the holy rite of Confirmation, and by a reference to the practice of the primitive Church, he showed that the administration of that ordinance should be confined to the episcopal order. He referred to one authority, among others, namely, to St. Jerome, who, though desirous of reducing to the minimum the authority of the bishops, admitted that the power of administering the rite of Confirmation as well as that of Ordination, rested exclusively with them. Reynolds then moved for several alterations in doctrine and discipline, and Bancroft, humbly desired the king that, since this was a time for renewing petitions, he might have leave to proffer two or three. He desired that for the convenience of "a praying clergy" certain regulations might be made, such for instance as would enable them properly to discharge their sacerdotal functions, in the absolution of penitents, the pronouncing of the benediction, and the administration of the Sacraments. He complained that among the Puritans, the functions of the ministry were almost confined to the pulpit, and maintained that the business of the clergy should not be restricted to this one office.\* What he said on this subject was approved of by the king, who also acceded to his request that, until preachers were better qualified for the work, the Homilies should be read and their number increased.† He also put in a petition that pulpits might not be turned into batteries, and every malcontent allowed to play his spleen against his

\* Barlow, in "The Phoenix," vol. i. p. 160.

† It should be remembered that the Church of England asserts very strongly, the propriety of using the Homilies or the composition of other men, when want of ability or want of time shall prevent the minister of a congregation from addressing the people in his own words from the pulpit. The use of sermons composed by other persons is thus in perfect accordance with the principles of our system.

superiors. James received this complaint very graciously, and purposely advised in the case of misconduct in Church officers, not to attack them from the pulpit, but to appeal in the first instance to the ordinary, then to the archbishop, and lastly, to the lords in council. If all these appeals fell short of a remedy, then the complaint should be made to his Majesty himself.\*

It was thus that Bancroft took the lead in the conference and showed much determination of character, though occasionally accompanied by a warmth of temper, and sometimes even a want of judgment, much to be lamented.

The conference ended, according to Collier, with a very affecting discourse from the king; and the Bishop of London exclaimed at the conclusion, "God's goodness be blessed for your Majesty and give health and prosperity to your Highness, our gracious queen, and all the royal issue."

The reports of the conference have varied so much, that we hardly know whether in giving the details we can be always correct. The Nonconformists appear to us to have been violently and rudely treated throughout the whole proceeding. But this they did not admit, for they asserted that they had come off perfectly victorious, and that what had been done was only the beginning of further reforms. But when they found that no such reforms came, they took the other line and accused Dr. Barlow of partiality in his narrative. †

Before the Prayer Book, as revised at the conference, became law, a few alterations were made. (1) In the rubric of absolution "remission of sins" was added. (2) In the rubric of private baptism the words "let them that be present," were changed into "let the lawful

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Alterations in  
the Prayer  
Book.

\* See Collier, vii. 288.

† Ibid. vii. 300; "Phoenix," 176.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

minister and them that be present." Other alterations with the same object in view were made in the other rubrics. (3) The rubric of Confirmation was now to stand thus—"Order of confirmation or laying on of hands on children baptized, and able to render an account of their faith, according to the catechism following." In the former rubric the words were, "Confirmation; wherein is contained a catechism for children." In the last review a further change was made into "laying on of hands upon those who are baptized and come to years of discretion." (4) "Jesus said" was printed in italics in the gospel for the Second Sunday after Easter, and the words "to his disciples" omitted. (5) Thanksgivings were added for rain, for fair weather, for plenty, for peace and victory, and for deliverance from the plague. A prayer for the queen and royal family, and a petition in the litany to the same effect were added. (6) An addition was to be made to the catechism of the questions and answers concerning the Sacraments.\* Although these alterations were suggested at the conference it does not appear that they were all carried out. The whole alterations are given by Strype in a document said to be drawn up by Bancroft and arranged under fifteen heads.† From these we learn that it was agreed, that any parts of the Apocrypha which seemed to be repugnant to the Canonical Scriptures should not be read, but that other portions of Scripture might be chosen in their place.

It was also arranged as a result of the conference, that, in all important matters, bishops should be assisted by some of their presbyters. A reformation of the High Commission Court was designed, and schools were to be

\* Collier, vii. 298.

† Joyce's Sacred Synods, p. 630; Strype's Whitgift, ii. 501.

founded in Ireland, Wales, and the borders of Scotland. The Articles were to be explained and enlarged and no one was to preach against them. A uniform translation of the Bible was to be made; and all persons were to receive the Holy Communion at least once a year. In matters of ceremony and order, being things indifferent, the rule of the Apostle was to be kept, "Let all things be done decently and in order, that so, grave, sober, and peaceable persons should not be urged too far at first, nor turbulent and unquiet persons, nor busy spirits do what they list."

The bishops and the orthodox clergy were so delighted with the line taken by the king, that they allowed themselves to be unduly excited and to be hurried into some not very wise remarks. The victory had been assuredly theirs, and they would have departed from the conference with entire satisfaction if they could have had confidence in the king, when he should be brought under the influence of a Puritan Parliament; as it was they were not without some anxiety and alarm, when they went back to their homes and resumed their diocesan duties.

The poor old primate retired to his palace at Lambeth in a state of great anxiety as to the coming Parliament. It did not follow that because the king was able to satisfy the minds of the bishops; a Puritan Parliament would be willing even to attempt conciliation. Whitgift apprehended some great danger to the Church, but desiring to give an account of his bishopric not to man but to God, he hoped that he might not live to see the evil work of the opponents of the Church.\* To the last he toiled to avert the evil from his successors, and the bishops

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

\* Fuller, x. § ii. 1. (iii. p. 198).

looked to the wise old man for that counsel and support which only his experience could give.

He determined not to shrink from his duty, and appointed a meeting at the Bishop of London's house at Fulham, at which he attended in person. But here he caught the cold which after a few days brought his great career to its close.\*

Whitgift lived just long enough to see the issue of the royal proclamation, suggested by him, which sanctioned the proceedings of the conference, and authorised the adoption of the new Prayer Book. In that proclamation all public officers are commanded to assist the hierarchy in carrying out its injunctions, and all classes of persons are "admonished not to expect any further alteration in the public service."†

We must now mention that which was the glory of Bancroft's episcopate, and which was, and is the glory of the English Church—the new translation of the Holy Scriptures. A letter was addressed by the king in July 1604 to Bancroft, then Bishop of London, informing him that he had selected fifty-four divines for the work of a new translation of the Bible. Of the expediency of this course Bancroft, as well as his predecessor Whitgift, had entertained a doubt, fearing lest the new version might afford the enemies of the Church, and especially the Romanists, an opportunity, if not actually an invitation, to throw discredit on the English Bible and on the doctrines which it supported, if alterations and various readings were pedantically introduced by persons who desired to show off their learning rather than to throw light upon the Church. But it was wisely ordered by the king, at

\* See above, p. 183.

† Collier, vii. 301. See also Cardwell's *Doc. Annals*, ii. 56; Strype, v. 35.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Whitgift's  
death,  
1604.

Royal pro-  
clamation.

New trans-  
lation of  
the Bible.  
1604.



the suggestion, as we presume, of Bancroft, who had overcome his scruples, that the first rule to be observed in translating, should be, that "the ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, should be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original would permit."\*

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

It was determined also that "when any word had several significations, that which had been commonly used by the most celebrated fathers should be preferred; provided it were agreeable to the context and the analogy of faith."†

In this work, as we have said, fifty-four learned men were employed, and the king directed that provision should be made for their maintenance out of the revenues of the Church. He required all the bishops to reserve their next preferments, that were "£20 per annum in the king's books," that he might prefer to them such of the learned translators as he should think fit. James declined to be at any expense himself, but advised Bancroft that he should call upon the bishops and deans and chapters to subscribe for the payment of the necessary expenses.‡ Thus, at the expense of the Church of England and by the labour of Churchmen, what is called our Authorised Version was completed, and so well was the work performed—being in fact a much improved edition of the Bishops' Bible—that it has been adopted by many sects and parties who are not in communion with the English Church.

By the Romanists and Socinians indeed, it has been attacked as incorrect; but by the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland none other is used, and learned men have for the most part agreed in praising its general

\* Strype's Whitgift, ii. 529.

† Collier, vii. 339.

‡ Cardwell's Doc. Annals, ii. 65.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Parlia-  
ment  
meets.  
1604.

The king's  
speech.

accuracy.\* The man who brought such a work as this to a happy conclusion, must have been a wise, as well as a learned man.

Very little change in the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs took place on the death of Whitgift, for Bancroft had been for some time the *de facto* Archbishop of Canterbury, and the king was still prepared to act by his advice.

The changes effected in the Prayer Book were sanctioned by James without reference to Convocation, an irregularity to which the enemies of the Church have frequently referred. It was not until the Convocation of 1662, that the Book of Common Prayer, in its present form, was duly authorised. The terms on which the Parliament was summoned, assumed also as the prerogative of the crown, powers which the crown did not constitutionally possess; a prejudice was therefore excited, both against the king, and against the Church, which was hardly allayed by a very able speech with which the Parliament was opened by the king himself. To this speech David Hume refers in terms of admiration.† James spoke, probably by Bancroft's advice, in a spirit very conciliatory to his Roman Catholic subjects. He referred to the Roman Church as the Mother Church of the Church of England, although he admitted the blemishes and corruptions which, so early introduced, had gradually divided, and still kept asunder the two communions. He desired Parliament to devise means for rendering unnecessary that punishment of recusancy which he admitted to have been forced to an unjustifiable extreme. When the king

\* See Jervis' History of the Translation of the Bible; Cardwell's Conferences and Synodalia.

† Hume, vi. 14.

more particularly referred to the blemishes and corruptions of the Romish Church, the gratitude which his complimentary observations may have before excited in the hearts of his Romish subjects was abated, for he stated that he especially adverted to two things which were insufferable—"the doctrine of the pope's supremacy, and the embroilment of civil government leading to the murder of kings." If, however, these evil doctrines were denounced, he was prepared to extend a very full toleration to other errors. When he spoke of the Puritans, the king distinguished between a Church descending by a succession of its ministers from Christ its Founder, and a sect founded by the passions and caprice of men; whose schemes of polity were scarcely endurable in a well regulated commonwealth. For his treatment of them he referred to his various proclamations which in that age had the power of law.\*

The Puritans, who, in Elizabeth's time, had become bold in their demand for power, were exasperated by this threat of an exertion of the prerogative, on the part of a sovereign who was as feeble as his predecessor had been firm.†,

There was one act passed in this Parliament, which was introduced by Bancroft, and which materially affected the external privileges of the Church. By the 13 Queen Eliz. cap. 1, the crown was permitted to accept Church lands, which no subject of the crown was allowed to do. But what was thus intended for the advantage of the Church had been turned to its damage. A courtier, according to Fuller, would covertly contract with a bishop to pass over a certain proportion of his

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Act to prevent the alienation of bishop's sees to the crown.

\* Collier, vii. 307; Cardwell, Doc. Ann. ii. 60.

† Lingard, vii. 32.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

land to the crown; and the crown, having obtained possession of it, bestowed what was thus iniquitously acquired, upon some royal favourite. The see of Exeter had suffered seriously through these proceedings.\* It was now, however, enacted that the king and his successors should have lands conveyed to them only for three lives, or twenty-one years.

The advantages of this act seem to have been obtained by a compromise, according to which a statute of Edward VI. of a reactionary nature was revived, and all processes and citations in ecclesiastical courts were to be issued in the king's name, and under his seal of arms. This, however, was a practice so contrary to the principles of the Church, and of such an Erastian character, that, as an opposition to Erastianism began to prevail, it was soon disregarded by the bishops.

On March 20, the day after Parliament was opened, the Convocation of the province of Canterbury was summoned and met. As no successor had yet been appointed to Whitgift, and the metropolitanical see was consequently vacant, Bishop Bancroft, under the seal of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, and by the license of the king, presided.†

Bancroft, with his usual attention to the minutiae of business, was prepared for his present duties. Various articles, injunctions, and synodical acts had been passed in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth; these had been carefully collected by Bancroft himself, and in the eleventh session of the Convocation he placed them, in the shape of a book of canons, in the hands of the Prolocutor of the Lower House. They were met by a

\* Harrington's "Brief view of the State of the Church of England," p. 89.

† Collier, vii. 310.

Convoca-  
tion,  
March 20,  
1604.

petition from the Puritans for the further reformation of the "Book of Common Prayer." But instead of bringing on a debate the petitioners were admonished, that before the ensuing Midsummer Day they would be expected to conform. All debate, however, was not excluded, for we read of a discussion on May 23 in the upper house on the subject of the use of the cross in holy baptism; the pith of the debate may be read in our 30th canon, which contains a learned and succinct defence of that ancient custom.

Rudd, the Bishop of St. David's, pleaded in vain on the Puritan side. Bishop Bancroft answered him, and then put an end to further discussion.

As the canons were the work of which Richard Bancroft was the chief author, a selection from them will not here be out of place, and will be read with interest by the student of the present day. It was declared that whoever affirmed that the Church of England, notwithstanding the reformation it had undergone, was not a true and apostolical Church, teaching and maintaining the doctrine of the Apostles, should be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored until he had made a public revocation of his wicked error.

This canon, which is still in force, condemns those partial or occasional conformists, who, attending the services of the meeting-house, yet take part in the debates in Parliament as consistent Churchmen.

Likewise *ipso facto* excommunication was pronounced to be incurred, by those who disparaged the form of godly worship established in the Book of Common Prayer, or who pronounced the rites and ceremonies of the English Church to be superstitious. Excommunication was also pronounced upon those who separated themselves from the Communion of Saints, as approved by apostolic

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.

1604-10.

Puritan  
petition  
against  
Prayer  
Book.

Compila-  
tion of a  
book of  
canons.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

rule in the English Church. The same penalty was incurred by all who, forsaking the Church, adhered to a foreign sect. The Common Prayer was to be said or sung distinctly and reverently upon the days appointed to be kept holy; and the ceremonies were to be observed in such place of every church as the bishop of the diocese, or the ecclesiastical ordinary of the place, thought meet for the purpose. No man was to appear in church with his head covered during divine service, unless he had some infirmity, in which case he might wear a cap or coif. All manner of persons present at divine service were reverently, at the time appointed, to kneel on their knees, when the General Confession, Litany, and other prayers were read, and they were to stand up at the saying of the Creed, according to the rules on that behalf prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. When the name of the Lord Jesus was pronounced, due and lowly reverence was to be done by all persons present, testifying by these outward gestures their inward humility, their christian resolution, and their due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ is the true and eternal Son of God.

In all cathedral and collegiate churches the Holy Communion was to be administered upon the principal feast days, and the bishop, dean, or canon in residence, or the principal minister, when he officiated, was to use a decent cope, and to be assisted by a Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably, according to the advertisements published in the 7th year of Elizabeth. All members of the cathedral body, including the petty canons and the singing men, were to receive the Communion four times yearly at least. We have already mentioned that the king still demurred to the use of the cross in baptism. It may be mentioned to the credit of Bancroft that, anxious as he

and his brethren were to conciliate the king and meet his wishes, they did not in this instance show any symptom of yielding to him, but enlarged in these canons on the primitive use of this profitable ceremony. As these canons never received the sanction of Parliament it has on more than one occasion been decided by the judges that they do not bind the laity. It is generally agreed, however, that the law of the case is fairly stated by Lord Hardwicke. "We are all of opinion," he says, "that the canons of 1604 do not *proprio vigore* bind the laity. I say *proprio vigore*, by their own force and authority, for there are many provisions contained in these canons which are declaratory of the ancient usage and law of the Church of England received and allowed here, which in that respect, and by virtue of such ancient allowance, will bind the laity."\* The canons made by the Convocation of Canterbury were, by the king's letters patent, made binding also on York; this had been done before by Queen Elizabeth.

The Northern Convocation regarding this as an impeachment of their independence, petitioned at their next meeting, that they might be allowed to retain their right of making canons for themselves, and when the concession was made, the Convocation of York adopted the canons which had been previously passed at Canterbury. It may, however, be remarked, that, during the reign of James, no canons were enacted by the Convocation of York, that Convocation, in fact, being in a state of abeyance; not even a prolocutor was elected, † except on the occasion of the ratification of the canons above mentioned.

What occasioned the delay in the appointment of a

\* Lathbury's Convocation, 231. Joyce's Sacred Synods, p. 640.

† Archbishop Wake, 507-508.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

successor to Archbishop Whitgift does not very clearly appear. Bancroft had been appointed immediately after the conference, one of the commissioners to regulate matters of the Church, and he was also placed in the commission for perusing and suppressing books printed here, or brought into the realm, without public authority; but it was not until October 9, 1604, that Bancroft was nominated by King James to the primacy. On the 10th of December, he was confirmed in Lambeth Church, the bishops of Durham, Rochester, St. David's, Chester, Chichester, and Ely officiating.

Bancroft  
Arch-  
bishop of  
Canter-  
bury,  
Dec. 10,  
1604.



## CHAPTER XXIX.

## BANCROFT, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Strong measures of the new archbishop—Letter to his suffragans—Subscription required to the three articles of the 36th Canon—Proceedings in the Star Chamber—Treatment of the Puritans—Gunpowder plot—New oath of allegiance—Blackwell's abhorrence of the plot—Articuli Cleri—State of the Church of Scotland—Dunbar and Abbot sent to Scotland—Illegal assembly at Aberdeen—Members thereof summoned before the king—Restoration of the Church in Scotland—Difficulties about the consecration of certain Scotch Bishops—Bancroft's share in the discussion—Consecration of the bishops—High Court of Commission—Bancroft's reforms at Cambridge—The pope condemns the oath of allegiance—Paolo Sarpi—Reformation of the Channel Islands—James Van Harmin—Foundation of Chelsea College—Cowell's interpreter—The king directs an inquiry into abuses—Bancroft's letter to his suffragans—Overall's Convocation Book—Bancroft's death—His will—His character.

ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT at the very beginning of his archiepiscopate certified to all parties, that it was not his intention to permit the laws of the Church to be evaded. Letters were received from the Council by him and by the Archbishop of York, Dr. Hutton, which were evidently prompted by the primate himself, intimating the royal expectation, that where advice did not prevail, or admonition take effect, there should henceforth be no more delay in compelling obedience to his Majesty's proclamation, in which he enjoined upon all the clergy to conform to the laws of the Church. The not unwilling primate forwarded copies of the letter on December 22, to each of his suffragans, and he enclosed in another letter

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Strong  
measures  
of the new  
arch-  
bishop.

