Oxford Church Text Books

The Reformation in Great Britain

BY

H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

THE REV. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A.

FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, LECTURER IN THEOLOGY AT ST. JOHN'S AND ORIEL COLLEGES, OXFORD

SECOND EDITION

RIVINGTONS

34 *KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN*

LONDON

1907

PREFACE

THE gifted writer who began this book died on April 27, 1899, before the work was completed, and I have endeavoured to finish it to the best of my ability. In losing Henry Offley Wakeman, Oxford has lost a true Christian, a true gentleman, and a true scholar, 'not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.'

This is an effort to provide educated Englishmen and Scotsmen with a brief but trustworthy account of the Reformation in their respective countries. Special attention has been given throughout to doctrine, that the thought as well as the action of the Reformers may be understood. Partly in order to show by contrast the real character of the English Reformation settlement, and partly on account of its own intrinsic importance, it has been necessary to give a somewhat detailed account of Calvinism, especially in its Scottish and Presbyterian form.

For the sake of thorough clearness, it is best to mention that the word 'Catholic' is here applied to the teaching and practice of the primitive and undivided Church; the words 'Roman Catholic' or 'Romanist,' to Christians who accept as infallible the decisions of the Council of Trent or later Roman definitions; the word

'Protestant,' which has greatly varied in meaning at different periods, is used in its modern sense, and is applied only to the denominations which took their rise in or after the sixteenth century. The terms 'High Church' and 'Low Church,' which originated as terms of opprobrium, have been scrupulously avoided.

LEIGHTON PULLAN.

CONTENTS

THE REFORMATION IN GREAT BRITAIN

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF THE REFORMATION

The Reformation Movement.—The Reformation movement of the sixteenth century in England was undoubtedly part of the greater movement which was agitating Europe at the same time. In common with that movement, it owed much of its strength to the desire of the human mind to assert the claims of independent thought against those of authority and tradition. Like that movement, its success was largely due to the failure of the existing Church system to meet the moral and religious needs of mankind. The Church in earlier ages had taken upon itself to govern the Christian world and to teach it not merely in the things of religion, but in every department and in every detail of human life and action. For this purpose it had organised itself in the West by slow degrees into a great universal State, with its sovereign, its law, its systems of education and administration, superior in theory and claim to those of secular States. Under the great Popes, assisted by the great teachers of the Middle Ages, the theory was almost translated into fact; the claim was almost admitted; and Innocent III. and Honorius III. stood forth before mankind as the most powerful of the rulers of Europe, asserting an authority and accepting a responsibility greater than that of any other Western potentate. But the house of the Popes

was builded upon sand, and when the storm came it fell. Luther and Zwingli and Henry VIII. were not the authors of the Reformation. They were merely generals who took a lead in a war which had become inevitable, if not as yet publicly declared. The sixteenth century merely registered what the fifteenth century had decreed, but the exact term of the decree was left, as is usually the case, to the registrars to determine; and in different places in different countries the terms varied a good deal. Common to all was the determination never again to permit the establishment of a system which imposed by Divine sanction rules and practices of religion and morals which were repugnant to the conscience of mankind, and were plainly due to worldly, if not sinful, motives. In France, Spain, Italy, and parts of Germany this determination eventually took shape in a tacit surrender of the Papal claim to interfere with secular governments, and a closer concentration round the Pope and the Church of the city of Rome in religious matters, which gave to all those who still acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the Pope a new creed, a new rule of faith, and an administrative uniformity, the effect of which is aptly described in the official title adopted by that branch of the Church—sancta *Romana* ecclesia Catholica. This movement, to which the name of the Counter-Reformation is generally given, had, no doubt, great defects and limitations. It clung too tenaciously to the theory of the Church as a State. It emphasised the crying defect of the mediæval Church in securing for the Pope the position of a despot over the Church of God, which was both unscriptural and uncatholic in principle, and has proved itself ineffective in practice. It developed some unwholesome tendencies in religious belief and devotion. But, in spite of these drawbacks, it remains one of the greatest of the many religious revivals which the Church has experienced. It purified conduct, raised the standard of duty, fostered the spirit of self-sacrifice, developed an ardent missionary zeal, cleared away many old-standing abuses, produced not only great ecclesiastics, great theologians, and great historians, but also great saints.

Protestant Forms of Reformation.—In northern Europe

and parts of central Europe things took a different turn. Partly owing to the characters of the men who first elevated the standard of reform in those countries, Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin; partly owing to the curious mismanagement and misunderstanding of the movement by the Roman authorities; partly owing to political shiftings and intrigues, which made the existence of religious opposition to recognised authority a most convenient weapon to use, as occasion offered, against Pope or Emperor; but mainly, beyond all question, owing to the strong, stubborn determination of the Teutonic character to clear the domain of religion and morals from crying abuse, men were prepared not merely to work for reform in the Church, but to declare war against the Church if the Church authorities seemed too slack in the work of reform. Zwingli in Switzerland, and Luther in Germany, were fired to insist upon reform at all hazards by their keen sense of the moral wickedness involved in the penitential system of the Church as then taught. When reform was delayed or refused by the constituted authorities they felt bound, in the supreme interests of religion, to carry out the necessary reform themselves in the teeth of constituted authority. To do this they had to define their own principles, and, in so doing, Zwingli laid down a theory of the place of the Bible in the scheme of the Christian religion, and Luther a theory of the ministry which were clearly incompatible with the system of the Church as it had existed from apostolic times. Calvin, coming a few years later, constructed a system of theology which was indeed in many points based upon the writings of earlier theologians of great authority, but was obviously impossible to reconcile with the doctrine of redemption as taught by the Church in all ages when formulated and pushed to an extreme as it was by him, for it involved the monstrous proposition that the death of Christ did not avail for all mankind. The result was that over the larger part of northern Europe, in North Germany, Scandinavia, Denmark, Holland, as well as in Switzerland and in many districts of France and South Germany, the necessary reform in 'head and members' which had been the constant demand of all noble spirits

in the Church for a hundred years was carried out by the establishment of new religious bodies and new religious systems, differing both from the Church and from each other in organisation in theology and in worship, but so far agreeing with each other in the principles of their opposition to the Church as to be willing to be included in the common term Protestant, which expresses a common solidarity against Rome, not a common religious faith or system. No sooner had Protestantism fairly sprung into existence than it sought to connect itself with the growing spirit of nationalism and offer to patriots a national religion in the place of a universal religion. In Switzerland Zwingli stood forth as the leader of civic democracy as well as of religious purity. In Germany Luther openly threw in his lot with the princes in their perpetual struggle against the Emperor on the one side and the Socialistic tendencies of the populace on the other. In France the Huguenots appear as the party of the smaller nobles against the Crown and the great nobles. In Sweden the cause of Lutheranism is bound up with the cause of the Vasa dynasty against the Catholic house of Jagellon, just as closely as in Holland Calvinism is bound up with the cause of the independence of the burghers of Amsterdam and the great towns against the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of Philip II. The influence of politics upon the religious movement was mixed, as it always is. It did some good and some harm. It weakened the purity of the religious sentiment. It gave stability to the religious system. Without the protection of Frederick the Wise and the support of the German princes the work of Luther would quickly have become only a religious memory, like that of Savonarola. There would have been no Schmalkaldic League and no Thirty Years' War. But it would not have degenerated into the lethargic handmaid of world power, as has so often been the case, or been content to figure as a policeman decked in the trappings of a priest.

The Scottish Reformation Calvinistic.—In no country were these two great characteristics of Protestantism—the desire to clear away abuse root and branch from the religious system, and the desire to base the religious system

upon the sentiment of nationalism—more conspicuous than in Scotland. The Reformation in Scotland has often been described as the uprising of outraged religious and moral feeling against patent misgovernment and religious abuse. It has often, too, been described as the uprising of the nation as a nation against foreign influence and domination. Both descriptions are true. Scotland, like Holland, could only preserve its independence by being intensely self-centred. Its strength lay in cutting off the bands which bound it to the great world outside and in developing its own character in its own way, relying on its poverty as its chief defence. There was little love for the Church as an institution. In no country perhaps were the abuses of the mediæval Church system more rampant. In few countries was the religious instinct more alive and so little done to satisfy it. In the struggle which broke out between Catholicism and Protestantism the strength of the nation was found in the ranks of Protestantism. Religious fervour, personal character, national feeling, even logical system, were arrayed on that side, and its victory was hailed as the opening of a new era in the national life. To a great extent, then, anticipations have been realised. In no Christian country has religion had more direct effect in moulding the national character for good or for ill. In few has the type of religion taught been so intensely dogmatic and exclusive. Scottish Calvinism has been a special type of its own. It has been more true to the teaching of its founder than has the Calvinism of England, Holland, or Switzerland. It has not hesitated to teach the terrible doctrines of election and reprobation in all the uncompromising severity laid down in the Institutes of Calvin. But at the same time it has maintained more staunchly than any other Calvinistic body the comparatively lofty views of the Sacraments and of the ministerial office enunciated by Calvin, and Scottish Presbyterianism has often shown itself more exclusively sacerdotal in principle than the Church of Rome or of England. It has sometimes laid great stress upon the grace of Ordination, and its transmission in regular order from the Apostles. Like the Church, it maintains the necessity of Holy Orders, but

differs from the Church in deriving them through the Presbyterate or Synod of Ministers, and not through the Episcopate. In Scotland Presbyter has indeed proved itself to be but Priest writ large.

The Reformation in England.—In England the course of the Reformation took yet another shape. The abuses of the mediæval Church system, although serious, were not such as to make men, and especially Englishmen, hurry into revolution in despair of reform. The Church was unpopular, not because she was wicked, but because she was oppressive. It was the petty tyranny of Church officials, much more than any deep-seated feeling of antagonism between the teaching of Christ and the practical system of the Church, which made England willingly acquiesce in religious change. But the great difference between the course of the Reformation in England and in other countries was this. Elsewhere it was a spontaneous growth; the demand for it came in some shape or other from the people. Civil and ecclesiastical authorities had to deal with a movement which they found in existence. They did not begin it. In England, on the contrary, the Reformation movement was begun by the Crown. All the most important Acts of the Reformation in England, from the first serious step taken against the power of the Pope in 1531 down to the restoration of the Anglican Church system in 1660, were initiated by the government. Sometimes, no doubt, the people were anxious for them. This is probably true of the general Church legislation of 1531, 1532, and 1533, of the restoration of the Latin services at the accession of Mary, and of the restoration of the Church system in 1660. Sometimes a section of the people were keenly enthusiastic for them, as they undoubtedly were for the translation of the Scriptures into English, for the alteration of the service-books, for the abolition of various ornaments and ceremonies on the one side, and the Law of the Six Articles and the restoration of the Papal authority on the other. But usually the people were passively acquiescent. They fell into line as the order was given. They accepted religious change initiated by the Government as they accepted any other Act of the

Government. They might not like it. Certainly they would never have carried it out of themselves. But they did not dislike it enough to risk their lives and their property in a struggle with a government which was strong, ruthless, and, on the whole, popular. When it was carried out they were not too scrupulous in trying to make the best of it for themselves. From the Russell or the Seymour who made himself rich and powerful out of the spoils of bishopries and religious houses, down to the villager who helped himself to lead from the roof of the dismantled abbey church, or built himself a new house and barn with the stones of the confiscated chantry chapel, but few were found unwilling to profit by the misfortunes of their clerical neighbours who had incurred the high displeasure of the King. It is significant that the only armed protests against the religious changes which were initiated by Henry VIII., Edward VI., or Mary, were directed against changes which interfered with the ordinary social and religious life of the people, like the destruction of the great monasteries and the introduction of the English Prayer Book instead of the Latin services, and they were in the nature of local, not national, risings. Far more important acts, like the repudiation of the authority of the Pope, or the acknowledgment of the King as Supreme Head on earth of the Church, not merely passed without much protest, but were accepted with singularly little hesitation. The reason is not far to seek. Englishmen were then, as now, stubbornly national and stubbornly loyal; but they were not irreligious. They resented foreign domination, even when it came to them in the guise of a spiritual autocracy. They became bitterly weary of it when the rule of spiritual autocracy had proved itself to be a rule of exaction and of oppression. Hardly an Englishman was found to stir a finger to maintain the authority of the Pope when the Crown made up its mind to attack it. Papal rule in England fell laden with the weight of its own misdeeds at the first blast of the royal trumpet. It fell long before any change whatever was made in the religious system of the country, sixteen years before any serious change was made in the doctrine, worship, or

ceremonial of the Church. The very fact that the changes which were made were dictated by royal policy, not by popular or sectarian enthusiasm, was a guarantee that they would proceed upon principle and not upon passion, and represent not only a revolt against Papal methods, but a definite theological and historical theory of the Church. Protestantism abroad had to formulate its principles and its theory of the Church as it grew, and different Protestant bodies formulated different principles and different theories. The Reformation in England, on the contrary, was the application of principles and theories already well known and frequently acted on in past ages to the existing state of affairs—an attempt to bring back the existing Church system into harmony with the best and soundest thought of primitive ages. Thus, in repudiating Papal rule as exercised in England, Englishmen were simply taking the only step open to them by way of protest against the mediæval theory of the Papacy enunciated by John of Salisbury and St. Thomas Aquinas, and endeavouring to enforce the older and more constitutional view held uniformly throughout the East, and asserted in the West by Imperial writers like Marsiglio of Padua. So, again, when a few years later the English Church refused to continue to impress the doctrine of transubstantiation upon its members, it was because that doctrine, as then defined, was the product of mediæval scholastic thought, and was not taught in that form by the Fathers. Hence the course of the Reformation in England proceeded on the whole in well-ordered procession, for it was based from the first upon well-established principles, and it continued true to them to the end. From time to time in its history came great crises. From time to time it seemed that new principles altogether were going to prevail. For three years in the reign of Edward VI. a strenuous effort was made to assimilate the religion of England to that of Switzerland. For four years in the reign of Mary, England was caught in the net of the Counter-Reformation, and became Papal almost in the modern sense of the term. For a short time in the reign of Elizabeth it took all the strength of the Queen's will

and all the loyalty of the Queen's ministers to maintain the distinctive character of the English Church against the political and ecclesiastical influences brought to bear in favour of union with foreign Protestantism. But in the end the old principles triumphed. Gradually in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. the nation divided itself religiously into two camps—Anglican and Calvinistic. That part of it which remained Anglican became more and more attached to the true principles of the Reformation. The Restoration settlement of 1660-62 finally set its seal to the work. The principles which underlay the ecclesiastical and parliamentary legislation of Henry VIII. were maintained in skeleton by the legislation of Elizabeth, and were made living active centres of spiritual force by the writings and the lives of Hooker and Herbert, Andrewes and Laud, Donne and Jeremy Taylor. And from 1662 these principles have been the acknowledged principles of the reformed English Church.

The Church of England consistent.—The events of the sixteenth century therefore left the English Church in a position peculiarly open to misunderstanding. In political life the man who sits apart from party, and brings an enlightened and balanced judgment to bear upon public affairs, seeking ever to base his conduct upon well-established principles, and preferring even to say nothing rather than to speak too hastily on doubtful questions, is a man whom the thoughtful and the wise in after ages will admire and follow, but the thoughtless and the prejudiced will misunderstand and dub with the name of the Trimmer. To the superficial observer, the Church of England has seemed since the sixteenth century to be the Trimmer of ecclesiastical politics. Men have looked upon her from one side only, and claimed or attacked her as wholly Protestant. Others have looked at her entirely from another side, and denied her the title of Protestant at all. Others in a contemptuous and hasty cynicism have tried to evade the difficulty by assuming that she is a mere bundle of compromises between opposing and mutually destructive principles, tied together and held together by the State,

which trims her sails for her now in one direction, now in another, to catch the varying winds of public opinion. The truth is, as we have seen, far otherwise. If in some things she has refused to dogmatise where others have freely dogmatised, it is not because she weakly evades responsibility, but because she deliberately refuses to speak beyond what is written, and to bind the freedom of man's conscience where there is no clear revelation. She deliberately denies that theory of the Church which represents her as a sort of automatic machine, ready at all times to produce a final decision on a question of faith and morals if a penny is put in the slot. If she retains within her portals those who hold very conflicting opinions upon important religious subjects, it is not because she has abdicated her office of teacher, and cares not for the truth, but because she has deliberately refused to impose as a test of membership anything beyond the creeds and conciliar decisions of the undivided Church, and prefers to educate rather than to punish. If indeed she be the Trimmer of ecclesiastical politics, it is only in the sense in which George Savile was the Trimmer in civil politics—a man who, living in times of great political excitement, ruled his public conduct by what he believed to be the true principles of the English constitution, and in so doing often found himself in sympathy with much of the action of both the rival political parties, but hardly ever in full agreement with either. So amid the jarring of creeds, the dogmatism of theologians, the fanaticism of partisans which has done so much to weaken Christianity and desolate Europe since the sixteenth century, the Church of England has held consistently a middle course at the risk of inevitable misunderstanding and partial isolation, not because she seeks to unite two opposite systems, but because she believes that to combine the principles of liberty and authority without exaggeration, to leave to the human conscience the fullest moral responsibility consistent with the existence of a Divine revelation, to train the souls of mankind by patience and sympathy rather than by coercion and punishment, to handle the reins of discipline as gently as loyalty to a Divinely appointed

organisation will permit, is to be true to the principles of the primitive Church, and to be consonant with the methods of Christ Himself.

Is the Church of England Protestant?—If this be true, the question naturally suggests itself, and is often asked, Is the Church of England Protestant? The answer obviously depends upon the sense in which the word Protestant is used. People often divide Christendom in their minds into two divisions, which they call Protestant and Roman Catholic, and assume that all Christian bodies must fall under one head or the other. Such a division is theologically and historically false. There are millions of Christians belonging to the Churches of the East, orthodox and heterodox, who are not and never have been either Protestant or Roman Catholic, and rightly repudiate both terms as representing declensions from the true ideal of the primitive Church. If the word Protestant is used strictly, it means the religious systems founded in Europe in the sixteenth century by Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin, and their followers. In that sense Protestantism never became engrafted on to the Church of England. Although the revisers of the English formularies frequently availed themselves of the works of Lutheran and Calvinistic theological writers, they always brought them into relation with English Church principles, and were careful to exclude expressions which might seem to express distinctive Zwinglian, Lutheran, or Calvinistic teaching. There is nothing in the Prayer Book or Articles which was taught by Zwingli, Luther, or Calvin, which was not also taught by the primitive Church; while there is much in the teaching and organisation of Zwinglian, Lutheran, and Calvinistic bodies which is directly opposed to the English Prayer Book and Articles. If terms are strictly used, it is therefore impossible to rank the Church of England among Protestant bodies from a theological or historical point of view. But, usually speaking, men do not use precise language on ecclesiastical subjects. When ignorant people talk of Protestantism, it is generally in opposition to what they call Catholicism, and by Catholicism they mean Roman Catholicism.

In the west of Europe the division is sufficiently true for practical purposes if the English Church is left out of account; and as the English Church has until recent years been small and unimportant, European writers have assumed that because she is not Roman Catholic she must be Protestant, and they have often included her among Protestant bodies. Greater knowledge and more accurate inquiry have already produced a very different style of writing among theologians and historians, but still to most people in Europe and to many in England the Church of England is Protestant because she is not Roman Catholic. If all that is meant by the word is that the Church of England is one with the Protestant bodies of Europe in their repudiation of the claims of the Pope to be universal bishop, and their repudiation of merely papal doctrines, she has no reason to object to the title, and it is in that sense that the word is used in the Coronation Service and the Act of Succession. But if we would be just, we must remember that there are deeper reasons than the rejection of Papal usurpation which induce men to call the Church of England Protestant. The Protestant movement of the sixteenth century, though in many respects regrettable, was often bound up with great thoughts and principles of conduct which have been of permanent value to civilisation, and are not in any way the monopoly of the theological systems which are in strictness called Protestant. They are principles which are brought into prominence in every great revival of human energy, and form a necessary part of every advancing wave of human civilisation. But undoubtedly in the great struggles of the sixteenth century in western Europe they were mainly championed at first by those arrayed on the Protestant side. The supreme importance of right conduct, the inalienable responsibility of every man for shaping his own life, the moral supremacy of the conscience, the emancipation of the intellect from invented systems, the vindication of the function of reason in the enlightenment of the conscience and intellect, the intrinsic importance of knowledge, the right of the Christian laity to understand and follow the services of

the Church, their right to the open Bible,—such are among the principles brought into prominence by Protestantism in the sixteenth century, though often unfortunately divorced from other aspects of the truth. They are not principles necessarily bound up with Protestant belief. Lutheranism and Calvinism, where they have been completely established, have proved themselves quite as intolerant of independent thought, quite as oblivious of the rights of the conscience as Rome herself. But no doubt the general tendency has been, from the sixteenth century to the present day, for Rome to insist more and more upon authority, and to permit less and less independence of thought and worship and conduct as far as her power extends, and for Protestant bodies to become more and more anxious to meet the claims of human thought, until they have become in danger of losing sense of many of the Divine commands, and of reducing the service of God into the service of man. In England the Reformation attempted, not unsuccessfully, to combine the two elements in just proportion, as they were combined in the early days of the Catholic Church. The English Church retained most scrupulously, as she conceived it, the faith, the organisation, the practice of the undivided Church, and as part of that practice she found the rights of the conscience and of the intellect and the importance of intelligible worship freely maintained. In reasserting them after a long period of obscurity, she showed her appreciation of what was good and Catholic in Protestantism, and endeavoured to hold out a truer standard of Christian faith and life than either that of the corrupted Catholicism of Papal Rome, or that of the contradictory systems of the Continental reformers.

CHAPTER II

THE BREACH WITH ROME

Growth of English dislike of Rome.—For many years before the accession of Henry VIII. to the English throne, there had been widespread dissatisfaction among the English people with the condition of the Church at home, and especially with the methods of government adopted by the Pope and the Roman officials. In the centuries which had elapsed since the Norman Conquest, the Pope had succeeded in absorbing into his own hands the chief departments of Church government one by one. He had obtained for himself and his own courts of law the supreme administration of justice. Even in the English Church courts the rules and procedure of the Papal courts and canon law were usually observed. He had succeeded in making himself a necessary party to the appointment of all bishops; so that if a man was consecrated to be a bishop without his previous sanction, the consecration would be considered irregular, though not invalid. He had established fairly successfully claims to levy taxes and exact fees from the English clergy on various pretexts, and was in the habit of drawing large sums of money from England under this head every year. By the system of exempting certain religious orders, or certain religious houses, from the control of their diocesan bishops, he had procured a direct influence of a very marked kind over large numbers of the monks and the friars. It is true that not one of these important powers had been gained without a struggle, and there was not one of them which had not been frequently protested against, even after it had been practically gained.

But the pressure from Rome was steady and consistent, the opposition of the English clergy and laity fitful and unorganised. Practically the English Church, in the later Middle Ages, could only resist the Pope successfully when it was supported and led by the State. This is the reason why the long series of protests, remonstrances, petitions, and statutes directed against the encroachments of the Papacy in the Middle Ages emanated from bodies which were secular in character, though they contained a considerable number of ecclesiastics like Parliament itself. But the State not infrequently found it more politic to abet the Pope in his demands than to resist him, and in that case discontent grew apace, for the sense of impotence was added to the experience of wrong. Upon a society so profoundly discontented with things as they were, came the doctrinal and half-socialistic teachings of the Lollards and the new views of life and systems of thought which ushered in the Renaissance. Men felt that a new era was beginning, and were prepared for change. The divinity which once hedged in the Pope as the Head of the Universal Church had now transferred its protective powers to guard the King as the Head of the nation. Leaders like Wolsey or Henry VIII. were profoundly orthodox in faith, but they were profoundly independent in policy. The bulk of the people valued good government more even than traditional orthodoxy, and were prepared to follow authority even into questionable paths, as long as it freed them from rapacity and misgovernment.

Change in the relations between England and the Papacy was therefore inevitable, and when it came it was certain to take the form of greater independence of the Papacy and greater self-government on the part of England. But there was no reason why it should cause a rupture between the two powers. The assertion of the royal supremacy and of the national character of the English Church were commonplaces of legal and ecclesiastical writers. Administrative reforms, such as the diversion of the funds of religious houses to secular collegiate foundations, had been carried out on a considerable scale by Henry V. as well as by Wolsey. The

recognition of Henry VIII. by the clergy as supreme head of the English Church, and the suppression of the monasteries, would never of themselves have brought about a breach between England and the Papacy.

Henry's Divorce of Catherine.—In ordinary circumstances the demand of Henry VIII. for a declaration of the nullity of his marriage with Catherine of Arragon would have created no difficulty. The Papacy had long been scandalously lax with regard to marriage and divorce. It had recognised the second marriage of Philip Augustus of France, though it had taken place in virtue of a sentence of divorce pronounced by the National Church in opposition to Papal directions, and had set aside the first marriage of Louis XII. on the ground of sterility. What the Papacy had done for France it could do for England. Had the question presented itself to Henry VIII. and Clement VII. in a simple form, it would easily have been solved. Unfortunately, it presented itself in the most complicated form imaginable. As we have seen, it presented itself at a time when Rome was extremely unpopular in the nation, at a time when the King was powerful, headstrong, and beloved. It presented itself in a form which raised very serious technical difficulties; for Clement was asked to pronounce invalid, either on substantial or technical grounds, a solemn act of one of his predecessors, which had been carefully made as valid as legal precaution could make it. The Papal lawyers felt that if the dispensation of Julius II. could be set aside, no act of the Papal Chancery could be considered as absolutely secure. But this was not all. It was further complicated by serious moral considerations. After the year 1527 it was a matter of common knowledge at Rome, as well as everywhere else, that Henry VIII. desired to be freed from his marriage ties with Catherine of Arragon, chiefly because he was passionately in love with Anne Boleyn. But it is likely that all these difficulties, serious as they were, would have been surmounted, had it not been for the still more serious complications occasioned by the political and ecclesiastical state of Europe. Hence an attitude of opposition.

The demand of Henry VIII. to be released from his

marriage with Catherine was necessarily from the first one of European importance, and not merely one of those personal questions in the solution of which the aid of the Pope is from time to time invoked by powerful sovereigns; for the lady to whom it was proposed to do this grievous wrong was the aunt of Charles v., who was not only King of Spain, Emperor and ruler of half the civilised world, but was the chief bulwark upon which Clement could rely to stem the advancing tide of Protestantism in Germany. More than this, negotiations had hardly commenced in earnest between Henry and the Pope than the latter found himself by an unexpected turn of Fortune's wheel absolutely at the mercy of Charles. From that moment it became almost a political impossibility for Clement to grant the request of the English King. The alternative before him was indeed a distressing one. If he granted Henry VIII. his will, he hopelessly alienated Charles v., lost all political influence in Italy, and probably condemned himself to impotence for the rest of his life. If he obeyed his master the Emperor, he ran the risk of losing the allegiance of England.