Letter to  
his suffra-  
gans.

CHAP.  
XXIX.Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

an order of constitutions for the government of the clergy, professedly from himself, directing them how to proceed. An "uniform kind of proceeding" was enjoined, and they were to follow exactly the 36th and 37th canons of the last Convocation.\*

The three  
articles of  
the 36th  
canon.

By these canons it is provided that no person should be allowed to hold any living, to preach or catechise, to be a reader or lecturer, unless by the license of an archbishop, bishop, or one of the universities, and then only on condition of his signing three articles, declaring:— I. The supremacy of the king in matters spiritual and temporal. II. That the Book of Common Prayer contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that he will use that book and that book only in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments. III. That the 39 Articles are agreeable to the Word of God.

*Ex animo*  
subscription  
thereto  
required.

The proceeding became the more stringent, because whosoever subscribed these three articles had "to set down both his christian and surname, viz. I, N. N. do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to these three articles above-mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them." † The beneficed clergy who refused to conform or subscribe were at once deprived, under the powers of the first act of Queen Elizabeth. Some short respite was granted to those who, though unwilling to subscribe again, were ready to promise conformity; but the act was soon after enforced in all its stringency—a measure subsequently censured by such sound Churchmen as Jeremy Collier and others of the nonjuring party whose opinions concur with those of that historian. But, throwing ourselves back into Bancroft's own age, we shall find that his severe measures were, by many of his contemporaries

\* Cardwell, Doc. Ann. ii. 69.

† Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of the Church of England, 36, 37.

applauded, as praiseworthy proofs of his firmness of character.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Although the Puritans after a season grew into a majority, yet when Bancroft first assumed the reins of authority, church feeling was still strong, and by most people the enforcement of stringent measures was recognized as a necessity. The Puritans and the recusants of course complained.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Looking at Bancroft's conduct from a modern point of view, we should accuse him of acting unconstitutionally and in violation of the law, but in doing so we should not judge fairly. Certainly his conduct shows, that although he defied Parliament, yet he regarded Parliament only as one of the institutions of the land, and not as the only one possessing legislative authority. He sought elsewhere for the authority which parliament refused to give. The Star Chamber, although a court which now we justly reprobate, was recognized with all its powers in the reign of James. If the proposal of the archbishop was not sanctioned by Parliament, it was sufficient for him to obtain the sanction of the Star Chamber, where all the estates of the realm were represented. By the existing constitution of the country, that council had supreme authority, and the king, acting under the advice of the archbishop, summoned the judges to attend therein and to be prepared to give their advice, the law ultimately resting on the will of the sovereign. The judges came in their robes of office, and being seated in the place of honour assigned to them, three questions were solemnly asked by the lord high chancellor.

Proceed-  
ings in  
the Star  
Chamber.

First, Whether the depriving of ministers by the Court of High Commission, for not observing the new canons, was a legal act of authority or not? Their judgment was that the "king having power *without Parliament* to make

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

and to deprive them if they did not obey, and that the king having power to delegate this ecclesiastical prerogative to commissioners, their answer could only be in the affirmative." Their judgment as to the next question was equally satisfactory to the king and primate. They were asked, Whether a prohibition be grantable against the commissioners upon the statute of 2 Henry V. if they do not deliver a copy of the libel to the party? They answered, "that that statute was intended where the ecclesiastical judge proceeds *ex officio* and *ore tenus*." Being asked in the third place, Whether it be an offence punishable, to petition the King for the redress of grievances real or supposed as the Puritans were wont to do? The judges unanimously replied "that it was an offence finable at discretion and very near to treason and felony in the punishment, for it tended to the raising sedition, rebellion, and discontent among the people." \* Neal, writing according to modern notions, accuses the judges of their giving to the king despotic power. But, in fact, they only stated the law as the law then was. The will of the king was the law of the land, subject to some undefined power of interference on the part of the three estates of the land,—or the Parliament. Stringent measures nevertheless they were, and they drove many of the Puritans into open non-conformity. Some of them fled to Holland and to other Continental refuges for malcontents. They were not, however, cordially received, and they proved themselves as unwilling to conform to sects which only expressed their own sentiments, as they had been to conform to the Church which in their petulance they had deserted. These determinations were, at least, so far impartial, that they bore with equal hardness on the Popish nonconformists and on the Puritans.

Treatment  
of the  
Puritans.

\* Neal's Hist. of Puritans, vol. i. p. 417.

Throughout the country the Puritans were increasing in violence, though not, as yet, in numbers. This we may safely affirm, for Bancroft could not have carried his very strong measures against them, unless he had felt secure of the support of the majority of the people as well as of the court. But a very lukewarm majority is unequal to contend with a minority full of enthusiasm, and of bitter feeling against their opponents. In revenge for the insults and injuries levelled at them, the Gunpowder Plot was devised by the recusants. Of the Gunpowder Plot the assertions of the leading Papists may, with some modifications, be accepted. This atrocious scheme was not devised by the leading members of that body, and when, by accident, it became partially known to persons of rank and respectability, they, with a very few exceptions, refused to give it their support, and seem scarcely to have supposed its originators to have been in earnest. It is well known to have originated with Robert Catesby, a Northamptonshire gentleman, who, with his father, had been persecuted for his religion, and who had thus been driven to despair. The letter revealing the intention of the conspirators, and addressed to Lord Monteagle, may still be seen at the State Paper Office. The legal punishment of Guy Fawkes, and the cruelty with which his accomplices were pursued, form a prominent page in the history of the period. The notion that King James, by his own sagacity, discovered the plot, though at one time popular, is now known to be without foundation. Nevertheless the case is complicated by the falsehoods which, as the Papists admitted, were uttered on the subject, and by equivocation, which, under the name of "economy," is still tolerated in the Roman Church, if the direct lie be avoided.\*

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

The Gun-  
powder  
Plot,  
1506.

\* Rapin, ii. 171. Winwood's State Papers, vol. ii. p. 170. Dodd's Church History of England, iv. 42-56.

CHAP.  
XXIX.Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

The discovery of this immoral notion led to the enforcement of a new oath of obedience, which was so worded that it might be taken even by Papists so long as they did not entertain the opinion that the Pope might depose temporal sovereigns. This was a conciliatory measure, and shows that Bancroft was still of opinion that however cruelly vindictive the Jesuits and seminary priests sent from abroad might be, the seculars were still loyal to the English crown, a fact which is abundantly proved by the history of the period. The extreme Romanists had not as yet dared to nominate a Papist to any of those English sees which, from the time of St. Augustine, had been created and filled according to the exigencies of the age. At the head of the Romish sect, there was only an archpriest, George Blackwell by name. This moderate and good man, on November 28, published a letter to the English Papists, in which he condemned the late plot as "a detestable and damnable practice, odious in the sight of God, horrible to the understanding of men." He exhorted them "not to attempt any practice or action, tending, in any degree, to the hurt or prejudice of the person of our sovereign lord the king, the prince, nobility, counsellors, and officers of state, but towards them, in their several places and degrees, to behave themselves as becomes dutiful subjects and religious Catholics." \*

George  
Blackwell's  
abhorrence  
of the plot.Stringent  
measures  
against the  
Papists.

The archbishop could not, however, prevent the enactment of a more rigid code of pains and penalties, which an avenging Parliament carried against the Papists who had designed its ruin.† But through his high position and his influence at court, Bancroft caused its severity to be gradually relaxed.‡ What gave great offence on the part of the archbishop to the Puritans, was his not being con-

\* Collier, vii. 320.

† Lingard, vii. 86.

‡ Burnet's Own Times, p. 5.

tent with the oath of loyalty and subscription to the Book of Common Prayer, but his requiring subscription to be made *ex animo*; and we shall all agree in thinking that this was an unjustifiable course of proceeding. The judges, also, took offence, and becoming jealous of Bancroft's supposed encroachment on their rights, enlarged, by their own authority, the power of their courts. They required many matters, although they had been already cited before the ecclesiastical judge, to be tried in the common law courts.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

The *Articuli Cleri* were exhibited in the Michaelmas term to the Lords of the Privy Council—they were in number twenty-five. The judges were the persons here assailed, and they took time to consider the judgment they were called upon to deliver on the matter. They were unanimous in their reply, which was delivered in the Easter term by the famous Lord Coke, and may be found in his *Institutes*. The object seems to have been to reverse the judgment they had given when consulted by the Star Chamber in 1604. The judges attacked the bishops, and maintained that the administration of law in the ecclesiastical courts was such that, even in ecclesiastical matters, many men preferred to have recourse to the king's courts. We have seen that, before the Reformation of our Church, similar complaints had been made, and what the judges now did was to offer a remedy. The archbishop's attempt to force discipline upon the Church and nation was ill-timed, and thus provoked opposition such as archiepiscopal despotism has met with in later times.

Bancroft's  
Articuli  
Cleri.

Lord  
Coke's  
reply.

It is sometimes asserted, and it is generally believed, that it was by Archbishop Laud that the restoration of episcopacy in the Church of Scotland was proposed; this however is a mistake. King James never forgot the

State of the  
Church of  
Scotland.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

treatment he had received from the Scotch Presbyterians, and he it was who determined to reduce the Presbyterian sect in Scotland to the model of what he found a church ought to be, when he arrived in England.

It must be admitted that, in the measures he adopted for this restoration, James showed more than his usual caution and policy. To this subject we shall have occasion hereafter to refer, but even here we may remark that his wisdom was in some measure shown, by his determination not to employ in this matter either of the two English metropolitans.

The union between the two kingdoms had already excited strong party feeling on either side, and this was sure to be increased when an union between the Church and the Presbyterian sect was proposed: James therefore proceeded slowly and carefully. Sir George Home, created Earl of Dunbar, was the king's representative in Scotland, and he selected for his adviser Dr. Abbot, known to be a Puritan in all things, except those which related to the Episcopate.

Although the statesmen did not venture at first to propose the consecration of the bishops, yet the divines selected for the episcopal office were permitted to sit with the title of bishop in the Scottish Parliament, and with loyalty and devotion to the Church united considerable national feeling. On the opposite side, certain Presbyterians assembled at Aberdeen had, in the year 1605, agreed to call themselves the General Assembly, and having thus constituted themselves an incorporated society, they adjourned. For this act they were arraigned and convicted of high treason.

The king, who, in a Parliament held at Perth in 1606 had obtained the restoration of the temporalities of the bishops, determined to break the spirit of these malcontents, but in the two Melvilles, in Balfour, and in Scot,

Mission of  
Dunbar  
and Abbot  
to Scot-  
land.

Illegal as-  
sembly at  
Aberdeen,  
1605.



he found opponents of powerful minds and obstinate tempers. There is something almost amusing in the retaliation to which these men were subjected. Of all the petty annoyances to which the maltreated and despised King of Scotland had been subjected, nothing had annoyed his peculiar temper more, than his being obliged to listen, without being able to return an answer, to the various Scotch preachers who railed against royalty, and especially against the royalty of one of so imbecile a character as the strange lounging sovereign before them, a sovereign better qualified for discussion in an ecclesiastical synod than for holding the sceptre of a great nation.

James, when King of England, had his revenge on some of these men, or on their representatives, by summoning them to London, and making them sit, for hours, to hear long discourses to which they were not permitted to reply ; but after all the vengeance was not complete, for if these men were called upon to attend, the persons who demanded their attention were some of the greatest men whom the English Church had produced.

Such were the Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Barlow ; the Bishop of Rochester, Dr. Buckeridge ; Dr. King, afterwards Bishop of London, and greatest of all, the illustrious Andrewes of Chichester. Andrewes discoursed upon “ the two trumpets,” and proved the convening and discharging of assemblies to belong to Christian kings and emperors.\*

The Scotch Presbyterians returned to their country in extreme ill-humour, and took particular offence at the consent given by the titular Scotch bishops to the condemnation of the Aberdeen assemblage, and to the upholding of the Perth Parliament.

The king’s party, however, obtained a further triumph in the convention held at Linlithgow in the follow-

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Members  
thereof  
summoned  
before the  
king.

\* Collier, vii. 331.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

ing December, when it was determined that every presbytery should have a constant moderator, and that the bishops of the several dioceses should occupy the moderator's chair. This course received its final sanction from the General Assembly at Glasgow in June 1610, after which one thing only remained to complete the good work, and that was, the consecration of the moderators as bishops of the Church.\*

Difficulties  
as to the  
consecra-  
tion of  
certain  
Scotch  
bishops.

As a bishop cannot be canonically consecrated except by a College of Bishops, and as by the Roman law *tres faciunt collegium*, three divines presented themselves to the king; Spotiswood claiming the bishopric of Glasgow, by the election of his chapter, Lamb claiming the bishopric of Brechin, and Hamilton that of Galloway. When Spotiswood suggested that they might be misunderstood by their brethren in Scotland, who might imagine that by accepting consecration from the English bishops, they would be brought into subjection to the Church of England, the king replied, that caution against this jealousy had been already taken, in the fact that the consecration was not to be conducted by either of the archbishops, but by certain prelates selected promiscuously from among the suffragans.

The bishops elect of Scotland professed to be satisfied with this arrangement, but another difficulty arose from a different quarter, in the solution of which Archbishop Bancroft made manifest his acquaintance with the history of the Primitive Church, and actually on one point showed himself more learned than the truly learned Bishop Andrewes, to whose *ipse dixit* the bishops generally were ready to defer. The Scottish bishops elect had not been episcopally ordained, and, in consequence, had not become priests. Bishop Andrewes, therefore,

\* Neal's History of Puritans, i. p. 448.

considered that they ought first to be admitted to the priesthood by the laying on of hands. This was a perplexing question at the time; Andrewes was not the man to state the difficulty unless he really felt it, and what was really felt by him, would be also felt by many who looked up to him as their leader. But the whole question of the Scotch consecration was one of such delicacy, that both the Church and the Court sought to hurry it over as soon as it could be accomplished.

Archbishop Bancroft ventured to come forward at this crisis. He argued that the previous ordination was not absolutely necessary, as the Church of England took for its precedent the Eastern Church, to which it was mainly indebted for its Liturgy and Prayer Book.

He pointed out to Bishop Andrewes and to the other prelates, who felt as deeply as he did about all that related to the Apostolical Succession, that previous ordination had not always been considered necessary by the Church, for in the consecration itself the lower functions of deacon and priest were contained. St. Ambrose, being himself a layman, was consecrated Bishop of Milan, and Nectarius, another layman, was consecrated Bishop of Constantinople. Eucherius, a lay monk, had been consecrated Bishop of Lyons, and if these instances had not been sufficient, he felt assured that he might discover other precedents. Bishop Andrewes, with that modesty which a really learned man is ever ready to show, expressed himself satisfied with the arguments of the archbishop, and being Bishop of Ely, he acted with the Bishops of London, Rochester, and Worcester in the consecration of the three Scotchmen in the Chapel of London House on October 21, 1610.\*

Thus was laid the foundation of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. In the disturbances which ensued upon the

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Bancroft's  
share in  
the discus-  
sion.

Consecra-  
tion of the  
bishops,  
1610.

\* Collier, vii. 362.

CHAP.  
XXIX.Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.Founda-  
tion of the  
Episcopal  
Church in  
Scotland.

so-called Reformation, the Apostolical succession had been lost; it was now restored under circumstances of peace and concord which, but a few months before, could hardly have been expected.\* The principles of the Church were enforced upon the royal mind with vigour, learning, and power of argument by Archbishop Bancroft, and they were carried out, in a manner in which they would not have been carried out by the impetuosity of our primate, by Dunbar and Abbot. These statesmen with manners more courteous and bland, were able to accomplish a measure which, if it had been advanced by Bancroft, would probably have met with harsh opposition. As it was, Bancroft did raise an opposition which might with a little worldly wisdom have been deferred. The Scottish bishops feared that they would not receive from the nobility that deference and respect which was accorded to the lords spiritual in England; nor from the people in general were they likely to meet with that courtesy which they had a right to expect. If they had waited with patience perhaps all would have come right, but the king and Bancroft having desired to place them on a perfect equality with the English prelates, determined that if they could not win for them the respect of the people, they should be armed with powers which should render disrespect impossible. This they had done by establishing a Court of High Commission. This court, while enforcing the laws of the Church, was in fact no part of the system of the Church, and to compel its adoption on an unwilling people was injudicious in the extreme.

Establish-  
ment of the  
Court of  
High  
Commis-  
sion.

While the attention of the king, advised by the Earl of Dunbar and Dr. Abbot, was directed to Scottish affairs,

\* At a later period, the Episcopal succession was again lost in Scotland, and recovered through the instrumentality of the English hierarchy.

the active mind of Bancroft was employed on university reforms. The Archbishop of Canterbury had become Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1608, and, while extending his care to the whole of the university, he directed his attention specially to two colleges of which he was visitor—New College and All Souls. According to a concession made to the great founder of our system of public education—William of Wykeham—the fellows of New College “were to be admitted to all degrees of the university without asking any grace of the congregation of masters, or undergoing any public examination, provided they were examined in the college according to the form of the university, and had their graces given in like manner by the government of the house.” This privilege excited much jealousy, and an appeal against it was made to Archbishop Bancroft as Chancellor of the University. After a patient investigation of the case, the archbishop gave judgment in favour of the college, refusing to interfere with a privilege that had been in existence for nearly 200 years.\*

Until the last few years Bancroft’s judgment was permitted to silence all controversy on the subject.

In the archives of All Souls there is a letter † addressed by Bancroft to its members which is especially valuable as it incidentally mentions the customs of the period, and the systematic abuse of hospitality which was one of the faults of that noble institution. The fellows were not permitted to appropriate a dividend beyond a certain sum, and the surplus of the college funds was appropriated to great feasts to which strangers were invited. An entire reformation was enjoined by Bancroft as visitor

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604–10.  
University  
reforms.  
1608.

Bancroft’s  
letter to  
the college  
of All  
Souls.

\* Le Neve, p. 85.

† We are indebted for this fact to Professor Burrows, who mentions it in his *History of the Worthies of All Souls*, p. 123.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

of the college. The feast was to last one day only, and was to be merely "a moderate refection for the officers and seniors" of the college, and the surplus was to be divided among the members of the society, according to modern universal practice. Going more into detail he says, "It is astonishing the kind of beer which heretofore you have had in your college, and has been some cause of your decrements;" and to remedy this he orders that "no other should be received into the buttery, but small or middle beer." But Bancroft was not a man to rest content with superficial enquiry or partial discipline; an error in a college implied a criminal excess throughout the university, and what Bancroft ordained as visitor of All Souls, as chancellor, he issued in a general order to the university.\* "I intend," he adds, "what I order herein, God willing, to see effected very shortly throughout the whole university." All parties agree that it was when Puritanism had the lead at Oxford, that these excesses prevailed; as Wood remarks, in former times proctors were chosen for their scholarship, their virtue, and their public spirit, but the university had degenerated, and in his days the candidate who could give the greatest entertainments, was in Wood's words, "Proctor against all the world." This vice extended to the election of inferior officers, and the bachelors imitated the masters by electing the collector by whom the greatest entertainments were given.

Lord Clarendon, in his autobiography, gives to Oxford a very bad character for this vice, during the time of his residence at Magdalen Hall, 1621-1625. His brother was ruined by his intemperance. Bancroft had a feeling that the university students could not indulge in these excesses if they observed regularly the services of the Church;

\* Wood's Hist. and Antiq. of Oxford, ii. 306, edit. 1796.

and in the first year of his chancellorship, he issued orders that all university students should attend daily prayers, and thrice in the year receive the Holy Communion.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

He also enjoined that, four times in every year, the thirty-nine articles should be read publicly in each college, and that the youth of the university should be catechised once a week. The injunction in relation to the thirty-nine articles is worthy of notice : it was issued by one of the firmest anti-Calvinists of the age, and this is sufficient to show that they cannot bear that Calvinistic construction which, a few years ago, it was attempted to place upon them.

King James must have been happy at this period of his reign, for he was involved in many controversies. Pope Paul had repudiated the oath of allegiance as offered to the people by his representative Blackwell, and in Venice the pope's authority was called in question even as it had been in England.

Oath of  
allegiance  
condemned  
by the  
Pope.

The English Ambassador was in close communication with the Venetian Senate, and his chaplain, Mr. Bedell, with Father Paolo Sarpi. Paolo Sarpi had been appointed one of the Council of State by the Venetians, who desired to employ his pen in defending the position they had taken in opposition to the See of Rome.\*

Paolo  
Sarpi.

James was in hopes that the Church of Venice would be modelled after the English Reformation, and be permanently separated from the Roman Church. It was by his encouragement that Father Paul composed his history of the Council of Trent, and the proof-sheets were regularly transmitted to the King of England. To preside over a general council was an object of great ambition to James, but, after all, the dispute between the Venetians and

His history  
of the  
Council of  
Trent.

\* Walton's Life of Sir Henry Wotton ; (Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. iv. 84;) Wellwood's Memoirs, 29-31.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

the pope, being chiefly a dispute as to jurisdiction, this speculation came to nought.

We are not concerned with the controversy in Holland. Although the king's paltry ambition led him to take part in it, he could not prevail, if indeed he attempted to do so, in making the Church of England and her primates take interest in the squabbles of a sect which they did not regard as the Church. Some few of our divines, to win favour at court, did indeed attend the Dutch Synod. But their action was simply undertaken on their own responsibility, under the patronage of the king, who did not clearly understand the mischief of his conduct.

Reforma-  
tion of the  
Channel  
Islands.

Bancroft was able to act with greater independence in completing the reformation of the Channel Islands. In throwing off the tyranny of Rome, the pattern of Geneva and of the French sects had been adopted, and by some oversight or other, this had not been corrected by any legislative enactment of Queen Elizabeth or, up to this time, of King James. The management of the details was left to Sir John Peyton, Governor of Jersey, who regarded it from a lay point of view, and who complained that, through the irregularity of the insular synods, the crown had been injured by the loss of some portion of its first-fruits. A controversy having been raised on the subject, the case, as was intended, was referred to the king. Commissioners were sent to Jersey, and steps were taken to abridge the authority usurped by the "colloquy," and "to recover the Church to a better establishment." Some time elapsed, however, before the controversy was settled, and it remained for Bancroft's successor to complete the work which this primate had begun.\*

In the meantime, Bancroft was labouring very dili-

\* Heylin's *Presbyterianism*, p. 396. Collier. vii. 376.



gently for the internal peace and welfare of the Church of England. It was about this time that Arminianism and Calvinism each assumed that distinctive character which, however marked in Holland, became particularly noticeable in England. In the year 1608, James Van Harmin, whose historical name is Arminius, became distinguished throughout Europe, for his opposition, as a religious philosopher, to the Calvinistic dogmas.

CHAP.  
XXIX.  
Richard Bancroft.  
1604-10.  
Calvinism and Arminianism.  
James Van Harmin.

In England, the court and the higher clergy, though they did not entirely agree with Arminius, became more and more opposed to Calvin. The idea of establishing a college at Chelsea for the study of controversial divinity, entered into the mind of Dr. Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, who bestowed lands to the amount of 300*l.* a year, and left by will 4,000*l.* to establish such an institution. The king warmly patronised it, and gave to it everything but money. Archbishop Bancroft was equally its patron, but the Church did not cordially take up the design, and the whole thing became gradually a failure.\*

Founda-  
tion of  
Chelsea  
College.

The controversy between the ecclesiastical courts and the courts of common statute law still went on. The king endeavoured to step in as arbitrator, but in vain; he commended a book written by Dr. Cowell at the solicitation, as it was supposed, of Archbishop Bancroft. It argued in extreme language in favour of the regale. James, who at first patronised the work, when he became acquainted with the unpopularity of the author, pusillanimously deserted him, and allowed him to be put in prison, though only for a short time.†

Cowell's  
Inter-  
preter.

This circumstance is mentioned to account for the unfavourable reception of a measure which was wisely

\* Fuller's Church Hist. x. § iii. 19-24 (vol. iii. p 235).

† Hallam, Const. Hist. i. 324.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

devised by Bancroft, for improving the revenues of the clergy.\*

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

It would occupy too large a space in these pages to give Bancroft's proposals in detail. They could not obtain a hearing in Parliament, and the members of the two Houses offered many complaints of the ecclesiastical administration. When the king prorogued Parliament, he himself admitted that many of the grievances required redress; and on the day after the prorogation, he directed the archbishop to inquire closely into all cases of real abuse, and desired that measures should be adopted for the correction of them.

The king  
desires an  
inquiry in-  
to abuses.

Bancroft's  
letter to  
his suffra-  
gans.

This message from the sovereign produced a letter from the archbishop to his suffragans, which, as illustrative of the condition of the Church at this time, is extremely interesting. The archbishop informs his suffragans that the king, on the grievance exhibited to him by the Lower House of Parliament, had been pleased to lay a burden upon him, which, without the assistance of his suffragans, he would be unable to bear. He inquired into the number of ministers in each diocese who had two benefices, and he asked whether each one had a preaching minister to supply his absence; if he had not, the grievance was to be immediately remedied. He required the name and degree of those who held livings in plurality, and stated that his Majesty's charge was, that the Bishops should "require their prebendaries to be present at their benefices and there to preach every Sunday;" they were to be particular in administering the oath of allegiance to recusants, and neither in the church nor in the churchyard were any excommunicated persons to be buried. Orders were given for keeping the parsonage-houses in repair, and complaint was made about the style of dress

\* Collier, vii. 352.

of some of the higher clergy, and of their families. He said that from the dean to every curate, nothing was often left to distinguish them from a bishop. "You will find deans usually in their velvet, damask, or satin cassocks, with their silk netherstocks, nay some archdeacons and inferior ministers, having two benefices, are likewise for the most part so attired; to omit that their wives, in the cost and vanity of their apparel, do exceed as much and more, which is one principal motive why there is such exclamation against double-beneficed men, and such as besides their two benefices have some other preferment *sine curâ*." \* He called for a strict account of collections made, and of the purposes for which they were made, as he found some of them had been misappropriated. Nothing definite, however, was done, in spite of this letter, and the Parliament, which met again in the following winter, was dissolved by the king without any further steps having been taken in the matter.

With the Parliament Convocation expired. That assembly had not, however, been idle during the seven years of its existence. Besides the 141 canons ratified by the king, which had become the constituted Canon Law of the Church, the sanction of Convocation was given to an extraordinary work which it is difficult to describe, but which consisted partly of canons, and partly of dissertations explanatory of the same. The subject of the treatise was "the government of God's Holy Catholic Church, and the kingdoms of the whole world." It seems to be now admitted that, having been drawn up by the archbishop, this book was introduced by him to Convocation. It is known as Bishop Overall's Convocation Book.† It fell out of notice until it was published by

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Dissolu-  
tion of  
Parlia-  
ment.

Overall's  
Convoca-  
tion Book.

\* Cardwell's Doc. Annals, ii. 159.

† Archbishop Wake's State of the Church, pp. 509, 510.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Archbishop <sup>s</sup>Bancroft, who thought through it to justify the principles of the non-jurors, though it is difficult to say how this was done. The book gave great offence to King James, who wrote an angry letter on the subject to Dr. Abbot. He thought that sufficient deference was not paid to the authority of kings, and he perhaps never forgave Archbishop Bancroft and his friends for the liberty they had taken in speaking of his powers. There is no accounting for the irritation of such an ill-regulated mind as that of James I.

Before the dissolution of Parliament, and a fortnight after the consecration of the Scottish Bishops, and the foundation of the Scottish Church, it was reported in London that Archbishop Bancroft was seriously ill. On November 2, 1610, the sound of the great bell of St. Paul's made known the fact that the archiepiscopal throne was vacant.

That Bancroft was unpopular, all historians conspire to assert, but why it is difficult to say. It was affirmed that the nobility complained of his want of hospitality, but we all know that he inherited a private fortune and that he died a comparatively poor man.

Neal, the historian of the Puritans, unwilling to leave the dead champion of the Church without a parting blow, states that the unostentatious manner of living practised by Bancroft, gave rise to the following satire on his death :—

Here lies his grace in cold clay clad,  
Who died for want of what he had.\*

It seems strange that the Puritan historian should object to the simplicity of his life. Can it be that he was angered at the sternness with which the archbishop had

\* Neal, i. 450. Wilson's Hist. James I. in Kennett's complete Hist. vol. ii. p. 685.

Death of  
Bancroft,  
Nov. 2,  
1610.

repressed the excesses of the—at that time—Puritan University of Oxford.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Bancroft was indeed stern to the Puritans, but against whom was this strictness exhibited? Those who were the objects of severity were persons who, having sworn to obey the law of the Church, objected to adhere to their oath. We do not, under these circumstances, wonder at his being maligned, but we may question the justice of the charge brought against him of being too strict and severe.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

By his will Bancroft ordered that his body should be interred in the chancel of Lambeth Church, and besides other munificent legacies, he left all the books in his library to the archbishops his successors. He forbade that any other but a plain stone should be laid upon his grave. His body was not to be opened, but to be buried within forty or fifty hours of his decease. This attention to economy in the midst of such munificent bequests may throw a light upon his character. The carpenters and joiners may have complained, but men of learning rejoiced in the library he handed down to his successors. The books were left conditionally. The archbishop for the time being, was to bind himself to leave them entire to his successor; failing this pledge on the part of the archbishop, the books were bequeathed to his Majesty's newly erected college at Chelsea, when that college should be finished. The books continued at Lambeth until the approach of the troublesome times; when, Chelsea College having failed, they were at Mr. Selden's suggestion, removed to Cambridge.\*

His will.

His dona-  
tion of  
books.

It is noticeable that, while directing expenses to be avoided, he desired that on some Sunday within a month

\* Le Neve, p. 87. After the Restoration, Archbishop Juxon demanded their restoration, but, as he died a short time afterwards, it was his successor Sheldon who restored them to Lambeth.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

of his death, the Bishop of London, Dr. Abbot, and the Bishop of Chichester, Dr. Harsnett, or one of his chaplains, should preach in Lambeth Church, and make such mention of him as should tend to the glory of God. They could not indeed have found a better illustration of conscientious work in the service of God, and for the well-being of His Church on earth, than the energetic life of England's Primate, Richard Bancroft.

I am induced to add a few more remarks on the character of Bancroft, because, in modern times, the malign statements of the Puritans have been stereotyped and sometimes repeated, by those from whom we should have expected better things. He has been accused of cruelty, but this accusation is at once refuted by the most unexceptionable testimony of Bishop Hackett, who was not likely to speak partially of Bancroft.

Comparing Bancroft's conduct in the High Commission Court, with the severity and vigour exercised by his successor Archbishop Abbot, Bishop Hackett says, that Bancroft would chide stoutly but censure mildly. He considered that he sat there rather as a father than as a judge—"Et pro peccato magno paululum supplicii satis est patri." He knew that a pastoral staff was made to bring back a wandering sheep, not to knock it down.\*

He has been accused also of covetousness. Every fact that comes under our notice contradicts the charge. A conscientious man having privately protested to him, that he was ready to be deprived rather than to conform, the archbishop asked him how he would maintain himself. He answered that he knew no other way than by begging. "No," said Bancroft, "you shall not need to do that; but come to me, and I will take order for your

\* Hackett's Life of Williams, p. 97.

Bancroft's  
conduct in  
the High  
Commis-  
sion Court.

maintenance.” \* “It is true that he did not keep up the state of his predecessor or successor in office, having a citizen to act as his steward, yet he was never observed to aim at enriching his kindred. “His clear estate at his death,” says Fuller, “exceeded not 6,000*l.*, no sum to speak a single man covetous, who had sat six years in the see of Canterbury, and somewhat longer in London.’ †

Clarendon in his remarks upon “the never-enough-lamented death of Dr. Bancroft,” states that “this metropolitan, who understood the church excellently, and had almost rescued it out of the hands of the Calvinian party, and very much subdued the unruly spirit of the nonconformists, by and after the conference at Hampton Court, countenanced men of the greatest parts in learning, and disposed the clergy to a more solid course of study, than they had been accustomed to; and, if he had lived, would quickly have extinguished all that fire in England, which had been kindled at Geneva; or, if he had been succeeded by bishop Andrewes, bishop Overall, or any man who understood and loved the church, that infection would easily have been kept out, which could not afterwards be so easily expelled.” †

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Richard  
Bancroft.  
1604-10.

Clarendon's  
estimate of  
his  
character.

\* Fuller, x. § iii. 34-37 (vol. iii. p. 245).

† Fuller, x. § iii. 34-37 (vol. iii. p. 245). ‡ Clarendon, i. 36.

## CHAPTER XXX.

GEORGE ABBOT—EARLY LIFE AND CAREER TILL HIS  
EPISCOPATE.

His character.—Puritanical views.—His birth.—Parentage.—His mother's dream.—Its influence on his career.—Educated at Guildford Grammar School.—University career.—Dean of Winchester, 1599.—Vice-chancellor.—Consulted regarding the cross in Cheapside.—His decision.—Conduct in the like case at Oxford.—His theology attacked by Laud.—Laud's defence of Apostolical succession.—Views of Abbot and his party.—His "Visibility of the Church."—Share in the translation of the Bible.—Opposes Laud's B.D. degree.—Supports Dr. Airey's censure of Laud's sermon, 1606.—Overall's "Convocation Book."—The king's remonstrance thereon to Abbot.—Death of the Earl of Dorset.—Abbot is appointed chaplain to the Earl of Dunbar.—Episcopacy established in Scotland.—Abbot's conduct as regards the Gowrie conspiracy.—Elected to the see of Coventry and Lichfield.

CHAP.  
XXX.

BANCROFT was succeeded in the primacy by George Abbot, a man whose principles were decidedly opposed to those of the late archbishop.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

George Abbot was evidently a man of piety and devotion, industrious, and firm in the assertion of what

*Authorities.*—We have no history of Abbot except one published by Speaker Onslow, which is little more than a reprint of the *Biographia Britannica*. In Heylin's *Cyprianus Anglicanus*, in Fuller's *Church History* and in Fuller's *Worthies*, in Wood's *Athenæ*, in Le Neve, in Hackett's *Life of Williams*, in Calderwood's *History of Scotland*, and in the *Cabala*—in which occur some of Abbot's letters—we obtain our chief information, except where specially mentioned in the following pages of George Abbot.



he believed to be right; yet, at the same time, he was narrow-minded and implacable.

He resented as an insult to himself all opposition to his principles, and seems never to have forgiven any divine who took a view of the existing state of affairs, which differed from his own. But to James I., vacillating in his principles, and at this time inclined to doctrinal Calvinism, Abbot commended himself. Abbot represented a new class of Puritans. There were some who held Calvinistic notions, but who did not see why they should be excluded from the emoluments of the Church. If they admitted the rights of the episcopate, they yielded all that James cared to demand of them. Such a man was George Abbot. He was commended to the royal notice by the king's old favourite, the Earl of Dunbar, who attributed toleration of episcopacy in Scotland, to the wise counsels and moderate conduct of Dr. Abbot.

When the see of Canterbury was vacant by the death of Bancroft, the Church of England expected that the most illustrious of her prelates—Bishop Andrewes—would be appointed as his successor. Bishops came to town to bear testimony to his merits, and returned to their dioceses well satisfied on being told, that of those merits no man was more fully persuaded than the king himself, who found pleasure in the wit and learning of the Bishop of Ely.

It was known that Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham were more strongly in favour of Bishop Andrewes. But although King James, in his good-natured indolence, generally yielded to the dictates of the prince and of his favourite, yet there were times when, with the perverseness of one whose will was weak, he overcame that weakness, and was obstinate in the opposition he offered to

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

His  
Puritan-  
ical views.

In avour  
with the  
Earl of  
Dunbar.

Preferred  
as arch-  
bishop to  
Bishop  
Andrewes.

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

their entreaties or remonstrances. Andrewes was not appointed; and it becomes my duty now to give the history of him whom, in obedience to the royal command, the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury elected to preside over the Church.

His birth.

George Abbot was born in the town of Guildford, where his father Maurice earned his livelihood as a cloth-worker. Maurice Abbot was a man of some notoriety in his neighbourhood, for he had suffered many hardships, and had hazarded his life for the maintenance of his principles in Queen Mary's reign. During the peace which succeeded those troublous times, Maurice Abbot espoused Alice March. With her he lived happily for fifty-eight years, and, only surviving her a few days, he died in 1606. Out of six sons, we know that three rose to eminence in the different lines of life they were led to adopt. Robert, the eldest, was sent to the University of Oxford, and was a man well known as an author. His piety was never questioned, although like his brother he was intolerant. He died Bishop of Salisbury. He caused, however, some affliction to his brother George, through a marriage he contracted in his old age, before the public mind had given its full consent to clerical marriages.