The Royal Supremacy.—Neither Clement nor Henry VIII. were under any illusions with regard to one another. From the time that it became probable that Clement would finally side with the Emperor, Henry had been preparing the ground in England for the successful repudiation of the claims of the Pope to administrative supremacy over England. He determined that if his people would support him, he would carry out his will even in spite of the Pope's prohibition, and appeal to the national spirit and traditions of independence against a system which he knew to be unpopular. The simple record of his acts shows clearly the policy which he adopted and the care which he took to make it effective. In 1526 he opened negotiations with Clement VII. for a declaration of the nullity of his marriage. In 1527 Rome was stormed by the Imperialist troops, and Clement became a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo. In 1528 the English envoys were directed to threaten the Pope with the loss of the allegiance of England if he did not accede to Henry's

demands. In 1529, on the failure of the negotiations with the Pope, Henry dismissed Wolsey and summoned a Parliament to meet for legislation, contrary to the uniform practice of all kings since the Wars of the Roses, and took great care to secure that only those should be returned to the House of Commons upon whose support he could rely. In the session of 1530 he tested its temper and secured its approbation by small but useful measures of ecclesiastical reform directed against the fees of the clergy and the officials of the Church Courts. By this time he saw that he need not fear Parliamentary opposition in a campaign against the Pope. In 1531 he took advantage of a purely technical offence against the Statute of Præmunire which had been committed by the clergy, to procure from the Convocations of both provinces of Canterbury and York, under threat of outlawry, an acknowledgment that they recognised the King to be 'the singular protector, only and supreme lord, and so far as the law of Christ will allow, supreme head of the English Church and clergy.' Secure thus of the support of Parliament and of the obedience of the Convocations, Henry was ready to proceed boldly. In 1532, by the Act in Restraint of the Payment of Annates, he asserted the right of the English Church to consecrate its own bishops, and celebrate the sacraments without first procuring the sanction of the Pope. By the submission of the clergy agreed to by Convocation in the same year, and embodied in an Act of Parliament in 1534, he obtained control over the system of law which was administered in the English Church Courts. By the Act in Restraint of Appeals passed in 1533, he asserted the right of the English Church to decide finally all questions of ecclesiastical law within the realm, and put a stop to the system of sending cases to be decided on appeal in Rome. By these measures the powers of government which the Pope claimed to have in virtue of his office as Pope over the English Church were taken away from him, and the position was definitely taken up that the powers of government which the Pope had been in the habit of exercising during the last few hundred years had been exercised by virtue of arrangement

with the English Church and licence from the English Crown, and not in virtue of prerogative inherent in the Papal office. That position was most clearly laid down in the preamble to the Statute in Restraint of Appeals. It is the master thread which runs through all the ecclesiastical legislation of these momentous years, and binds it on to the legislation of Elizabeth. Could the Popes have once brought themselves to acknowledge the constitutional and historical justness of the claim, there would have been no permanent division. But, unfortunately, things were tending in the opposite direction. It was impossible for Clement to satisfy Henry in the matter of his marriage because of his obligations to the Emperor. Consequently, Henry took steps to assert the rights of the English Church to independence of the Pope in certain departments of administration. That assertion of independence was accepted by the spiritualty and welcomed by the laity of England almost without exception. By virtue of it the Convocations of the English Church pronounced against the validity of the King's marriage with Catherine in 1533. A few weeks later the Archbishop of Canterbury (Cranmer) formally declared it void, and Anne Boleyn became the legal and canonical wife of Henry VIII. as far as the English Church and realm could make her so. But, as we have seen, the Pope could not, in the interests of the Church in Italy and Germany and his own security, recognise either of these acts even as accomplished facts. He was still less likely to acknowledge the truth of the theory of the limitation of his own power upon which they proceeded. Consequently, an estrangement sprang up between the two powers, which was embittered by personal attacks on both sides. Henry removed the Pope's name from the public services, and declared that he had no more power in England than any other foreign bishop. The Pope prepared a bull of excommunication against Henry and his abettors. By 1535 the breach was too wide to be bridged over in the lifetime of Henry or Charles V. By the time that they were dead the Papacy had put itself at the head of the Counter-Reformation movement, and was seeking to reconquer Europe by the theory of a Papacy supreme,

infallible, and almost divine, whose teaching it was sinful to question, whose policy it was treason to oppose. Such a theory was pledged to destroy, not to make terms with national Churches; and the Church of England, like the Church of France, found in the reformed Papacy a sleepless, virulent, and unscrupulous foe. In England itself, too, a generation had arisen far more anti-papal in its sentiments than that of 1534. Many had had their eyes opened to the weak places in the Papal armour, more had their interests affected by having become rich out of the spoils of the Church. Religious conviction with some, personal interest with others, bound them to oppose an accommodation with the Pope. And so it came about that the breach of 1534 had become an impassable gulf by 1559. Men realised more and more that the true line of England's progress lay along the path of independence. They rejected each effort at amalgamation as it was made. Terms of formal union with German Lutheranism under Henry VIII., absorption by the Rhineland Calvinists in the reign of Edward VI., conquest by Roman Catholicism of the Papal and Spanish type in the time of Mary, were one by one thrown off by the nation as by a giant in his sleep. When England woke under Elizabeth to a full sense of her power and destiny, she deliberately rallied to the national religion, as she did to the national sovereign, and prepared herself to face without fear the risks of a splendid isolation in religious as well as political matters.

The breach with Rome was therefore, as a matter of fact, complete in 1534. So far it had been carried out with singular unanimity. Not only had Convocation and Parliament supported each step which had been taken, but the clergy all over the country, almost without exception, and the official classes had taken a personal oath recognising the validity of the marriage between Henry and Anne Boleyn and repudiating the authority of the Pope. The dissentients were indeed distinguished for their character and reputation, but they were singularly few in number. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, the most respected of the bishops; Sir Thomas More, the late Chancellor, the most eminent of laymen; and the Franciscan Friars Observant of Greenwich and Richmond, were the only

persons who found themselves unable to take the oath. Never was so great a change effected with such apparent harmony.

But the King and his chief adviser Cromwell knew quite well that however unwilling the nation as a whole was to raise a finger in defence of the power of the Pope when the Crown was heading a campaign against him, the influence which the Pope could bring to bear, both abroad and at home, was by no means to be despised. The clergy were frightened at the masterfulness of the royal policy and the growth of Lutheran and Zwinglian opinions among the people. The nobles chafed to see themselves ousted from political power in favour of upstarts and favourites like Cromwell and the Boleyns. A combination was by no means impossible between the nobles and the clergy, supported by the Emperor, which should clip the growing wings of the Crown and restore the authority of the Pope. Henry set himself strenuously to avert this danger. He opened negotiations with France and with the German Lutherans, with the object of keeping Charles v. fully occupied with European affairs. He took the first pretext which came ready to hand to put to death all in his power who had any shadow of claim to the throne. He thus did his best to secure himself from attacks from the outside. At home he pursued a policy which was as effective as it was tyrannical. By the Verbal Treasons Act of 1534 all opposition to the royal policy in ecclesiastical or civil matters, whether in act or only in word, was made high treason; and those who were looked upon as prominent critics of the Government, such as Fisher and More and the monks of the London Charterhouse, were put to death. No word of criticism, much less any act of dissent, was permitted. By this recognition of the supremacy, and the submission of the clergy, Henry had already obtained control over the clergy as a whole. By the Verbal Treasons Act he became master of both clergy and laity as individuals.

The Dissolution of the Monasteries.—But there were still two classes of the community from whom danger might come—the religious and the nobles—and Henry

determined to purchase the support of the one by the confiscation of the other. In the year 1535 special powers were conferred on Cromwell as Vicar-General of the King, with the object of carrying out the suppression of the religious houses and the confiscation of their property to the King. Commissioners were appointed to examine into the affairs of the religious houses and the lives of their inmates, and were empowered to take surrenders of their property. During the years 1536, 1537, and 1538 nearly all the religious houses in England were suppressed on one pretext or another. Some made voluntary surrenders, some had surrenders forced from them, some were forfeited for treasonable practices after the abortive insurrection in the North in 1536, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, most of the smaller houses perished in virtue of an Act of Parliament passed in 1536, which gave to the King all religious houses with an income of less than £200 a year. Some were suppressed without any legal authority at all. Finally, all that remained were granted to the King by Act of Parliament in 1539. Most of the plate and jewels from the dismantled shrines was sent straight to the coffers of the King, but the larger part of the lands of the religious houses was given by the Crown to the nobles. Thus the most influential men in England became pledged to the support of the anti-papal policy of the Crown by the strong tie of personal interest. With the monks and the friars and the nuns reduced to penury, with the clergy reduced to impotence, with the nobles pledged to his policy, and partners of his oppression, with foreign nations fully occupied with their own internal difficulties, with all possible leaders or propagators of disaffection summarily disposed of, Henry felt at last that he was safe. He had carried out the most notable change in English history with extraordinarily little friction, and, on the whole, with very little shedding of blood. The question of the future was, Would he be able to maintain the position which he had so successfully taken up?

CHAPTER III

RELIGIOUS CHANGES IN ENGLAND

Internal Reforms in the Church.—By the end of 1535 the Reformation movement in the English Church was complete as regards her relations to external authority. She had freed herself entirely from the claims which the Popes had been making upon her in ever-increasing volume since the Norman Conquest, and in so doing had been obliged to interrupt the filial relations with the Papacy which she had dutifully observed ever since the coming of St. Augustine. On the other hand, she had definitely pledged herself to submit to a control on the part of the Crown over the working of her administrative system and the making of her laws, which was, in fact, greater than had hitherto been customary, and was liable quickly to degenerate into sheer tyranny in the hands of a headstrong or unscrupulous prince. But in so doing she had been careful to assert that she did not intend to do anything, and did not, as a matter of fact, do anything to impair the continuity of her descent from the Church of the Apostles, or imperil in the slightest extent the validity of her claim to be the Catholic Church in this country. Nor, indeed, to judge from the unanimity with which this policy as a whole was accepted by all classes in the nation, was there much doubt among Englishmen as to the truth of the claim. So far the changes which had taken place did not touch the ordinary religious life of Englishmen. They were mainly in the region of historical theory and constitutional principle, not of practical religious change for good or for ill.

But during the years in which the struggle with Rome

had been going on there had gradually grown up in England in more than one quarter an ardent desire for practical religious change.

The doctrines of Zwingli came over into England from the Low Countries, and a small but ardent party of Zwinglians soon made their presence known by their opposition to the sacramental system of the Church. They never had any chance of obtaining tolerance, much less approval, from Henry VIII., who was the consistent enemy of Swiss Protestantism all his life, and himself presided at the trial of Lambert in 1538, in order that the royal mouth should have the credit of refuting the heretic. In London, however, and some of the towns in the east and south, which had close relations with the continent, the Sacramentaries, as they were called, obtained considerable influence among the people. The writings of Luther played a more important part. The Lutheran princes of Germany occupied a political position of some distinction in Europe, and their friendship was eagerly sought by all those opposed to the Emperor. Some of the rising statesmen of Henry's court, especially Cromwell, were anxious in consequence to effect a close alliance between England and the League of Schmalkald, and get Henry VIII. acknowledged as Protector of the League. At the same time Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, though a weak and pliable politician, was honourably distinguished in that self-seeking court by his fearless honesty in his search after truth, had been much impressed by the learning and piety of the great Lutheran theologian Melanchthon. Under the leadership of Cromwell and Cranmer a definite attempt was made in 1538 to bring about a formal union, both religious and political, between England and the North German Lutherans. It failed ignominiously as a scheme of union, or even alliance; but the study of Lutheran writings which it fostered powerfully affected the minds of Cranmer and of some of the other leading theologians in England, and has left its impress on the language of the English formularies.

The Church more Catholic and more National.—But the bulk of the party of religious reform in England

owed little or none of its inspiration to foreign influence. It was essentially national, and busied itself after the manner of Englishmen much more with the practical reform of religious abuse than with the exact definition of religious truth. In pursuing this policy the reformers in the reign of Henry VIII. kept before them three great objects. They desired, in the first place, as so many reformers before them had desired, to purge the Church of superstitious practices, which the credulity of the people had demanded, and the ignorance and often the poverty of the clergy encouraged. Such practices, for the most part, drew their strength from the system of pilgrimages to specially favoured shrines and the worshipping of specially honoured relics, which had become so common in the Middle Ages, and led to much sordid dealing and some actual imposture on the part of the clergy who profited by it. The burning of some of the wonder-working images, the exposure of the frauds connected with them, followed by the suppression of the religious houses and the destruction of the celebrated shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury in 1538, and of images which had been used for superstitious purposes, were advocated and defended from that point of view. Putting aside the needless vandalism and irreverence which accompanied the rifling of the shrines, there can be little doubt that their suppression as centres of popular devotion and incentives to popular superstition was in the true interests of the Church, and did much to purify the religious conceptions of the people.

Secondly, the reforming party in the English Church desired to take full advantage of the great helps to the acquisition and distribution of religious knowledge brought about by the new learning and the invention of printing. With this object they pressed for an authorised translation of the Bible and the use of English in the public services of the Church. Their success was only partial. The bishops offered no objection to an authorised translation of the Scriptures, but desired that the work should be undertaken by responsible divines of the English Church, and naturally refused to adopt the translations of Tyndale and Coverdale,

which had been made in Germany, and contained a number of expressions designedly introduced to combat doctrines which the Church of England held. But for some reason or other the King refused to let the bishops undertake the work, and eventually all that was done was to authorise by royal authority the use of a revised edition of Tyndale and Coverdale, known as the Great Bible, in 1538. Still, imperfect as the work was, after 1538 it was possible for every Englishman to obtain access to the whole Bible in his own language. The use of English in the services of the Church was in like manner delayed by being mixed up with the larger question of the revision of the services, but there seems to have been no objection in principle to the change. Anyhow, the first steps were taken in that direction by the authorisation of the Litany in English in 1544, and the provisions made by Convocation in 1543 for the reading of lessons in English every Sunday, as well as the customary instruction of the people in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in English.

In the third place, they desired that the laity should be able to take an intelligent part in Divine worship, as they were accustomed to do in earlier ages, and not content themselves with merely being present while worship was being offered on their behalf, as was too often the case in the Middle Ages. To effect this it was necessary that the laity should be better instructed, that the services should be simplified and made more intelligible, and that they should be in English and not in Latin. Of these objects, the first seemed to Henry VIII. and his advisers to be the most pressing.

New Religious Books.—No less than four documents were drawn up by the bishops and published with the sanction of the King during the last ten years of his reign, with the object of guiding the faith and devotion of Englishmen into right channels. In 1536 the Book of the Ten Articles was published, containing teaching on such subjects as the creeds, the sacraments, justification, and the ceremonies of the Church, some of which was subsequently incorporated in the Thirty-nine Articles of Queen Elizabeth's reign. In 1537 appeared a more

elaborate treatise of instruction, called the 'Institution of a Christian Man.' In 1543 followed a carefully expressed revision of the 'Institution,' under the name of 'The Necessary Erudition for any Christian Man'; and finally, in 1545 an authorised devotional primer was issued to take the place of the various primers of devotion which were used by the educated in the Middle Ages. These various books show quite clearly the principles which actuated Henry VIII. and his advisers in carrying out the Reformation of the Church during his reign. Just as they were careful to justify their repudiation of the authority of the Pope on the grounds that his claims as made had no warrant by the words of Scripture, the tradition of the Catholic Church, or the acceptance of the English Church, so in carrying out their practical reformation they are careful to refer back to the authority of Scripture as witnessed to by the great teachers of the undivided Church; and though they do not hesitate to adopt the words of later, and not infrequently of Lutheran divines, it is only when they do not imply distinctive Lutheran theology. It is significant to notice that the English reformers, when they adapt Lutheran service books or definitions of doctrine for the use of the English Church, always omit or alter phrases and words which imply tenets held and taught by Lutheran, and not by Catholic, writers.

So although the English Reformers in the early part of the Reformation freely made use of the more moderate Lutheran formularies and service books, such as the 'Confession of Augsburg,' and the 'Consultation of Hermann,' and the 'Nuremburg Mass Book,' they showed by their use of them that they did not thereby intend to commit themselves to Lutheranism.

In like manner they used the reformed Roman breviary of Cardinal Quiñones without thereby committing themselves to doctrines or practices distinctively Roman. They were willing in their theological and liturgical work to draw impartially from all sources what seemed to be most fitting for their purpose. But as long as Henry VIII. lived it was certain that no step would be taken by England which would run the risk of

compromising her with any unorthodox tenets or practices.

Henry's Religious Belief.—Henry VIII. never in any way changed the religious opinions in which he had been brought up; and when he found that new religious opinions, like those enunciated by Luther and Zwingli respectively, on the doctrine of the sacraments and on that of the ministry, were gaining a footing in England, he did what he could to root them out by fire and sword. A Society called the Christian Brothers, which was a good deal affected by Luther's writings, was dispersed by Wolsey. In 1533 Frith and Hewett were tried by Cranmer and burned for their views on the Eucharist. In 1535 fourteen men were put to death for promulgating Anabaptist opinions. In 1538 Henry personally condemned Lambert to be burned for holding anti-sacramental views on the Eucharist. In 1539 Henry procured, by his own personal exertions, the passing of the Law of the Six Articles by Parliament, under which men might be delated for heretical opinions before a lay court and burned unless they subscribed to the mediæval definition of Transubstantiation. In 1540 three men were burned for holding the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only. To the end of his life he was perfectly consistent. There is no sign from first to last of doubt or hesitation. He held stedfastly to the religious faith in which he had been brought up, and was prepared to impose it upon all his subjects by pains and penalties. He maintained that his repudiation of the authority of the Pope lay entirely within his own rightful sphere of action, and did not affect, except incidentally, the religion of himself and of the nation.

He was willing, nay, anxious, to effect reforms in the practical system of the Church as well as in its legal and constitutional system, and with that object extended his favour to moral reformers like Latimer and theological reformers like Cranmer, and personally assisted them with his advice and instructions. Like an enlightened child of the new learning, he was no friend to reactionary theology or to superstitious practice. But in his religious

faith he was as firm as a rock. He left the Church of England when he died in 1547 practically revolutionised as regards her relations to the Pope and to the Crown, purged of a good deal of moral and official abuse, relieved of much which tended to induce superstitious practice, enriched by the use of the English language, assisted by carefully drawn manuals of religion in the national tongue, and rigidly orthodox in faith according to the more moderate mediæval expressions of orthodoxy.

Doctrine of the Church of England in 1547.—At the end of the reign of Henry VIII. the Church of England had repudiated the claim of the Pope to be a bishop of the whole Christian world, but had not repudiated the ancient Catholic view that the Bishop of Rome is the first bishop in the Christian world. The Church of England had condemned mediæval indulgences, but had retained the Catholic faith as to absolution given to the penitent through the priesthood. The Church of England had condemned the superstitious habit of invoking the saints as though they could themselves bestow gifts and graces, but had not condemned the long universal practice of asking them for their prayers. The Church of England had condemned the use of the word purgatory and the abuses connected with it, but had fully maintained the primitive and universal practice of praying for the faithful departed. And when it became necessary in 1546 to draw up a statement with regard to the mystical offering of the body and blood of Christ to the Divine Father in the Holy Eucharist, instead of adopting the superstitious theory which had been popular during the last hundred years, by which it was taught that each Mass is a fresh satisfaction or atonement for the daily sins of mankind, the following carefully chosen words were written: 'The Church, by the ministration of the priest, offereth daily at the mass for a sacrifice to Almighty God the selfsame body and blood of our Saviour Christ, under the form of bread and wine, in the remembrance and representation of Christ's Death and Passion. The same body and blood is the very propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the world, forasmuch as it is the selfsame in substance which was

offered upon the Cross for our redemption; and the oblation and action of the priest is also a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving unto God for His benefits, *and not the satisfaction for the sins of the world, for that is only to be attributed to Christ's Passion.'*

No doubt there were still defects to be removed. It was impossible to return in a day to the pure faith of the undivided Catholic Church. But a real improvement was taking place in doctrine, and the circulation which was given to a translation of the Bible, of which the bishops approved, and the gradual reform of the service books, and the introduction of English into the public services of the Church, were facts that augured well for the future.

CHAPTER IV

THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND MARY

The Protestant Privy Council.—When Henry VIII. died, Edward VI. was only nine years old. The duty of governing the kingdom accordingly fell into the hands of the Privy Council until the young King came of age. A struggle at once broke out upon ecclesiastical questions. Some of those who had been most strongly identified with the measures of Henry VIII., such as Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Wriothesley the Lord Chancellor, and Bonner, Bishop of London, were anxious, on grounds of general policy, to let things remain exactly as Henry VIII. had left them until the young King was old enough to direct the policy of the country for himself; and they further maintained, as a matter of constitutional principle, that the royal supremacy over the Church was a personal prerogative of the Crown, and could not be exercised by a body of councillors acting in the name of the Crown. The majority of the Council, however, with the Duke of Somerset, the King's uncle, at their head, took the other view, and were determined to exercise all the functions of royalty and to enjoy all its emoluments as far as they could. Somerset was made Lord Protector, Wriothesley was dismissed, and Gardiner and Bonner imprisoned on the first available pretext; and the Council, safe from criticism and opposition, applied themselves individually and collectively to the congenial task of transferring as much property as they could from the coffers of the Church into their own. It was a low-minded and sordid age. Hardly a statesman or a bishop can be found who was not guilty of impoverishing the

Church for his own private advantage. Men as unscrupulous as these were naturally unscrupulous in their use of the powers intrusted to them. The Council effected alterations in the furniture or services of the Church regardless of the rights of Convocation or the Episcopate, or even of Parliament. Bishops issued orders for the destruction of things to which they objected, without any legal or canonical authority whatever. For a few years the constitutional government of the Church by bishops and synods under the regulating authority of the Crown fell into abeyance, and in its place appeared part tyranny, part chaos. Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was not made of stuff stern enough to resist high-handed authority. Trained in the school of Henry VIII., he carried deference to the wishes of the Council to the verge of slavishness, and made no protest against their assumption of the governing powers of the Episcopate. His gifts were not those of the ruler, but of the theologian, the student, and the translator, and he was content to leave the government of men to the civil rulers while he devoted himself to the work of revising and correcting the doctrinal and liturgical formularies of the Church.

The Book of Common Prayer.—In carrying out this extremely delicate task Cranmer had to steer warily between the Scylla of mediæval and the Charybdis of contemporary error. If mediæval theologians had gone wrong in insisting on doubtful definitions of the mode of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, in exaggerating the position and prerogatives of the Bishop and See of Rome, and in elaborating a mechanical penitential system which could not fail to weaken the sense of sin and enervate the conscience, Luther had exaggerated the doctrine of the Fall and denied that of the Church, Zwingli had reduced the Sacraments to mere symbols, and Calvin had put the majority of the human race outside the possibility of salvation. To avoid falling into pitfalls such as these Cranmer had recourse to a principle which, as we have seen, had already played a considerable part in the English Reformation. Just as Henry VIII. had appealed to the state of affairs at a time before the Popes had

gained predominant authority over English Church affairs as a justification for restoring the relations between Rome and England to the condition in which they then were, so Cranmer appealed to a time before controversies began to be raised about the nature of the Eucharist, or the Divine prerogative of the Pope, or the treasury of merits, as the safest evidence of what the truth really was. If the Church of England professed the same faith as the undivided Church, she could not go far wrong. Accordingly, we find the appeal to antiquity forms the leading principle of the liturgical and doctrinal reformation, as the appeal to history did of the constitutional reformation of the English Church. The faith and practice of the undivided Church were taken as the touchstone by which all proposals for change were to be tried; subject to that, simplicity and intelligibility were to be the main objects to be achieved by the changes which were made. The work soon began. In March 1548 a form in English for receiving the Holy Communion was published by a committee of bishops and divines, and its use enforced by royal proclamation. In January the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., which had been drawn up by the same Committee, was enforced by an Act of Parliament, which provided that from Whitsunday, June 9, 1549, no other form should be employed in public worship.

The services in the different English dioceses before the Reformation differed considerably in detail, although there was a tendency to prefer the use of 'Sarum' or Salisbury. These various diocesan uses, like the present services of the Church of Rome, were of a mixed origin. They were mainly derived from the magnificent Roman service-books of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, which were originally used only in Rome and southern Italy. When St. Augustine came to England in AD. 597, another type of worship, known as the Gallican, prevailed in Britain, Spain, North Italy, and France. This was gradually replaced by the Roman. The mediæval English and Roman services contain many features of Gallican origin, sometimes inserted very clumsily into the Roman rite. Besides an element of confusion which was thereby

introduced, many grave defects attached to the later mediæval uses. In addition to the Holy Eucharist eight daily services were appointed to be said by the clergy, the most important of these services being Matins and Evensong. Now, it was originally intended that the obligation of reciting these services should cause all clergymen to say all the Psalms every week and read through the Bible every year; but by the time of the Reformation the services had become so much marred by the insertion of legends, by a bad arrangement of the Psalms and lessons, and by the addition of extra services, that the devotional system of the Church was half ruined.

Simultaneously with these changes, the service of the Eucharist or Mass had become affected. The actual words of the service had altered very little, but popular misinterpretations had gathered round its most sacred prayers, so that even many educated Christians believed that our Lord is present under the forms of bread and wine in a materialistic rather than in a mysterious fashion, and that the action of the priest caused a sort of repetition of the death of Christ. Besides this, the primitive practice of communicating every Sunday had been given up, and many Catholics thought that it was wrong to communicate more than once a year.[1] The practice of receiving the body of our Lord at Holy Communion, but not partaking of the chalice, had become common in England at the end of the thirteenth century, and was not remedied until the publication of the Order of the Communion in 1548.