Career of  
his  
brothers.

Maurice, the youngest brother of the archbishop, was educated as a merchant, and, having won considerable applause for his skilful management of mercantile affairs, was the first person who received knighthood at the hand of King Charles I. In the first year of that king's reign he was elected a member of Parliament, and he was soon after chosen Lord Mayor of London.

Prevalent  
super-  
stitious  
belief in  
dreams.

In the diary of Archbishop Laud, intended to meet no eye but his own, though published to malign his character by the villany of Prynne, we have frequent record of his dreams, and of the inferences he drew

from them. We regard this as superstition, but we ought to remember that it was a superstition prevalent among most men in the age in which he lived.

A more prosaic character than George Abbot could not well exist; but we find that even he was not uninfluenced by this superstition. Just before his birth his mother dreamed a dream, which she often repeated, and which the family fondly cherished as portending the future greatness of the son she was expecting. She imagined that some one told her that, if she could catch and eat a jack or a pike, the child she went with should prove a son, and rise to high preferment. Curiously, or craftily, Alice Abbot, in drawing water from the river hard by, happened to entrap a young pike in her pitcher, and, full of high expectations for the future, by eating the fish she fulfilled her dream, and watched with superstition or faith, the rising talent of the son who was soon afterwards born. The story being noised abroad, some persons of distinction offered to be sponsors to so promising a child; and from them George Abbot received such acceptable assistance, as enabled him to obtain an education which otherwise his parents would have been unable to afford him.

At the excellent grammar school of Guildford, which had been founded and endowed by Robert Beckenham, of London, he received the first rudiments of his education. At the age of sixteen he entered Balliol College, Oxford, as a student, and, taking his degree of B.A. in 1582, he was in the following year elected a probationer Fellow of that society. In 1585 Abbot became Master of Arts, and, entering into holy orders soon after, he rapidly gained honour and popularity in the university as a preacher. In the year 1593 he took his B.D. degree, and became a Doctor in Divinity in

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Dream of  
Abbot's  
mother.

Its in-  
fluence on  
his career.

Abbot  
educated  
at Guild-  
ford  
grammar  
school.

His  
university  
career.

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

1597, in which year also he was elected Master of University College.\* Soon after his admission to holy orders, Abbot became chaplain to Thomas Lord Buckhurst, on whose death in 1608 he was appointed chaplain to the Earl of Dunbar, Treasurer of Scotland. Of the events to which this appointment gave rise, we shall have occasion hereafter to speak at large.

In 1599, the Deanery of Winchester being vacant by the advancement of Dr. Martin Heaton to the Bishopric of Ely, Abbot was installed dean of that cathedral.

At the beginning of this chapter we have adverted to the peculiar tenets of Dr. Abbot. He seems already to have established for himself the character which, throughout his life, he consistently sustained. He sought to win the Puritans by preaching from the pulpit Calvinistic, or perhaps we should say Augustinian doctrines. He sought, at the same time, to conciliate the goodwill of the orthodox, by maintaining the constituted order of things in the Church, including its episcopacy.

He was vice-chancellor of his university in 1603 and 1605. His sermons at St. Mary's, Oxford, were attended by a large and attentive audience, and received the attention which was their due.

While he was holding the office of vice-chancellor, a reference was made to the two universities by the citizens of London. A controversy had been raised against the Bishop of London, Dr. Bancroft, with respect to the re-erection of the cross in Cheapside, which had fallen into decay. In the year 1600 the cross had been taken down with a view to its reparation. This reparation the Puritans opposed with their usual violence. They refused to obey the bishop, and sought the advice

\* Le Neve, p. 89.

Dean of  
Win-  
chester,  
1599.

Vice-  
chancel-  
lor.

Consulted  
regarding  
the cross  
in Cheap-  
side.

of both universities on the subject. That Abbot's decision was against the cross was only what we should expect; but we should hardly have supposed that, instead of the erection of a cross, the symbol of the Christian atonement, he would have advised the erection of a pyramid, the symbol of Egyptian superstition. Abbot referred, in defence of his conduct, to his own example in similar affairs at Oxford. In the marketplace of that city, he had caused to be burnt various superstitious pictures. Among them was one in which the figure of God the Father was placed over a crucifix, as ready to receive the soul of the Lord Jesus Christ. He mentioned also the case of certain young men, who were observed kneeling and beating their breasts before a representation of the Crucifixion in a window in Balliol College. On the discovery of this, the masters and fellows had caused the painted windows to be removed; and Abbot, with the advice of the Bishop of London, and the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift, decided that the crucifix should be removed, and a plain cross inserted in its place.

With regard to the cross in Cheapside, Bancroft decided—and the Londoners acquiesced in his decision—to pursue a similar course. A cross was erected, but without the figure of the Lord upon it.

Abbot was thus reigning supreme in the university, when his indignation was roused at hearing that his theology was attacked by a young man—William Laud—of whose history we shall have to treat in our next volume. To be opposed by a man so much younger than himself,\* and to hear him applauded as one of the most powerful

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.

1611–33.

Abbot's  
decision.  
Conduct  
in the like  
case at  
Oxford.

Abbot's  
theology  
attacked  
by Laud.

\* At the beginning of the century Laud was three years less than thirty, while Abbot was upwards of forty.

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Laud's  
defence of  
Apostolical  
succession.

preachers in the university, was far from agreeable to Abbot, and excited in him feelings of animosity against Laud, which he continued to display throughout his life.

Laud now gave utterance to an opinion which was gaining ground, that the prevalent theology of the university was in itself unsound. He maintained strenuously the constant and perpetual visibility of the Church of Christ derived from the Apostles, and continued through the Church of Rome and of the East, and not lost in England at the Reformation, which historical incident purified but did not destroy the Church. He also declared the necessity, to the existence of a Church, of the order of diocesan bishops, and boldly acknowledged the succession of our bishops through the ante-reformation Church.

Views of  
Abbot and  
his party.

Such doctrines were especially repugnant to Abbot and his Puritan friends, who saw that their maintenance involved a separation from foreign sects, and a repudiation of the doctrines of their apostle Calvin. They endeavoured to steer a middle course, by which they might claim the Church, whose emoluments they enjoyed, as their own, at the very time that they denied her fundamental doctrines. They desired that bishops should be considered as heads of the Church, for they coveted bishoprics; yet they would look upon them only as superior pastors, not as a separate order in the ministry.\* They desired to uphold the visibility of the Church, for they did not wish to lose their position therein; but they would fain trace it from the Albigenes to the Hussites and Wickliffites, and from them to the sects of Luther and Calvin, and they wilfully closed their ears to the question, "Where was your church before the rise of these sects?" This position was cleverly maintained in a book published at this time by

Abbot's  
"Visibility  
of the  
Church."

\* Heylin's *Cyprianus Anglicanus*, pp. 51-53.

Dr. Abbot, entitled the "Visibility of the Church;" but the jealousy with which the vice-chancellor could regard the rising fame of the young Fellow of St. John's, Mr. Laud, seems to imply that he was conscious of the weakness of his cause.

Other duties now occupied the mind of Dr. Abbot, for we find him appointed about this time to that work which was, as Fuller says, "one of the best things produced by the Hampton Court Conference"\*—the new translation of the Bible. The Bible was divided into six portions, each one of which was entrusted to the care of a committee of the most learned men that England could produce.

Two of these companies were assembled at each of the universities. At Westminster, Abbot took his place, as second only to the Dean of Christchurch, in what was considered the most important of all the companies, namely, that which was appointed to revise the translation of the Gospels, the Acts, and the Apocalypse.

But even this important work could not divert his mind from the excitement of party feeling, which was his bane throughout life. His book against Dr. Hill's "Reason for Upholding Popery" was written about this time; and fired perhaps with fresh indignation, aroused by his own skill in polemics, he takes the opportunity of his third vice-chancellorship to attack Laud, on the occasion of his proceeding to the degree of B.D., for the opinions expressed in his exercise.

Baptismal regeneration and diocesan episcopacy were the subjects of dispute; and Abbot would fain have refused his degree to Laud for propounding the Catholic principles of the Church, if it had not been that the

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

His share  
in the  
transla-  
tion of the  
Bible.

His oppo-  
sition to  
Laud's  
B.D.  
degree.

\* Fuller's Ch. Hist. Book x. § iii. 1. (vol. iii. p. 227).

CHAP.  
XXX.George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Supports  
Dr. Airey's  
censure of  
Laud's  
sermon,  
1606.

growing strength of the orthodox party restrained his zeal. Dr. Abbot and the Calvinists, however, determined to watch their opportunity for involving the young Bachelor of Divinity in trouble. It does not appear that they found their opportunity until the year 1603, when Dr. Airey was vice-chancellor. We then find Dr. Abbot zealously supporting Dr. Airey, who had the temerity to censure a sermon preached by Laud on October 26, for containing "sundry scandalous popish passages."

"The good man," says Dr. Heylin, "taking all things to be matter of Popery which were not held forth unto him in Calvin's Institutes; conceiving that there was as much idolatry in bowing at the Name of Jesus as in worshipping the brazen serpent, and as undoubtedly believing that Antichrist was begotten on the whore of Babylon, as that Pharez and Zarah were begotten on the body of Tamar. Which advantage being taken by Dr. Abbot, he so violently persecuted the poor man (Laud), and so openly branded him for a Papist, or at least very popishly inclined, that it was almost made an heresy (as I have heard from his own mouth) for any one to be seen in his company, and a misprision of heresy to give him a civil salutation as he walked the streets."\*

At this time Abbot was taking a prominent part in the convocation of Canterbury, in which he sat as Dean of Winchester. Dr. Overall was elected proctor, and the chief work of the session was the consideration, and finally the adoption, of a document drawn up by him, presented to convocation by Archbishop Bancroft, and known as Overall's "Convocation Book concerning the government of God's Catholic Church and the kingdoms of the

Overall's  
"Convoca-  
tion Book."

\* Heylin's Cyprianus Anglicanus, p. 54.



whole world." The special object of the book was to refute the claims of papal supremacy, and the doctrines of secular government as set forth by the Jesuits; but it contained matter which was distasteful to the king, who, as a weak man, was jealous of any seeming interference with his prerogative. This book received the sanction of both houses of convocation in Canterbury and in York.\* It is a sign of the rising influence of Dr. Abbot at court that the remonstrance which King James thought fit to write on the subject was addressed to him.

"Good Dr. Abbot," he writes, "I cannot abstain to give you my judgment of your proceedings in your convocation, as you call it; and both as 'rex in solio,' and 'unus gregis in ecclesia,' I am doubly concerned. My title to the crown nobody calls in question but they that love neither you nor me; and you guess whom I mean. All that you and your brethren have said of a king in possession (for that word I tell you, is no worse than what you make use of in your canon) concerns not me at all. I am the next heir, and the crown is mine by all rights you can name, but that of conquest, and Mr. Solicitor has sufficiently expressed my own thoughts concerning the nature of kingship in general, and concerning the nature of it, 'ut in meâ personâ:' and I believe you were all of his opinion; at least none of you said ought contrary to it, at the time he spake to you from me." The king then describes the reason of his having called convocation together, namely, to decide on the rectitude of assisting a neighbouring nation to shake off the yoke of tyranny; a doctrine which, perhaps, he felt might one day be inconvenient to himself. He wished the convocation to share the responsibility of "owning

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

The king's  
remon-  
strance  
thereon to  
Abbot.

\* Joyce's Sacred Synods, p. 635.

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

the Hollanders at this time," and therefore he had consulted them; but "this I needed not have done," he says, "and you have forced me to say, I wish I had not. You have dipped too deep in what all kings reserve among the 'arcana imperii.' And whatever aversion you may profess against God's being the author of sin, you have stumbled upon the threshold of that opinion, in saying upon the matter, that even tyranny is God's authority, and should be revered as such. If the King of Spain should return to claim his old pontifical right to my kingdom, you leave me to seek for others to fight for it; for you tell us upon the matter beforehand, his authority is God's authority if he prevail." Thus far the secretary's hand, as I take it; the rest follows in the king's own hand: "Mr. Doctor, I have no time to express my mind further in this thorny business, I shall give you my orders about it by Mr. Solicitor, and until then meddle no more in it; for they are edge tools, or, rather like that weapon, that's said to cut with the one edge and cure with the other. I commit you to God's protection, good Dr. Abbot, and rest your good friend.—JAMES R." \*

Abbot had hitherto been supported by Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset, and Chancellor of the University, and was perhaps looking forward to a further exertion of his patronage, when in 1608 Lord Dorset died.

In common with other Puritans of Oxford, Abbot thought it no sin to seek the highest offices of the Church, and to pay court to the great. He paid that court now to the Earl of Dunbar, whose character as a statesman was admitted and admired by James. To the

\* Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iv. p. 405. Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i. p. 332.

Death of  
Abbot's  
patron,  
Lord  
Dorset,  
1608.

Earl of Dunbar he was now made chaplain, and to this circumstance and his close connection with the earl, he was chiefly indebted for the many opportunities offered, through which his talents and learning might raise him to a high position. George Home, Earl of Dunbar, Treasurer of Scotland, and one of the earliest favourites of King James, was sent by the king into Scotland to introduce the doctrine of episcopacy, in which the king had found that peace and quiet which had been denied him when he reigned or seemed to reign over the Presbyterians of Scotland. The prudence and sagacity with which Dr. Abbot, then Dean of Winchester, suggested a course of conduct on this subject endeared him to his patron, and induced the king to think highly of his abilities as a statesman.

Lord Dunbar had been preparing measures for the conversion of Scotland for about two years before Abbot's arrival. The opposition of the Presbyterians had been steady; but Abbot suggested that they might become like himself, and be permitted to hold episcopal discipline, if they were at the same time allowed to preach Calvinism in every other respect. Dr. Abbot succeeded in obtaining certain concessions to Church principles from the Presbyterians, which, although they were afterwards evaded, seemed to conciliate for Abbot the goodwill of the king. He further ingratiated himself into the favour of James at this time, by a work he published when George Sprot, a notary of Aymouth, was executed for having been concerned in the Gowrie conspiracy. Many persons persisted in doubting the reality of that conspiracy, and any attempt to prove that a conspiracy had really existed, was sure to gratify his Majesty. Abbot attended both the trial and execution of Sprot, and, with a long preface of his own, published the notes of Sir William Hart, who tried the

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Appointed  
chaplain  
to Lord  
Dunbar.

Episcopacy  
established  
in  
Scotland.

His con-  
duct as  
regards  
the Gowrie  
conspi-  
racy.

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

case. The worthy Dean of Winchester was now on the high road to preferment, and it was no part of his Puritanism to eschew, or of his Low Churchism to undervalue, the temporal advantages of high station. He became, perhaps unconsciously, the flatterer of a monarch peculiarly open to flattery. When we remember the stern but respectful independence of the primitive bishops to the rulers of this world; when we bear in mind that after Abbot had reached the highest station in the Church, he could himself act an independent part; and when we recollect the monarch to whom the words were addressed, we cannot but marvel at the following extract, which is anything but creditable to the character of the writer. Abbot speaks of James as one "whose life hath been so immaculate and unspotted in the world, so free from all touch of viciousness and staining imputation, that even malice itself, which leaveth nothing unsearched, could never find true blemish in it, nor cast probable aspersions on it." He says: "All must acknowledge him to be zealous as David, learned and wise, the Solomon of our age, religious as Josias, careful of spreading Christ's faith as Constantine the Great, just as Moses, undefiled in all his ways as a Jehosaphat or Hezekiah, full of clemency as another Theodosius." \*

Abbot's  
flattery of  
the King.

This passage however is valuable to the historian of King James's reign, because, whatever we may think of the flattery adopted by Abbot, of which we must not forget that an example was set him by Whitgift and Bancroft, the character of James cannot have been what the Puritan writers have represented it, and subsequent historians have adopted from them. In spite of his love of unseemly jocosity, James was regarded as a man of

\* See Sir William Hart's "Execution, Arraignment, and Conviction of George Sprot, with a preface by G. Abbot, D.D."

sound sense by all who approached him. The weakness of his will was his main fault; and of that Dean Abbot had no reason now to complain, since, as the reward of his labours in Scotland, he was soon nominated by the king, and, at his command elected by the dean and chapter, to the see of Coventry and Lichfield.\*

CHAP.  
XXX.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

\* Such was the title of that diocese till the Restoration, when precedence was given to Lichfield. When we consider the liberality of the inhabitants of Coventry, and the zeal they have, for many years, displayed in the cause of religion, we may express a hope that Coventry will, once more, be converted into an episcopal see.

## CHAPTER XXXI.

THE PRIMACY OF ABBOT UNTIL THE INCIDENT OF  
BRAMZIL PARK.

Abbot is translated to the see of London.—His nomination to the archbishopric.—The appointment generally unpopular.—His use of the High Commission Court.—James's Arminian controversies.—Henry, Prince of Wales.—Espouses the Puritan cause.—His sickness and death.—Popular grief thereat.—Abbot's attendance at his death-bed.—Marriage of the Princess Elizabeth.—Cruel persecutions by James and Abbot.—Legget and Wightman burnt to death.—Abbot protests against the alienation of the Charter House funds.—His firmness in the divorce case of Lady Essex.—The king's anger thereat.—James's dislike to the Puritan Sabbath.—Publication of the 'Book of Sports.'—Abbot opposes it.—The Irish Articles.—Channel Islands required to conform to the Church.—The king refuses to support the Elector Palatine.—Abbot urges a contrary course.

CHAP.  
XXXI.George  
Abbot.

1611–33.

Translated  
to the see  
of London,  
1610.

DR. ABBOT had not obtained much experience in the episcopal office before his promotion to the see of Canterbury. Having been consecrated Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield in December 1609, he only held that bishopric for one month, when he was translated to the see of London in January 1610. Here he remained only a few months, scarcely having time to perform "any part of the office of bishop therein."\* It is remarkable, however, that, during this short time, he was called upon, under a commission from the primate, to take the chief part in the consecration of the three Scotch bishops, whose appointment was in a great measure the result of his own labours, the full reward of which he was shortly about to reap. In

\* Le Neve, p. 91.