A real reform in public worship was needed, and the need was supplied by the publication of the First Prayer Book. It is mostly translated from Latin originals or from Latin versions of continental books, and we must confess that Cranmer's skill as a translator was almost magical. His work is also marked by a wonderful

[1] It is important to observe that Erasmus, who was not particularly partial to priests, says plainly that the practice of rare communion was due 'not to the priests, but to the laity, in whom, alas! love hath grown too cold.' *Opp.* T. v. col. 503. Lug. Bat. 1704.

freedom from insularity. While it was based upon the Sarum Missal, Manual, and Pontifical, it was influenced by so many books that it is only with great difficulty that the full genealogy of the Prayer Book can be traced. The revised Roman breviary of Cardinal Quiñones, the so-called 'Mozarabic' Gallican Missal used at Toledo, the Greek liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, and the reformed German services used in the archdiocese of Cologne and those used in Schleswig-Holstein, are the foreign sources of the Prayer Book that call for special mention. The objects kept in view by Cranmer and his colleagues are sufficiently stated in the preface to the Prayer Book (now headed *Concerning the Service of the Church*), which is derived from the preface to the breviary of Quiñones. The Prayer Book made the services more simple and more congregational than the Latin services had been for many centuries, but simplicity was gained at the sacrifice of much that was edifying and scriptural in the mediæval services. No provision was made for worship at the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day, in spite of the primitive authority for such a custom; the beautiful old anthems were almost extirpated; and it is hard to see on what grounds no Epistle or Gospel was provided for the feasts of the Transfiguration and the Name of Jesus. The result, however, was that English public worship was brought back to the type of worship which prevailed in Western Europe in the age of St. Augustine and St. Gregory, and hardly anything that belonged to that age was omitted, except the anointing at confirmation. The anointing at baptism was retained as well as the apostolic custom of anointing the sick with prayers for their recovery. The Burial Service contained plain and explicit prayers for the deceased person, and provision was made for a Mass to be celebrated at burials. The sacrament was still reserved for the purpose of communicating the sick. The Mass or Communion Service differed from our present Communion Service in several particulars. It was directed that the service should begin with an Introit or Psalm sung at the entrance of the priest; the commandments were not read; the name of Mary, the Mother of God, was specially

mentioned in the praise offered for the saints, prayer was offered explicitly for the departed; the consecration included a prayer for the sanctification of the elements by the Holy Spirit and the Word; the words repeated in delivering the sacrament were only the first clause of those now used. It was directed that water should be mixed with the wine at the offertory, and that the *Benedictus* and *Agnus* should be sung. The Canon of the Mass, containing the account of the institution of the sacrament by our Lord and the consecration of the same, was more clearly arranged than in the mediæval books, and it implies the Catholic doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice.

The forms for the ordination of bishops, priests, and deacons were not published until 1550. There were no services which needed more careful revision. In particular, the later mediæval ordination of priests was of the most confused character, very unlike the majestic and simple early Roman form which can be found, but little altered, in the Anglo-Saxon Missal of Bishop Leofric. The later mediæval form for the ordination of priests contained the Gallican and the Roman forms joined together and supplemented by two other forms. The same four forms still exist in the modern Roman books, where the rubrics disguise the fact more successfully than the Sarum rubrics. The result of Cranmer's work was to restore the ordination services to a form which is fundamentally the same as the ancient Roman form, though not quite so simple. It should also be noticed that in compiling the new services Cranmer availed himself of various suggestions of the Lutheran Bucer, but scrupulously avoided accepting the Lutheran notion that the three orders of the ministry are substantially the same. Cranmer employed no material which he could not fit into the Catholic framework of the *Ordinal*.

The Protestant Misrule.—The publication of the First Prayer Book and the Ordinal marks the completion of the first, and in many respects the noblest, part of the English Reformation. It is true that the outward changes and improvements in public worship were very unpopular in a large part of England, especially in Devonshire and

Cornwall, where a serious insurrection broke out with a demand for a restoration of the Latin services. It was not a demand for a restoration of union with Rome. The English peasantry had no more desire than the English and Irish episcopate to see a restoration of papal supremacy and all that it involved.[1] But they wanted to hear the old words sung in the old way at Mass, Matins, Evensong, and Procession, and did not know why they should be urged to communicate more than once a year, though as late as the fourteenth century their forefathers had communicated more frequently. Ignorant as they were, there was considerable reason for their disquiet. With a little caution and patience, and much compassion and piety, they might have been gained. But their political masters were engaged in a game of their own, and had no intention of allowing it to be interrupted by the play of such fine feelings.

Somerset had realised from the first that his political ascendency could only be secured by the formation of a new party both in State and Church, and that party a Protestant one. In faith he was a Calvinist, in policy an Erastian, and in character a thief. He robbed the Church with insatiable rapacity. He destroyed three bishops' houses in order to build Somerset House, and it is said that he would have destroyed Westminster Abbey itself if he had not been bought off with a bribe of twenty manors. Nor did he only covet the vineyard of the Church. His library was furnished from the Guildhall, and he and his packed Parliament in 1547 not merely suppressed the chantries whose endowments had been devoted to prayers for the dead, but even decreed the confiscation of the endowments of lay corporations which had promoted the civic welfare of the living. They found that an attempt to enforce this

[1] This is testified plainly by Daniele Barbaro, the Venetian envoy, who says, 'The detestation of the Pope is now so confirmed that no one, *either of the new or old religion*, can bear to hear him mentioned.'—*Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), vol. v. p. 346. We observe that he describes Catholics who repudiated the Pope as members of *the old religion*.

latter part of the Act would cause resistance, and it was therefore abandoned. A very few schools were aided by the spoils of the old chantries, but the bulk of the property disappeared, and education was in a far worse state than before. The introduction of Protestantism into England, so far from promoting the cause of education, did enormous injury to it. More than two hundred grammar-schools, according to a moderate estimate, were literally looted at this shameful period by Somerset and his successors.[1]

The Foreign Refugees.—The work of Somerset was aided by the arrival of certain foreigners whose combined influence temporarily wrecked the hopes of a constitutional Reformation in England. Protestant parties on the Continent were shifting their places. Luther died in 1546, and the Swiss Reformers, Zwinglian and Calvinist, were drifting further from Lutheranism and nearer to one another. In 1549 two very prominent Lutherans, Melanchthon and Bugenhagen, accepted the Leipzig Interim, an official arrangement which endeavoured to combine a moderate Lutheranism with Catholicism. The result was that Martin Bucer, who had acted as a mediator between the Swiss and the Lutheran Protestants, was obliged to leave Germany and came to England. He was a man of high character, and not an extreme Protestant. He was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1550, and wrote an elaborate criticism on the Prayer Book before his death in 1551. Several other foreigners of the most fanatical opinions accompanied Bucer to England, and his death left them free to air their opinions with greater effect. Among these people must be mentioned Pollanus of Strassburg, John à Lasco, a Polish nobleman who stayed in Cranmer's house, and Peter Martyr, an Italian of such extreme Protestant views that he strongly objected to children being baptized by the Lutherans, who held a higher doctrine of the sacraments than he held himself. He apparently did not understand the English language, but

[1] Conclusive evidence as to this spoliation will be found in Leach, *English Schools at the Reformation*, 1546-48 (Constable, 1896).

the Government made him Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford!

These men, and there were many like them, disliked the English liturgy and opposed the doctrine of the Real Presence.

In the meantime the Privy Council had steadily encouraged the publication of Protestant books of a more or less scurrilous character. The tendency of these books is not merely to criticise or abuse the Pope and Popery, but to introduce the Zwinglian and Calvinist doctrines that the sacraments are not channels by which God conveys His grace to the human soul, and that men are not strictly responsible for their actions, whether good or evil. The result of the introduction of these Protestant negations into England was immediately seen, not only in the growth of irreverence, but in the growth of vice. The testimony afforded by two eminent reformers on this subject is even plainer than might be expected. Traheron, writing to Bullinger in 1550, says: 'Religion is indeed prospering, but the wickedness of those who profess the Gospel is wonderfully on the increase.'[1] Bucer, who morally towers above the other leading foreigners connected with the English Reformation, wrote as follows from Cambridge shortly before his death: 'Not a few, casting aside all care for true penitence, faith, good works, ecclesiastical communion and discipline, work and strive, and that often in the most irreligious spirit, for this alone, that they may withdraw Christ our Saviour from our sacraments and sacred assemblies, and may shut Him up in His own place in heaven.'[2] This was too plain speaking for some of Bucer's co-religionists, so when the letter containing the above passage was 'edited,' the editor ingeniously altered the concluding words.

Cranmer's Vacillation.—As early as the summer of 1548 Cranmer was absorbing Swiss theology, and had at least

[1] *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation.* First portion, p. 324 (Cambridge, 1846).

[2] See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1897, p. 131. Bucer is referring to the extreme Protestant teaching which denies that Christ in any way becomes present, even in the heart of the faithful communicant.

given up a belief in the Real Presence. Cranmer was 'a thing of moods and changes,' and it is difficult to know his mind upon any given subject, for the simple reason that he did not know it himself. It is possible to pity him, but not with that pity which is most akin to love. His life was neither avaricious nor unclean, and in these respects he was vastly better than some of the great Italian and Scottish ecclesiastics of his time. But he vividly illustrates the principle that a very weak man will sometimes, when placed in a critical position, do as much harm as a very bad man. He had been a fellow of a college in Cambridge, and to the end of his days he resembled the weaker type of theologian produced by the English universities. Cultured and receptive, he was always reading, and was always modifying his opinions under the influence of 'stimulating' and 'suggestive' writers of Swiss or German origin, and he was unable to perceive that theories which had fascinated him for six months might injure the religion of his country for as many centuries. The fluid state of his convictions and his servile dependence upon kings and privy councillors led him into actions in which diplomacy became identical with deception. He swore allegiance to the Pope with no intention of obeying him[1]; he deprived clergymen for marrying, when he had a wife in secret; and in the First Prayer Book he left phrases which implied the doctrine which he had renounced.

The Second Prayer Book.—Somerset's influence came to an end at the close of 1549. Henceforth the leading man in the Council was Warwick, whom Edward created Duke of Northumberland. He was utterly indifferent to religion, but decided to continue the policy of Somerset. There were no more monasteries and chantries to plunder, so bishoprics were stripped of their revenues. Bishop Gardiner was deprived, mainly because he would not identify the authority of the Council with that of the king. Bishop Heath was imprisoned and then deprived simply because he would not set his name to the Ordinal

[1] The oath and Cranmer's views upon it are printed in full in the Appendix to Strype's *Cranmer*.

of 1550, although he was willing to use it. Bishop Tunstall of Durham was deprived because Northumberland coveted his lands. Bishop Day of Chichester was deprived for refusing to obey a command of the Council to destroy the altars in his diocese. Hooper, a Zwinglian, who had been a chaplain of Somerset, was made Bishop of Gloucester in spite of his known opposition to the Prayer Book. In April 1552 Parliament passed a statute which declared the First Prayer Book to be 'agreeable to the word of God and the primitive Church,' but said that doubts had arisen 'through curiosity,' and that therefore the book would be explained and made perfect. The hypocrisy of this statement was made plain when the new book came into use on November 1, 1552. The outward aspect of the services was greatly changed by a prohibition of the use of the alb, cope, and vestment. The apostolic custom of anointing the sick and the primitive custom of reserving the sacrament for the sick were omitted. Plain prayers for the dead were omitted, and the word 'Mass' was dropped. The words of the Communion Service, though orthodox in themselves, were so arranged as to leave an open door for the doctrine of the Eucharist held by Calvin and Bucer. This is shown by the words ordered to be employed in the administration of Holy Communion. In the First Prayer Book they had been: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' In the Second Prayer Book they were: 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.' Even this did not satisfy the Council. So at the last moment they inserted a *Declaration on Kneeling*, now popularly called the *Black Rubric*, declaring that kneeling at communion does not mean that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any *real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood*. It is possible that the word *natural* saves the statement from heresy, but the rubric was plainly intended to strike at the doctrine of the Real Presence.

Cranmer was not responsible for the *Black Rubric*, but he was responsible for many of the changes in the Second Prayer Book, and he was also responsible for Forty-two Articles of religion which appeared in 1553. The majority of these Articles were far less definitely Protestant than they have been popularly supposed to be, but Article Twenty-nine denied the doctrine of the Real Presence, and said: 'The body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places.'

The English Church at the end of the reign of Edward VI.—The Church of England, betrayed by the primate and scourged by the State, had suffered terribly. The Church was poor, and the holy and beautiful houses of God in England had been plundered with a zeal which might have characterised the invasion of a horde of Moslems. Bishops had been deprived and imprisoned on false charges. No episcopal authority could be exercised without a licence from the Crown. The Second Prayer Book had been introduced at least in some places, although it was alien to the wishes of an immense majority of the people. Bernard Gilpin, afterwards called 'The Apostle of the North,' tells us how unfit men were ordained and lay patrons sold Church benefices, and that since the departure of the friars some English pulpits had not had four sermons in fifteen or sixteen years. But the Church had not repudiated the Catholic faith. Convocation does not appear to have sanctioned the Second Prayer Book, and certainly did not sanction the Forty-two Articles, and even the king did not sign the proposed Protestant book of canon law known as the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*. The Church had repudiated neither the ancient ministry, nor the creeds, nor the Catholic doctrine laid down in the King's Book of 1543.

Queen Mary and Reaction, 1553.—The boy Edward, dying of consumption, was persuaded by Northumberland to make a will leaving his crown to Lady Jane Grey, a girl of sixteen, and a fervent Protestant. The councillors, Cranmer included, signed the will. This absolutely unconstitutional act on the part of Edward was doomed to failure. The whole country welcomed Mary, the

rightful Queen, and Northumberland's own soldiers threw their caps into the air in honour of her name. Northumberland was executed, and in the speech which he made upon the scaffold he exhorted the people to return to the 'old learning,' and referred to Germany and its religion in no complimentary language. He declared, in penitent words, that he thanked God for calling him now 'to be a Christian, *for these sixteen years he had been none.*' Mary's first proclamation was marked by the most tolerant tone, and she simply endeavoured to restore religion to the state which it had occupied in the last year of Henry VIII. She retained the title of Supreme Head of the Church, and by virtue of this authority gave licence to preachers, and when Parliament annulled her mother's divorce, Parliament did it without referring to the Pope. She made Gardiner her Chancellor, released the imprisoned bishops, and restored to them the sees of which they had wrongfully been deprived. But Parliament also repealed all the ecclesiastical legislation of Edward's reign, and this made an end of the Act for receiving communion in both kinds, the Acts authorising the two Prayer Books, and that authorising the Ordinal. Mary also deprived four married bishops, and three who had received their sees under letters-patent from the Crown. In fact, Mary simply wiped out everything, good or bad, which had been done during the reign of Edward VI. The foreign refugees were ordered to depart within twenty-four days, and the mediæval services were restored. Mary was popular, and in most places the mediæval worship was popular, and if she had only been content to leave things as they were, nine-tenths of the nation would have been fully content.

Mary's Marriage, 1554.—The Queen, however, was anxious to marry Philip, the eldest son of her cousin, the Emperor Charles V., and it would hardly have been possible to do this without acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope. Moreover, she probably had always been anxious to see that supremacy restored. Her mother's life and her own life had been made miserable by men who rejected the Pope, and only the people who believed

in the Pope had maintained the legitimacy of her own birth. Parliament presented a petition against her proposed foreign match, and the result of Mary's partiality for Philip was an insurrection. The rebellion failed, and Parliament gave its consent to the hateful marriage. Mary had now forgotten to be merciful, and Gardiner was forced into the background to make room for Cardinal Pole, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. While Gardiner was supreme, no person was executed in England for heresy.

Mary's Romanism.—Pole, who was the legate of the Pope, with full powers, is an interesting character, and his opinions mark the period of transition from mediæval Catholicism to the Counter-Reformation of the Roman Church. While in Italy he had himself fallen under suspicion for teaching the doctrine of justification by faith in a form which could hardly be reconciled with current Roman theology, and he was anxious to promote a reformation in culture and morality in the Church of England. At the same time he was more Roman than many of the Romans in some of his doctrines, and the fact that Rome suspected his opinions possibly made him the less inclined to protest against a severe treatment of the enemies of Rome. Under his influence the Church of England went back to the position which it had occupied at the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII. He formally absolved the English Queen and Parliament for their supposed sin of schism in repudiating papal supremacy, and there are grounds for thinking that Convocation was likewise absolved. Mary received the absolution with joy, believing that the path to prosperity and heaven was now opened for herself and her country. It is important to observe that in spite of this 'absolution' being administered, the Church of England had never been excommunicated by the Popes, no one having been excommunicated but Henry VIII. himself. Nor had the adherents of the Papacy been yet forbidden to attend the reformed English services. Nor did the Church of England, in repudiating the supremacy of the Pope, ever excommunicate the Pope or the Churches which still acknowledged his usurped jurisdiction.

The Beginning of Persecution, 1555.—The submission of England to Rome was followed by the outbreak of a persecution unique in the history of England. During four years the number of persons who were burnt alive amounted to at least 277, including five bishops and fifty-five women. The greater proportion of these victims belonged to the poorer classes, and the burnings were confined to a comparatively small area, being chiefly in the eastern counties and on roads most easily accessible from the seaports. These facts suggest that many of the sufferers belonged to the more fantastic and ignorant continental sects, such as that of the Anabaptists, and it is a strange coincidence that John Rogers, who was the first to suffer under Mary, had himself requested in 1550 that Joan Bocher, an Anabaptist, who denied the Incarnation, might be put to death. The people responsible for this savage persecution were, no doubt, Philip and Mary themselves. Philip and his Dominican friars were bigots of the first rank. Mary's blood was half Tudor, half Spanish, and it is probable that she inherited a slight touch of insanity from her mother's family. For a long time it was the custom to lay the blame on Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Bonner, Bishop of London. But this idea of their guilt must be modified. For no execution took place in Gardiner's diocese until after his death, and although Bonner was of a more violent disposition, he was reprimanded by the Privy Council for not carrying out the brutal laws more strictly.

Death of Five Reforming Bishops.—The first bishops to die under Mary's persecution were Hooper of Gloucester, who was burnt on February 9, 1555, and Ferrar of St. David's, who was also burnt amid circumstances of very great cruelty on March 30, 1555. Ridley and Latimer were burnt at Oxford, in the ditch outside the old city wall, in front of Balliol College, in the middle of the present Broad Street, October 16, 1555. Latimer's words have never been forgotten: 'Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out.' The prophecy was fulfilled

triumphantly, though others had to suffer the same excruciating death. Among them was Cranmer, who was also burnt in Oxford, March 21, 1556. If Mary had been a great saint she might have pardoned Cranmer, but as she was only a very human woman, she was determined to have the blood of the man who had ruined her mother, had flattered her enemies, had robbed her of her birthright, and tried to rob her of her kingdom. Cranmer recanted six times, hoping to save his life. It was in vain. As he had judged Queen Katherine, so he was judged; as he had condemned Joan Bocher to the stake, so he was condemned. At the end he bore much indignity with patience and died courageously, holding his right hand in the flames inasmuch as it had written 'many things untrue.'

Since all of these prelates, except Cranmer, died for their opinions, and their death has had so great an influence upon history, it is well to inquire for what opinions they died. Nothing can be more useless than to indulge in vague statements which cloud the points at issue, or to whitewash the teaching of men whose cause has become popular.

Hooper is known to have held opinions of an extreme Protestant type; but the doctrine of Ridley and Latimer is difficult to tabulate. Viewed from a Catholic standpoint, it appears rather inadequate and confused, but not more so than that of their foremost opponents.

Ridley and Latimer were condemned to the flames for the three following matters:—(1) They were accused of opposing the statement that the 'natural' body of Christ is in the sacrament—a statement which might be given an orthodox meaning, but certainly was often meant in an unorthodox sense by their opponents.[1] Gardiner held that Christ was in the sacrament in the same fashion as He is in heaven, and with the 'quantity' of a natural body; and Pole held that Christ was sensually present in the sacrament, both of which opinions

[1] Ridley expressly said that the natural body of Christ is in the sacrament, though not in the fashion asserted by his opponents.

are heretical and uncatholic. (2) They affirmed that the substance of bread and wine remained after consecration. This doctrine was in accordance with ancient teaching, and had been retained by some even after the doctrine of Transubstantiation was set forth at Rome in 1215. (3) They denied that there is a 'propitiatory sacrifice' in the Mass. In 1562 the Roman Catholic Council of Trent adopted the assertion that the sacrifice of the Mass is 'truly propitiatory,' explaining that by it we find mercy and grace if we approach God *contrite and penitent*. But when the English Reformers perished it was often held that the Mass availed for those who were *not contrite*; and consequently it was superstitiously believed that a priest could apply the merits of Christ to a soul which was really unfit for any such grace. And with regard to the nature of the act of sacrifice itself, wide divergences of opinion had prevailed among mediæval writers, and Ridley's own statement on the subject closely agrees with that of St. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest of mediæval theologians. Ridley says of the sacrifice of the Mass, 'it is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and as a representation of that bloody sacrifice, and *he doth not lie which saith Christ to be offered.*'[1] Even Bishop Gardiner's statement was in substantial agreement with this. And peace might have been perhaps reached with regard to this doctrine if the mediæval party had been content to state that the action of the priest and the Church in the Mass does not by itself take away sins, but is parallel to our Lord offering Himself as our propitiation in heaven. One mediævalist bishop, Watson, did draw out this parallel.

On the whole, we are bound to conclude that the doctrines of Ridley and Latimer, though not without defects, were better than those of many of their opponents, and also that some of their assertions are far indeed distant from the popular Protestantism of the present day.

[1] Foxe, *Eccles. History*, vol. ii. p. 1622; *cf.* St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III. lxxxiii.

The case of Bishop Ferrar of St. David's is on a rather different level, being complicated by a quarrel with some officials of his diocese. He wished to appeal to Pole, but his appeal was harshly disallowed. So far as we can judge from the Articles which he refused to subscribe, his teaching was of a pronounced Protestant character. Cranmer's case is distinct from all the others. He was not a martyr for his religious opinions, for it is evident not only that he recanted Protestantism, but also that Mary was determined to have his blood in spite of his recantation. His recantation was an abject submission to the Pope as 'Christ's vicar,' and to all Roman teaching. When he recanted his recantation, immediately before his death, he repudiated the Pope as Antichrist, and said that he maintained the sacramental doctrine stated in his book against Gardiner. That doctrine is Calvinistic and almost Zwinglian, and Cranmer *did not deny that he had accepted the Zwinglian doctrine* when charged with this at his trial.[1] He attributed his change of mind to Ridley, but he seems to have outrun his teacher.

It is plain that both among the Reformers and their opponents there was much confusion of thought with regard to the Eucharist, and we, who reflect upon those unhappy far-off days, may well be thankful that we are bound neither to the opinion of Pole and Gardiner, nor of Cranmer and Hooper, and we can hope that they all are reconciled where all bitterness and all error are laid aside.

The Popes and Anglican Orders.—The treatment of the English bishops who were executed by Mary throws an interesting light upon the view then held with regard to the validity of Anglican orders by the Popes and Cardinal Pole. The rank of Cranmer and perhaps of Latimer was recognised, but Ridley, Ferrar, and Hooper were treated as priests only, although Ridley had been consecrated bishop according to the Latin Pontifical, and Ferrar had been consecrated in 1548 with English words, but probably with the mediæval rites. Hooper was consecrated

[1] Cranmer's *Works*, vol. iv. p. 97 (Oxford edit 1833).

by the English Ordinal of 1550. According to the most rigidly Roman teaching Ridley and probably Ferrar were both truly consecrated, and therefore their enemies showed themselves ignorant of theology in treating them as priests. The same haphazard ignorance was displayed in dealing with the priests who were reconciled to Rome. Pope Julius III. in his Bull of 1553 speaks of those 'who never or badly received orders.' Probably the 'never' refers to those ordained by the rite of 1552, and the 'badly' to those ordained by the rite of 1550.[1] As a matter of fact, it seems that some were reordained, while others went through the mediæval ceremony of having their hands anointed, a rite which could not possibly give validity to an insufficient ordination. On the other hand, Pope Paul IV. in 1555 recognised the validity of orders given according to the reformed rites. His statement, which was misquoted by Pope Leo XIII. when he condemned Anglican orders in A.D. 1896, is, in its genuine form, as plain as can be. In it the Pope declares that 'those who have returned to the bosom of the Church, and have been restored to unity, we will indulgently receive *in their orders and benefices.*' Cardinal Pole acted upon this principle in the 'dispensation' granted by him when England was reconciled to Rome.[2]

The Birth of Puritanism.—The severity of Mary's persecution caused a large number of English priests to flee to Switzerland and Germany. They found homes at Zürich, Geneva, Strassburg, and Frankfurt. At Frankfurt the magistrates allowed the exiles to make use of the same church as the French Calvinists. The English

[1] A remarkable testimony to the fact that the Ordinal of 1550 was regarded as valid by intelligent Roman Catholics, is to be found in a statement made by Daniele Barbaro, envoy of Venice to England. He became patriarch of Aquileia in 1550. In writing about the English form for conferring holy orders he says, 'Nor do they differ from those of the Roman Catholic religion save that in England they take oath to renounce the doctrine and authority of the Pope.'—*Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), vol. v. p. 349.

[2] See the pamphlet *Leo XIII. versus Paul IV.* (Parker and Co., London, 1898).

chose as their chaplain John Knox, who had been ordained in Scotland, became a Protestant in 1545, and was forced to leave Great Britain in 1554. Knox and others sent a description of the Second Prayer Book to Calvin 'for his judgment therein.' The great man whose genius had made him almost omnipotent at Geneva, behaved as great men are tempted to behave when we ask for their opinion and profess to regard their opinion as an infallible decision. He snubbed the English clergy, and he sneered at the Prayer Book. Strange to say, they hastened to assure him that they gave up 'private baptisms, confirmation of children, saints' days, kneeling at the Holy Communion, the linen surplices of the ministers, crosses, and other things of a like character.' Among the men who were guilty of this cowardly concession were Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely, Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, and Grindal, who held both the English archbishoprics. It was these foreign exiles who formed the nucleus of a disloyal Protestant party which almost destroyed the Catholic character of the Church of England in the time of Elizabeth. They beheld at Geneva a compact Protestant system marshalled against the compact system of Rome. They saw a society under a so-called Holy or Godly Discipline which interfered with every detail of human conduct, and was administered by an ecclesiastical Consistory which was itself governed by six ministers of religion, of whom every one was a breathing instrument of the Protestant Pope. They knew that if a man's attire displeased Calvin the man might be punished, and that if his theology displeased Calvin he might be burnt as Servetus was burnt. They saw some of the most hideous features of contemporary Romanism reflected in this new religion, and yet they fell in love with it. They were deeply sincere in the conviction that Rome was the Babylon of the Revelation, and that Calvinism was a copy of that heavenly Zion of which Babylon is Satan's substitute.

Mary died in misery on November 17, 1558. The united years of her reign and that of her brother were only eleven. But during these years a work of tragic

magnitude had been accomplished. In 1547, in spite of such differences of opinion as may be found in every national branch of the Church Universal, the Church of England was united. In 1558 the most virulent party spirit was supreme, and every seed of future discord had been sown. A hundred years were needed to repair the mischief of eleven.

CHAPTER V

THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH

The Difficulties of Elizabeth.—Elizabeth, when she first heard the news of Mary's death, was sitting under an oak in Hatfield Park. 'This,' she answered, 'is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.' She immediately entered upon the labour of destroying everything that Mary had done in State and Church. She was not a very good woman, but her ability was almost boundless, and she had a deep affection for the English people, and a shrewd appreciation of the English Reformation without any continental trimmings. Her position was sufficiently difficult to tax her genius. Cardinal Pole, happily for himself, had died two days after his cousin Queen Mary, and the last and by no means the unworthiest Archbishop of Canterbury who had received the pallium from Rome, was laid to rest by night in the crypt of his cathedral church. Convocation and the remaining bishops were probably more Roman in their sympathies than they had been at any previous period of English history. The great body of the clergy and of the laity would probably have been quite content to return to the state of things which prevailed in 1547. Elizabeth might perhaps have consented to such an arrangement, but she had to reckon with the Protestants, a small body much too vigorous to be ignored, officered by the exiles who had returned from Frankfurt and Geneva. National and religious unity were all-important for the country, and one false step on the part of the Queen would make unity impossible.

Mass was still said in the royal chapel according to the

use of Sarum, although the host was not elevated, the Queen disliking the ceremony of elevation in spite of her decided belief in the Real Presence. The Epistle, Gospel, and Litany were said in English. The Queen was crowned on January 15, 1559, also according to the Latin rite, but without the elevation of the host. In the meantime Elizabeth asked for the assistance of Sir Thomas Smith, a learned lawyer, who drew up a document called 'Device for the alteration of Religion.' The revision of the liturgy was intrusted to Parker, Grindal, Cox, and some others, assisted by Smith, and directed by Sir William Cecil, the Queen's secretary, a shrewd and faithful statesman inclined to favour Puritanism. Parker was an able and moderate man, with most of Cranmer's merits and few of Cranmer's defects. He fell ill, and his place was taken by Guest, afterwards Bishop of Rochester. Guest, though he believed in the Real Presence, was violently opposed to Catholic ceremonial, and when Sir Thomas Smith, as representing the Queen's wishes, advised the restoration of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., he and his party insisted on the restoration of the Second Prayer Book. The Queen was forced to yield, but she was resolved that she would only accept the Second Prayer Book in a catholicised form.

The Settlement of Religion.—Parliament and Convocation both met at the end of January 1559, and Convocation issued a formal protest against any changes in religion, and asserted the supremacy of the Pope. Parliament immediately retaliated in a bill asserting the royal supremacy. But the Act of Supremacy was very moderate and contained nothing to which any Catholic Christian could reasonably object. The title *Supreme Head*, which had been held by Henry VIII., and at first by Queen Mary, was dropped, and the Queen was simply called *Supreme Governor of this realm*. To remove all idea whatever that Elizabeth claimed either to be a kind of Pope or to usurp the unique prerogatives and rights of our Lord Jesus Christ, the meaning of the title was further explained to imply that the Queen only claimed the authority 'which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, to

have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms.'

Before the passing of the Act of Uniformity, which introduced once more the English Prayer Book, an interesting debate was held in Westminster Abbey between eight champions of the mediæval or Marian party and eight champions of the Reformation. The question of the supremacy of the Pope was avoided, the only three points put forward being (1) the use of a dead language in worship, (2) the right of each particular national Church to alter ceremonies, and (3) the doctrine of the Mass. The reforming party had the best of the argument, and were generally on Catholic ground in opposing the views of the mediævalists on (1) and (2). Unfortunately some disputes about etiquette made it necessary to break off the discussion, and (3) was never dealt with. Another vigorous debate took place in the House of Lords with regard to the Act of Uniformity. Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, and Scott, Bishop of Chester, warmly opposed the Bill, and it is most instructive as well as saddening to notice that their opposition to reform was plainly caused not by reformation as such, but by the Protestant anarchy of Edward's reign. They fastened upon the Second Prayer Book for denying the doctrine of the Real Presence which the First Prayer Book assumed, declared that Cranmer had altered his own views, and mentioned the blasphemy of Protestant brawlers who trampled on the Sacrament with their feet, and hung the knave of clubs over the altars in derision. However strongly we may disagree with their idea that submission to the Pope was the only remedy against such aberrations of profanity, we cannot withhold our sympathy from their protest.

The Bill passed in spite of it, and it provided that the Prayer Book should come into use on June 24, 1559. The Prayer Book was, in the main, the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., but it was deliberately altered in such a way as to include the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist.

1. The *Declaration on Kneeling* at the end of the Communion Service, which declared that kneeling at the

time of communion did not imply adoration 'unto *any real and essential presence* there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood,' was struck out.

2. The priest, in administering Holy Communion, was directed to use the ancient form of words which had always been connected with the doctrine of the Real Presence, viz. *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life,* and *the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.* These words were henceforth repeated before the words which had been used according to the Second Prayer Book, and which, if they stood alone, would seem to ignore the Real Presence.

3. A restoration was made of the vestments and ornaments which had for so many ages accompanied the celebration of the Holy Eucharist and the other services. It was directed *that the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI.* This restored the use of the alb, the cope, and the chasuble for the celebrant, and the alb and tunicle for the deacons who assisted at solemn celebrations.

Much discussion has taken place with regard to the precise meaning of the words *the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI.* The simplest way is to interpret it literally, and in this case the words mean the period between January 28, 1548, and January 28, 1549. During this period the greater part of the service was generally said in Latin, although English was sometimes employed in London. Against this interpretation it has been urged that in Acts of Parliament *the first year* of a king's reign was reckoned from the first Parliament held under that king. If the Ornaments rubric employs this method of reckoning, then it must refer to the First English Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1549). Whichever is the true explanation, the difference is not very important. For the more important ornaments used in 1548 are sanctioned by the Prayer Book of 1549. And though the Prayer Book of 1549 has rather brief

rubrics, and does not mention very many ornaments, we cannot argue that it forbids all the ornaments which it does not expressly mention. Old service-books never went into full details with regard to such matters. In Queen Elizabeth's own chapel there were tapers upon the altar, and there was also a crucifix on the altar, though it was once impudently broken by the Court jester. Neither tapers nor crucifix are mentioned in the First Prayer Book, yet it is plain that Elizabeth regarded them as legal. In fact, any mediæval church ornament appears to be lawful in the Church of England, if a suitable *time of ministration* is provided by the Prayer Book itself. Incense appears to have been used in the royal chapel, and it is well known that Bishop Andrewes, who had been a chaplain of Queen Elizabeth, used incense during divine service. In 1548 incense was generally used before the Gospel, and at the Offertory at a solemn celebration, and at the *Magnificat* at Evensong. Since these *times of ministration* are retained, the use of incense at these points is apparently sanctioned by the Prayer Book.

A similar argument applies to certain words in the Act of Uniformity of 1559 to which the Prayer Book was annexed. The Act says that no ceremonies other and otherwise than those contained in the Prayer Book are to be employed. But in the seventeenth century this was understood, and no doubt correctly understood, to leave unprohibited various reverent and appropriate actions connected with the rites of the Prayer Book, even if they were not connected with particular ornaments of the Church. Among these actions we may mention turning to the east at the *Gloria*, and the custom of certain bishops to make the sign of the cross when administering confirmation.

Under the authority of the Queen's letters-patent a Latin version of the Prayer Book was published in 1560. It is marked by a very Catholic tone, and it provides both for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick, and for a celebration of the Eucharist at funerals. In 1559 there was published a layman's private prayer book, or *Primer*, such as had been used both before and during the Reformation. This Primer contains appro-

priate prayers for the dead. The manner in which prayers for the dead were regarded as lawful in the Church of England was illustrated in September 1559, on the occasion of the death of Henry II., king of France. A catafalque was erected in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and in the afternoon of September 8, the Dirge (*i.e.* special Evensong and Matins) for the dead was sung in English by Parker and other bishops-elect. The next morning a solemn Requiem celebration of the Eucharist in English was sung by bishops attired in copes, six of the principal mourners communicating. It is also interesting to notice that in Elizabeth's time wafer-bread for Holy Communion was regularly used by loyal members of the Church of England, both the Queen and Parker insisting upon its use. The Prayer Book merely says that 'it shall *suffice* that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten,' *not* that it shall be *necessary* or *expedient*.

Elizabeth and the Bishops.—There was a terrible mortality among the bishops about the time of Elizabeth's accession. In England, Wales, and Man there were twenty-seven sees. Six sees were vacant through death, and nine more bishops died within a few months. There were thus left eleven bishops who had been bishops in the time of Mary, but it must be remembered that some of the Marian bishops were placed in their sees uncanonically by Mary. All these Marian bishops, except Kitchin of Llandaff and Stanley of Man, refused to take the oath of supremacy acknowledging Elizabeth to be Supreme Governor. Here again we see the mischievous effect of the work of the Privy Council of Edward. In the time of Henry VIII. only one bishop refused to acknowledge the royal supremacy, but the bishops who remembered the unjust and unconstitutional manner in which Edward and his Council had acted, came to the conclusion that the Pope was better than the Privy Council. No course was open to Elizabeth but to select bishops who would acquiesce in the principle which the Church had itself asserted in the time of Henry. She had previously chosen as Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, who had been ordained priest according to the Latin rite, and had dwelt in England during the Marian

persecution, and thus had not lived under the thumb of the continental Protestants. He at first declined. She showed how little sympathy she had with Protestantism by offering the primacy to Wotton, who had been Dean of Canterbury under Mary, and then she probably offered it to Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster. Wotton preferred to remain Dean of Canterbury, and Feckenham was opposed to the Reformation. Parker then consented, and Elizabeth again showed her desire to conciliate the Marian bishops by inviting certain of them, including Tunstall, to take part in Parker's consecration. They were either unwilling or unable to act. After being canonically elected, Parker was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in the chapel of Lambeth Palace by Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells; Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester; Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter; and Hodgkin, suffragan Bishop of Bedford. The fact of Parker's consecration is beyond all doubt, and it was not until the next century that the Romanists invented a scandalous legend which declared that Parker had gone through a mock consecration at an inn. Nor can there be any doubt that the four bishops who consecrated Parker were genuine bishops with the power of conferring the apostolic laying-on of hands. Barlow and Hodgkin were both consecrated bishops according to the Sarum rite, the validity of which is unquestioned, and Scory and Coverdale were both consecrated according to the English rite of 1550, the validity of which was not disputed by the Popes in the time of Mary. Two facts come plainly to the surface in the history of Parker's consecration: (1) That there was no creation of a new Church of England in the time of Elizabeth, but a continuation of one and the same Church as had existed before; (2) That the Marian bishops who refused to acknowledge the royal supremacy compelled Elizabeth to deprive them against her will.

The Clergy, Prayer Book, and Articles.—An apostolically ordained primate of high character was now on the throne of St. Augustine, a man determined to defend the Church of England alike from the encroachments of Rome and of Geneva. No one acquainted with the ancient forms of

ordaining and consecrating could deny that his ordination was valid, and no one could deny that the Prayer Book in its present revised form was in harmony with the faith of the ancient Catholic Church. It is true that in 1562 the Roman Catholic Council of Trent prohibited attendance at the English services, but the prohibition had to be repeated so frequently that it was evidently often disregarded by the people who had attended the Latin services in the time of Mary. Almost the entire body of the English clergy accepted the royal supremacy and the new service-books; for of more than nine thousand clergymen, only rather more than two hundred refused to accept the change, and all over England the old vicar or rector remained in his parsonage and his church. What is equally important is the fact that the Popes would themselves have sanctioned the use of the English Prayer Book if the Queen would have acknowledged their supremacy over England. There are reasons for believing that Pope Pius IV. offered to give his approval to the Prayer Book on this condition, and it is practically certain that Pope Pius V. would have done so. Sir Francis Walsingham received an offer from the Pope's nuncio in Paris, to the effect that the Pope would declare the English Prayer Book to be Catholic and allow its use 'if the Queen would have acknowledged the same as received from him.'[1] But the Queen could not acknowledge that the Pope had the same authority in England as in Italy, as she would have done if she had made any such acknowledgment. We shall see later how the Popes treated the English sovereigns when they found that their usurped supremacy would not be recognised any longer.

The Thirty-nine Articles cannot be described at any length in this small book. It is enough to say that Archbishop Parker and Bishop Guest carefully revised the Forty-two Articles which had been published without the authority of the Church of England in 1553. They were finally revised and received the sanction of Convocation in 1571. They contain several improvements of great importance. Among these improvements we may

[1] *Calendar of State Papers* (Foreign, 1569-1571), p. 477.

observe that the authority of the Books of the Bible is asserted to rest upon the authority of the Church (Article Six), that the Church is asserted to have the power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith (Article Twenty), that Article Twenty-eight is carefully altered so as no longer to oppose the doctrine of the Real Presence, and that the statement that the sacraments do not avail *ex opere operato* is now omitted. The Articles do not pretend to be a complete body of divinity or to be the infallible statements of a General Council, and it is quite true that they contain one or two ambiguities. But these ambiguities are no greater than the ambiguous statements about the sacrifice of the Mass and Indulgences which were made by the Roman Council of Trent, which did pretend to be infallible, and was sitting for part of the time during which the Articles were composed. It may safely be asserted that the utmost ingenuity has failed to show that the Thirty-nine Articles shut out a single Catholic doctrine when they shut out a number of superstitions which were then common, and some of which are still fostered by the Church of Rome. For instance, the Articles, in condemning the 'Romish' doctrine of Purgatory, do not condemn the primitive practice of praying for the dead; and though strong words are employed against the notion that the sacrifices of Masses were fresh propitiations for the 'actual' sins committed by men in their daily life (Article Thirty-one and Article Two), nothing is said against the ancient doctrine that our 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' in the Eucharist is our sharing in the present work of Christ in heaven. It has frequently been stated that the Articles are Calvinistic. The statement is positively ludicrous. The Calvinists made perpetual efforts to get them altered, and one of the chief reasons why the Articles were enforced is that the Calvinistic Puritans objected to them.

Renewal of Elizabeth's Difficulties.—Although Elizabeth and Parker had been successful in securing for the Church of England a system which was both Catholic and reformed, a series of acute difficulties awaited the Church. We shall briefly trace the manner in which it

was assailed both by Puritans and Romanists. At the same time it is necessary to mention another great danger, which has too often been overlooked by Anglican writers who have shown themselves alive to the dangers which came from Romanism and Presbyterian Puritanism. This great danger was the disloyalty of several of the English bishops. Parker, immediately after his own consecration in 1559, had to consecrate bishops for several vacant sees, and he and Elizabeth then took their first false step. There were few men of zeal and learning among the friends of the Reformation, except the men who had been exiled in the time of Mary. From this number several of the new bishops were selected, including Sandys, Grindal, Cox, and Horn, all of whom had signed the letter to Calvin, in which they asserted that they gave up *confirmation* and *kneeling at communion* and *surplices*. In fact they were almost Calvinists or Zwinglians at heart. Possibly the Queen and Parker did not know their real sentiments, possibly they thought that their theology would become more conservative and more mellow when they occupied episcopal chairs, and that they would be less dangerous if they were treated with generosity, than if they were treated with severity.

The fact remains that the disloyal sentiments of these Protestant bishops are shown to us by their letters to their continental friends, and by their policy at home. Sandys expresses his attitude towards the Ornaments rubric as follows: 'Our gloss upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away; but that they may remain for the Queen.'[1] Such dishonesty requires no comment. Bishops Grindal and Horn say that the teaching of the Black Rubric, *which had been deliberately expunged from the Prayer Book*, was still diligently impressed upon the people.[2] If these men conformed to the rules of the Church of England, they only conformed grudgingly and of necessity, and their dislike of its spirit was artlessly expressed by Jewel in the words, 'O Zürich! Zürich! how much oftener do I now think of

[1] *Parker Correspondence*, p. 65.
[2] *Zürich Letters*, vol. i. p. 180.

thee than ever I thought of England when I was at Zürich.'

These men were far superior to the half-pagan bishops who were to be found in Italy in the first half of the sixteenth century, or the half-Mohammedan bishops who disgraced the Church of Spain, when Spain was ruled by Saracens, and yet it is almost a miracle that the Church of England was saved from destruction while under their misleading guidance.

Puritanism under Elizabeth.—With a Queen whose religion was largely based upon political convenience, and bishops who were in league with the Swiss Protestants, it is not surprising that many of the clergy should hazard the attempt to transform the Church of England. As early as 1564 the services of the Church in several dioceses were in a state of chaos. In some places a cope was used, in others even the surplice was not worn. In some places the altar stood in the middle of the chancel, in others it was near the east wall. In many churches in the South of England, worship was practically Presbyterian. On the contrary, the Yorkshire people, always tenacious of those things which they have once learnt to love, some years afterwards still made the sign of the cross, and recited the *De Profundis* (Psalm cxxx.) for the dead, and priests elevated the host when they celebrated the Communion Service. To stop the prevalent confusion, Parker in 1566 published a *Book of Advertisements* insisting on a minimum of decent ceremonial, compelling the clergy to use the surplice in parish churches, the cope in cathedral churches, and the square cap when they walked out of doors. It may be remarked in passing that the Puritans disliked the square or 'college' cap, which had, of course, been worn before the Reformation, almost as much as they hated a crucifix. So widely had Protestantism spread among the London clergy under the episcopate of Grindal, that thirty-seven refused to conform, while sixty-one promised to obey.

Parker's action on behalf of uniformity was therefore caused by the disobedience of the Protestant party in the Church, not by the Catholic party. His endeavours were met by a corresponding activity on the side of the

innovators. A regular plan of campaign was inaugurated, and *Puritanism* became an organised force.

A few Puritans immediately seceded from the Church, on the ground that 'the ceremonies of Antichrist were tied to the service of God.' But the majority determined to destroy the Church from within by changing it into a Presbyterian body. The leader of this party was **Thomas Cartwright**, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. He was a man of immense learning and fiery eloquence, uniting the skill of a Russian diplomatist with the bigotry of a Spanish friar. He did not disguise the fact that he believed that those whom he called 'false teachers' should be put to death, and added, 'If this be bloody and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost.' He attacked the threefold ministry of the Church, and in 1570 was justly deprived of a position which he had only received as a minister of the Church. Two years later, in 1572, the Puritans published the *First Admonition to Parliament*, written under Cartwright's supervision. It was an outspoken but ill-arranged manifesto. It attacked the Ordination service as blasphemous, and demanded that the priests ordained in the times of Henry VIII. or Mary should be removed. The Prayer Book is said to be 'culled and picked out of that popish dunghill, the Portuis and Mass book.' It is important to observe that the writer treats the 'vestment and pastoral staff' as still required, and asserts that in the Burial Service 'prayer for the dead is maintained.' The hideous Calvinistic doctrine that God does not give many Christians any chance of salvation, can be traced in the objection to praying that all men *may* be saved.

A *Second Admonition* was written by Cartwright himself. He calls the Church a 'bastard,' and compares the masters of colleges to cormorants. The bishops he describes as a 'remnant of Antichrist's brood,' and he renders an interesting testimony to the soundness of the belief of some of them by accusing them of 'flat heresy in the sacrament.' But the book is vigorous as well as violent, and logical as well as low. It puts into a clearer form the teaching of the *First Admonition*, and from the two books these great facts emerge: (i) It was

determined to destroy Episcopacy, the order of bishops being held to be contrary to the Bible; (ii) All members of the new Church were to be under the rigid discipline of a Presbyterian Consistory; (iii) Nothing was to remain in public worship which recalled the worship of the mediæval Church, and nothing done but that for which the express warrant of the Bible can be produced.

Walter Travers, in 1574, published both in Latin and English a treatise called *A full and plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline*, containing a scheme substantially the same as that of the two Admonitions. Travers makes the same scurrilous attacks as Cartwright upon the universities, which he calls 'skulking places of drones; monasteries of yawning, snoring monks.' These amusing libels serve to throw into higher relief the writer's main theme. It is an impressive definition of the rights of Christians, and the duties of the Presbyterian senate. It contains a strong attack on Episcopacy, though no objection is raised against the word bishop, provided a bishop is only a doctor or a pastor.

We must not suppose that the Puritan party confined their industry to the circulation of scholastic treatises. They formed a huge organised conspiracy. More than five hundred beneficed clergymen declared their assent to a Presbyterian book called the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*, which was intended to insert the whole system of Calvinistic doctrine and Presbyterian organisation into the Church of England. It is a proved fact that the party agreed that they would omit the ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer 'if it may be done without danger of being put from the ministry.' In order to propagate their tenets they held meetings for *prophesying*, by which was meant Puritan preaching. When the queen in 1577 compelled the bishops to put a stop to these gatherings, the Puritans vainly endeavoured to get their agitation supported by Parliament. In the meantime, **Archbishop Whitgift**, who became primate in 1583, opposed the so-called 'Holy Discipline' of Cartwright and Travers by the simple and straightforward plan of compelling the clergy to assent to the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles.

Failing in their attempt to influence legislation, the more violent Puritans tried to attract public favour by publishing a series of libellous attacks upon the bishops. The author of the first tract wrote under the feigned name of Martin Marprelate, and the series is called by this name. The authors were met by literary opponents whose weapons were as sharp as their own. But Parliament, in spite of its Protestantism, had now begun to be alarmed by the treasonable tone of the Marprelate tracts, and the result was that in 1593 an Act was passed which prohibited attendance at schismatical conventicles, and three leading schismatics, Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry, were hanged on charges of sedition. In the Marprelate tracts the more extreme Protestants overreached themselves and brought their cause into disrepute. But in the meantime the less openly disloyal clergy had strongly intrenched themselves in the universities, men eminent in the State had shown them encouragement, and some of the bishops, including Whitgift himself, had too feeble a grasp on Catholic doctrine to defend the Church effectually against Puritan or Papist.

Romanism under Elizabeth.—Judged by the standard of the sixteenth century, Elizabeth's conduct towards the adherents of the Papacy was at first marked by leniency. A change began in 1569. In that year Mary Queen of Scots, a staunch Roman Catholic, was a prisoner in England, whither she had fled for refuge from her Scottish enemies. The northern English lords, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, were Romanists. They wished to depose Elizabeth in favour of Mary, and were determined that Elizabeth should at least be forced to renounce the Reformation and declare Mary to be her heir. Elizabeth's suspicions were aroused, and she demanded that the two earls should come to her court. They resolved not to run the risk of placing themselves in her power, and they and their adherents rose in revolt. It was distinctly a religious war. The army marched with sacred emblems for their banners, and when Durham was captured, Mass according to the Latin rite was sung with enthusiasm in the cathedral church. But though the war was religious, it was none the less

rebellious, and it was under the disadvantage of being conducted by two noblemen of dissolute life who cared 'more for dice than for religion.'

The revolt and a second revolt which followed it were total failures, and were severely and rapidly punished. Here the matter might have ended if it had not been for the infatuation of Pope Pius v. We have already noticed that he would have sanctioned the Prayer Book, if Elizabeth would have acknowledged his supremacy. Finding it hopeless to attempt to gain her submission, he wrote to the rebel earls a letter containing a grossly insulting reference to the Queen and a promise to send them pecuniary help. As soon as the first rebellion was over, the Queen issued a *Declaration of the Queen's Proceedings since her Reign.* This Declaration insists on the duty of attending 'divine service in the ordinary churches.' While thus commanding attendance at the reformed worship, the Queen's language is remarkably well-balanced and tolerant for the time in which it was written. She expressly asserts that she claims no right to define the faith or 'change any ancient ceremony of the Church from the form before received by the Catholic and Apostolic Church,' she defends 'the ecclesiastical ancient policy of the realm,' and adds that the faith of none of her subjects shall be molested, if they do not gainsay the Scriptures and the faith contained 'in the Creeds, Apostolic and Catholic.'

This Declaration by Elizabeth prophetically refuted the new Papal Bull which was fixed to the gate of the Bishop of London's palace, on May 15, 1570. This Bull excommunicates Elizabeth in bitter and exaggerated language. It falsely declares that she had claimed 'the great authority and jurisdiction of the supreme head of the Church,' whereas she had plainly denied that she had an authority similar to that claimed by the Pope, and it accuses her of introducing 'impious mysteries and ordinances, according to the rule of Calvin.' It declares that she is cut off from Christ and has forfeited her title to the kingdom of England, and *puts under anathema any Englishman who obeys her laws.* After this, Elizabeth had no choice but a struggle for life or death. Pius v.

compelled men to take sides, and the religious schism in England was complete. The guilt of schism must lie at the door of those who based their authority upon a false ground. If the Pope has the right to give away all earthly kingdoms, to restrain the power of every bishop, and to speak with an authority equal to that of a General Council of the Church, then the Church of England is in schism. If, on the other hand, these claims of the Pope are false, the English Roman Catholics are guilty of schism, in opposing the Church of England.

After the Papal Bull excommunicated Elizabeth, Parliament, in 1571, declared it to be high treason to bring Papal Bulls into England, and to be reconciled to the Church of Rome was also declared to be high treason. Elizabeth, however, hesitated to enforce her powers until the more earnest Romanists rushed upon their fate. A number of British Roman Catholics, in exile on the Continent, saw with sorrow the gradual decay of their religion in Great Britain. Among these exiles was **William Allen**, who is to English Romanism what Cartwright is to English Puritanism. He had been Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and was a man of indomitable zeal and far-sighted purpose. Recognising that the few Marian priests who had refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Elizabeth would soon be dead and gone, he founded, in 1568, a college at Douai in the Netherlands, as a seminary for missionaries to England. The life of the students was well organised and directed, and it is worth observing that one effect of the Reformation upon the plan of studies at Douai, was a minute attention to the Bible. By 1579 one hundred missionary priests had been sent to England, and in 1596 there were about three hundred at work in England. It is to these seminary priests that the maintenance of Romanism in this country is due, and between 1577 and 1618 no less than one hundred and thirty-five old students of Douai were put to death in England.

In 1580 the **Jesuits** came to England. They were led by Edmund Campion, who was executed in 1581, and **Robert Parsons**, who lived until 1610. These Jesuits were not numerous in England, but they were clever,

courageous, and energetic. They dressed as soldiers or men-servants, or even as priests of the English Church. They distributed books printed at secret presses, and moved from one county to another, hiding in the country-houses of Roman Catholic gentlemen, who constructed the most ingenious secret chambers for their accommodation. The Jesuits, and particularly Parsons, were more responsible than any one else in bringing upon the English Romanists the persecution which the Popes had kindled. Parsons was a cool-headed and treacherous intriguer. He aroused the indignation of the more moderate English Roman priests by his ambition and by his treasonable conspiracies, and then attacked them with as much bitterness as he showed against the Church of England. The seminary priests became infected with his spirit, and Allen himself joined in the political schemes of Parsons. A plan to assassinate Elizabeth was formed by a Jesuit named Ballard in 1586, and in 1588 the Spanish Armada, the work of Papal and Jesuit scheming, came with the blessing of Pope Sixtus v. to subjugate England. When even the English Roman Catholics flocked to fight the Spaniards, and the winds and waves strewed the shores of Britain with the wreck of the 'invincible' Armada, the English people felt that God had spoken and that the cause of Rome was finished.

We should feel pity and admiration for the constancy and suffering of many Roman Catholics, both priests and laymen, who lived and died under Elizabeth. But we must also remember that they were part of a system, and that this system was guided by Popes who, in the name of Jesus Christ, promised 'plenary indulgence and pardon of all their sins' to all who assisted in deposing or 'punishing' their Queen.