November 1610, Bancroft died, and all eyes were fixed upon Bishop Andrewes as his successor. But the king was not forgetful of Abbot's judiciousness in Scotch affairs, and Abbot did not lack a friend at court. In March 1611, about four months after the death of Bancroft, he received the intimation of his nomination to the Primacy of all England. There is no doubt that the influence of the Treasurer of Scotland had much to do with the appointment, indeed, a saying was current at the time that, "by a strong north wind coming out of Scotland, Abbot was blown over the Thames to Lambeth."\*

CHAP.  
XXXI.  
George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.  
Nominated  
to the  
arch-  
bishopric,  
1611.

The appointment was popular with no one; even the Puritans were doubtful whether Abbot would support them at the court as he had done at the university. The country clergy were indignant at finding placed over them, a prelate who could not understand their difficulties or sympathize with their cares, for Abbot had never been a parish priest. Having attended to his books and to university politics rather than to the more direct work of the ministry, he was not qualified to give that ghostly counsel and advice which the laity as well as the clergy have a right to expect from their chief pastor. Bishops truly ought to be men of experience both as to the practical working of a parish and as to the direction of souls; and it seems incongruous for a man who has never been a parish priest himself, to give directions, in his charges, to clergy who may, with their greater experience, smile at the impracticability of the mandates of

Abbot's  
appoint-  
ment  
generally  
unpopular.

\* Secretary Calvert's letter. Abbot was confirmed in Lambeth Chapel, April 9, by the Bishops of Oxford, Lichfield and Coventry, Ely, Worcester and Chichester. The temporalities were restored in May, and in June the archbishop was sworn of his Majesty's Privy Council.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

a mere theorist. Some men can, by the force of genius, overcome such a difficulty; but it would be well if none were consecrated but such as have had at least five years' experience in a parish.

His use of  
the High  
Commis-  
sion Court.

We are not surprised to find a man who was trained, as Abbot had been, directing his attention in the first instance to the High Commission Court. This court had gradually drawn into itself the business which rightly belonged to the diocesan courts, and its power and importance were continually on the increase. Whitgift had endeavoured to check these proceedings of the High Commission Court, not liking either its arrogance of power or the severity of its judgments. Bancroft also, though he had made use of the authority of the High Commission Court, yet ever shrunk from wielding the full powers of punishment or persecution which it placed in his hands. He "did chide stoutly, but censure mildly," as Hackett, no friend to Bancroft, tells us, while "sentences of correction, or rather destruction, have their epocha from the predominancy of Abbot in that Court."\* By throwing the onus on the court, he sought to shelter himself from the charge of severity.

Passing from the Court of High Commission to the Church at large, there is much truth in what is said by Osborne of the prevalence of two factions at the court of James, each struggling to carry its point with the weak-willed monarch. Sometimes one party prevailed to obtain an appointment, sometimes the other; and the work done by one was undone or marred by his successor. "The consequence was," says Osborne, "that the clergymen knew not how to proceed; and they who endeavoured to promote reconciliation were suspected by both parties, and the divisions thus promoted in the Church branched

\* Hackett's *Life of Williams*, p. 97.



forth in the city and country into divers popular differences." \*

We have seen that James was influenced in his choice of the new primate by the counsel of Dunbar, and by his own gratitude for the zeal and discretion shown by Abbot in Scotland. But we cannot help thinking that the king's foolish controversies with the Arminians on the Continent had something to do with his choice of a Calvinistic archbishop.

Of those controversies we need not speak, as they were carried on by the king for his own pleasure or policy. Some of our divines were sent to the Continent, and they behaved with much discretion; but they were sent, not as the representatives of the Church, but as the ambassadors of a ridiculous though learned monarch, at whose folly the statesmen of Europe were astonished, and no doubt amused.

From Heylin's statements, indeed, we gather that the king had political motives for his interference in the religious controversies of the Continent, and "he was moved to such harshness against the remonstrants because they had put themselves under the patronage of John Olden Barneveldt." † Now this statesman was a foe of the king's friend the Prince of Orange, and the prince was a staunch supporter of the Calvinists. By patronising Calvinism therefore at home, James thought to strengthen his position abroad.

Everything seemed to be now tending to the advancement of the Puritan cause; but the Puritans relied not solely on the king or on the primate; they looked with enthusiastic regard to the heir apparent to the throne, Henry, Prince of Wales. Of him Neal asserts that he

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

James's  
contro-  
versies  
with the  
Armin-  
ians.

Henry,  
Prince of  
Wales,

\* Historical Memoires on the reigns of Elizabeth and James.

† Certamen Epistolare, or the Letter Combate, p. 180.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Espouses  
the  
Puritan  
cause.

was the "darling of the Puritans," for he had often declared that his first care on coming to the throne would be to reconcile the Puritans to the Church of England.\* An heir apparent who did not scruple to state what he would do at his father's death, was not likely to be a favourite with the reigning sovereign; and Henry had the bad taste also to treat with ridicule his more devout brother Charles, whom he promised to make Archbishop of Canterbury, so that by his cassock some deformity of his legs might be hidden.

His  
sickness.

The hopes of the Puritan party, however, were frustrated by the sudden and unexpected death of the prince. Busied with the preparations for the coming marriage of his sister Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine, Prince Henry had neglected a cold which, aggravated by his carelessness, soon grew into a fever. The people became alarmed at the reports from the palace; and on the fifth day of his illness the appearance of a lunar rainbow awakened all their superstitions, and was at once accepted by the Puritans as a "fatal signe."† The court physicians were perplexed with the disease, which appears really to have been very similar to that which, a short time ago, threatened the life of the present heir apparent to the throne of England. The only remedy which seemed to have the slightest effect upon the dying man, was a cordial sent by Sir Walter Raleigh from the Tower, and which, except in the case of poison having been administered, he confidently recommended as an almost certain cure.

His death,  
1612.

The remedy, however, came too late; and, though the young prince rallied for a short time under its effects, he

\* Neal, vol. ii. p. 91.

† Nichols's Progresses, vol. ii. p. 447.

scon sank into a stupor from which he was never again awakened. He died on the following day, the twelfth of his illness, November 6, 1612.

The grief of the people—or, at all events, of that portion of the people who looked forward to the reign of Henry as a sort of Puritan paradise—knew no bounds. Twice had a false report of the prince's death been spread from his chamber, "at which time," says Nichols, "there arose wonderful great shouting, weeping and crying, in the court and adjoining streets." We can but compare it to the more general grief which wrung the hearts of all Englishmen, when the death of the Princess Charlotte was announced; or, in yet later times, to the genuine sorrow and despair with which, day by day, during the fearful illness of our present Prince of Wales, every person of every grade and of every shade of religion or politics sought intelligence of his state.

In the seventeenth century, people were not content to accept such a blow as the loss of a favourite prince, without endeavouring to fix the blame on some one; and there were not wanting persons, who declared that the death of the prince had been accelerated by the king himself. Such an opinion was perhaps unintentionally encouraged or purposely suggested by the words used by Sir Walter Raleigh in recommending his potion for the use of the patient. The whole history of James, however, and the slightest attention to his character, indisposes us to entertain the suspicion; but the secret which Somerset afterwards threatened to disclose, is thought by some historians, and among them we may mention Charles James Fox, to show an *ex-post-facto* knowledge of the crime supposed to have been actually committed by, or with the connivance of, Somerset himself.

At the bedside of the dying prince, Abbot had been

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Popular  
grief  
thereat.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Abbot's  
attendance  
at his  
bedside.

a constant attendant, and very earnest and affecting were his addresses as the end drew nigh. On the last day of the prince's life, when he could no longer speak, and when his strength was well-nigh spent, the archbishop, whispering in his ear, reminded him of what had passed between them on the previous day; calling aloud to him to remember Jesus Christ, to believe, and hope, and trust in Him with assured confidence of mercy, to lift up his heart, and to prepare to meet his Lord. "Thereafter," adds Nichols, "he called more loudly thrice together in his ear, 'Sir, hear you me? if you hear me, in certain sign of your faith and hope in the blessed resurrection, give us to our comfort a sign by the lifting up your hands.'" The dying prince gave the sign, lifting up both his hands together. The archbishop, "with streames of teares, poured out at the bedside a most exceeding powerfull, passionate prayer," and gave orders that continual intercession should be made on behalf of the dying prince, not only in the chamber and the palace, but "in every place where the danger was knowne." \*

The death of the prince made it necessary to postpone the marriage of his sister, to which he had looked forward with eagerness and some party zeal. But the delay was not long. Directly the Prince of Wales was dead the hopes of the Puritans were centred on the Princess Elizabeth, and they were anxious to see her marriage with the Protestant German Prince accomplished. This match was hailed as another triumph by that party, and, urged by them, James gave his consent to the shortening of the days of mourning for the Prince Henry, and to the acceleration of the preparations for the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth.

\* Nichols's Progresses, vol. ii. p. 485.

On December 27, with great solemnity, Elizabeth was affianced to Frederick, the Elector Palatine, in the banqueting hall of the palace at Whitehall. On February 14 following, being "Shrove Sunday," the prince and princess were married by the archbishop, in the chapel of the same palace, assisted by the dean of the chapel, and, "vested in their rich copes," they performed the service "in all points according to the Book of Common Prayer."\*

On April 19 his Electoral Highness returned to Germany; but before his departure he made a present of plate to the archbishop, to the value, it is said, of 1,000*l.* -- a mark of the sense he entertained of the pains taken by his Grace to forward the marriage.

Abbot was well pleased with an alliance which had been strongly and perseveringly urged, if not suggested, by himself; and we feel gratitude towards him when we remember that to his perseverance we are indebted for the accomplishment of an event, which paved the way of our Sovereign Lady, Queen Victoria, to the throne of these realms.†

As the gentler parts of Abbot's character had been brought out in the illness of the prince, the sterner nature of that prelate was displayed, in the share he took in certain transactions which cast a dark shadow over his primacy and over the reign of King James. I refer to the legal murder of Legget and of Wightman, which occurred in the earlier part of the same year; and which could not have taken place without the mandate or concurrence of the primate.

We read of "Bloody" Queen Mary, and of persecuting Bonner; Gardiner is represented to us as a bloodthirsty

\* Nichols, vol. ii. p. 547.

† The youngest daughter of Elizabeth was Sophia, Electress of Hanover and mother of George I.

CHAP.  
XXXI.  
George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.  
Marriage  
of the  
Princess  
Elizabeth.  
1613.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

tyrant, though we find him, except in the pages of the martyrologist Foxe, on the side of leniency; and we are inclined to be loud in our condemnation of the government, as it existed between the death of Edward and the accession of Elizabeth. At the same time, we pass over or palliate, in unjustifiable terms, the legal murders of which Archbishop Cranmer was guilty, and we regard the severities by which he and some of his compeers were disgraced, as a necessary enforcement of the laws of the land. I find no fault in taking this view of the subject, if the view taken is impartial and we apply it to either side, in a time when the severity of the laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, fills us with indignation and disgust. I freely confess that from long prejudice I have myself been guilty of such partiality, which, in the case of most English readers, must be attributed to the receiving of a tradition not examined with sufficient care. When we see the absurdities into which some members of the English Parliament, even in the nineteenth century, are hurried in this respect, we may expect due allowance to be made. We must remember that, on all sides, whether as regards Papists or Puritans, or ourselves, the sin has been committed, and is a national sin for which the whole nation should be penitent. The severities committed in the name of religion in the reign of Queen Elizabeth will bear explanation, and we can hardly find fault with the severity shown to those who, in the name of religion, openly declared that their main object was the assassination of the reigning sovereign. But what are we to say, when history hurries us back to those dark spots in Smithfield, in which the fires of persecution had, at one time, been lighted by Queen Mary, and we hear the proclamation issued by James and endorsed by Abbot, that those pyres were again to be ignited, and that the cause of persecution was once more to claim its victims? The Seminary priests

and Jesuits of a former reign were men of erudition and courage, and knew the risk they ran; but the Anabaptists and Arians who, under the episcopate and advice of Abbot, were ordered by James for execution, in many instances appear not to have known the peril to which their conduct exposed the Christian faith, nor to have understood how the constitution of the country might be endangered by an evasion of the ecclesiastical laws. It is remarkable that, in this dreadful enforcement of the law, the Puritans took the liveliest interest. One would have supposed that they would have contemplated with horror, a doom which might so easily be turned against themselves, if the principles of the State were changed.

If ever Neal had just cause for attacking the Church it might have been now; but he actually relates, without a word of condemnation, the burning of these poor victims of royal intolerance.

Bartholomew Legget, a man of about forty years of age, was the first who suffered. He was a man bold of spirit, fluent of speech, and skilled in Scripture.\* The royal controversialist, having been set at nought by the States General, and being unable to vent his malignant spleen against Vorstius, had frequent conversation with Bartholomew Legget, whose heresy was that of Arius. James found in Legget a disputant as eager in controversy as himself; but, considering their relative positions, we must regard the king as being, as in this instance he certainly was, an unmanly and cruel person, when we hear of his daring on one occasion, when he could not

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Bartholomew  
Legget.

Con-  
troversial  
disputes  
with the  
king.

\* It might be expedient to change the law, but while the law lasted everyone seemed determined that it should be enforced. Somers's Tracts, ii. p. 400, gives us an account of the proceedings against Legget. We are surprised and shocked to find that for this poor sufferer Fuller has not a word of pity, but, on the contrary, approves of his sentence.

persuade the heretic to think as he did, to spurn him with his foot. He sent him for trial to the Consistory Court; and there the poor heretic, showing a temper similar to that of the king, denied the authority of the court, and treated the judges with marked contempt. In these days Legget would have been committed for contempt of court; for he took a pleasure in irritating the judges, whom he insulted by his manner as well as by his words. But, although they declared that by the law the heretic was condemned to a penalty of death, no sentence upon the offender could be pronounced by these judges. We must add the disgraceful fact, that, when his case was brought before the civil court, by which alone sentence could be passed, the presiding judges were actually canvassed for his condemnation, and that, too, by Abbot himself, a prelate whose praise is even now to be found in the partial page of history, in which his own sufferings are pitied, while the persecutions of which he was guilty are ignored. In the "Egerton Papers," published by the Camden Society, we find the two following letters from Archbishop Abbot to the Lord High Chancellor:—

"To the right honorable my very good L., the L. Ellesmere, L. Chancellor of England, geve these:—

"My very good Lord. His Majestie being carefull that justice should proceede against those two blasphemous heretikes, Legate and Wightman, gave me in charge that before the terme, when the judges drewe towards the towne, I should make his Majesties pleasure knowne unto your Lordship. And that is, that your Lordship should call unto you three or foure of the judges and take their resolution concerning the force of lawe in that behalfe, that so with expedition these evill persons

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

His trial  
by the  
Consistory  
Court.

His con-  
demnation.

Abbot's  
share  
therein.

Abbot's  
letters to  
the Lord  
High  
Chan-  
cellor.



may receive the recompence of their pride and impiety. His Majestie did thinke the Judges of the Kinges Benche to bee fittest to be dealt withall in this argument, as unto whom the knowledge of causes capital doth most ordinarily appertaine. And, as I conceived, his Highnesse did not muche desire that the Lord Coke should be called there unto, least by his singularitie in opinion he should give staye to the businesse. So, hoping shortly to see your Lordship abroad, with remembrance of my best love, I remaine,

“Your L<sup>ps</sup> very loving frende,

“G. CANT.

“Lambich, Januar. 21, 1611.”

“To the right honorable my very good L., the L. Ellesmere, L. Chancellor of England :—

“My very good Lord. I cannot chuse but well approve your Lordship’s choise of the judges. And if any more should bee added, I distrust not but Justice Crooke would do well. Mr. Justice Williams was with mee the other day, who maketh no doubt but that the lawe is cleere to burne them. Hee told me also of his utter dislike of all the Lord Coke his courses, and that himselfe and Baron Altham did once very roundly let the Lord Coke knowe their minde, that he was not such a maister of the lawe as hee did take on him, to deliver what he list for lawe, and to dispise all other. I finde the Kinges Atturney and Soliciter to bee thoroughly resolved in this present businesse. My servant, Hart is at this present out of the way, but as soone as he cometh in hee shall waite upon your Lordship. And so wishing your Lordship ease and health, I remaine,

“Your Lordships very ready to do you service,

“G. CANT.\*

“Lambich, Januar. 22, 1611.”

\* Egerton Papers, Camden Society, pp. 446-448.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Legget  
burnt to  
death at  
Smithfield,  
1611.

Wightman  
burnt to  
death at  
Lichfield.

The persecutors, although they encountered many doubts and difficulties, at length succeeded, and, on March 11, letters came from the king, under the Privy Seal, to prepare the writ, "de heretico comburendo," under the broad seal, and to direct it to the sheriffs of London. On March 18 Bartholomew Legget was burnt to death in Smithfield.\* Astonished London poured forth its thousands to witness a sight which filled all who saw it with horror. A month after this, the example set in London was followed in the provinces, and Edward Wightman, convicted of ten heresies, of the very names of which he probably was ignorant, suffered the penalty of death, being publicly burnt in the market-place of Lichfield.

How far other judges, civil or ecclesiastical, were to blame, it is not for us to surmise; suffice it to know, that Abbot was the primate under whom these atrocities were committed. The horror, however, occasioned by this severity alarmed King James himself, who declared that heretics hereafter, though condemned to death, should pay the penalty by solitary confinement.

We turn with relief from these examples of the archbishop's unchristian zeal, to dwell with pleasure upon two instances of his firmness in the cause of justice and of truth. Thomas Sutton, of Knaith, in Lincolnshire, having bequeathed his immense wealth to found the noble institution, which, under the name of the Charter House, is still a blessing to the country, it was proposed to defeat the purpose of the will of the founder, and to divert these great riches to channels more suitable to the convenience or prejudice of the king.

Bacon, then Solicitor-General, gave his advice in

\* See Cobbett's Trials, and Fuller, x. §. iv. 6-12 (vol. iii. p. 255).