Conclusion.—The Church of England, after the defeat of the Armada, gradually became both more popular and more pure. We have seen how she was attacked by two forces. The extreme Protestants and the extreme Romanists numbered in their ranks many of the most enthusiastic and most earnest men in the country, but the former party were traitors to the Church of England of which they professed to be members, and the latter party were

rebels to the Queen who had linked her fortunes with those of the Church of England. Both parties attacked the Anglican reformation with much learning and real skill. In sustaining this double opposition the Church learned to consolidate itself. Theologians such as Bancroft and Bilson defended Episcopacy, not in the timorous tones of men who are upholding what is expedient, but with the decision of men who know that they are maintaining what is right. Richard Hooker, who published his famous book on *Ecclesiastical Polity* in 1594, is the greatest figure who stands at the beginning of the new epoch. His threefold appeal to human reason, Holy Scripture, and ecclesiastical tradition, constitutes a splendid vindication of the Church of England against Puritanism and Romanism. His deep piety kept him from using against the Puritans the ribald vehemence which too often disfigured their controversial books, and his wide reading made him openly assert that as far as the Roman Catholics follow reason and truth, 'we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone.' His theology has its defects; he speaks with a somewhat uncertain sound even with regard to the Eucharist and the ministry. But then we must not regard him as an infallible Pope, but, as he really was, a great theological pioneer. Just as some of the Fathers of the early Church who had to wage a double combat against half-Jewish and half-heathen heresies, occasionally fail in clearness or completeness, so it is with Hooker. But in reverence for truth, in command of language, in unworldliness of life, and thoroughness of learning, Hooker is one of the noblest examples of what the reformed Church of England can produce. He died in the winter of the year 1600, three years before the indomitable Queen who, with all her faults, 'loved our nation.'

Note.—For information concerning early Puritanism the reader is referred to Dr. Paget's *Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*: for information concerning the attitude of the Popes towards Elizabeth, to Prof. Collins' work on *The English Reformation*, and *Queen Elizabeth's Defence of her Proceedings*, both published by S.P.C.K.

CHAPTER VI

RELIGIOUS CHANGES IN SCOTLAND

The Ancient Scottish Church.—The ecclesiastical history of Scotland is sometimes completely severed from the ecclesiastical history of England, sometimes subtly interwoven with it, and the character of the Scottish Reformation cannot be really mastered without some knowledge of the relations which previously existed between the Churches of Scotland and England, and of the state of religion which prevailed when those relations were either improved or interrupted.

The ancient ecclesiastical history of Scotland falls, roughly, into two periods. The first, or Celtic, period begins about A.D. 425 with St. Ninian, sometimes called in Scotland 'St. Ringan,' and it closes with the coming of St. Margaret as the bride of King Malcolm Canmore, about A.D. 1068.

The Celtic Period, 425-1068.—At the beginning of this period the population of Scotland was composed of the Picts, who were probably akin to the Celts of Ireland, and of the Britons, who were closely akin to the modern Welsh. The latter settled in and around Dumbarton after 573. The first missionary of the Picts was St. Ninian, who was born about 350 and was trained in Rome. He built a church of stone at Whithern in Wigtonshire, and he laboured with great success in the central and south-western parts of Scotland. The cave to which he was wont to retire for prayer is still shown in the sea-cliffs of Glasserton. His great work was eclipsed by that of **St. Columba** (in Gaelic, Columcille, *i.e.* Dove of the Church), who was born of the bluest

Irish blood in 521. He belonged to the Irish division of a great Gaelic tribe, partly settled in Ulster and partly in Scotland, where they gained supremacy over the Picts in the sixth century. Ireland was at that time called *Scotia*, and one result of the conquests made by the Scots from Ireland was that the name of Scotia or Scotland came to be given to *Alba*, though the Scottish Highlanders still call their country *Alba*. Columba laboured for many years in Ireland before he went to the little island of Iona,[1] on the west coast of Scotland, and began his noble work of converting the Picts, to which he probably devoted himself as a work of penance for a serious quarrel which he had kindled in his own country. He was the very type of Irish character. He was passionate, 'fragile as glass,' says an ancient writer. He had a fair face and large grey eyes, a voice 'sweet with more than the sweetness of the bards.' He was a lover of all things that God made, as is shown by his fondness for oak-trees and his care for a tired crane which fell upon the beach of Iona. In the midst of his indefatigable work of preaching and writing, he cherished a wistful affection for the land of his birth, and in his Gaelic poems he tells us of the tear in the eyes which he turns back to Erin. He died on June 9, 597, the very year in which St. Augustine came as a missionary to Kent.

It was the special work of Columba and his associates to found monasteries and schools such as covered Ireland during the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. The culture to be found in these schools was often remarkable, and we may observe that Greek was studied in Ireland in the seventh century. The learning of the Gaelic monks was combined with fervent missionary zeal, and it was from Iona that **Aidan**, the apostle of northern England, came as bishop for Northumbria in 635. The

[1] The origin of this name is doubtful. Before the time of Columba it was called *Ioua*, a name which is still known to a few Highlanders. It has been thought that the name Iona arose from the error of a scribe in writing Ioua. But it is probable that Iona is Ii-shona (the *s* is mute), meaning 'island of the blessed.'

strength and sweetness of his character enabled him to lay the foundations of the faith so firmly in Northumbria that no foe was able to destroy it, and we are able to rejoice that this good Celtic work is imbedded in the walls of the Church of England. But, unhappily, there were disputes between the Celtic missionaries in England and the Saxons trained by missionaries from Rome. With regard to all matters of faith, they were in complete agreement with one another, and their doctrines can hardly be distinguished from those of the Church of England at the present day. But the Celts used services of a Gallican type, they retained an old-fashioned method of calculating the date of Easter according with the older Roman usage, and they were not disposed to bend to those somewhat haughty assertions of the authority of the Roman see which were then beginning to prepare the way for future Roman supremacy. At Whitby, in 664, King Oswiu gave his decree for the Roman usage, and Bishop Colman and some of his clergy left Northumbria, and some of them removed to Ireland. In Scotland itself the later Roman method of observing Easter made way and was fully adopted in the eighth century, and thus the Church of North Britain began to he assimilated to that of the South.

The Celtic Church of Scotland and Ireland—a Church rich in saints and bards—attracts us by that subtle fascination which belongs to most things that are Gaelic. But it was no match for the more progressive Christianity of the Saxon. Its organisation was fitted for the tribal system of the people who had embraced it; hut it was not fitted for the life of large towns and large kingdoms. It needed unity and direction. Even after the Church of Scotland had united with that of the South in the keeping of Easter and in allowing her bishops to be more independent than formerly of the abbots of monasteries,[1] she had little power of guiding either the enthusiasm or

[1] The early Celtic Church in Scotland was thoroughly episcopal, and not presbyterian. At the same time, we must remember that definite dioceses did not yet exist, the bishops were attached to a particular tribe, or to a particular monastery and abbot.

the intellect of her children. The Culdees (*i.e.* 'servants of God'), the Celtic hermits who afterwards opposed the influence of England, probably did something for religion and learning, but ended by being secular and idle. They first appear in Scottish history in the eighth century, after the monks of the type of St. Columba were expelled. There were similar hermits not only in Ireland, but also in England and on the Continent.

The Second Period, 1068-1560.—The second and middle period of the Church history of Scotland begins with the marriage of St. Margaret, a kinswoman of the English King Edward the Confessor, to Malcolm Canmore. The marriage of this Saxon princess was immediately followed by great results both for Church and State. A steady modification of Celtic institutions began to take place. This modification was the more easily effected because for many years a steady immigration of *Saxons* from England had been coming north of the Tweed. These immigrants were the forefathers of the modern Lowland Scots, and under the influence of Margaret and her sons this Saxon element in the population began to develop with a persistence which gradually made the Celtic element quite subsidiary. Margaret was as clever as she was religious, and she used all her skill in endeavouring to reform the Scottish Church after the English model. It is a matter of small importance that some Gallican peculiarities of ritual were given up, but it is a significant sign of her influence that she caused the Scots to cease from the desecration of the Lord's Day, to return to the practice of communicating at Easter, and to suppress marriage with a stepmother. On November 16, 1093, she lay dying in Edinburgh Castle, and had already received the last sacraments when she heard that her husband and her eldest son were slain in battle against the English at Alnwick. With a most touching prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ she fell asleep. Her precious volume of the Gospels lately found its way from an English parish library to the Bodleian Library in Oxford.

Margaret's sons, Alexander and David, consolidated the work which Margaret had begun. They erected no

fewer than eight episcopal sees, including a restoration of the ancient see of Glasgow. If we remember that when Alexander came to the throne, St. Andrews was the only fixed see beyond the Forth, we can imagine how great a change was made by these active monarchs. David, moreover, built the abbeys of Kelso, Jedburgh, Dryburgh, Melrose, and others, whose ruins are the pride of Scotland and the delight of every traveller. Active monastic orders, Benedictines, Cistercians, and Augustinian canons replaced the now degenerate Culdees, parishes were formed in the various dioceses, and tithes were exacted for the permanent maintenance of the Church. David's generosity to the Church was of a piece with his patronage of art and agriculture, and it has been said that southern Scotland was the creation of this king with his Anglo-Norman tastes. The Churches of Scotland and England were 'more than friendly' in spite of some rather injudicious claims to ecclesiastical supremacy over Scotland made by certain English archbishops. These claims were not so unreasonable as has been thought, inasmuch as the Scottish kings held Scotland south of Forth and Clyde 'by an indefinite sort of vassalage to England, or at least by English aid.'[1] The chapters of Scottish cathedrals occasionally elected English bishops to rule over them. When King William the Lyon in 1178 founded the rich abbey of Arbroath he actually dedicated it in honour of the popular English martyr, St. Thomas of Canterbury, and the Latin service-books of Salisbury rapidly became universal in Scottish churches.[2]

This close union was interrupted by the wars with England, A.D. 1286-1371. King Edward I. knew that his assistance would be accepted by some Scotsmen in their political difficulties, and he took advantage of the fact to assume the function of Lord Paramount of Scotland. In the long and brutal struggle which ensued

[1] Mr. Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 99.

[2] It should be remembered that the older Lowland Scottish dialect was simply Northern English, and that even after it became more affected by French, the Scottish writers still sometimes called it English.

the Scots secured their freedom, but they were left in a state of almost chronic misery, and the development of the country, though real, was slow and stunted. In the fifteenth century the signs of intellectual movement became evident. Three of the four Scottish universities were then founded, and in 1496 the famous Educational Act of James IV. compelled all barons and freeholders to send their eldest sons to school. James IV. himself spoke six languages in addition to Scots and Gaelic. Printing was introduced in 1507, and Scotland began to be touched by the spirit of the Renaissance. The famous Scottish poet and priest, Dunbar, belongs to this period. He certainly visited Oxford and preached at Canterbury. He was more gay than sacerdotal. But among the ecclesiastics of the time shine the vigorous James Kennedy, Bishop of St. Andrews, and William Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen and founder of King's College in that city. Throughout this period the Churches of England and Scotland continued to be at one in worship, though not perhaps in sympathy. The use of Salisbury still triumphantly held its ground in Scotland, though there were false slanderers who asserted that it had been forced upon Scotland by Edward I., and a breviary was vainly printed at Aberdeen in 1510 with the express intention of supplanting the Salisbury books.

But in spite of isolated instances of ecclesiastical and religious activity the state of the Scottish Church between the year 1400 and the Reformation was exceedingly corrupt. Three facts, all closely connected, produced a complication of disorders which ended in the death of the Church itself.

1. The Scottish Church was under the heels of the Pope when the Papacy was at its worst, and it was often to the interest of the sovereign to act in league with the Pope—Scotland never completed its ecclesiastical organisation by forming itself into a definite ecclesiastical province under an archbishop until 1472, when St. Andrews was made an archbishopric. As early as 1188, when the Scottish Church had shown its natural desire to be independent of the Archbishop of York, Pope Clement III. had adroitly taken advantage of the

circumstances of the time and declared that the Scottish Church was the 'daughter of Rome by special grace and immediately subject to her.' The result has been well stated by a recent Scottish writer: 'The jealousy of an Italian potentate which was always powerful in England . . . had little influence farther north. Scotland followed the Pope, even when he went to Avignon, and when England had accepted his rival or Anti-Pope. And while in this it sympathised with France, it had little of that traditional dislike of high Ultramontane claims which we saw to have been so strong in Paris. The Pope remained the centre of our church system.'[1]

2. The wealth of the Scottish Church was more than sufficient for the spiritual needs of the country, but by a scandalous injustice, the wealth was diverted from the parish churches. The payment of tithes, instituted during the reforms which began with St. Margaret, was in many cases made to the great abbeys and cathedrals, to the detriment of the parishes to which the tithes really belonged.

The abbey of Kelso had the tithes of twenty-seven parishes handed over to its keeping, and the abbey of Arbroath was given thirty-four parishes in the course of one reign! The result was that the possession of an abbey or a bishopric was a prize coveted by the men who loved the Church's goods better than they loved the Church's good.

3. The kings and the greater nobles, unable to take holy orders themselves and coveting these vast possessions, obtained bishoprics and abbacies for their younger children or for their illegitimate sons. Rome granted the dispensations required for these bastards, and kept discreetly silent. The result was that the highest offices in the Church were in the hands of men bred in an atmosphere of lust and greed, and the inferior clergy copied the manners of their superiors as well as their narrow means permitted.

A brief description of the archbishops of St. Andrews will sufficiently illustrate the state of the Scottish Church

[1] Mr. Taylor Innes, *John Knox*, p. 22.

at the eve of the Reformation. The first archbishop, Patrick Graham, lost his reason and was deposed in 1478. He was accused of every conceivable crime, but his alleged resistance to papal mandates suggests that his chief crime may have been a wish for independence. He was succeeded by his bitterest enemy, William Scheves, who in 1487 was placed in a position corresponding with that of the Archbishop of Canterbury in England. He was engaged in such perpetual and ruinous disputes with the Archbishop of Glasgow that Parliament was forced to put a stop to the quarrel. Scheves was followed by a youth aged twenty-one, who in addition to the primacy of Scotland held the abbacies of both Dunfermline and Arbroath. This youthful prelate died in 1503, and was succeeded by an illegitimate son of James IV., aged *sixteen*. Rome expressly permitted this shameless transaction. The juvenile archbishop died in battle. He was followed by Archbishop Forman, who made a real effort to compel his clergy to be more reverent and more moral. But he was a man whose insatiable ambition had led the Scottish army into the mire and blood of Flodden Field, and won for himself an English priory and a French archbishopric. It is more than probable that he sold his country for gold, and he kept the abbey of Dunfermline side by side with his archbishopric. In 1522 James Beaton became primate. He wore a coat of mail beneath his episcopal habit, and spent his time in persecuting Protestants and fighting the archbishop of the rival see of Glasgow. He was followed in 1539 by his nephew, Cardinal David Beaton. Like his uncle, he was loaded with revenues of ecclesiastical offices which he held in addition to his archbishopric. He is known to have had at least seven illegitimate children, and he erected a castle which he adorned with the initials of his favourite mistress. David Beaton was followed in 1549 by John Hamilton, an illegitimate son of the Earl of Arran. By the Pope's permission he held with his archbishopric the noble revenues of the abbey of Paisley, which was bestowed upon him at the age of fourteen. His immorality was notorious and beyond dispute. With Hamilton closes the list of the pre-Reformation primates

of Scotland, a list which comprises the names of some men of genuine ability, but not the name of a single man who was a blessing to his Church or country.

For this disgraceful state of affairs the Scottish kings were quite as much to blame as the Popes. It was a 'far cry' from the Vatican to Linlithgow, and the Popes guessed that it was safer to yield to the wishes of royalty than to risk a quarrel. James v. promoted all his five bastard sons to ecclesiastical dignities; one of them received the rich priory of St. Andrews before he was seven years old, and another received the abbacy of Holyrood at the age of five. The student of the Church history of this period feels that he is present at the feast of Belshazzar and sees the divine warning written on the wall.

Beginning of the Reformation.—In the fifteenth century there were the same isolated instances of opposition to the received doctrines of the mediæval Church as in England. In 1406 an English priest was burnt at Perth for heresy, and in 1433 a physician from Bohemia was burnt for heresy at St. Andrews. Tenets of a Wyclifite character gained adherents among various ranks of society, and as early as 1416 every Master of Arts in the university of St. Andrews was obliged to take an oath to defend the Church against the Lollards. In 1494 thirty persons belonging to Ayrshire, and known to posterity as the *Lollards of Kyle*, were brought before King James IV. and his council and charged with thirty-four heresies, including the assertion that the Pope is Antichrist, that prayers may not be offered to the glorious Virgin Mary, that the bread in the Mass is not changed into the natural body of Christ, and that priests may marry. The offenders were dismissed with an admonition not unmingled with merriment.

It was under the influence of the Lutheran reformation that Protestantism, properly so called, first arose in Scotland. Lutheran books began to arrive at Scottish seaports, and in 1525 Parliament prohibited the importation of the books of 'Lutheris his discipillis.' Copies of Tyndale's New Testament were among such books, and were circulated at St. Andrews while Archbishop James

Beaton was hiding in the hills in a shepherd's dress to escape from his political opponents. Among those who welcomed the vernacular New Testament was **Patrick Hamilton**, a young layman who held the abbacy of Ferne and had studied at Louvain, Paris, and Marburg. He began to teach the Gospel, as he understood it, in the neighbourhood of Linlithgow. There can be little doubt that Beaton was half afraid to tackle a reformer who had the power of so great a family as the Hamiltons behind him. He invited him to a friendly conference, encouraged him to frankly declare his sentiments, and apparently desired that he should save himself by flight. Hamilton resolutely determined to defend his teaching at all hazards, and appeared at St. Andrews even before the day fixed by the archbishop in his citation. He was then condemned in the cathedral church for various opinions which his opponents regarded as Lutheran. The accusation was not unjust, for Hamilton's antinomian depreciation of good works has a peculiarly Lutheran ring. On some points he was less extreme. On the same day on which sentence was passed, the last day of February 1528, he was burnt before the gates of St. Salvator's College. The execution was hurried on before enough dry wood had been provided for the fire. A furious storm prevented Hamilton's brother crossing the Forth with troops to rescue him, and the wind blew the flames hither and thither so that six hours passed before the sufferer was roasted to death. The professors of Louvain wrote to congratulate the archbishop on his work, but their congratulations were premature. Protestantism gained the force which only martyrdom can produce, and it was well said that 'the reek (*i.e.* smoke) of Patrick Hamilton infected all on whom it did blow.'

During the next few years several persons in Scotland were burnt for heresy, some like Alexander Alane took refuge on the Continent, and many found shelter in England after the break between England and Rome in 1533. Pitiful as were the sufferings of some of these early Protestants, we must in justice remember that in the sixteenth century both parties regarded death as the suitable punishment for religious error, and that the

Protestants were suspected, not altogether unjustly, of treasonable connections with England.

George Wishart and Cardinal Beaton.—In 1539 Archbishop James Beaton was followed by his astute and masterly nephew, David Beaton. Whereas his uncle had chastised the Protestants with whips, David Beaton determined to chastise them with scorpions. His most famous victim was George Wishart. He was among the Scots who had fled for safety to England. There he adopted some irreligious opinions and denied the merits of Jesus Christ. Cranmer persuaded him to recant and made him bear his fagot in sign of penance. He afterwards visited Zürich and Basel and returned to England in 1542. He brought back with him the semi-Zwinglian confession of faith known as the First Helvetic Confession. After studying in Cambridge he began to preach in Montrose and Dundee. He was well born and well read, a man of tall stature, with black hair and a long beard, of comely but melancholy appearance, courteous and energetic. He gained much influence among the gentry of Montrose, and with great devotion ministered to the people of Dundee while the plague was raging in that city. Knox tells us that at Dundee a priest attempted to assassinate him after one of his sermons, and that Wishart saved the man from the fury of the mob. He was finally seized at Ormiston, East Lothian, and tried at St. Andrews. He was burnt March 1, 1546. In some accounts it is said that his sufferings were watched from a window by Cardinal Beaton, and that Wishart called out, 'He who feedeth his eyes with my torments, within few days shall be hanged out at the same window.'

Whether the words were said or not, they describe what actually happened. Early on May 29, 1546, a number of mercenary gentlemen, who expected to be rewarded by King Henry VIII., surprised the cardinal in his castle at St. Andrews. The cardinal, on awaking from his sleep, barricaded the door of his room. The conspirators threatened to burn him, and thus compelled him to give them admission. When the unhappy prelate cried out, 'I am a priest, ye will not slay me,' he was reminded that he had shed the blood of George Wishart,

and was stabbed until life was extinct. After this hideous deed his body was hung over the wall of the castle and shamefully insulted. 'Fie, fie,' said the dying cardinal, 'all is gone.' And he spoke more truly than he knew. With him died the only man who would have outwitted John Knox, and the only woman who might have done it threw away her opportunity.

It has been disputed whether Wishart himself had not been privy to this long-projected plot. It is certain that *a* Wishart had been in the conspiracy and had been employed in carrying letters between the conspirators and the English court. But it appears that there was another George Wishart of Dundee who was a friend of England, and this may perhaps have been the real culprit. At any rate the crime was one which would not excite such horror in Scottish society at that period as at a later time, and the fact that John Knox regarded the crime with exultation[1] suggests that his forerunner and teacher, George Wishart, might have regarded the plot with composure. If Wishart really foretold the death of Beaton, he must, almost certainly, have been acquainted with the plan. It is at least certain that he was intimate with men who tried to arrange for the murder.

Wishart's importance has hardly been realised by some modern writers. He may be truly called *the founder of Scottish Protestantism*. It is probable that Hamilton would have been content with a reformation of the ancient Church. But Wishart endeavoured to create a new organisation. He formed new congregations at Montrose and Dundee, and his complete break with the ancient conception of the ministry is shown by the fact that he, although a layman, went through the form of administering communion to himself before his death. Moreover, it was he who connected Scotland with the extreme Protestantism of Switzerland rather than the more moderate Protestantism of Germany. His confession of faith was Swiss, not German, and the communion service

[1] Knox, having described Beaton's murder, adds, 'These things we write merrily, but we would that the reader should observe God's just judgments.' *History of the Reformation*, p. 72 (London, 1644).

used by Knox at Berwick in 1550, which is partly translated from the Zürich service, is almost certainly derived from Wishart. Knox completed what Wishart began, and the fact that the disciple was greater than the master must not obscure the master's influence on his country.

John Knox.—The desperadoes who had murdered Cardinal Beaton ensconced themselves in the castle of St. Andrews,[1] and Knox joined them in this stronghold in April 1547. Knox had received holy orders in the Church and then accepted the teaching of Wishart, nor can it be doubted that he had passed through some religious change by which he believed that he had been brought to assurance of peace with God through Christ. He was a man who, to a very great extent, knew himself, and in a meditation which he wrote in 1566 he describes the temptations which approached his inflammable nature: 'Pride and ambition assault me on the one part, covetousness and malice trouble me on the other; briefly, O Lord, the affections of the flesh do almost suppress the operation of Thy Spirit.' Imperious, dogmatic, practical, and far-sighted, he believed that he was called by God to preach and minister in the cave of Adullam which he had entered. His lot was determined from that moment. The castle was attacked by a French fleet, and its defenders were carried off to languish in prison or toil in galleys.

For nineteen months Knox was chained to an oar, and was then released by the French at the intercession of King Edward VI. He preached to the English garrison at Berwick, but declined the bishopric of Rochester, offered to him through the time-serving Northumberland. Early in Mary's reign he married an English lady, and escaping from England visited Geneva and Frankfurt. At Geneva he made the acquaintance of John Calvin, whose doctrinal system he completely accepted, and at Frankfurt he endeavoured to bring the English congregation into full sympathy with Calvin's practices. His own

[1] It is a remarkable fact that almost all the murderers, if not all, came sooner or later to a violent end. Knox describes the chief murderer as 'most gentle and most modest.'

principles with regard to divine worship are expressed by him with much clearness: 'All worshipping, honouring, or service invented by the brain of man in the religion of God, without His own express commandment, is *idolatry*. The Mass is invented by the brain of man without any commandment of God, therefore it is idolatry.' This delicate logic can only be fully appreciated when we learn that Knox also taught that it was the duty of the magistrate to punish idolatry with death. To these principles he grimly adhered, and on his return to Scotland in 1555 he won the support of some of the most powerful nobles to his doctrines. He was cited to appear before the bishops, and came attended with gentlemen, like a feudal lord. The bishops dropped proceedings, but Knox soon afterwards judged it prudent to retire again to Geneva, where the whole system of Calvin was being adapted for British use by the establishment of a form of Church organisation, and the planning of a Bible with Calvinistic notes, a liturgy, and a metrical Psalter.

During his absence the Lords of the Congregation, as the reforming nobles were called, had resolved that the English Prayer Book of 1552 should be read in all parish churches. A little before this the infatuated Scottish hierarchy had realised that they must be up and doing. A provincial council was held at Edinburgh in 1549 and passed an abundance of excellent resolutions, the effect of which was somewhat blunted by the fact that of the six bishops there present, three were known to have illegitimate children. Another council was held at Edinburgh in 1552. It enacted new provisions for the improvement of the Church, and congratulated itself on the fact that heresies had now been checked, but confessed that few of the people, even in populous places, attended Mass. It was directed that a catechism should be compiled, and it appeared in August 1552, and has always been known as *Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism*. It is well written in a vigorous late Scottish dialect. It contains an exposition of the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Hail Mary, with an instruction on prayers to the saints and prayers for the dead. On the

whole, it is so moderate a statement of mediæval doctrine that by itself it would hardly have been accepted by the Council of Trent. Nothing is said about the Pope or indulgences. Although the catechism denies that in the Eucharist the substance of the bread remains after consecration, the explanation of the 'sacrifice of the altar' would be accepted by most Protestants, and falls short of the explanation given by the great Anglican divines. It is merely described as 'a quick and special remembrance of the Passion.' Mary is said to have been 'preserved from original sin,' but it is plainly stated that Christ alone is the mediator of our redemption, and that the saints are only mediators by way of intercession for us to God. In the explanation of purgatory a strenuous attempt is made to keep within the teaching of 1 Cor. iii. 13. The explanation of penance is peculiarly good and scriptural.

The last provincial Synod of the mediæval Scottish Church met in March 1559. The bishops received a weighty petition requesting that public worship might be in English, and that only qualified men should receive bishoprics and benefices. The bishops refused to adopt the use of English, and showed how little the canons of their previous councils had been observed by making new directions which reveal a disgusting state of clerical morality. This time they were perhaps in real earnest, but they were giving their house the benefit of a spring cleaning when its walls were already cracking.