Abbot  
protests  
against  
the aliena-  
tion of  
the Char-  
ter House  
funds.

accordance with the wishes of James. Abbot's voice was loud against such an act of injustice; but when at last his counsels were successful, he modestly gives the praise to the king whose conscience he had guided. "His Majesty," he says, "did himself much honour in the case of Sutton's hospital. Notwithstanding all importunity, he suffered the judges to do their conscience."\*

With regard to the second instance of the primate's firmness, it was at this time exhibited in the divorce case of Lady Essex. I must refer to the trial, though, with regard to the circumstances of the case, I may be permitted to echo the words of the quaint old historian Fuller: "Expect not of me an account of the divorce of the Lady Frances Howard from the Earl of Essex and her re-marriage to Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset."†

According to the light of after events, we can recognise in this trial an attempt, under the disguise and form of justice, and by means of perjured witnesses, to legalise a crime which even such a king as James I. did not dare, except by a perversion of justice, to countenance or support. A court of justice, so called, was formed, consisting of five civilians and four bishops, who, it was supposed, would carry out any wishes of the king. Archbishop Abbot and Dr. King, Bishop of London, were among the ecclesiastical judges. They at once waited on the king to entreat and implore him not to persevere in the iniquitous course which, in the perversion of his mind,

\* About ten years later the idea was revived by Buckingham, who wished to employ the funds of the Charter House for the maintenance of a standing army. Laud, then Bishop of London, opposed this design, and by his advice it was given up. The pamphlet written by Laud on that occasion may be seen in vol. iii. pt. 1. of Laud's works in the Anglo-Catholic Library.

† Fuller, x. §. iv. 24-25 (vol. iii. p. 260).

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.  
The king's  
anger  
thereat.

he had determined to pursue. James was violent in his anger, and the more so against Abbot, since he could not but feel that Abbot owed his high position in the Church, not to any peculiar merits of his own, but only to the royal favour.

The archbishop received a command to meet the king at Windsor. James here, presuming on his royalty, expressed his displeasure at the course pursued by the archbishop, in language so strong and unmeasured, that the primate, forgetting his own dignity and still more the dignity of the high office to which he had been divinely called, fell down on his knees, and, weeping like a child, he exclaimed, "I beseech your Majesty, if ever I have done you any service, whom I do serve with a faithful heart, rid me of this business."

Abbot, sorely perplexed, returned to Lambeth.

"As I came homeward in my coach," he says, "from Windsor, and that same night, two things did run much in my mind; the one was what a strange and fearful thing that his Majesty should be so much engaged in that business, that he should profess that himself had set the matter in that court of judgment, that the judges should be dealt withal beforehand, and in a court directed what they should determine."\* The next day the judges had been ordered to meet and to agree to the divorce; but we rejoice to be able to add that, unwilling as Abbot was to offend his benefactor, he found grace from God to determine not to decide against his conscience. The bishops were thus divided in their votes, two pronouncing for, and two against, the nullity of the marriage. To gain his point, however, the king, in

\* This is curious, as Abbot himself had been guilty of a similar act of injustice, when he canvassed for the legal murder of Legget.

defiance of justice, now quashed the original commission and issued a new one. This contained the names of Bilson and Buckeridge, who were probably selected on account of their well-known personal hostility to the archbishop. The king forwarded papers to the archbishop which contained an answer to those reasons which Abbot had produced when he refused to agree to the divorce; but, says the archbishop, "I could not force my conscience, which cried upon me that it was an odious thing before God and man to give the sentence the king desired without better warrant." \*

Of course the trial ended as the king had determined; but the horrible tragedy to which it led, not long after, opened the eyes of James to the iniquity of his proceedings, and proved the wisdom, as it endorsed the integrity, of Abbot. For a short time Abbot won his way back into the royal favour. But another trial was awaiting him; and, whether we agree or not with the conclusions of his theology, we cannot fail to admire the independence of his action. In the year 1617, the king, in his progress through Lancashire, † had observed with displeasure, that the rigour of the Puritan clergy was depriving the working men of their rightful holiday of the Sunday. Having just returned from Scotland, it is probable that the strictness of the Presbyterian Sabbath awakened in his mind a recollection of his former servitude, and the King of England determined, that his subjects should not suffer from the puritanical tyranny to which he had been subjected by the Scotch ministers.

At the present day, public opinion has done that which

\* See Archbishop Abbot's own account of the case given in vol. ii. of Cobbett's State Trials.

† Preface to "Book of Sports" as set forth by Charles I., reprinted 1709.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

James sought to accomplish by a Royal Proclamation and Bank holidays, short-time regulations, and the Saturday half-holiday are designed to give the scope for that innocent recreation for which, in his time, Sunday was almost the only day.

We cannot but prefer a plan which leaves one day in seven free for holy rest; but we can understand the feeling which urged James to take the part of the lower classes of his time, and to endeavour to rescue them from that tyranny which, having deprived them of the many holidays formerly observed according to the Festivals of the Prayer Book, sought now to deprive them of Sunday rest also, and to turn the Feast of the Lord's Day into a Fast. Contrary, perhaps, to the dictates of sound policy, James now put forth the "Book of Sports." At first this was intended only for Lancashire, but afterwards it was ordered to be read in all churches of the United Kingdoms. By this means he desired to encourage a return to the ancient custom of the Church, which had always pointed out Friday as the Fast, and Sunday as the Feast, of each week. It must be observed also, that, with a curious faith in its possibility, the declaration makes a rule that such innocent games should be the reward of those only who had attended Divine service, and that all absentees, for whatever cause, from worship were to be compelled to abstain also from the recreation of the day. In this case, Abbot was staunch to the principles of his party; and we may, perhaps, be able to sympathise with the foresight which perceived that too strong an encouragement of lawful recreation might lead to a total neglect of the sanctity of the day.

Publica-  
tion of the  
"Book of  
Sports."

Abbot's  
opposition  
thereto.

Abbot's resistance took an active form by his forbidding the Proclamation to be read in his church at Croydon; and that he was strongly supported by public sentiment

we may conclude, as the endeavour to enforce the reading of the Proclamation soon ceased.

It is a noticeable fact that, but two or three years before this, the king, with the consent of the archbishop, had assented to certain articles drawn up by a Calvinistic clergy for the acceptance of Irish Protestants, and these articles expressly forbade the use of the "Sunday Sabbath," as it was called, for any other purpose than religious exercises. Here the archbishop appears consistent, while the charge of inconsistency rests upon the king.

Another prominent feature of these Irish Articles was, that they utterly ignored the existence of bishops as a separate order. In agreeing to this Abbot, though he contradicted his practice, was consistent with his own theory and that of his party, while the king incurs the charge of inconsistency. We must remember, however, that it was a part of James's policy to check the arrogance of one party, by throwing the weight of his authority on the side of the other. Thus, by supporting the Calvinism of the Scotch settlers in Ireland, he hoped to keep a check upon the fanaticism of the Irish Papists, of whom he was wont to declare that *he* had their bodies, but the pope their consciences.

It is curious to turn from Abbot's behaviour towards the Irish, and to notice how he followed the lead of the king in his dealings with Calvinism in Jersey and in the Channel Islands. Inundated by a flood of Calvinism from the neighbouring continent, these islands had almost entirely thrown off their allegiance to the Church of England. Sir John Peyton was appointed governor there, with the express purpose of urging a return to unity with the English Church. His measures, however, produced a storm of anger and irritation, resulting in an appeal to the court of England; and the malcontents were informed

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.  
The Irish  
Articles.

The  
Channel  
Islands  
required  
to conform  
to the  
Church.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

by Abbot, in the name of the king, that they must accept again the English Liturgy, and make use of the Book of Common Prayer in all their churches. This determination having met with much resistance an "interim" was granted, in which some latitude was allowed to the discontented, while Abbot, assisted by Williams—the Lord Keeper—and by Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, busied himself in drawing up canons for the regulation of the Church. After this the islands were placed under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of a dean subject to the Bishop of Winchester, in whose diocese they were declared to be. Thus conformity to the Church may be said to have been established by the influence of Archbishop Abbot.

In the year 1619, Abbot's attention was directed to affairs on the Continent. The Protestant Elector Palatine, whose marriage with the Princess Elizabeth Abbot had been so anxious to secure, was drawn into a contention with the greater powers of Europe by his acceptance of the crown of Bohemia. The King of England was strongly urged by a large portion of his subjects to send aid to his son-in-law. But James foresaw the difficulties in which he would be involved by such a contest, and for sound political reasons he refused to obey the bigotry of his people. Abbot, seeing nothing in it but a party struggle, threw the whole weight of his influence on the popular side. Being unable to attend the Council, on account of illness, he indited a very vehement letter to the secretary, Naunton,\* in which he urged the necessity of taking up the cause of the Protestant Prince, and foretold that such a course would lead to a uniting of all the Protestant Powers in Europe. Not having himself to provide the funds for a

James  
refuses to  
support  
the  
Elector  
Palatine.

Abbot  
urges a  
contrary  
course.

\* Cabala, p. 102.



war which would evidently be one of great magnitude, he was content to say, concerning them, "providebit Deus."

James, however, saw the matter in the light of one upon whom the whole responsibility of the affair would fall. He refused to interfere; and he neither acknowledged his son-in-law as King of Bohemia, nor suffered him to be prayed for in the churches under that title.

Many reasons have been assigned for the conduct of James in this matter; and while his enemies have attributed it to mere pusillanimity of nature, his admirers have discovered in it much political sagacity.

In the following year Abbot had the mortification of hearing of the complete defeat of his royal friend. The prince lost, not only all hope of the crown of Bohemia, to which he had aspired, but also the Palatinate, his inheritance. From his too powerful foes he was driven to seek shelter in Holland.

A circumstance, however, now occurred which drove all foreign affairs from the mind of the primate, and centred his thoughts upon himself and his position in the Church of England; but of this I shall treat in another chapter.

CHAP.  
XXXI.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

## CHAPTER XXXII.

ABBOT'S PRIMACY FROM THE INCIDENT OF BRAMZIL PARK  
TO HIS DEATH.

Vacancy of four bishoprics.—Abbot opposes Laud's nomination.—Incident of Bramzil Park.—Question as to Abbot's consequent irregularity.—Commission appointed for full enquiry.—Restitution of the archbishop.—Abbot opposes the proposed Spanish match.—Marriage articles drawn up.—Marriage treaty broken off.—Mocket's "Politia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ."—Death of Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury.—Abbot attempts university reforms.—Doctrines of Paræus condemned.—James's "Directions concerning Preachers."—The Archbishop of Spalato.—Marriage treaty between Charles and Henrietta Maria.—Illness and death of the king, 1625.—Laud's influence with Charles.—Help sent to the Elector Palatine.—Arrival of the queen.—Plague in London.—Coronation of Charles.—Abbot's unpopularity at court.—He censures Montague and Sibthorpe.—Suspended for a time.—Restored to favour.—Character and death.—Munificence.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

EARLY in the summer of 1621 four bishoprics were vacant, and the king, guided by the advice of Lord Keeper Williams, soon made choice of the divines fitted to fill them.

Vacancy of  
four  
bishoprics.

Williams chose for himself the bishopric of Lincoln, while at his suggestion Dr. Carew and Dr. Davenant were appointed respectively, to the sees of Exeter and Salisbury. About the see of St. David's, to which Laud was nominated, there was more difficulty. The archbishop was opposed to the nomination of one whose prejudiced opponent he had been throughout his life.

Abbot  
opposes  
Laud's  
nomina-  
tion.

That Abbot's influence with the king was not lost by his recent opposition to his Majesty's policy, is evidenced by the fact of the difficulty experienced by Williams in procuring the appointment of Laud. But the mind of the primate was soon directed to a subject of a more personal character. While the four bishops elect were looking forward to the day of their consecration, an event occurred which not only delayed their advancement, but which seemed, at first, to promise to the more ambitious, a still higher step in ecclesiastical preferment.

The archbishop having been invited by Lord Zouch to his house in Bramzil Park, joined his noble host in that which was then the favourite relaxation of clergy and gentry alike, a stag-hunt in the park. With a caution which was customary to him, Abbot had warned the keepers that they should not advance too far when urging the game towards the sportsmen. Notwithstanding this injunction, one Peter Hawkins had twice during the day exposed himself to some danger, in his eagerness to give the archbishop good sport, and had been rebuked for so doing.

It is probable, that his Grace was not a skilled marksman, for his earlier days had been spent, rightly, amid theological studies, and he had not possessed the opportunity of practising that art of shooting which then, as now, formed the favourite amusement, or toil, of the aristocracy. At all events, a buck rose in front of the archbishop. He quickly discharged an arrow at the game, when, to the horror and consternation of all, it was perceived that his Grace's arrow had missed its mark, and had pierced the arm of the over zealous keeper. An artery had been severed, and in a short time the unfortunate man bled to death. The agony of Abbot's mind was deep and lasting : upon the widow of Peter Hawkins he immediately settled

CHAP.  
XXXII.<sup>1</sup>

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Incident of  
Bramzil  
Park.

The arch-  
bishop ac-  
cidentally  
kills a  
keeper.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

an annuity of 20*l.*, tantamount in those days to 200*l.*, and during the rest of his life he observed Tuesday, the day of the fatal occurrence, as a weekly fast.

That Abbot committed no wrong, according to the laws and customs of the day, in actually following the chase, appears certain, though, according to our ideas in the nineteenth century, it seems incongruous that an archbishop should be a huntsman.\* The question for the canonists

\* In the "Apologie for Archbishop Abbot" in the "Reliquiæ Spelmanianæ," which is supposed to have been written at the suggestion of the archbishop himself, and is published with an answer by Spelman, written in an acrimonious style, it is clearly shown that there was no canon of the English Church prohibiting the bishops of the several dioceses from engaging in field sports; on the contrary, it was a portion of the episcopal privilege. The readers of the preceding volumes have seen, that the establishment of several of the bishops as well as of other great lords, were supported by the game which the thinly-populated country produced in abundance. In the "Charta de Foresta," archbishops and bishops have liberty to hunt. In the 13th of Richard II. cap. 13, a clergyman who had 10*l.* by the year might keep greyhounds to hunt; and Linwood, who lived soon after that period, and was of all men best versed in the ecclesiastical constitutions and laws of England, in treating of hunting, severely censures clergymen, who used that exercise *unlawfully*, as for instance, in places "restrained or forbidden," but not one word does he utter simply against hunting. The Archbishops of Canterbury had formerly more than twenty parks and chases to use at their own pleasure, and by charter they had free warren on all their lands.

Down to the time of Abbot the bishops continued to hunt in their own parks, and in those of the neighbouring nobility. Of Archbishop Whitgift we read that, hunting in the park of Lord Cobham, near Canterbury, he there, by the favour of that lord, killed twenty bucks in one journey, using hounds, greyhounds, or his bow at his pleasure, although he never shot well. The same is reported of Archbishop Sandys. The deans and members of the Chapter of Winchester made use of their estates to the same purpose. Some of the archbishops claimed a not undisputed right to hunt within any forest of England. Archbishop Cranmer was himself an adept at field sports; his father had permitted him to employ hawk and hound, and he was always known

was, whether the archbishop, by having blood on his hands, had become "irregular;" incapable, that is to say, by common law, of discharging the duties of his high office. Although no blame could attach to the archbishop in the matter, nevertheless the general gloom of his character had prevented his conciliating many private friendships, and the selfish feelings of the Puritans were directed rather to the disgrace brought upon their party, than to the sufferings of the poor man himself who, without going all their lengths, had nevertheless from early life been their supporter, if not their patron. But amid the cruelty of some of his opponents and the coolness of almost all Abbot's former friends, we regard with pleasure the generosity of the king, whose character always shone brighter when an appeal was made to his kindly feelings. The remark of the king on hearing of the archbishop's mishap was, "An angel might have miscarried in this sort:" and on being informed that, by law, the archbishop's personal estate was forfeited to the crown, James immediately took that opportunity of writing an autograph letter to Abbot to inform him, that "the king would not add affliction to his sorrow or take one farthing from his chattels and moveables." Abbot sorrowfully retired to his native town and took refuge in the almshouse, which his own munificence had built;

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Question  
as to  
Abbot's  
consequent  
"irregularity."

Generosity  
shown by  
the king  
to Abbot.

to sit well upon a horse. In field sports Cranmer sought relaxation from the heavy affairs of state, and he was known in his family to manage a restive horse better than any of his household; in hawking and hunting he was particularly skilful, and although short-sighted, when he took a bow in hand he was almost sure to hit the object of his pursuit with his arrow.

From all which the apologist for Abbot concludes that, whatsoever canons beyond the seas affected the hunting of foreign prelates, no such canon existed in England, where by the favour of princes and of the State, the diocesans had baronies annexed to their sees.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Interest  
in the  
matter  
shown by  
foreign  
divines.

there he awaited the judgment of the Church and of the king in his case; anxiously hoping, as we are assured, that he might be permitted to end his days in this peaceful retirement. In the meantime, the question was violently agitated both at home and abroad. In Paris the Sorbonists thrice met to discuss the subject in their schools,\* and the interest shown by the Gallican Church in their affairs, was a source of gratification to the divines and the canonists of England. But with the Sorbonists the question was one chiefly of theoretical discussion, whereas in England it had a hard practical bearing, especially as regarded the four bishops elect who were awaiting their consecration. With the exception of Dr. Davenant, the bishops elect demurred to receive consecration at the hands of one who, however unwillingly, had been the cause of a fellow creature's death; they did all they could to avoid consecration by the metropolitan "not out of enmity or superstition, but to be wary that they might not be attainted with the contagion of his scandal and uncanonical condition." †

Immediately on the event being made known, Williams wrote a harsh letter on the subject to the Duke of Buckingham, to be communicated to the king. In this letter, on the ground of the scandal it would be in the eyes of the Romanists, and of the offence committed against the Canon Law by the retaining of a "man of blood" in so high an office in the Church, the lord keeper evidently calls for a condemnation of the unfortunate Abbot, whose place he no doubt considered would be better filled by himself. ‡ But James would not yield to the advice of

\* Hackett's *Life of Williams*, p. 65.

† *Ib.*, p. 66.

‡ Letter of Lord Keeper to Duke of Buckingham, Cabala, p. 260. Cyprianus Anglicanus, p. 87.

The lord  
keeper's  
letter con-  
cerning  
Abbot.

the lord keeper, and he determined at once to issue a commission that full enquiry might be made into the law of the case. Accordingly, on October 3, the king addressed a letter from Theobalds to the Lord Keeper (Williams), the Bishops of London (Montaigne), Winchester (Andrewes), and Rochester (Buckeridge), (the elects of) Exeter (Carew), and St. David's (Laud), Sir Henry Hobart, Kt., Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Mr. Justice Dodderidge, Sir Henry Martin, and Dr. Steward, or any six of them, whereof the lord keeper, the Bishops of London, Winton, and (the elect of) St. David's to be four, in which he says: "I have made choice of you to inform us concerning the nature of the case: and do therefore require you to take it presently into your consideration, and the scandal that may have arisen thereupon: and to certify us what in your judgment the same may amount unto, either to an *irregularity* or otherwise. And lastly, what means may be found to redress the same (if need be): of all which points we shall expect to hear your reports, with what diligence and expedition you possibly may."\* The commission met and debated as speedily as possible at Westminster; but it was not till the 10th of November, that they returned their final answer to the king. Three points had been placed before them: as to the irregularity, as to the scandal, and as to the restitution to be made. Concerning the first point they could not agree, the laymen and Bishop Andrewes holding the negative, the other five considering him irregular. Concerning the scandal, agreeing with Sir Henry Hobart and Dr. Steward, Bishop Andrewes doubted, while the rest determined that there was a "scandalum acceptum, non datum,"† or, as they explained

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Commis-  
sion  
appointed  
for full  
enquiry.

Their  
answer to  
the king.

\* Reliq. Spel. p. 121. Collier, vii. p. 417.

† Hackett's Williams, p. 67.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

it in their letter to the king, "scandal might be taken by the weak at home or the malicious abroad; but no scandal was given by the Right Reverend Father." On the third question, as to the restoration of the archbishop, it was unanimously agreed that this might be done by restitution from the king; and the majority determined that the king should be advised to grant the pardon by the hands of certain divines delegated by His Majesty for that purpose, and that Abbot should sue for such dispensation "in majorem cautelam si qua forte sit irregularitas." \*

This advice was followed, and on December 24 James issued a commission under the great seal, to the Bishops of Lincoln, London, Winchester, Norwich, Coventry and Lichfield, Bath and Wells, Ely, and Chichester, to declare the archbishop assoiled of all irregularity, scandal, and infamation, and capable of the entire authority of a primate.† This manner of dealing with the case entirely commends itself to our judgment. An archbishop has no special authority of his own; he is simply a bishop invested by the Church and State to see that order and regularity are observed by the clergy, whether bishops or priests in general. Abbot was considered to have done nothing to vitiate his sacred orders as bishop, and therefore it was left to the king as head of the State, and to the bishops as fathers of the Church, to declare that he might also retain his position of *primus inter pares*, and again exercise his authority as primate of all England. Before the issue of the king's declaration the bishops elect had received consecration at the hands of six bishops, commissioned by Abbot for that purpose.

\* Reliq. Spel., p. 123; Collier, vol. vii. p. 418.

† "Dispensatio cum Georgio Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi super irregularitate."—Reliq. Spel., p. 124.

Restitu-  
tion of the  
arch-  
bishop.



The archbishop now desired to spend the rest of his days in peaceful retirement, but being pronounced "rectus in curia," the king would not permit him to fulfil his desire. Thus entirely restored to his former position, Abbot endeavoured to resume his activity in party politics, though the encroachments of old age and the attacks of his old enemy, gout, rendered his interference in public affairs of greater difficulty and of less importance. He was, however, sufficiently strong to show once more his independence by deprecating the proposed alliance with Spain by the marriage of Prince Charles with the Infanta. Matters had however advanced so far, that Charles had gone surreptitiously with Buckingham to Spain without any guarantees for his safety; and while the people of England, when apprized of the fact, clamoured over the danger to the faith of the prince, his father wept for the peril of his son's life.

When, however, it was known that the prince had arrived safely, and that he had been received honourably in the capital of Spain, it was James's first care that the religion which he represented should be placed before the Papists of the Continent in a becoming light.

He sent to his son, under Abbot's advice, or at least with his sanction, what was then customary for the carrying on of the daily service and for the administration of the Holy Communion.

Two chaplains, Maw and Wren, were despatched to Madrid, bearing the following instructions:—

"I. That there be one convenient Room appointed for Prayer: the said room to be employed during their abode to no other use.

II. That it be decently adorned, Chappel-wise, with an Altar, Fonts, Palls, Linen Coverings, Demy Carpet, Four Surplices, Candlesticks, Tapers, Chalices, Pattens,

CHAP. XXXII.

George Abbot. 1611-33.

Abbot opposes the marriage of Prince Charles.

Charles and Buckingham to Spain.

James's directions for observing the English service in Spain.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

a fine Towel for the Prince, other Towels for the Household, a Traverse of Waters for the Communion, a Bason and Flagons, Two Copes.

III. That prayers be duly kept twice a day: that all reverence be used by everyone present, being uncovered, kneeling at due times, standing up at the Creeds and Gospel, bowing at the name of JESUS.

IV. That the Communion be celebrated in due form, with an Oblation of every Communicant, and admixing Water with the Wine; the Communion to be as often used as it shall please the Prince to set down, smooth Wafers to be used for the Bread.

V. That in the Sermons there be no Polemical Preachings to inveigh against them, or to confute them; but only to confirm the Doctrine and Tenets of the Church of England, by all positive Arguments, either in Fundamental or Moral Points; and especially to apply themselves in Moral Lessons to Preach CHRIST JESUS crucified.

VI. That they give no occasions (or rashly entertain any) of Conference or Dispute (for fear of dishonour to the Prince, if upon any offence taken, he should be required to send away any one of them); but if the Lord Ambassador or Mr. Secretary wish them to hear any that desire some information, then they may safely do it.

VII. That they carry the Articles of our Religion in many Copies, the Books of Common Prayer in several Languages, store of English Service Books, the King's own Works in English and Latin." \*

By means of this open celebration of their worship, the English were able to prove that they had a religion, a fact much questioned by the ignorant Spaniards.

Prince Charles and the pope exchanged letters, in

\* Cyp. Ang., p. 106. Collier, vii. p. 433.

which the discretion and dignity of the former are amply shown ; and it is to be remarked that the expression *Roman Catholic* is made use of by Charles—a term which James himself had expressly used in order not to compromise his claim of Catholicity for the English Church.\*

Articles were drawn up between the courts of Spain and England,† in which the latter undertook to modify the penal laws against the Romanists, and to make various concessions to the future Papist queen.

These articles were signed by Abbot as well as by the others of the king's Council, and so seemed to have obtained the sanction of all parties in the kingdom. A very strong letter, however, was written to the king at this time against the Spanish match, which was attributed by many to the pen of the archbishop ; but both Hackett and Mr. Brewer, in his notes on Fuller's History, doubt its authenticity, and we may believe that Abbot, having officially signed the articles of the treaty, was content to declare his personal distrust of the match from the pulpit of Whitehall.‡

Nothing could exceed the alarm felt in England for the safety of the prince, and the king's jester did but express the popular sentiment when, with the freedom allowed to those of his profession, he put his fool's cap on the king's head. On James asking "What if the prince comes safe back again?" "Then," said the jester, "I will put it on the King of Spain's head."§ The king's surmise proved true, and Charles returned not only safe in person, but free

CHAP. XXXII.

George Abbot. 1611-33.

Marriage articles drawn up.

Popular alarm for the prince's safety.

\* Rushworth, p. 83. Isaac Disraeli in his *Court of Charles I.* (vol. i. p. 45) notices the fact "that in one of the Papal state Papers, where his Holiness applied the term 'Catholic Church' to his own, James inserted 'Roman,' asserting that he held himself to be as good a Catholic as the Bishop of Rome himself."

† Rushworth, vol. i. p. 86.

‡ Hackett's Williams, p. 143.

§ Rapin, vol. ii. p. 221.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Joy at his  
return.

Marriage  
treaty  
broken off.

Moket's  
"Politia  
Ecclesie  
Angli-  
canæ."

from all affection for the Infanta. England was now wild with joy, but whether the change of circumstances was due to the interposition of the Puritans with Buckingham,\* or to the tardiness of the King of Spain in fulfilling his stipulations, or to some lingering recollection of beauty seen in the court of France by Charles in passing, it is not for an historian of the archbishops to enquire. The match was broken off, and Abbot rejoiced in the prospect of a Protestant consort for the heir of the throne.

It may be well here to enter into a short digression upon the doings of the primate at Oxford. Abbot had never lost his interest in that university where he first rose to eminence. As visitor of All Souls College he still retained some influence there, and two successive wardens of that college, Mocket and Astley, had been his chaplains. In the year 1617, Dr. Mocket had published a book in Latin called "Politia Ecclesie Anglicanæ." It professed to be an apology for the Church of England, and contained a translation of the Prayer Book, the Ordinal and the Thirty-nine Articles, and an epitome of the Homilies, which Fuller says were faithfully extracted. It was published with the consent of the archbishop and, it would appear, without any sinister design † but, as Fuller observes, "it fared worse for the author, the author for his patron the archbishop, against whom many bishops began then to combine." ‡ I have not seen the book itself § but it gave great offence at court by as-

\* Neal, vol. i. p. 487.

† Cyp. Ang., p. 76.

‡ Fuller, Ch. Hist., Book x. § iv. 46-49 (vol. iii. p. 266).

§ The book is exceedingly scarce and only partially reprinted; the complete title of the book, of which a copy is preserved in the British Museum, is as follows: "Doctrina et politia ecclesie Anglicanæ a beatissimæ memoriæ principibus, Edvardo Sexto, regina Elizabetha stabilitæ et a religiosissimo et potentissimo monarcha Jacobo Magnæ Britan, &c., rege continuata. Londini, 1617."

serting the Archbishop of Canterbury's power to confirm the election of bishops in his province.

The author cited the 6th Canon of the 1st Nicene Council established by imperial authority. "If any man be made a Bishop without the consent of his Metropolitan he ought not to be a Bishop." King James, jealous of his own prerogative, could not approve of such a confirming power of the archbishop, which would imply a negative voice in any case in which a royal nominee might be disliked by the primate. We must add that this was not the only offence; for Mocket attributed the appointment of fast days by the Church of England to mere political motives, in direct variance with the doctrine of the Church, which was to observe certain fast days in conformity with apostolical and primitive times. He also omitted a part of the 20th Article, which states the power of the Church in controversies of faith and in decreeing rites and ceremonies. Mocket's book thus giving offence in a variety of quarters was condemned to be burned and the sentence was carried into effect. So sensitive was Mocket by nature, and he felt the disgrace so keenly, that he soon after died of grief. Archbishop Abbot felt tenderly the loss of his friend, and indignantly the insult offered to himself through the triumph of his opponents.

Keenly as he felt this disgrace he had a greater and nearer grief in the departure from this life of Robert Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury, who was not only his brother but also a dear friend in his Oxford career. The two brothers had lived long in close fraternal friendship, but Robert had taken to himself a wife late in life, and by his marriage he caused considerable annoyance to the archbishop. It was soon after his consecration, when he was nearly 60 years of age, that he married the widow of Dr. Cheyne, a physician, and his contemporary at Balliol. The primate

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Its publi-  
cation  
proscribed.

Death of  
Robert  
Abbot,  
Bishop of  
Salisbury.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

addressed to the new bishop a sharp and bitter letter on the occasion, but the zealous manner in which Robert Abbot fulfilled his duties at Salisbury, must have won back his brother's affection, even as it gained for him the respect and esteem of all within his diocese. \*

Abbot  
attempts  
university  
reforms.

To return to All Souls. As early as the year 1616 Abbot, like his predecessor, is found combating the excesses which prevailed in this college and in the rest of the university.

Letters to  
All Souls'  
College.

His letters have frequent reference to the faults of the college. "I do require you, Mr. Warden," he says in one of these letters, "and the rest of the officers, severely to punish such of your society as neglecting their studies do spend their time abroad in taverns and alehouses to the defamation of scholars and scandal of your house; and not to impart any common favours unto them unless they thoroughly reform themselves." Finding soft words were not sufficient to meet the case, in 1625 Abbot suspended one of the fellows, for contempt of his injunctions and of the statutes, from his commons and from all voice in college affairs for the space of four months. Still he laboured in vain, and, in 1632, on hearing of some great breach of discipline in which apparently "the doors and gates of the college had been torn off," and other enormities committed, he addressed a severe letter to the authorities, tracing some recent misfortunes in the college to the wrath of God for these unchecked excesses, and concluding, "I would move it unto you whether it be not fit that you, Mr. Warden and seniors, should in the fear of God seriously consult together whether by some prayers or other courses agreeable to the laws of the Church and Kingdom you did not in humiliation expiate those sins either open or secret which may be thought to have provoked the wrath of God upon you. 'Dictum sapientibus

\* Biog. Britan.

sat est' and so I leave it to yourselves . . . and so praying God Almighty evermore to direct and bless your endeavours I cease, but not to be

“Your very loving friend,

“G. CANT.”\*

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

At the same time we find him obtaining a legal opinion on the respect statutablely due to the warden. The question had immediate reference to the expression “debita reverentia.” The opinion was in favour of the warden and it was thus confirmed by Archbishop Abbot:—

Judgment  
concerning  
the respect  
due to the  
warden.

“I do approve of the judgment of these learned men and further do declare that it is a part of debita reverentia unto the Warden from any of the fellows of whatever degree to be uncovered in his presence in any public or private place within the precincts of the College.” †

Abbot's influence at Oxford, which at one time, as we have seen, had been very great, was now on the decline, and the teaching of Laud and his school was in the ascendancy. The king, in 1622, had himself interfered to silence a puritanical preacher who, following the doctrines of Paræus, ventured to assert the liberty of the subject to take up arms against his king, in defence of his religion. The king censured Knight, the preacher, caused Paræus' book to be burnt, and wrote a long exhortation to the obsequious heads of colleges on the subject of the theological studies of the students. ‡

Condemnation of the  
doctrines  
of Paræus.

About the same time Abbot received from the king some “Directions concerning Preachers,” in which the king forbids discussion of theological questions in sermons by any under the rank of a bishop or dean, confines afternoon discourses to the subjects of the Catechism,

James's  
“Directions  
concerning  
Preachers.”

\* Worthies of all Souls, p. 126.

† Ibid. p. 128.

‡ Wood's Athenæ, vol. ii. p. 343.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

and forbids all allusion to the "five points," or the king's authority, and any "indecent railing against Papists or Puritans." Lastly, he prohibits all lecturers from preaching, unless with the recommendation of the bishop the fiat of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a confirmation under the great seal of England. In forwarding the king's letter to his suffragans, Abbot remarks on the king's "care, that men should preach 'Christ crucified,'" but otherwise confines himself to a few general expressions of hope that the bishops will do as the king wishes.\*

The directions causing some offence, the archbishop was required by the king, in the following month, to write an explanation to the Bishop of London. This duty Abbot performed with skill and moderation, proving the necessity of the steps taken, from the "growth of Popery and Anabaptism, principally caused by the lightness, affectedness, and unprofitableness of that kind of preaching of late years taken up." † But it is doubtful whether the good sense of the archbishop was imitated by all who professed to be of his party. That party indeed was at this time much disconcerted by the defection of the Archbishop of Spalato, who had been made much of by the Puritans. They imagined that they saw in him a brand snatched by them from the fire of Rome. But that ignoble prelate, having got all he could in England, deserted his new friends, thinking to find in Rome a ready welcome on his return. His hopes were however defeated, and a long imprisonment, ended only by his death, was the just reward of his peculations and his perfidy. Fuller, in his quaint manner, dismisses the subject

\* Cabala, p. 104.

† See Cabala, p. 105, where the letter is wrongly attributed to the Bishop of Lincoln; cf. Cardwell's Doc. Ann., vol. ii. p. 146, note.

The Arch-  
bishop of  
Spalato.



with the following remark:—"Italian converts, like Origen, where they do well, none better; where ill, none worse."\*

In 1623 the Spanish match had been broken off, and the same year was signalised by a sudden cessation of all persecution of Protestants in France.† The reason of this toleration became apparent towards the close of the year, when ambassadors were sent to France to treat for the hand of Henrietta Maria as consort to the Prince of Wales. This match was satisfactorily concluded in the following year, and helped to revive the hopes of the Papists. They had been deeply disappointed by the failure of the Spanish match, and in the attempt to aid the Elector Palatine they feared a reaction in favour of Puritanism.‡ But the revival of the true Catholic spirit in England was the real danger to the Papists, against which they had not prepared themselves, and which really destroyed their power in this realm.

The king did not long survive the completion of his wishes with regard to his son's betrothal. The contract was made in November, and in the following March James was no more. After ten days' illness James I. died at Theobalds, on March 27, 1625. Four days before his death he had sent for the archbishop, that he might receive at his hands the Holy Communion. Feeling the comfort and peace which the devout reception of that Holy Sacrament ever brings to the departing soul of a Christian, James could not help expressing his feelings to those around him, adding: "O that all my Lords would do but thus when they are visited with the like sicknesse; themselves would be more comforted in their soules and the world less troubled with questioning their religion."§

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Cessation  
of Pro-  
testant  
persecu-  
tion in  
France.

Marriage  
treaty con-  
cluded be-  
tween  
Charles  
and  
Henrietta  
Maria.

Illness of  
the king.

\* Fuller, Ch. Hist. Book x. § vi. 20. (vol. iii. p. 308.)

† Rushworth, p. 93.

‡ *Ib.* 154.

§ Nichols' Progresses, vol. iv. p. 1030.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

His death  
March 27,  
1625.

From this time to the hour of death "short sentences of devotion" were read to him by the archbishop, and when the last moments evidently drew near, Abbot, kneeling by the bedside, repeated the commendatory prayer, which was scarcely concluded ere the king's soul had left the turmoils and perplexities of this mortal state to await, with his meanest subject, the sentence of the King of kings. From the chamber of death the Primate retired with some misgivings as to the future of England, now to be ruled by one whose chief counsellor he suspected would be William Laud, the object of his continued and continual dislike and suspicion.

Laud's  
influence  
with the  
new king.

It was as Abbot feared; for almost immediately on assuming the reins of government, Charles called to his aid in church matters the Bishop of St. David's, who had long been gradually gaining influence at court. To Laud the king applied for a list of all the prominent divines of the day, with letters affixed to their names, denoting their orthodoxy or their Puritanism, and so entirely was Charles under the influence of that prelate, that the history of the Church at this time is better told in the life of Laud than in that of Abbot, and to the next volume the reader is therefore referred.

Charles  
sends help  
to the  
Elector  
Palatine.

Immediately on the death of James, the young monarch, in obedience to the wishes of his council, sent an army to the aid of the Prince Palatine, and at the same time ambassadors were despatched to complete the arrangements for his marriage with the French princess. No doubt the archbishop agreed to the marriage, which it would have been useless to oppose, and he did so indeed the more readily, in order that he might urge with greater effect the proffer of aid to the unfortunate King of Bohemia.