The Downfall of the Church.—The accession of Elizabeth, in November 1558, caused the British refugees on the Continent to break up their congregations. Those at Geneva were among this number, and Knox returned to Britain. Elizabeth, justly incensed at his insolent tract against the monstrosity of a kingdom being ruled by a woman, refused to allow him to pass through England. He sailed from Dieppe to Scotland, and went from Edinburgh to Dundee and Perth. He arrived at a critical moment. The people had been inflamed in the preceding year by the burning of Walter Myln, a priest aged eighty-two. Queen Mary, the celebrated 'Queen of Scots,' was a child, and the French Queen-Regent, her mother,

vainly tried to soften the Protestant lords with pretty speeches in delicious broken English. Arrived at Perth, Knox preached against the Mass with such effect that the monasteries of the town were sacked, the multitude seeking 'some spoil,' as Knox terms it. The result was immediate civil war. The reforming party was the stronger, and soon Knox preached in triumph at St. Andrews and at Edinburgh. A hideous destruction of magnificent churches ensued. English invaders had previously wrecked many fine churches, but Scottish hands demolished the beauties of St. Andrews, Edinburgh, Dunblane, Dunkeld, and many another place where Scottish architects had displayed the vigour and picturesqueness of their noble art. The frenzy of the ribald mob is well manifested in the popular verses of the period, such as this:—

'The Paip, that pagan full of pride,
Hath blinded us ower lang,
For where the blind the blind doth guide,
No marvel baith gae wrang.
Like prince and king,
He led the ring
Of all iniquity;
"Sing hay trix, trim go trix
Under the greenwood tree."'

This zeal of the converts to the new faith has been neatly described by Sir Walter Scott in the words, 'Marry come up, we had as good have been Romans still, if we are to have no freedom in our pastimes!'

But the young Queen Mary was now married to Francis, who became king of France in July 1559. The danger of the Scottish Government suppressing the rebellion with the aid of French troops was so imminent that Knox left no stone unturned in trying to gain assistance from England. He wrote urgent letters demanding money and troops, and in one epistle to Queen Elizabeth he adroitly alluded to Mary's claim to the English crown. At length these tactics were successful.[1] Elizabeth sent

[1] The most popular modern Presbyterian manual on the *Church of Scotland* (by the Rev. Pearson M'Adam Muir, D.D.), pp. 30-32, omits all reference to this part of Knox's work.

a fleet to the Forth, and a treaty was concluded between Elizabeth and the Lords of the Congregation on February 27, 1560. Thanks to Knox's treason, the Scottish Protestants were now uppermost. The last weak obstacle was removed by the death of the Queen-mother on June 10, 1560. They harried her to the last, sending to her a preacher who touched upon 'the vanity and abomination of that idol, the Mass.' The dying Queen confessed that 'there was no salvation but in and by the death of Jesus Christ,' and begged with tears for the forgiveness of all whom she had offended. But she would not revile the Mass. So her corpse was 'clapped in a coffin of lead,' and was denied Christian burial, as the brutal preachers of Calvinism withstood 'the use of any superstitious rites.' Francis, Mary's husband, died in December 1560.

Establishment of Semi-Presbyterian Calvinism.—Parliament met in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh on August 1, 1560. A coarse petition was presented in which it was said that 'in all the rabble of the clergy there is not one lawful minister,' and a 'godly reformation of abuses' was requested. A Calvinistic Confession, which will shortly be described, was also presented, and the bishops acted as dumb spectators until August 17, when the Primate and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane pleaded for delay. The Confession was put to the vote and carried. On August 24 three more Protestant Acts were passed. The first abolished the jurisdiction of the Pope and the bishops, the second rescinded all former statutes passed in favour of the Roman Church. The third enacted that no one should administer the sacraments but those admitted by the congregation, and that no one should hear or say Mass under pain of confiscation of all their goods for the first offence, banishment from the kingdom for the second, and death for the third.[1]

The ancient Church was not yet wholly destroyed, but it was a shattered ruin.

In the year 1560 the new Church of Scotland was

[1] Dr. M'Crie, in his *Life of Knox*, vol. i. p. 333 (third edition), gracefully glosses the truth by saying that Parliament 'prohibited under certain penalties the celebration of Mass.'

consolidated in the *first* form which it assumed. The *First Confession of Faith* and the *First Book of Discipline* were composed to formulate the new creed and to regulate the new worship. The **First Confession of Faith**[1] formed the banner of Scottish Protestantism in all its wrestlings and conflicts. It is marked by the intellectual power, the enthusiasm, and the vulgarity of John Knox, but it can be partly traced to the Genevan Calvinistic confessions and a summary of doctrine written by the Zwinglian A Lasco. While it retains the ancient orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation, it repudiates expressly the doctrine that there is one visible Catholic Church, a doctrine which St. Paul expounded in the closest connection with the doctrine of the incarnate universal Saviour. The article on 'Election' asserts the truth of predestination very moderately, and is in marked contrast with the more extreme Calvinistic statements of the later Scottish and English Puritans. On the other hand, we find an assertion of the narrow theory that in consequence of the fall of our first parents the image of God was *utterly* defaced in man, a doctrine which denies that those who have lived piously without the knowledge of Christ, have enjoyed any of that Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. The brief statement on baptism is quite Catholic so far as it goes, and the truth that the faithful feed upon the body and blood of Christ is asserted in the plainest language at considerable length. There is 'unmeasured language of vituperation' towards the unreformed Church. The English Thirty-nine Articles are content with condemning Romish errors and saying that 'the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England,' but the Scottish Confession refers to the unreformed Church as 'the filthy synagogue' and 'the horrible harlot.' The doctrine of Apostolical Succession, by which the Christian Church teaches that no one is a genuine minister of the Church unless he has received the laying-on of hands from the successors of the Apostles, is rejected, 'lineal descent' in the Church being openly disowned.

[1] This and the other Presbyterian Confessions may be conveniently read in Schaff, *Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches.*

The **First Book of Discipline** logically applies the aforesaid doctrine. In exact accordance with Calvin's *Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques* of 1541, it intrusts the government of the Church to (i) ministers or pastors; (ii) doctors or teachers; (iii) elders; (iv) deacons. 'Readers' were to be provided for those churches which could not be supplied with ministers. Over all were superintendents who were ten in number for the whole realm. These offices show an attempt to reconstruct a ministry similar to that contained in the New Testament, but the distinction made by the Scottish Protestants between an elder and a pastor is not scriptural, and we must further observe that the 'superintendents' bore only a superficial resemblance to bishops or to delegates of an apostle, such as Timothy and Titus. The Scottish superintendent might be appointed by an ordinary minister, and the best proof that the office was not regarded as essential is that it was soon allowed to fall into abeyance. The laying-on of hands by bishops is contemptuously rejected as the work of 'dumb dogs,' and the lawful ministers are those appointed with no outward rites but election, examination, and admission. In face of such facts it is simply astounding that some good and learned modern Presbyterians should assert that at the Reformation their Church intended to *retain* the ministry which Christ instituted,[1] or assert that 'the very fact that no theory of Apostolical Succession hampered the free action of the Reformers, makes it all the more noticeable that that succession was not broken.'[2] For the Scottish reformers intended to *create* again a ministry which they believed to have existed in the apostolic age. And they were not hampered by a theory of Apostolical Succession for the reason that they held and acted upon an absolutely different theory, which involved the assertion that the ministers of the unreformed Church 'are not ministers of Christ Jesus.' This is the assertion of the Confession itself in Article Twenty-two.

In calling attention to the defects of the *First Book of*

[1] Rev. James Cooper, D.D., *The Church Catholic and National*, p. 18.

[2] Rev. Pearson M'Adam Muir, D.D., *The Church of Scotland*, p. 33.

Discipline, we must not forget to notice certain merits. It shows an enlightened regard for the poor peasantry, and complains that 'some gentlemen are now as cruel over their tenants as ever were the Papists.' This alludes to the exactions which the vicars of Scottish parishes had demanded from their parishioners in the times immediately before the reformation, exactions which were certainly cruel, but which the vicars were almost compelled to make in consequence of the poverty to which they were reduced by the rich monasteries and their rollicking abbots. Some excellent suggestions were made with regard to the education of the young, which it was intended to carry further than had been reached by the Education Act of 1496. But the plan sketched by Knox did not meet with very wide acceptance, and it was not to the Presbyterians but to the Episcopalians that Scotland owed the establishment of parish schools. Archbishop Spottiswoode, in 1616, brought forward a motion in the General Assembly for the erection of grammar-schools. The Privy Council ratified it, and in 1633 Parliament did away with all ambiguity left by the Privy Council, and made the erection of a school in each parish compulsory.

In 1564 the **Book of Common Order**, popularly known as 'John Knox's liturgy,' was enjoined. In the *First Book of Discipline* it is correctly called 'The Order of Geneva.' It was first used in 1556 by Knox's congregation which met in the church of Marie la Neuve at Geneva, but it appears that the first draft of it was drawn up before the end of 1554 for the use of the English-speaking Puritans at Frankfurt. The formulæ can be traced back to services of Calvin and Farel through the modifications made by Pollanus of Strassburg in 1551. Thus the worship, like the theology, of the Scottish Protestants, was both thoroughly continental and thoroughly revolutionary. The fact that it should ever have won acceptance in a country so much attached to its old traditions as Scotland is equally a proof of the genius of John Knox and of the indifference of the Scottish nobility towards their ancient religion. The fact is plain that the Scottish noblemen who supported the Reformation mostly supported it because it enriched them, and this was in a

or abbacy. The so-called bishops raise much more complicated questions.

There were, firstly, genuine bishops ordained before the Reformation, who found it more and more impossible to exercise their spiritual functions. Some acquiesced in the new state of affairs; some retired to the Continent. The two most important of these bishops were Bishop Leslie of Ross and James Beaton, who was consecrated Archbishop of Glasgow at Rome in 1552. In 1588 James VI. restored to them their temporal possessions as a reward for their fidelity to his mother. Beaton, who was a man of unblemished character, died in 1603, just before James had the full opportunity of restoring Episcopacy. After this class of bishops must be mentioned Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney, who was elected in 1558 and died in 1593. He appears to have been the only real bishop who both rejected communion with Rome and continued to act as a minister of religion. Thus he may be regarded to some extent as a link between the mediæval Church and the reformed Scottish Episcopacy of the seventeenth century. He married Mary to the Earl of Bothwell, and in 1567 he crowned and anointed James VI., in spite of Knox's objection to the anointing. He neglected his diocese, disliking the climate of Orkney and the rough sea-passage thither.

The mock bishops may be classified as follows:—

1. *Titular bishops*, who were appointed by the State or by an arrangement between the Calvinistic Church and the State, known as the Convention of Leith, made in 1572. These titular bishops were

either (*a*) priests who were nominated bishops, but *not* consecrated on account of the changes in Church and State. Among these are to be reckoned Alexander Gordon, 'Archbishop' of Athens, and John Carswell, 'Bishop' of the Isles;

or (*b*) laymen who had often received some form or other of Calvinistic ordination. Among such must be reckoned John Douglas, titular 'Archbishop' of St. Andrews, who was

nominally ordained by the dissolute Robert Stewart, so-called 'Bishop' of Caithness, and others, none of whom appear to have been even in priest's orders.

II. *Tulchan bishops*, who were appointed by private patrons, and were mere nominees of great noblemen, who used them as accomplices in robbing the revenues of the Church. As the patrons secured the greater share of the emoluments, these 'bishops' were derisively called tulchan bishops by the populace. A 'tulchan' was a calf's skin stuffed with straw, and set up beside a cow to make her yield her milk more easily. So the people observed that the 'bishops' had the name, but the nobles had the milk.

These mock bishops, especially the last-named class, swell the list of the ruffians of the Reformation. Alexander Gordon transferred the bishopric of Galloway and the abbacy of Glenluce, as if they had been his own property, to his natural sons. A lad named Alexander Campbell obtained in 1566 the grant of the bishopric of Brechin, and then to a large extent alienated the lands of the see to his patron, the Earl of Argyll. In 1581 Robert Montgomery was appointed so-called Archbishop of Glasgow on promising to hand over all the revenues of the see to the Duke of Lennox for a yearly consideration.

It is necessary to call attention to the exact character of these persons who were allowed the name of bishop by the early Scottish Calvinists, on account of the effort which is sometimes made to blacken the genuine Scottish Episcopacy of later times by associating it with the mock bishops.[1]

The Second Book of Discipline.—John Knox, victorious

[1] This has been done in a Presbyterian manifesto which devotes a chapter to the foundation of Presbyterianism without any suggestion that the so-called bishops appointed between 1560 and 1610 were not real bishops, or that a genuine Episcopacy was started in 1610 by men who were true Scotsmen and had been Presbyterians—Rev. A. Morris Stewart, *The Origins of Scottish Presbytery*.

and vigorous almost to the last, died on November 24, 1572, confident that the grace of God was in him. A great concourse followed his body to the grave, but it seems that no Christian rites were used. Instead of prayer, a brief eulogy was pronounced by the stern Regent Morton, who said, with a true appreciation of Knox's character, that he 'neither feared nor flattered any flesh.' In 1578 Protestantism received an additional impetus from the *Second Book of Discipline*, a book which is marked by a more restrained diction but a still narrower doctrine than the *First Book of Discipline*. It was based upon a document drawn up by the French Calvinists at Paris in 1559. A careful Presbyterian writer, who protests against the idea that the Second Book is not to be regarded as complementary of the First, says that 'the grand ideas of Knox concerning the place of the laity in the Church, the education of the young, and the support and kindly treatment of the aged poor . . . fall considerably into the background'[1] It is remarkable that the Second Book orders the *laying-on of hands* to be used in the ordination of ministers. This order may be compared, to use a proverbial expression, with the shutting of the stable door after the horse has gone out. The Second Book was not fully ratified until 1581, and even if it were true that ordinations administered by presbyters were valid, the ministers who were ordained between 1560 and 1581 were incapable of ordaining their successors. A man cannot hand on to others an office which he has never received the right to have or bestow.

To the year 1581 also belongs the **Second Confession of Faith**, also known as the *Negative Confession* or *King's Confession*. It is merely a virulent manifesto against Romanism, which was signed by the youthful king James VI. to soothe the Protestant alarm caused at that time by the activity of the Roman Catholics. With the fine command of epithets which distinguishes early Calvinism, it denounces the decrees of the Council of Trent, which are far more temperate than itself, as 'erroneous and bloody.'

[1] Dr. Alexander F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 216.

Establishment of thorough Presbyterian Calvinism.—After the publication of the Second Book, Scottish Protestantism began to stiffen into a more rigid Presbyterianism. It began to be asserted with increased resolution that the office of a presbyter is the highest permanent office in the Christian Church, and that the ordinary minister of a congregation must not be under any superior official or bishop. This doctrine teaches that Presbytery, or the government of the Church by the ministers of congregations and the 'elders' who assist them in spiritual concerns, is *of divine right*. The assertion of this doctrine in Scotland is attributed to **Andrew Melville**. He was born near Montrose in 1545, studied in Paris and Geneva, and in 1575 gained the assent of the Scottish Protestants to the doctrine that any minister in charge of a flock is a *bishop*, and therefore need not be under the authority of any superintendent, though it was still maintained that some ministers might exercise supervision over others. The *Second Book of Discipline*, which was mainly composed by Melville, identified presbyters with bishops, and finally, in 1592, the principles of Melville completely triumphed, and Parliament established Presbyterianism pure and simple. Its organisation is now as follows:—

The minister and elders of a congregation form the *Session*, which attends to the spiritual concerns of that congregation, the temporal concerns being intrusted to deacons. The ministers of congregations in a district, with elders from each, constitute the *Presbytery* of that district, the Sessions being subordinate to this Presbytery. Presbyteries join to form a higher court, the *Synod*. This Synod is provincial, and exercises authority over all within the bounds of its jurisdiction. Each Presbytery also elects a number of its members to constitute the *General Assembly* which is the supreme court of the Presbyterian Church. Appeals may ascend to it from all the lower courts, and from it legislation descends to all. Such is the skilfully planned organisation of Scottish Presbyterianism, which received the full sanction of the Scots Parliament of 1592. It is a direct imitation of the Church government of the French Calvinists.

Effects of Presbyterianism.—It remains to ask what benefits had been conferred upon Scotland by the Reformation when the sixteenth century came to an end. The adoption of the republican theocracy of Geneva gave the common people a relish for democratic government, and the reading of the Bible became general, but was attended by 'mischievous nonsense' and 'social anarchy.' There had been no progress in religious liberty, the Protestants were infinitely more cruel towards Catholics than the Catholics had been towards the Lollards of Kyle in 1494. A very distinguished Scottish historian asserts that the Protestant persecution was more ruthless and effective than the often half-hearted persecution inflicted by the Catholics.[1] Some of the most gruesome forms of superstition actively survived, and in a few years the Protestants burnt more persons for alleged witchcraft than had been burnt within any known period before the Reformation. The same shameless robbery of the property which had been devoted to sacred purposes was continued after the Reformation in the same manner as before. Art had visibly declined, and the Reformation inspired no original religious poetry that can be compared with that of the Middle Ages or that of the German Lutherans. The prose writing of Knox is keen and graphic. That of Buchanan is precise and elegant, but the bulk of his works are in Latin, and his education belongs essentially to the pre-Reformation period. There was so little sense of life in Scottish vernacular prose that it virtually terminated with the accession of James VI. to the English throne, and the educated classes immediately tried to write their thoughts in English.[2]

As for the condition of Christian conduct manifested in Scotland, we are happily able to set side by side two statements of great interest. The first is that by David Calderwood, the special historian of Presbyterianism. He says 'The Kirk of Scotland was now come to her

[1] Mr. Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 431.

[2] Mr. T. F. Henderson, *Scottish Vernacular Literature*, p. 10, says, 'The Scottish Reformation, which the vernacular literature in some sense heralded, and in many ways assisted to bring about, in the end effectually smothered that literature.'

perfection, and the greatest purity that ever she attained unto both in doctrine and discipline, so that her beauty was admirable to foreign Kirks. The assemblies of the saints were never so glorious nor profitable to every one of the true members thereof.'[1] But Calderwood honestly inserts a document emanating from the General Assembly of the aforesaid Kirk which does not suggest that its moral successes had been very marked. It speaks of 'the common corruption of all estates within their land.' It speaks of 'an universal coldness and decay of zeal in all estates, joined with ignorance and contempt of the Word, ministry, and sacraments'; not only 'blasphemy of the holy name of God' and 'profanation of the Sabbath' are rebuked, but 'the document becomes somewhat more descriptive of prevailing vices than the decorous habits of modern literature would sanction.' Ministers are accused of using light and profane company, gambling, dancing, carding, dicing. It is found necessary to order the deposition of ministers who are swearers and drunkards, and the admonition of those 'given to unlawful and incompetent trades for filthy gain.' After a plain-spoken description of idlers of various kinds it is added, 'Lying, finally, is a rife and common sin.'[2]

The impartial reader will judge whether it is better to trust the Assembly or the historian whom the Assembly pensioned to write history.

Extension of Presbyterianism.—To what extent was the Presbyterian system heartily accepted by the Scottish people? It is very difficult to give an exact answer, but there is little doubt that popular imagination has exaggerated the influence of Presbyterianism both in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth century. The complete victory which Presbyterianism finally secured after A.D. 1745, when the non-Presbyterian Christians of Scotland were so ingeniously persecuted by the British Government, has blotted out the recollection of a good many facts. It has caused the notion to arise that Scotsmen accepted John Knox with a universal veneration which

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 387.
[2] See Burton, *History of Scotland*, vol. vi. p. 78.

even a prophet does not receive in his own country. But great as was the influence of Knox in large districts of the south of Scotland, it was probably slight throughout the north. It depended more upon the great landowners than upon the variations of race and language in different districts.[1] It is true that many of the Highlanders remained attached to Rome, as do some of their descendants in Scotland and Canada at the present day. But the first book printed in Gaelic was a translation of Knox's *Book of Common Order* by Carswell, titular Bishop of the Isles, and on the other hand it was the Anglo-Scottish city of Aberdeen which was the centre of the Roman Catholic Earl of Huntly, the 'Cock of the North.'

In 1562 a Jesuit named De Gouda visited Scotland and wrote a careful and very unfavourable account of the state of the old religion. He declares that the monasteries are ruined, that the Catholic preachers are unequal to dealing with points of controversy, and that even wealthy Catholics only hear Mass occasionally, and in their own houses. Professing Catholics are represented as incurring great danger, the magistrates do little or no justice to them in the courts of law, and even priests publicly abjure the Catholic faith. He seems to have been perfectly correct in his estimate of the intellectual powers of his co-religionists. Quintin Kennedy, abbot of Crossraguel, and Ninian Winzet, master of the Grammar-school of Linlithgow, were for some time the only able defenders of the old system in Scotland. Knox held a public and courteous disputation with Kennedy, but was nettled by a parody of Winzet on his *First Blast*. He urged the magistrates of Edinburgh to arrest the writer, but Winzet escaped to the Continent and died in 1592 as abbot of the Scots Benedictine

[1] At the beginning of the reign of Queen Victoria, the dividing line between the Gaelic language and the Scottish dialect of English could be marked in the shape of a bow drawn from Nairn to near Dunkeld, and then westward so as to include the isles of Bute and Arran. To the north and west of that line nearly every one knew Gaelic. In the sixteenth century Gaelic extended somewhat farther south and lingered in Galloway.

Monastery at Ratisbon. It is worth noting that Winzet, Kennedy, and De Gouda all attribute the ruin of the Church to the corruptions connected with the episcopate.

After the time of De Gouda there came missionaries from the Continent who brought with them the zeal and doctrine of modern Roman Catholicism. They met with very considerable success. Their history cannot be discussed in this small book, and it must suffice to say that for many years after the Reformation Presbyterianism had very little spiritual hold in large districts of the north, although it was able to cripple the Roman missions by persecution.

We must also inquire whether in the sixteenth century there were good and intelligent Scotsmen who would have preferred a reformation on better lines than those devised by Knox and Melville. The answer, happily, can be given in the affirmative. Early in the century lived John Major, the finest Scottish teacher of the age, who was as antagonistic to the absolute supremacy of the Pope as he was to the licence of the Scottish clergy. He appears to have been quite opposed to Protestantism. Patrick Hamilton himself was probably quite unaffected by the Swiss and French opinions which dominated Knox, and the fact that he composed the music for a Mass is enough to suggest that he was separated by a great distance from the chill Church of Geneva. The truly cultured and conciliatory Alexander Alane, to whom Melanchthon gave the name of *Alesius*, or the wanderer, knew Calvin, but his principles were not those of Calvin. Among his numerous writings is a famous translation in Latin of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., a translation which shows that the author was more conservative and mediæval in tone than the Prayer Book itself. Yet he was a man prepared to suffer for his opinions, and he was confined in a filthy dungeon at St. Andrews simply for criticising the immorality of his companions. Even among the persons directly concerned with the Scottish Reformation, there were men like Wynram, formerly sub-prior of St. Andrews, and Erskine of Dun, who were antagonistic to the extreme principles which gradually won the day, and whose connections

with titular Episcopacy appear to have been entirely honest. Nor should we forget to mention that the English Prayer Book was often bought and read by Scottish readers at this period. These facts must be remembered when we come to study the attempt which was afterwards made to reform the Reformation.

CHAPTER VII

FROM JAMES I. TO CHARLES II.

James VI. and I., 1603.—Elizabeth's 'cousin of Scotland,' as she called him, James VI., came to the English throne as James I. This accession of a Scottish monarch to the English throne naturally resulted in an attempt to unite the religion of England and of Scotland. The attempt was only finally abandoned when the last Stuart monarch, James II., abdicated, and William III., himself a Dutch Calvinist, established Calvinistic Presbyterianism as the religion of Scotland in 1690.

James assumed something like real power in Scotland in 1578, at the age of twelve. Educated by George Buchanan, one of the greatest scholars of his age, the king was a strange compound of shrewdness and folly, and his learning was not accompanied by the modesty which is the usual mark of a genuine student. But whatever his faults were, he was not so stupid as to live in ignorance of the general character of the religion of which Calvin had drawn the ground-plan, and which Knox and Melville had erected. He had seen around him spoliation, savagery, and sedition. When he was decoyed and captured in the Raid of Ruthven, the Calvinists had approved. When in 1584 Parliament endeavoured to give a real jurisdiction to the titular 'bishops,' an action not inconsistent with the form of Calvinism then established, the Acts were libelled and labelled as *The Black Acts*. When the king asked the ministers to pray for his mother, they not only refused, but stirred up a layman to enter the pulpit and exclude the appointed preacher. They finally, as they thought, worsted him in 1592, when the most definite Presbyterianism was ratified by Parliament. There were faults on

both sides, but nothing can be discovered which disproves the words which James wrote concerning the more fiery ministers: 'Never was there a faction in my minority but they were of it. I was calumniated in their sermons, not for any vice in me, but because I was a king, which they thought the highest evil. For they told their flocks that kings and princes were naturally enemies to the Church.'[1]

James and the Puritans.—The English Puritans, mistaking the real opinions of the king, presented him as he came towards London with a document called the Millenary Petition, because it was intended to be signed by a thousand ministers. The chief Puritan demands, as then stated, or as subsequently modified, were that the wearing of the surplice should not be compulsory, that the word 'priest,' bowing at the name of Jesus, the sign of the cross at baptism, and kneeling at Holy Communion should be abolished, and that Confirmation should be altered or abolished. A more reasonable demand was that clergymen should preach every Sunday. Some of the proposals look small enough, but any one skilled in the controversies of the time can see that they are symptoms of a chronic opposition to the Catholic doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments. This is placed beyond dispute by the fact that the Puritans not only desired to alter the Prayer Book, but also wished to alter the Thirty-nine Articles in a manner which would sanction Calvinism. The king, who loved an argument, appointed the meeting of a Conference at **Hampton Court** in January 1604. It was clear that the leaders of the Church were definitely antagonistic to the proposed changes, which would have prepared for a Presbyterian triumph, and delighted the Jesuits by driving Catholic-minded Anglicans into the arms of Rome. James, as might have been expected, was inclined to the Episcopal party, and when Reynolds, the leader of the Puritans, incautiously made an allusion to 'presbytery,' the king immediately scented danger and cried out with a vehemence born of experience, 'A Scottish presbytery

[1] *Basilicon Doron*, Works, p. 160.

agreeth as well with a monarchy as God with the devil. . . . Until you find that I grow lazy, let that alone.'

The Hampton Court Conference did not end in a mere negation to Protestant demands. It resulted in the addition to the Church Catechism of the questions and answers on the Sacraments, a temperate and thoroughly Catholic addition, and also in the magnificent translation of the Bible which we call the *Authorised Version*. It is an interesting fact that this new translation of the Bible was first suggested by a Puritan, and that in time it became the means of ousting the famous Puritan version known as the Genevan Bible. A number of important canons or rules affecting members of the Church, and especially the clergy, were collected in 1603. Among them is a canon which gives directions with regard to sacramental confession to a priest, and another which asserts that we do not separate from the Churches of Italy and other continental countries, except wherein those Churches have 'fallen from themselves.' Conformity to these rules was strictly enforced by the new primate, **Richard Bancroft**. The increasing influence of the English Reformation was also illustrated in the early part of this reign by the translation of the New Testament and the Prayer Book into Irish Gaelic, and the translation of the Prayer Book into Manx Gaelic.

James and the Romanists.—The Roman Catholics, like the Puritans, hoped to gain toleration from James I. In the first year of his reign he remitted the fines imposed upon them for not attending the parish churches. This leniency was followed by such an increase in the number of 'recusants,' as they were called, that James became alarmed and banished their priests from London. Then the more desperate members of the party, with the knowledge of certain Jesuits, made a plot to blow up the king and Parliament at the opening of Parliament on November 5, 1605. A coal-cellar was hired under the House of Lords, and the plot would no doubt have succeeded if one of the plotters had not betrayed the secret. Guy Fawkes, a soldier who had been sent into the cellar to fire the train, was captured, and all the conspirators who were taken alive were executed. A

Jesuit writer has lately attempted to whittle away the evidence with regard to this plot, but his effort has done little more than excite the contempt which it deserves.

The Gunpowder Plot, as might be expected, did great harm to the cause of English Roman Catholicism. Very severe laws were passed against it, but the king still wished to treat the Romanists with some degree of lenity. He devised an oath to be taken by them as a guarantee of their loyalty, that those who would take it might be exempted from the penal laws. Their archpriest Blackwell gave it his approval, but the oath was condemned by Pope Paul v., and once more the Roman Catholics of England, often unimpeachable in their loyalty, were forced by a Pope to forfeit the sympathy of their fellow-countrymen.[1]

The Catholic Revival.—In the meantime the Church of England was stirring like a giant refreshed. The work of Hooker and Bancroft was taken up by a group of active prelates and theologians, and a change began which can best be compared with that inaugurated by the Oxford movement in the nineteenth century. Nonconformity began to decline, and the services of the Church began to be more frequent and more reverent. Fasts and festivals were better observed, the surplice and the cope were worn, and buildings beautified. Nor was the revival a mere revival of externals. A Church is doomed unless it can produce men who are both students and saints, and the Church of England began to produce men who were both. We now see the unfolding of a long line of names which make English theology venerable, and which extend through the succeeding reign. There was Overall, now Bishop of Lichfield; Bramhall, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh; Montague, Bishop of Chichester; and Jeremy Taylor, the author of *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*. Nor must we omit George Herbert, the typical English poet, priest, and gentleman, and Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding, whose large household was devoted to prayer and good works, and

[1] For this oath see Prof. Collins, *The English Reformation* (Church Historical Society).

proved that much which is admirable in a monastery may be copied in a home. Above all, there was **Lancelot Andrewes**, Bishop successively of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester. He was one of the few men who have lived truly in the world but not of it, and have combined the duties of a courtier with the mind of an apostle. His sermons were justly valued for their vivid exposition of Scripture, and his chapel, with its lights and incense, copes and wafer-bread and mixed chalice, showed his fidelity to the Reformation settlement as it really was, and not as the Puritans would have liked it to be. A powerful antagonist of Rome, he firmly maintained the Catholic position of the Church of England, and insisted on the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice. That sense of humour which of old had been found in St. Athanasius and St. Basil was not lacking in Andrewes, as the following tale bears witness. 'My lords,' said James once to Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Neile, 'cannot I take my subjects' money when I want it, without all the formality of Parliament?' 'God forbid, sir, but that you should,' at once replied Neile, 'you are the breath of our nostrils.' Andrewes remained silent. 'How think you, my lord?' reiterated James. 'I think, sir,' answered the bishop slowly, 'that it is lawful for you to take my brother Neile's money, for he offers it.'

James and the Church of Scotland.—James never lost sight of his intention of restoring ecclesiastical union between England and Scotland. This could only be done by giving Scotland an Episcopal ministry. So he summoned to London three prominent Presbyterian ministers, **Spottiswoode**, Lamb, and Hamilton, and explained to them that 'he had called them to England, that being consecrated themselves they might at their return give ordination to those at home, and so the adversaries' mouths be stopped, who said that he did take upon him to create bishops, and bestow spiritual offices, which he never did, nor would he presume to do, acknowledging that authority to belong to Christ alone and those whom He had authorised with His power.' With great tact he provided that they should not be consecrated by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, lest any of his

fellow-countrymen should imagine that he was introducing an English ecclesiastical jurisdiction into Scotland. So the consecration was duly performed by four bishops in the chapel of London House, on Sunday, October 21, 1610.

From a Catholic point of view there can be no doubt as to the validity of this consecration. It is true that the English bishops decided not to ordain the three Scottish ministers to the presbyterate before advancing them to the episcopal order. But the greater rank includes the lesser, and in earlier times St. Ambrose of Milan and Nectarius of Constantinople were both consecrated bishops without being ordained presbyters, and the same is true of several of the bishops of Rome.

The new bishops on their return to Scotland proceeded with the consecration of the prelates nominated for the other sees. The opinion of the nation was divided with regard to Episcopacy, but Parliament in 1612 ratified it and abolished the Presbyterian enactments of 1592. The nobility were, on the whole, favourable to the change; the ministers in the south were mostly opposed to it, but in other districts they were favourable; the common people were rather callous. Some fantastic objections to anything regarded as Popish still continued to be felt in the south of Scotland. Incredible as it may appear to a modern reader, university degrees were regarded as Popish, and when James attempted to revive them, some ministers declined to receive a degree. The Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, and General Assemblies, which the Scottish Protestants had borrowed from the French, were retained after the introduction of Episcopacy. Though not national in their origin, they were capable of being useful to the nation, and their retention seems to have been a prudent concession.

In 1617 James visited Scotland. The chapel of Holyrood was carefully furnished, and the English Prayer Book, which had not been used publicly in Scotland for nearly sixty years, was again read in Edinburgh. In 1618 a definite step towards the abolition of Presbyterian innovations in worship was taken by a meeting of the General Assembly at Perth. By an overwhelming

majority the Assembly accepted what are known as the **Five Articles of Perth.** These are rules (1) to kneel at Holy Communion; (2) to give private communion to the sick; (3) to administer private baptism in cases of necessity; (4) to administer confirmation; (5) to observe the days of Christ's Birth, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and also Whitsunday. Thus, before James I. died, the United Kingdoms of England and Scotland possessed Churches which were at least closely approaching to union. His attitude towards Scottish Presbyterianism, though not always tolerant from a modern point of view, was toleration itself when compared with the ferocious tyranny of Knox and his disciples. The common practice of censuring James for imposing English customs upon a people whose sense of nationality was too keen to admit the introduction of a foreign system is as puerile as it is false. James was a Scotsman dealing with Scotsmen, and he employed Scotsmen in carrying out his wishes. The Five Articles of Perth were accepted by the Scottish General Assembly, and ordered nothing which had not been universal in Scotland before the introduction of French Calvinist rites. And the revival of Episcopacy meant a return to the practice of the times of Columba, Aidan, and Cuthbert, when Scottish Christianity possessed both an apostolic government and an apostolic fervour.

Charles I., 1625.—The new king was both more dignified and more religious than his father. Moreover, in all religious questions he was in touch with the learned and devout Catholic school in the Church of England. The strength of Calvinism had been weakened by philosophers who disliked its narrowness, historians who disliked its false claim to be scriptural, and believers who disliked its cruel view of God and its melancholy worship. James only emancipated himself by degrees from the doctrines of the Calvinistic Church, against whose methods he had rebelled. Charles had grown to manhood in the gentler air of the Catholic faith. Unfortunately, he was injudicious. With his faults in politics we are not now concerned, but it is necessary to say that he did not understand how strong Calvinism still was both in

England and Scotland. He was in a hurry to effect improvements, and attempted to do in ten years a work which required fifty. In his ecclesiastical policy he had the hearty co-operation of Archbishop Laud, who shared the same hopes and the same death as his royal master.

Archbishop Laud.—Few men of unselfish heart and conscientious action have aroused such intense hatred as Laud. He was rather sharp and dictatorial, and somewhat imprudent in his methods even when his plans were very wise. Thus he was a man whom it was easy to dislike. Men probably felt that they agreed with Andrewes even when they disagreed with what he said, but they were tempted to disagree with Laud even when they agreed with what he said. He was profoundly convinced that the Church of England had the right to exist as Catholic, but not papal, and to claim the affection of the English people. He wished primarily to convert members of the Church of England to their own Church, and he knew that ignorance was one of the main obstacles in the way of this conversion. Therefore he never forgot to minister to the needs of learning. In Oxford he rebuilt a large part of St. John's College in exquisite taste, wisely providing so large a library that even now the steady purchase of books has not made it overcrowded. He put the whole world of letters under an obligation by fostering the study of Semitic languages and by founding the University Press. He trained or influenced some of the most remarkable ecclesiastics whom the Church of England has ever produced, including Bishop Wren and Bishop Cosin, who aided in the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661, and good William Juxon, who attended Charles I. on the scaffold and became primate at the Restoration.

Laud became Bishop of St. David's in 1621, of London in 1628, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. Wherever he exercised his episcopal office, he set his face towards the reformation and improvement of the Church. He was convinced that fixed forms of prayer are a safeguard against falsehood and novelty, and he was determined that the forms of the Church of England should be honestly and reverently employed. It is a cruel

injustice to suppose that he possessed any feminine passion for the mere external aids of worship, or even that he insisted upon his clergy employing the maximum of ceremonial which the Church of England sanctions. He did not enforce the Ornaments rubric of 1559, but he insisted that the altar should be placed where it could not be used as a hat-stand, and that the surplice should be worn, and not left in the vestry, or hung in derision round the leg, as one clergyman wore it. His own principles he explained by saying, 'The inward worship of the heart is the great service of God, and no service acceptable without it; but the external worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world that our heart stands right in that service of God.' When in London, he restored St. Paul's Cathedral, and, in dealing with the parish churches, he suppressed the Puritan lectures, which had been arranged in such a manner that the services of the Church might be recited on Sunday morning and reviled on Sunday afternoon. On his becoming Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 his activity increased and the opposition to his measures became more determined.

Opposition to Laud.—The three chief reasons for the opposition to Laud were as follows:—

1. Very unjustly, Laud was involved in the unpopularity which in some districts had attached to the Church on account of the laxity of the clergy. It was not uncommon for the clergy to be ignorant, worldly, and slack. Baxter the Puritan was by no means free from prejudice, but we can certainly trust him when he says that his father was called a Puritan and a Precisian because he read the Bible and reproved drunkenness. Men of earnest morality became enlisted in the cause of Puritanism by the mere fact of clerical negligence, and they did not pause to consider that Laud was a man of the same moral force as themselves. Strange as it may appear, this tide of bitterness was swollen by the hatred of prominent men who understood Laud, and hated him because they knew that he was strict. 'He did court persons too little,' says Clarendon, and a great modern historian says, 'he had roused animosity in the upper

classes by punishing gentlemen guilty of immorality, or of breaches of church discipline, as freely as he punished more lowly offenders.'[1]

2. Laud's unpopularity was largely caused by his political principles. The almost absolute authority of the king was at this time sincerely believed in by a considerable section of the people, and had become a part of their ordinary mental equipment. The supremacy of Parliament over the Crown, which was the natural outcome of the doctrine held by the leading English Puritans, seemed to the Royalist party in general, and Laud in particular, as incompatible, both with the English monarchy and Holy Scripture. Here we can frankly admit that Laud and others were mistaken in exalting the personal government of the king at the expense of national freedom. They committed an error which sometimes bordered on a crime. But we must also admit that the problem was more complicated and the error less criminal than they appear at first sight. A careful scrutiny of the history of the time shows us that the various Protestant sects which had arisen in England since 1530 differed fundamentally, not only on doctrinal but also on political questions. The Independents were infinitely more democratic than the Presbyterians, and there is conclusive evidence of the existence of Communistic principles among the more extreme Protestants before the death of Charles I. Amid the divisions and turmoils of the day, to support the king in all things might well seem to many men the only security for discipline and stability.

3. Laud's unpopularity was especially due to his religious teaching. It is here that time has vindicated him triumphantly. We must remember that the influence of Calvin's writings and the Genevan Bible with its Calvinistic notes had penetrated into the English middle class in many districts. The result was that the Presbyterian Puritans were cemented together in one hard sharp system. Modern English Protestantism is a collection of fragments, containing pieces of Anglican

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *Student's History of England*, vol. ii. p. 521.

ritual, a Zwinglian doctrine of the Sacraments, a Lutheran doctrine of faith, and the old Calvinistic doctrine of the Church, fragments which are becoming gradually corroded by the smoke of scepticism. But the Puritans of the seventeenth century believed, and knew what they believed. They were quite certain that the Pope was Antichrist, and that everything which the Pope sanctioned in public worship was sinful, unless it could claim the direct authority of the New Testament. Therefore it was quite useless to tell them that Laud was one of the ablest opponents of Rome that had ever been born, or that he had won back distinguished converts from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. Laud had been willing to allow that the Church of Rome was part of the Catholic Church, and he liked crucifixes and copes. He was therefore a friend of Antichrist, and an enemy of Christ. To any man who was a thorough-going Puritan this was the necessary conclusion, and to argue with him was like discoursing to a brick wall. Moreover, Laud believed that free salvation is offered to all men in Christ, that He died for all, that 'whosoever will, may come.' This was detested by the Puritans; it was 'Arminianism,' it was 'Popery,' it was a direct denial of their pet doctrine, on which the whole system of Calvin rests, the doctrine that Christ died only for the elect, and that God rejects the non-elect and appoints the means for their damnation. Laud declared this opinion to be one which his soul abominated, 'for it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world.'

Laud and the Puritans were both right in this, there could not be room for him and them in the same Church.

The New Sects.—In considering the opposition to the Church during this period, it becomes necessary to mention various sects which arose at a later period than Calvinism. Slowly but steadily the adherents of the new religion were departing further from the faith:

> View
> Each shrinking stalk and silent falling leaf.
> Truth after truth, of choicest scent and hue,
> Fades, and in falling stirs the angels' grief.

First came the **Independents**, more familiar to us nowadays under the name of **Congregationalists**. Their founder, Robert Brown, had been a pupil of the Presbyterian Cartwright. He crossed to Holland and wrote several books in which he suggested the plan by which the Reformation should be conducted. He declared that the magistrate was to have no ecclesiastical authority whatever, and that it was a sin not to avoid the communion of false Christians. In 1592 Bacon tells us that the Independents were 'a very small number of silly and base people,' but they rapidly increased on the lines laid down by Henry Barrow, who modified the teaching of Brown. The central point in the theological system of the Independents was that 'the whole form of church government, and all acts thereunto appertaining' are to be settled 'by the most voices in and of every particular congregation.' This brought the Independents into violent collision with the Presbyterians, and yet it was a logical development of Presbyterian Calvinism. If it be true, as the Calvinists asserted, that there is no *visible* organised Catholic Church, there is no reason why each individual visible congregation should not govern itself according to its private interpretation of the Bible. The Presbyterians were unfitted to resist the Independents until they employed Catholic weapons in the shape of a theory about a visible Catholic Church.

Next to the Independents came the **Baptists**. Early in the seventeenth century the English Independents had a church in Amsterdam. From this church two members seceded, Smyth and Helwisse. They adopted the opinions of Menno the Anabaptist, and introduced them into London, where Helwisse founded a church in 1611. The Anabaptists, or Baptists as they now strangely call themselves, declared that the baptism of infants is an impious mockery, and they made a large number of converts in England. On most points they agreed with the Independents, and in rejecting infant-baptism they logically developed the doctrine of the Independents. Infant-baptism was believed by the early Christians to date from the apostolic age, and it was sanctioned by the whole visible Catholic Church, but if the idea of

a visible Catholic Church is erroneous, then a custom which rests upon the authority of that Church is erroneous. Moreover, the Presbyterians and Independents believed that baptism did not put the baptized person into a right relation with God, unless he was predestined, as they understood the word. Therefore the Baptists could logically say that baptism was in the case of an infant unnecessary, though in the case of adults it was an edifying ceremony sanctioned by the Bible.

The **Quakers** went one step further. Their rise belongs to the period of the civil revolution. Bitterly detested by the other sects, they were the offspring of those sects. A large proportion of the early Quakers were converts from the Baptists. Like some of the early Baptists, they maintained that no Christian might carry arms or wage war, and they rejected both baptism and Holy Communion. Many of them, in their reaction against the teaching of the Presbyterians and Independents, adopted more Catholic views about faith and justification than their opponents, and they were therefore all the more detested as being 'Popish.' It is both important and interesting to remember that Quakerism was at first quite as much a protest against Presbyterianism as against the Church, and perhaps more so. When George Fox began to preach his doctrines in 1647, the churches had been largely taken from churchmen, the 'steeple-houses,' against which he testified, had become Presbyterian places of worship, and the 'priests' were Presbyterian ministers. The fact that Quakerism left no definite place for external teachers of religion is, perhaps, mainly due to the fanatical clericalism of the Puritan ministers.

Charles I. and the Church of Scotland.—The first definite resistance on a large scale to the ecclesiastical policy of Charles I. and Laud began in Scotland. And yet we may say that if all the actions of the king had been as blameless as his actions towards the Church of Scotland, he would have deserved all the praise which was won for him by *Eikon Basilike*, the little book which endeared his memory to so many of our forefathers. Almost at the beginning of his reign the king showed that he meant to pursue a determined policy in Scotland. In

November 1626 it was announced at the Cross in Edinburgh that the king had resolved on a general revocation of all Church lands to the Crown. The king held that the Church lands were attached to ecclesiastical offices for duties done, and that the possession of them by laymen was illegal. He meant to restore to the Church at least a substantial portion of the property of which it had been robbed. The plan, though righteous, was premature. For the religious amelioration of Scotland it was essential that the king should have the support of either the landowners or the clergy. The majority of the clergy were still deeply infected with Calvinism, and therefore likely to oppose a king whom they regarded as half a Papist. When the healing influence of time and example had removed the soreness caused by the king's theology, it would have been possible to adjust the compensation due to the landowners who were asked to surrender their ill-gotten property. But in 1626 the king's edict could only have the effect of joining the landowners to the Calvinistic clergy. Some members of the nobility did give up part of their lands, but when Lord Nithsdale was commissioned to obtain the remaining Church lands, an arrangement was made to murder him quietly,[1] and he prudently returned to Court. The king's scheme was therefore given up, but the baser members of the nobility did not forget it.

For a while affairs went happily. The king, with a degree of toleration which was rare at this period of history, advised the bishops not to enforce the Five Articles of Perth on those ministers who had been ordained before those Articles had been passed. He was successful in putting the stipends of the parochial clergy on a satisfactory footing for the first time since the Reformation, and the ministers of the Presbyterian Establishment still enjoy the advantage of this arrangement. Parliament also ordered the erection of a school in every parish, in accordance with the desire expressed by Archbishop Spottiswoode in 1616, and then ratified by the Privy Council. In the summer of 1633 the king

[1] Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, vol. i. p. 30.

paid his long-expected visit to Scotland, and was crowned with stately ceremony in the chapel of Holyrood. Accompanied by Laud, he visited different places of interest in Scotland, and resolved to restore the cathedrals of Iona and St. Andrews. It is said that as Laud gazed on the ruins of the cathedral of Dunblane he remarked that it was a goodly church. A bystander replied, 'Yes, my lord, this was a brave kirk before the Reformation.' The bishop quickly corrected him, 'What, fellow, Deformation, not Reformation.'

After the visit of Charles to Scotland he formed the diocese of Edinburgh 'for the glory of God and the good of His Church in his ancient and native kingdom.' St. Giles' was then made the cathedral church, and Dr. William Forbes, a saintly and Catholic prelate, was made the first bishop. Unhappily he died shortly afterwards, and was thus unable to give the king the benefit of his counsels in the crisis that was approaching. In 1636 an Ordinal was published for use in Scotland, and also a book of canons. These canons were published by the king on 'the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian emperors in the primitive Church.' They were based on the English canons of 1603, and were drawn up with the co-operation of the Scottish bishops. The fact that they are singularly reasonable and moderate is outweighed by the fact that they were formally issued on the king's sole authority, and Juxon, Bishop of London, was not far wrong when he predicted that they would 'make more noise than all the cannons in Edinburgh Castle.'

The Scottish Liturgy, 1637.—The Book of Common Prayer composed for Scottish use was virtually completed in April 1636, and the Scottish bishops could then have satisfied themselves as to the nature of the new service-book. In the reign of James a liturgy had been completed by the Scottish bishops, and it was sent to London for approval in 1629. It was a poor performance, being written in a mixture of Scots and English, and being composed of alternate slices from Knox's liturgy and the Book of Common Prayer. Laud advised the adoption of the English Book of Common Prayer instead of this

strange composition. John Maxwell, then a prominent clergyman in Edinburgh, and afterwards Bishop of Ross, urged that his countrymen would be better pleased if they could have a book of their own. The king fully saw the wisdom of this plan and wished that the new book should be on the one hand 'in substance not differing from this of England, *that so the Roman party might not upbraid us with any weighty or material differences in our Liturgy*,' and on the other hand that it might 'truly and justly be reputed' a book composed by the Church of Scotland. With a persistence which is next-of-kin to partisanship, the book has been, and often is, called 'Laud's liturgy,' and thus it has been blackened by association with a name which is everywhere spoken against. But Laud did not wish for the book, and did not assist in its preparation until he was compelled to do so. It was, to a large extent, modelled by James Wedderburne, Bishop of Dunblane, a man of good Scottish family, a gentle scholar, who was hunted out of his fatherland by the Presbyterians and found a now neglected grave in the aisles of Canterbury.

The Scottish Prayer Book, which would have been a credit to any scholar in any age, was first used in Edinburgh in St. Giles' Cathedral, Sunday, July 23, 1637.

The Calvinists took good care to warn their people beforehand against its 'gross heresies,' 'Popish superstitions,' and 'the garment of Baal's priests.' Their warnings were fatally effective. At eight o'clock in the morning there was read as usual John Knox's liturgy—an adaptation of continental rites. No Episcopalians came to protest or riot. At ten o'clock the Dean began to read the Morning Prayer—an adaptation of English rites. When he began the collect there was a clapping of hands and shouts, while low women and apprentices dressed as women began to throw stools and Bibles. The doors were shut, and while a surging mob beset the church, the clergy with difficulty escaped. That evening the bishop courageously read the service and scarcely escaped with his life. The whole affair was a more or less organised brawl of the most shameless description. But it has been

glorified as a magnificent assertion of liberty and truth, a fictitious heroine of the name of Jenny Geddes has been invented to account for the origin of the riot, and some Presbyterians have erected a tablet in the church to the memory of the legendary virago.[1]

The Religious Revolution in Scotland.—The tactics of the leading Presbyterians at this period deserve a closer attention than they always receive in modern books. The nobility of their party formed the backbone of the opposition, and they were determined to overthrow Episcopacy as the surest means of retaining the Church lands which they possessed. Their forefathers had long been adepts in the formation of bonds or leagues for opposing the Crown, and this old expedient was again adopted. It was determined to form a new bond for the purpose of resisting Episcopacy, and on February 28, 1638, the **National Covenant** was ready for subscription. It consisted of three parts; the first was James VI.'s Confession of 1581, the second rehearsed various Acts of Parliament against Popery, the third part or Covenant proper pledged the subscribers to 'recover the purity and liberty of the Gospel.' The country was soon in a blaze which was eagerly fanned by professional agents, and signatures were procured in great numbers, in spite of the fact that much of the intellect of Scotland was opposed to the Covenant and that it was condemned by the universities of Aberdeen and St. Andrews. The Covenanters were not too particular as to the methods which they employed to gain subscription, for we read that those who refused to sign were treated 'with what threatenings, with what beating, tearing of the clothes, drawing of the blood, and exposing to thousands of injuries.'

The Covenanters now set about preparations for a General Assembly with the full intention that Episcopacy should be abolished with what claimed to be ecclesiastical sanction. They also intended to 'execute' Archbishop Spottiswoode,[2] who fortunately escaped into Yorkshire.

[1] See Burton, *History of Scotland*, vol. vi. p. 443.
[2] Baillie, *Letters*, vol. i. p. 87.

The Assembly met in the Cathedral at Glasgow, November 21, 1638. Apart from the infamous Robber Council of Ephesus in A.D. 449, the Glasgow Assembly might perhaps be regarded as solitary in the history of Christendom. The disorder caused by 'the multitude' was so great that even the Presbyterian Baillie says that the manners shown were worse than those of 'Turks or Pagans.' The Marquis of Hamilton, who was Lord High Commissioner, was compelled to retire when he found the Assembly resolved to exclude the bishops from a voice in its proceedings by the ingenious method of bringing them before the Assembly in a body as criminals.

The bishops were dealt with in the following manner. Both the commissioner and judges having refused to interfere with them, the Covenanters had appealed to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, which had no more right to deal with the question than one English diocesan conference, *minus* its bishop, has to judge the entire English episcopate. However, an elaborate libel was prepared, charging the bishops not only with Arminianism and Popery, but with 'excessive drinking, whoring, playing at cards and dice . . . adultery and incest.' The Presbytery actually gave its support to these statements, and a Scottish Roman Catholic writer, by no means friendly to the Episcopal Church, tells us that 'these abominable calumnies against men, many of them venerable for their piety, learning, and years, were appointed to be read in all the pulpits on a Communion Sunday.'[1] The filthy document was read almost over the emblems of the Redeemer's sacrifice, and was transmitted to the Assembly. The Assembly passed an Act condemning as null and void the Acts of previous Assemblies held with the co-operation of bishops, abolished the liturgy and canons, and the Five Articles of Perth. Then began the exhilarating work of dealing with the bishops on the information which had been so carefully collected. An abandoned woman had been interviewed who made 'adultrie very probable' in the case of the Bishop of Brechin. The Archbishop of St. Andrews was accused of

[1] Kinloch, *Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical History*, p. 54.

'carding and dicing in time of divine service, tippling, adultrie, incest, sacrilege, and frequent simonie.' The Bishop of Galloway was accused of the enormity of possessing a crucifix, 'and spoken for the comfortable use he found into it.' The Bishop of Edinburgh was 'a wearer of the rochet' and 'an elevator of the elements at consecration.' The Bishop of Ross had worn a cope and had been guilty of the sins of ordaining deacons, giving absolution, and keeping fasts every Friday. The Bishop of Argyll was 'a preacher of Arminianism,' the Bishop of Orkney 'oversaw adultrie,' and the Bishop of Moray had 'the ordinar faults of a bishop,' and was accused of witnessing a dance of naked people in his own house.[1]

All the fourteen bishops were deposed, eight suffered the sentence of excommunication, which carried with it the loss of every civil right, and exposed them to exile, and six were 'delivered into the hands of the devil.'