We pass on now to the marriage of Charles I. An

alliance of the king of England with the French court must have been nearly as objectionable to Archbishop Abbot, as had been the projected marriage of the heir apparent with the Infanta of Spain. Both James and Charles, but especially the former, had been disappointed and outwitted. Their desire was to represent themselves as Catholics to the kings of Spain and France. But the Jesuits and Seminarists of England, headed by the Pope, interfered to prevent this recognition if the Papal supremacy were denied.

It was clearly seen that the demands for toleration of the Papists made by the court of France, if granted, would at once place the recusants on a better footing than the Puritans. A deep murmur expressed the indignation of the latter class, and their feelings were responded to and represented by Abbot. Meantime the young king was in love, and, forgetful alike of good policy and public duty, he neglected the claims of the country upon its sovereign, in his determination to indulge his private feelings.

The marriage took place by proxy in the cathedral of Notre Dame, at Paris, under circumstances of more than ordinary magnificence. The young queen arrived in England in June, suffering much from the length of her journey and disappointed at not finding her unknown husband ready to greet her; for he had been compelled to await her long delayed arrival at Canterbury. She had, however, little time to feel the contrast between the magnificence of her parting from her native land and the gloom of her arrival in England; for early on the following morning, the king was announced as having arrived at Dover, impatient for an interview with his wife. In the enthusiasm of his admiration, Charles forgot the sedateness which generally marked his character, and the queen, fascinated by the attentions paid to her by

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Arrival of  
the queen  
in Eng-  
land.

Charles's  
eagerness  
to meet  
her.

her devoted husband, conducted herself at first with due decorum.

With her conduct, in writing the life of Abbot, we have little to do, for the Archbishop of Canterbury was not permitted to speak to her on religious subjects. We will only remark, that the queen was not allowed by the Papists, appointed to control her actions, to participate with her husband in the sacred ceremonial of the coronation. With singular bad taste, as the procession passed to the cathedral, the young and giddy French woman was seen in company with her maids of honour, dancing, with truly French frivolity, in a chamber over the gate of the palace yard, which had been prepared to enable her to view the solemnity, in which her husband was to take the most distinguished part.

An ominous shadow was cast over the ceremony of coronation, as London was again smitten with the plague. Arising in the close alleys of Whitechapel, it threatened the whole city with destruction. The clergy seem, during this terrible visitation, to have attended with commendable devotion to their duties. No fewer than fifty-five of them, including the Archdeacon of London, fell victims to the disease. Abbot, at the command of the king, ordered a general fast, and issued a form of prayer to be used in all churches for the averting of the plague, and for the prosperity of the Palatinate expedition.

Williams, who, as Dean of Westminster, would naturally have made arrangements for the coronation, was in disgrace; and Laud, one of the prebendaries, was at once selected to take the place of the dean. We hear little of Abbot in the important ceremonial, except that he performed the function as it had been arranged by Laud, and in consequence gave it his assent. There is no reason why he should not have done so, for, as we have shown in a

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

The  
Plague  
rages in  
London.

General  
fast  
ordered.

Coronation  
of Charles.

former volume, on the authority of Sir Francis Palgrave, the coronation oath and ceremony was in substance the same as that used in the Holy Roman Empire, and had been in use in England both before and since the Reformation.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Vested in a gorgeous cope Abbot administered to the king the solemn oath of coronation, before the great altar of Westminster Abbey, on which, it was remarked, stood a crucifix, discovered among the ancient regalia, and made use of by Laud on this occasion. This fact I mention, as no objection was raised by the Puritan archbishop to that which was afterwards brought up against Laud as a symptom of his Papistical tendencies.

Abbot's  
share in it.

At the court of Charles, Abbot was no favourite; and indeed we can scarcely wonder at that being the case, seeing that he let no opportunity pass of insulting Laud, in whose integrity the king put implicit trust, and whose piety was a restraint upon the extravagancies of Buckingham, that prelate's devoted and admiring friend. In 1624, we hear of the archbishop refusing to place the Bishop of St. David's upon the High Commission, an affront so manifestly unjust that he was soon compelled to reverse his conduct. In the following year he again endeavoured to show his animosity to Laud, who, regarding the difficulty encountered by some of the country clergy in paying the subsidy, which had been voted by Convocation, endeavoured to bring in a measure for their relief. This was a secular matter, and it did not occur to Laud that on such business the archbishop need necessarily be consulted. Abbot wrote him a very bitter letter on the subject, to which, however, Laud returned a temperate reply.\*

Abbot's  
unpopu-  
larity at  
court.

Abbot's  
animosity  
to Laud.

\* Cyp. Ang., p. 118. · Rapin, vol ii. p. 240.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Laud himself seems never to have indulged malignant feelings against Abbot; the primate's real enemy at court was not the Bishop of St. David's but the Duke of Buckingham. That nobleman had originally been introduced to the king's favour by Abbot, who, wishing to annihilate the mischievous influence of Somerset, had determined upon doing so by the introduction of young Villiers.\* In this scheme he had been aided by the queen. Villiers by his talents and ready wit soon made way for himself, and Abbot became quickly jealous of his own creation. The friendship, which was at first sincere, was turned into the bitterest enmity; and now Abbot's hated rival supplanted him in the favour of the powerful duke, as he had formerly done in the honours of Oxford. The archbishop had already given offence at court by venturing to speak against a book which had given the king satisfaction. Being appointed by the House of Commons to give judgment on Montague's "Appello Cæsarem," he had exhorted him "to write no more on such subjects." The rebuke, we should have thought, was sufficiently

Abbot  
gives  
offence by  
his cen-  
sure of  
Montague.

\* 'Archbishop Abbot, his Narrative,' see Rushworth, vol. i. p. 457. Abbot's intentions in doing this seem to have been good and his affection for the young man sincere. Bishop Goodman (Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 161) mentions a letter addressed by the archbishop to the rising favourite which shows his affection and does credit to his wisdom—

"And now my George because of your kind affection towards me you style me your father, I will from this day forward repute and esteem you for my son, and so hereafter know yourself to be. And in token thereof, I do now give thee my blessing again, and charge you as my son daily to serve God; to be diligent and pleasing to your master, and to be wary that, at no man's instance, you press him with many suits; because they are not your friends that urge those things upon you but have private ends of their own which are not fit for you.

"So praying God to bless you, I rest

"Your very loving father

"G. CANT."

mild, but Charles was angry that any exception should be taken to a book which was the composition of one of his own chaplains.

Soon after this, Dr. Sibthorpe, having preached a sermon at the Northampton Assizes, much to his own satisfaction, ventured to publish it. He felt sure that his exaltation of the royal prerogative (especially with regard to the right of levying taxes) would find favour at a needy court.\* Buckingham, under the royal sanction, sent the sermon to Lambeth for the archbishop's imprimatur.

We have an account of this proceeding in the archbishop's own words; and his report of a conversation in the early part of the 17th century is itself so interesting and curious that I give it to the reader as I find it in Rushworth. To avoid, as he remarks, "the *inquit* and *inquam*, I said this and he said that," Abbot throws the conversation into the form of a dialogue between himself and a Mr. Murrey, a young man, who, being of the king's bedchamber, was chosen to convey to his grace the desire of the sovereign.

"*Murrey*. My Lord, I am sent unto you by the king, to let you know that his pleasure is, that whereas there is brought unto him a sermon to be printed, you should allow this sermon to the press.

"*Archbishop*. I was never he that authorised books to be printed; for it is the work of my chaplains to read over other men's writings, and what is fit, to let it go; and what is unfit, to expunge it.

"*Murrey*. But the king will have you yourself to do this, because he is minded that no books shall be allowed but by you and the Bishop of London; and my Lord of

\* The sermon is of very inferior merit, and utterly unworthy of the fictitious fame which it gained.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

Sib-  
thorpe's  
sermon on  
the royal  
preroga-  
tive.

Conver-  
sation be-  
tween Ab-  
bot and one  
Murrey.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

London authorised one the other day (Cousens his book), and he will have you do this.

“*Archbishop.* This is an occupation that my old master, King James, did never put me to, and yet I was then young, and had more abilities of body than now I have, so that I see I must now learn a new lesson, but leave it with me, and when I have read it I shall know what to say unto it; a day or two hence you shall understand my mind.

“When I had once or twice perused it, I found some words which seemed unto me to cross that which the king intended, and in a sort to destroy it; and therefore upon his return, a day or two after, I expressed myself thus:—

“Murrey, I conceive that the king intendeth that this sermon shall promote the service now in hand about the loan of money, but in my opinion it much crosseth it; for he layeth it down for a rule, and because it shall not be forgotten he repeateth it again: that Christians are bound in duty one to another, especially all subjects to their princes according to the laws and customs of the kingdom wherein they live.

“Out of this will men except this loan, because that there is neither law nor custom for it in the kingdom of England.

Secondly, in my judgment, there followeth a dangerous speech, ‘*Habemus necessitatem vindicandæ libertatis.*’ For this was all that was then quoted out of Calvin, no mention being made of any the other words which are now in the printed copy. For when by the former rule he hath set men at liberty, whether they will pay or no, he imposeth upon them a necessity to vindicate this liberty, and *vindicare* may be extended to challenge with violence, *cum vi*. But, for my part, I would be most



unwilling to give occasion to sedition and mutiny in the kingdom.

“Again, here is mention made of poll-money, which, as I have heard, hath already caused much distaste where the sermon was preached.

“Moreover, what a speech is this, that he observes the forwardness of the Papists to offer double, according to an Act of Parliament so providing, yea to profess that they would part with the half of their goods, where he quoteth in the margent, Anno 1 Caroli, the Act for the subsidy of the laity, whereby popish recusants were to pay double, when indeed there is no such Act.

“And in the fifth place it is said in this sermon, that the princes of Bohemia have power to depose their kings, as not being hereditary, which is a great question; such a one as hath cost much blood, and must not, in a word, be absolutely defined here, as if it were without controversy.

“I pray you make his majesty acquainted with these things, and take the book with you (where it is to be noted that all this time we had but one single copy, which was sometime at the court and sometime left with me).

“*Murrey.* I will faithfully deliver these things to the king, and then you shall hear further from me.

“Some two or three days after, he returned again unto me, and telleth me that he had particularly acquainted the king with my objections; and his majesty made this answer: First, for the laws and customs of the kingdom, he did not stand upon that, he had a precedent for that which he did, and thereon he would insist.

“*Archbishop.* I think that to be a mistaking, for I fear there will be found no such precedent. King Henry the Eighth, as the chronicle sheweth, desired but the sixth part of men’s estates, ten groats in the pound; our king

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.

1611-33.

desireth the whole six parts full out, so much as men are set at in the subsidy book. And in the time of King Henry, although he were a powerful king, yet for that taxation there began against him little less than rebellion ; so that he held it wisdom to desist, and laying the blame upon Cardinal Woolsey, professed that he knew nothing of the matter.

“ *Murrey*. Secondly, the king saith, for the words ‘ *Habemus necessitatem vindicandæ libertatis*,’ he taketh them to be for him ; and he will stand on his liberty.

“ Thirdly, for poll-money, he thinketh it lawful.

“ Fourthly, it is true there was no such Act passed, and therefore it must be amended (and yet in the printed book it is suffered still to stand, such slight, and I may say slovenly, care was had by them that published this sermon).

“ And fifthly, for that of Bohemia, he hath crossed it out of the book.

“ Some other matters there were against which I took exception, but Mr. Murrey being a young gentleman, although witty and full of good behaviour, I doubted that, being not deeply seen in divinity, he could not so well conceive me, nor make report of my words to his majesty. And, therefore, I being lame, and so disabled to wait on the king, did move him, that he would, in my name, humbly beseech his majesty to send the Bishop of Bath and Wells unto me, and I would, by his means, make known my scruples. And so I dismissed Mr. Murrey, observing with myself that the answers to my five objections, especially to two or three, were somewhat strange ; as if the king were resolved, were it to his good or to his harm, to have the book go forth.” \*

At last Abbot distinctly refused to license the sermon,

\* Rushworth, vol. i. p. 437.

and sent his reasons in writing to the king. To the objections of the primate, the Bishops of Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and St. David's, were appointed by the king to draw up a reply. This answer provoked some very splenetic utterances from the poor afflicted invalid at Lambeth, who states the whole matter at length, in his 'Narrative.'

CHAP.  
XXXII.  
George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Many conferences were held between Murrey and Abbot, but the archbishop, being unequal to a lengthened controversy, rather than yield his point, submitted to the punishment of his contumacy. The primate was compelled to live in retirement at his country house of Ford, and the Bishop of London was easily persuaded to license the sermon. During this quasi-suspension of the primacy, ecclesiastical affairs were administered by a commission of bishops arbitrarily nominated by the king,\* and sermons and pamphlets enlarging on the royal prerogative were freely sanctioned by them. Such publications would not be tolerated in the nineteenth century, though in the early part of the seventeenth, they stated what was supposed to be the constitutional view of the subject; that the king, for special purposes, had a right to tax the subject.

Abbot is  
suspended  
for a time.

The disgrace of the archbishop did not last, the king being of far too generous a nature to be irritated long by those faults of temper which made Abbot a thorn in his side. As Christmas drew near, Charles sent for Abbot, and received him at court with many marks of esteem and regard. From this time, though he never attained to much favour, the archbishop lived unmolested by his adversaries at court; taking less and less interest in public and political affairs. The last public act of

Restored  
to favour.

\* Cardwell Doc. Ann. ii. 165.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

Abbot indicates that, in the time of his retirement, his attention was drawn to a sense of the decencies of religion, which in the time of his activity he had too much neglected. In settlement of a dispute arising among the parishioners of Crayford in Kent, he directed that, for the more reverent reception of the Holy Communion, the parishioners should receive that Sacrament kneeling at the steps which led up to the altar at the east end of the church.

While thus inactive it must have been a source of grief to the aged primate to hear of the failure of Protestant expeditions, ill planned and feebly carried out; and while the protests of parliament against the exercise of prerogatives (hitherto unquestioned), on the part of their well-meaning, but not far-seeing sovereign, must have struck a chord of sympathy in his heart, he was, at the same time, pained to see the triumph, at court, of the principles against which he had, through a long life, contended. He contemplated death also with the less complacency, when his mind was directed to the thought of his certain successor, in the person of one whom through life he had persecuted with unrelenting bitterness—William Laud.

Character  
of Abbot.

There is no doubt that the primacy of Abbot in some measure prepared the way for many of the troubles which beset his successor. A good and conscientious man himself, he had not shrunk from his duty when that duty dictated a line of conduct in opposition to the will even of the king, but his religion was of that purely personal type which closes the eye to the general welfare. While he imagined that, by laxity of discipline in ceremonial observances, he was merely making allowance for conscientious scruples, he was in reality creating a lawlessness of disposition which caused the overthrow

of the throne, and threatened with disaster, though it could not destroy, the Church of Christ itself, so far as the kingdom of England was concerned.

In other ways Abbot was a very strict ruler, and his stern behaviour towards his clergy made him many enemies, while it gained him but few supporters.\* Brought up in a narrow-minded school, his contact with the world does not seem to have enabled him to cast off the effects of his early training. Throughout the history of Abbot's life, the admiration we could entertain for his conscientiousness and boldness is chilled by the constant display of his harshness and want of sympathy or regard for the feelings of others. That he was ambitious we cannot doubt, and we may notice perhaps a gradual souring of his nature through the failure of his Oxford career, and the subsequent checks and disappointments of his life at court. We are shocked to find him a persecutor, sending heretics to the flames; but we must remember that such was at this time the law of the land; and that not only Bonner, but also Cranmer and Latimer, had caused others to be burnt, before they were themselves committed to the flames. His own account of the affair of Sibthorpe displays a petulant, querulous nature, though we must make allowances for the painful complaints under which he was suffering.

Worn out with disease, and in the 72nd year of his age, Abbot was at last made aware of his approaching end, and on August 4, 1625, he died in his house at Croydon. Scarcely anything is told us of the manner of his death; and his departure from the primacy made little difference in the Church polity of the land. His successor had for long wielded almost supreme

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-32.

Death of  
Abbot,  
August 4,  
1625.  
33.

\* Clarendon's Hist. Rebellion, vol. i. p. 38; Collier, vol. viii. p. 72; Wellwood's Memoirs, p. 36.

CHAP.  
XXXII.

George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

His muni-  
ficence.

power in the Church of England. But, while few mourned his loss as a primate or as a politician, many wept for him as a munificent patron. He had always been profusely hospitable, having been warned, as he tells us, by King James, that hospitality is one of the chief duties devolving upon a bishop.\* In his bequests and benefactions he was most generous. Besides building a hospital at Guildford, to the present hour a blessing to the town, Abbot subscribed to the schools in Oxford the sum of 150*l.* He added to the endowment of Balliol College in the year 1619, for the increase of the library and the repair of the building. In the city of Canterbury he erected a conduit. Towards the foundation of Pembroke College he contributed 300*l.*, in discharge of a debt due to that society from Balliol College. He left by will to the town of Guildford 100*l.* to be lent without interest to four poor tradesmen in his native town for two or three years. To the poor of Lambeth he left 30*l.*, and bequeathed 10*l.* each to forty inferior servants who had served him faithfully. The books in his great study marked with his name, he left to his successors for ever; and the books at Croydon were devised in part to the Dean and Chapter of Winchester, and in part to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.†

According to his own request, Abbot was buried in the Lady Chapel of Trinity Church, Guildford, and over his grave was raised a handsome monument, which remains to the present day. He is represented in the episcopal robe, including the cope. During the long primacy of Abbot, the discipline of the Church of England was relaxed, and with his increasing years his remissness with regard to the Puritans who had crept into the preferments of the Church increased. Clarendon says, "that

\* Rushworth, vol. i. p. 450.

† Le Neve, p. 114.

temper in the archbishop, whose house was a sanctuary to the most eminent of that factious party, and who licensed their most pernicious writings, left his successor a very difficult work to do, to reform and reduce a church into order, that had been so long neglected, and that was so ill inhabited by many weak, and more wilful churchmen.”\*

CHAP.  
XXXII.  
George  
Abbot.  
1611-33.

\* Clarendon, Hist. Rebellion, vol. i. p. 36.

END OF THE TENTH VOLUME.