The reader had opened the Bible at the chapter containing the words, 'They shall put you out of the synagogues, yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.' Of course the Assembly could not tolerate such a chapter, so the reader had to make another selection. Henderson, the Moderator of the Assembly, gave an address of a virulence which one of the most distinguished of modern Presbyterian historians has pronounced 'frightful' in 'a Christian minister,'[2] and in the dim December light the malignant gathering departed singing—

> How happy a thing it is, and joyful to see
> Brethren together fast to hold the band of amitie,
> It calls to mynde that swete perfume and that costlie
> oyntment
> Which on the sacrificer's head by God's precept was
> spent.

---

[1] Even Baillie rejects this scandal. *Letters*, vol. i. p. 163.

[2] Rev. James Cooper, D.D., *Transactions of St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, vol. iii. part iii. p. 137. He sternly adds that Henderson's speech is yet sometimes cited 'as if it were an utterance of the grandest heroism!'

Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1643-1648.—In 1642 Charles set up his standard in sign of war against the Parliament which had thwarted him. The Royalist armies having been successful in opposing the Parliamentary forces during June and July in 1643, Pym, who was prominent among the Parliamentarians, resolved to ask the Scots for help in order to vanquish the king. The Scottish Presbyterians saw their opportunity. They consented to help on condition that the Church of England should be transformed into a Presbyterian establishment. Already in 1640 certain Scottish commissioners in London actively intrigued to fan the feeling against Episcopacy. They were accompanied by four Presbyterian ministers, Alexander Henderson, Robert Blair, Robert Baillie, and George Gillespie. The commissioners apparently imagined that there was a Presbyterian faction in London fully prepared to welcome them, but in this they were mistaken. Baillie has narrated the events which followed in his *Letters*, which throw a very interesting light upon the Presbyterian methods of procedure.

Henderson, with more candour than prudence, published a 'little quick paper' against Episcopacy. This was premature, and so Baillie says that a 'mollifying explanation' had to be given; in other words, the paper had to be explained away. The result was a 'new pickle.' The English peers, who were mostly in favour of Episcopacy, demanded that the retraction should be published, but the Presbyterians dared not publish it lest it should be taken by their own friends for a 'recantation.' It is abundantly plain that Henderson's colleagues meant to hold their tongues about Episcopacy until a happy moment arrived for the unveiling of their real sentiments.[1]

Fortune played into their hands. For on November 2, 1642, the Commons passed a declaration inviting the aid of the Scots. The Lords put the declaration on one side. But the defeat of the Fairfaxes and the treacheries of Hotham made the Lords resolve, and the English Parliament then agreed to accept the Solemn League

[1] Baillie, *Letters*, vol. i. pp. 306-7.

and Covenant with one or two refinements introduced to act as a salve to the conscience. They swore their allegiance to the Covenant on July 22, 1643. Now the wish for a systematic reference of religious difficulties to an assembly of divines had been avowed in the English Parliament as early as November 1641, and in 1642 the House of Commons was engaged in selecting divines for this purpose. But the very Presbyterian and Scottish form which the Assembly took, when it met on July 1, 1643, was the direct result of the treaty between the Parliament and the Scots.

It had been intended that the Assembly should contain one hundred and twenty-one English divines and eight Scottish commissioners, but the average attendance of English divines was only about sixty. The principal subjects discussed were the Thirty-nine Articles, Church government, and the divine right of Presbyterianism to be the sole Church government, Ordination, a Directory of Worship to supersede the Book of Common Prayer, a Confession of Faith, a longer and a shorter Catechism, and a new metrical version of the Psalms. The Scottish commissioners had been appointed to 'treat with the English Parliament or Assembly for the union of England and Scotland in one form of kirk government.' It soon became evident that the union was meant to consist in the swallowing of the Church of England by Presbyterianism. The discussion on the Articles revealed a dislike of the statement in Article Sixteen, that Christians can *depart from grace*, such a theory being contrary to the Calvinistic theory of predestination. This dogmatic discussion, however, was interrupted by the introduction of the question of Church government. Open warfare broke out between the Presbyterians and the Independents with regard to this highly controversial topic. The 'wrestling' continued for weeks, and Baillie confidently asserts that Presbyterianism 'must be a divine thing to which so much resistance is made by men of all sorts; yet by God's help we will very speedilie see it sett up in spight of the devill.'[1] The difficulties were so great that not until

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 317-18.

August 19, 1645, did Parliament issue an ordinance for the erection of the Presbyterian Church government, and not until June 1646 was the Presbyterian Church machinery set in action.

In the meantime the Independents warmly contested the Presbyterian administration of the sacraments. The Presbyterians with great dexterity determined to clear the ground for their own victory by turning the forces of the Independents against the Prayer Book. Once more it is the ingenuous Baillie who shows us how the affair was managed. He and Henderson agreed to 'eschew a publick rupture with the Independents' until they were able to get the better of them; in the meantime they were to join hands in order 'to abolish the great idol of England, the Service-Book, and to erect in all parts of worship a full conformitie to Scotland in all things worthie to be spoken of.'[1] Complete success attended the scheme. In a short time the Houses of Parliament gave up the custom of attending the English daily service, and the two Puritan sects were settling the details of the new ritual. The Presbyterians were wont to bow in the pulpit, but the Independents vehemently disliked the practice. The Independents refused to leave their pews to come to the communion table, the Presbyterians declared that they must. The precise use of the hat in church was an attractive theme for the ceremonialists, and one Independent divine sagely propounded that during the sermon the minister should wear his hat and the congregation remain uncovered, and that during the sacrament the congregation should wear their hats and the minister take his hat off. The Presbyterians fully realised the importance of these issues and determined to 'dispute every inch.' Their earnestness met with its reward, and Baillie felicitously remarks, 'all this with God's help we have carryed over their bellies to our practice.'

So on March 5, 1645, the new *Directory for the Public Worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms* received the sanction of Parliament. The Presbyterians at first

[1] *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 117.

desired that any one who preached or wrote against it, should for their third offence lose all their goods and suffer 'perpetual imprisonment.' Parliament, moved to mercy, took a gentler line, and directed that persons reading the Prayer Book should pay £5 for the first offence, £10 for the second, and for the third suffer only a year's imprisonment.

The **Westminster Confession of Faith** was completed on November 26, 1646. After the Confession was written, a long time was spent in collecting scriptural proofs of the statements made. This Confession is one of the most complete statements of Calvinistic Christianity in existence. In 1690 it became the legal standard of Scottish Presbyterianism, and hence became the general standard of English-speaking Presbyterians elsewhere. With those portions of it which agree with the Catholic faith we are not now concerned, further than by noting that it asserts the existence of a Catholic *visible* Church, and thus repudiates the doctrine of the Scottish Confession of 1560, which states the ultra-Calvinistic doctrine that the Catholic Church is only an invisible society composed of the elect. In dealing with the actual controversies of the reign of Charles I., it should be noted that the Westminster Confession directly asserts the two great points of Puritan teaching which the Catholic party refused to accept. First, it is directly asserted that the Pope is Antichrist. Secondly, the doctrine of 'God's eternal decree' is stated thus—'By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death. These men and angels, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished, . . . neither are any other redeemed by Christ. . . . The rest of mankind God was pleased, . . . for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.' It is taught in the strongest fashion that the elect *cannot* be cast away in spite of their sins,

and that the non-elect 'cannot be saved' in spite of having in them 'operations of the Spirit.'[1]

A larger **Catechism** was written, but was never passed by the House of Lords. The **Shorter Catechism** was agreed upon on September 22, 1648. It is far too long and difficult in style to be easily mastered by young children, but it contains many passages of great excellence. On the other hand, we must note that it assumes the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and it can hardly be doubted that in this way it has exercised a very deplorable influence upon many of the countless thousands of souls among the English-speaking sects of various countries. The pathetic words of a distinguished American preacher with regard to the deadening influence of Calvinism record what has probably been the experience of other Christians: 'The iron entered into my soul. There were days and weeks in which the pall of death over the universe could not have made it darker to my eyes than those in which I thought, "If you are elected you will be saved, and if you are not elected you will be damned, and there is no hope for you."'[2]

Religious Anarchy and Persecution.—The triumph of the Covenant in Scotland was followed by the orgies of a morbid fanaticism. In the north and west there was a pitiful destruction of the remnants of religious art which had survived the times of Knox. The sculptured monuments of Iona were flung into the sea, the painted screen of Elgin Cathedral was chopped up for firewood, and 'the portrait of our blessed Virgin Mary and her dear Son' in the cathedral of Aberdeen was taken down. Christmas was abolished, and with a refinement of cruelty Easter Day, the immemorial day of consecrated joy, was turned into a fast. Even this tyranny pales before the ferocity of ministers who allowed a baby to die at the foot of the pulpit rather than break through the Presbyterian custom of preaching before a baptism.

[1] See Schaff, *Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches*, pp. 608, 625, 627.

[2] Henry Ward Beecher, *The Christian World Pulpit*, November 13, 1882.

In 1645, after the battle of Philiphaugh, when the Royalists under Montrose were defeated by Leslie, the action of the Presbyterians was peculiarly atrocious. At Philiphaugh a number of Royalists surrendered on the promise that their lives should be spared. They were then hewn in pieces at the command of the Presbyterian ministers. Other Royalists, who had also been promised quarter, were beheaded with legal formalities. Among them was Sir Robert Spottiswoode, the son of the archbishop, who had borne no arms against the Covenant and was guilty of no crime. His last words were, 'Merciful Jesu, gather my soul to thy saints and martyrs, who have run this race before me.' Another victim was the Marquis of Huntly, who on the scaffold declared his faith in the reformed Catholic Church and recommended it to the people.

Meanwhile, events moved rapidly in England. As early as 1641 commissioners were appointed by the Commons to visit the churches. They began the hideous havoc of our cathedrals and parish churches which was consummated by the Parliamentarian soldiers. Presbyterianism was by no means effective in England except in London and Lancashire and a few other districts. Nevertheless, a great number of the clergy were turned out of their livings in 1643, and many more in 1645, when the use of the Prayer Book was prohibited. Archbishop Laud, after a long imprisonment endured with resignation, was beheaded on Tower Hill, in London, January 10, 1645. He forgave his enemies, and prayed for the peace of the kingdom. When a bystander asked him, 'What was the comfortablest saying which a dying man could have in his mouth?' he replied in Latin, which was still the language of scholars, 'I desire to depart and to be with Christ.' His martyrdom illustrates the truth that it is often the divine plan to use failure as a stepping-stone to success. Laud's remains lie under the altar of his college chapel, beneath a simple slab. He needs no marble urn or fretted canopy. When the Church was again set up in England, it was a Church with the doctrine for which Laud lived and died.

Charles himself was beheaded on January 30, 1649.

The Independents probably regarded his death with far more satisfaction than the Presbyterians, and a considerable number of Roman Catholic priests assembled near the scaffold at Whitehall, rejoicing over what they believed to be the final downfall of the reformed Catholic Church of England.[1]

Oliver Cromwell, who had justified and defended the death of Charles I., came to supreme power in the State in 1653. He was himself an Independent; and although Presbyterian formularies were not abolished, Independency practically became the religion of England. Cromwell was willing that all Christians should enjoy toleration except Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England and Antinomians. It is a strange fact that a man of such consummate ability, a man, too, whose aims were often just, should have been content to group these three classes together. His savagery towards the Roman Catholics of Ireland has passed into a proverb, and in 1655 he issued an edict forbidding any ejected minister in England to keep a school, act as a tutor, or use the Prayer Book even privately, under pain of banishment. In 1657, on Christmas Day, a congregation which had assembled for the celebration of the Eucharist in London was carried off to prison. In spite of the fact that congregations were sometimes unmolested, it is evident that within a generation or two the Church under such treatment would have dwindled to a small and isolated society, unable to manifest the religious life of the nation, and unable to inspire that life with truth.

The Restoration, 1660.—The work of Oliver Cromwell was attended by victory abroad and by failure at home. He was unable to secure the constitutional system which he desired, and his religious policy left the great majority of Englishmen equally disgusted with the tyranny of the Presbyterians and of the Independents. Oliver died in 1658, and his incompetent son, Richard, abdicated his shadowy throne in 1659. Sooner than be ruled by the army, Englishmen of almost all religious parties preferred a return to the ancient form of civil government,

[1] See Craven, *Scots Worthies*, p. 88.

and **Charles II.** entered London amid enthusiastic crowds on May 29, 1660. The political settlement was soon followed by a religious settlement. The Presbyterians were fairly numerous, and held many lucrative and important posts. They protested against the restoration of the Prayer Book, and the result was that in April 1661 a conference was held between the bishops and certain Puritan divines. The most important men on the side of the Church were Cosin, Sanderson and Gunning, all of whom have claims to be considered as liturgical scholars. The most important Puritans were Edmund Calamy, an eloquent preacher, and Richard Baxter, well known as a devotional writer. The conference met at the Savoy Palace, and is always known as the **Savoy Conference.** Baxter, who described the Prayer Book as 'a dose of opinion,' urged his co-religionists to ask for every change which they thought desirable. Thus the controversy was conducted with great candour and with very happy results. It became perfectly evident that the Protestant party objected to the whole sacramental system of the Church, and a dislike of the Catholic doctrines of baptism, confirmation, marriage, the ministry, and the communion of saints, had only to be stated by the Puritans to be repudiated by the bishops. After the close of the Savoy Conference, Convocation carefully revised the Prayer Book. Three points in this revision deserve special attention. The Puritans had particularly demanded (1) that the Ornaments Rubric, which enjoins the use of the ancient vestments and ornaments, should be omitted from the Prayer Book; (2) that the Black Rubric or Declaration about kneeling at Holy Communion, which had been cut out in 1559, should be inserted again. The Church, compelled to take up a definite attitude, restored the Ornaments Rubric in a stronger form than before. Next, the Black Rubric was put back after it had been carefully altered by **Dr Gunning,** a staunch Catholic of great learning and honesty, who was afterwards Bishop of Ely. It was altered in such a way as to be entirely in agreement with the doctrine of the Real Presence, and it was deliberately altered in order to be in agreement with that doctrine. In its

original and Protestant form the rubric contained a condemnation of the doctrine of any *real and essential* Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament. In its present form it rightly condemns, not a real and essential Presence, but only a *Corporal* Presence, such as was implied by the materialistic doctrine which had been common in England during the later Middle Ages. Lastly, there was put at the end of the Communion Service a rubric which forbids that any of the consecrated Bread and Wine shall be 'carried out of the church.' Some ministers had been guilty of horribly profaning the Holy Sacrament, and in order to prevent such profanation in the future it was directed that the priest should 'reverently eat and drink' what was not consumed during the service itself. Some writers have imagined that this rubric was intended to forbid the primitive custom of reserving the Sacrament in order to give it to sick Christians who are unable to come to church, but these writers are certainly mistaken.

The revised Prayer Book came into use on August 24, 1662, with the authority of Parliament in an Act of Uniformity, and the Protestant ministers who refused to use the Prayer Book and to accept ordination were compelled to give up the Church livings which they had usurped. Many of these ministers were men of piety and eloquence, but the Church, if it had retained them, would have ceased to be a Church, and would have become a mere menagerie of sects.

Conclusion.—The story of the English Reformation is accomplished. It is the unique story of a struggle between men who desired to retain 'whatsoever things are true' and 'whatsoever things are lovely' in the religion of their forefathers, and a Puritan party which was often learned but not enlightened, generally earnest but always narrow. The teaching and worship of the Church of England remain to-day in the position which was secured in 1662, after so many attempts had been made to undermine it, or to carry it by assault. The history of religion in Scotland must be put aside with the deep regret that the Government of Charles II. employed against the Covenanters, and in favour of

Episcopacy, the cruel methods which the Covenanters had employed against the Royalists. When William III. came to the throne, Presbyterianism was established in Scotland on the lines laid down in the Westminster Confession, and with the aid of the Government and the English army, Episcopacy was nearly exterminated by the year 1760.

We often hear such words as 'the Reformation Settlement' and 'fidelity to the principles of the Reformation.' Such phrases may mean very different things, and it is dishonest to give them our approval unless the meaning of the speaker is unequivocal and unambiguous. For there was one kind of reformation in Italy and another in Germany, another in England, and yet another in Geneva and Scotland. These various forms of reformation were fundamentally different from one another, and fidelity to one necessarily implies divergence from the others. And those Christians who have both a sound mind and a sound heart will give their allegiance to a Church which is both old and new, and is not afraid to say that reverence for the Church is reverence for the Body of Christ.

Archbishops of Canterbury.	Kings of England.	Kings of Scotland	Archbishops of St. Andrews.
Wm. Warham, 1503.			
	Henry VIII., 1509.		
		James V., 1513.	
			James Beaton, 1522.
Thos. Cranmer, 1533 (*burnt* 1556).			
			D. Beaton, 1539 (*murdered* 1546).
		Mary (*infant*), 1542.	
	Edward VI., 1547.		
			John Hamilton, 1549 (*murdered* 1571).
	Mary I., 1553.		
Reginald Pole, 1556.	Elizabeth, 1558.		
Matthew Parker, 1559.			
		James VI. (*infant*), 1567.	
Edmund Grindal, 1576.			
John Whitgift, 1583.			
	James I. and VI., 1603.		
Rich. Bancroft, 1604.			
Geo. Abbot, 1611.			John Spottiswoode, 1610 (*escaped from murderers to England*, 1638).
	Charles I., 1625.		
William Laud, 1633 (*beheaded* 1645).			
Wm. Juxon, 1660.	Charles II., 1660.		
			James Sharp, 1661 (*murdered* 1679).

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

The sentences printed in italics *relate to events in Scotland, those in* heavy type *to events of the greatest ecclesiastical importance for England or Scotland.*

1526. Tyndale's New Testament brought into Britain.
1528. *Patrick Hamilton burnt for Lutheranism.*
1531. Church of England asserts the royal supremacy.
1533. Archbishop Cranmer pronounces Henry divorced from Catherine.
1534. **Church of England denies that Scripture gives a universal jurisdiction to the Bishops of Rome.**
1536. The Ten Articles.
1537. The Bishops' Book explains the Christian faith.
1538. Authorisation of the English Great Bible by Henry.
1543. The King's Book, a revision of the Bishops' Book.
1544. The Litany sung in English before High Mass.
1546. *Geo. Wishart burnt for Swiss Protestant teaching.*
Protestants murder Cardinal Beaton at St. Andrews.
1547. Accession of Edward VI. Government in the hands of Somerset, a Calvinist.
1549. **First Prayer Book of Edward VI.** Somerset superseded by Warwick.
1550. Ordination services in English.
1552. *Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism.*
1553. Accession of Mary.
1554. Reunion of England and Rome.
John Knox visits Frankfurt and Geneva.
1556. Archbishop Cranmer burnt.
1557. *English Prayer Book used in Scotland.*
1558. Accession of Elizabeth.
1559. **The Reformation sanctioned by Parliament.**
Revision of the Prayer Book. Consecration of Parker.
Knox returns to Scotland.
Last Synod of the mediæval Scottish Church.
1560. **Establishment of Swiss-French Calvinism in Scotland.**
First Scottish Confession and First Book of Discipline.

1568. Mary Queen of Scots imprisoned in England.
Foundation of English Roman Catholic seminary at Douai.
1570. Pope Pius v. excommunicates Elizabeth.
1571. Completion of the Thirty-nine Articles.
1572. *Death of John Knox.*
First and Second Admonitions to Parliament by Puritans.
1574. Puritans publish the 'Ecclesiastical Discipline.'
1580. The Jesuits come to England.
1581. *Second Scottish Confession and Second Book of Discipline.*
1582. **Puritans organise a great secret society in the Church of England.**
1587. Execution of Mary Queen of Scots.
1588. The Spanish Armada.
Puritan Marprelate libels against the Church.
1592. *Scottish Calvinism becomes strictly Presbyterian.*
1594. Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' published.
1603. Accession of James to the English throne.
1604. Revision of the Prayer Book.
1610. **Restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland.**
1611. The Authorised Version of the Bible.
1618. **The Five Articles of Perth.**
1625. Accession of Charles I.
1633. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury.
Establishment of Parochial Schools in Scotland.
1637. *The Scottish Prayer Book used.*
1638. **Presbyterian Covenant and rebellion in Scotland.**
Glasgow Assembly deposes Scottish bishops.
1643-1647. Westminster Assembly gives Presbyterianism its final form.
1645. Archbishop Laud beheaded.
1646. **Presbyterianism made the established religion of England.**
1649. King Charles I. beheaded.
1653. Oliver Cromwell made Protector.
Sect of Independents gains on the Presbyterians.
1655. Prohibition of even private reading of the Prayer Book.
1660. **Restoration of Monarchy and Church of England.**
1661. The Savoy Conference between bishops and Puritans.
Restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland.
1662. **Completion of the English Reformation.**

APPENDIX

SELECTIONS FROM OLD ANGLICAN DIVINES

(I.) THE REAL PRESENCE

'BOTH you and I agree herein that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead, only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being.'—Bishop Ridley said this at his last examination, A.D. 1555. See Foxe, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 1927.

'We receive the nature of flesh, and a life-giving blessing in the bread and the wine.'—Bishop Ridley, *Præfatio*, A.D. 1555.

'I told him plainly that this word *only* in the aforesaid Article (*i.e.* Article 28) did not exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof. For I said unto him though he took Christ's Body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally, as the doctors (*i.e.* ancient divines) do write, yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it.'—Bishop Guest, who himself wrote Article 28, wrote these words in 1566. See Rev. G. F. Hodges, *Bishop Guest* (Rivington, Percival & Co.), London, 1894.

'And for the Church of England, nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.'—Archbishop Laud, *Works*, vol. ii. p. 328, A.D. 1626.

'We allow that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, and truly to be adored.'—Bishop Andrewes, *Responsio*, p. 266, A.D. 1610.

'There is that union between the visible Sacrament and the invisible reality (*i.e.* the Lord's Body) of the Sacrament which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ' (*ibid.* p. 265).

(II.) THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

'It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and as a representation of that bloody sacrifice, and he doth not lie which saith Christ to be offered.'—Bishop Ridley, A.D. 1555. See Foxe, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 1622.

'The thing that is offered is the body of Christ, which is an eternal and perpetual propitiatory sacrifice, in that it was once offered by death upon the cross, and hath an everlasting and never-failing force and efficacy. . . . Christ offereth Himself and His body once crucified, daily in heaven. . . . And in this sort we also offer Him daily on the altar.'—Richard Field, Dean of Gloucester, Appendix to the third book *Of the Church*, A.D. 1606.

'The Encharist ever was and by us is considered both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice.'—Bishop Andrewes, *Answer to Perron's Reply*, p. 20, A.D. 1629.

'For as it is a commemoration and representment of Christ's death, so it is a commemorative sacrifice. . . . He sits, a high priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate. . . . And this also His ministers do on earth; they offer up the same sacrifice to God, the sacrifice of the cross, by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to His holy institution. It is, ministerially and by application, an instrument propitiatory; it is eucharistical, it is an homage and an act of adoration.'—Bishop Jeremy Taylor, *Works*, vol. ii. p. 643, A.D. 1649.

'We acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative sacrifice, or a memorial of the sacrifice of the cross; a representative sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the eyes of His heavenly Father; an impetrative sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of His Passion, by way of real prayer; and lastly, an applicative sacrifice, or an application of His merits unto our souls.'—Archbishop Bramhall, *Works*, tome i. discourse iii., A.D. 1674.

(III.) PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED.

'Almighty, eternal God, to whom there is never any prayer made without hope of mercy, be merciful to the souls of Thy servants, being departed from this world in the confession of Thy name, that they may be associate to the company of Thy saints. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.'—Queen Elizabeth's *Primer*, A.D. 1559.

'Prayer for the resurrection, public acquittal in the day of judgment, and perfect consummation, and bliss of them that are fallen asleep in the sleep of death, is an apostolical tradition.' —Richard Field, Dean of Gloucester, *Of the Church*, vol. iv. p. 262, A.D. 1606.

'And so I end, beseeching God to give to us all, as He gave to him, our parts in the "first resurrection" from sin to grace; and to grant to him and all the Faithful and Saints departed, and us all with him, a joyful resurrection to everlasting life, and glory in Jesus Christ. Amen.'—Bishop Buckeridge, *Sermon preached at the funeral of Bishop Andrewes*, A.D. 1626.

'The funerals of a deceased friend are not only performed at his first interring, but in the monthly minds and anniversary commemorations.'—Bishop Jeremy Taylor, *Op. cit.* p. 643, A.D. 1649.

N.B.—'Monthly mind' was the mediæval name of a service for the faithful departed.

'O ye that pass by into the house of the Lord, the house of prayer, pray for your fellow-servant that he may find mercy in the day of the Lord.'—From the epitaph of Bishop Barrow of St. Asaph, A.D. 1680.

(IV.) SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

'If there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his

conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.'—From the Exhortation before Communion in the Book of Common Prayer.

'If any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the Minister . . . we do straitly charge and admonish him, that he do not reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy.'—Canon 113 of the Church of England, A.D. 1603.

'Confession unto the minister which is able to instruct, correct, comfort, and inform the weak, wounded and ignorant conscience, indeed I ever thought might do much good to Christ's congregation, and so I assure you, I think even at this day.'—Bishop Ridley, A.D. 1555. See Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, vol. iii. p. 373.

'If God had appointed His angels or His saints to absolve me, as He hath His ministers, I would confess to them.'—Dr. Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, London, *Sermons*, p. 589. A.D. 1621.

'To receive the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ with frequent devotion. . . . And for better preparation thereunto, as occasion is, to disburthen and quiet our conscience of those sins that may grieve us, or scruples that may trouble us, to a learned and discreet priest, and from him to receive advice, and the benefit of absolution.'—Bishop Cosin, *Private Devotions*, A.D. 1626.

'It is a very pious preparation to the Holy Sacrament that we confess our sins to the minister of religion.'—Bishop Jeremy Taylor, *Works*, vol. vii. p. 484.

(V.) THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

'This belongs to the use and custom of the Anglican Church, according to the most ancient traditions founded upon the revealed Word; inasmuch as of old times among our forefathers, and in our own days among our own selves it is a frequent practice to make the sign of the cross in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ; both publicly in Baptism as we are commanded to do, and in the Confirmation of those who have been catechised, and in all the other Sacraments of the Church; and also in our ordinary life and conversation.'—Bishop Montague, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, tome i. part 2, p. 79, A.D. 1636.

(VI.) EXPLANATION OF THE EUCHARISTIC VESTMENTS.

(Abbreviated from the *Rationale*, an early document of the English Reformation.)

The priest therefore . . . puts upon him clean and hallowed vestments, partly representing the mysteries which were done at the Passion, partly representing the virtues which he himself ought to have.

First, he putteth on the *amice* which, as touching the mystery, signifies the veil with which the Jews covered the face of Christ when they buffeted Him; and as touching the minister, it signifies faith, which is the head of all virtues.

Secondly, he puts upon him the *alb* which, as touching the mystery, signifieth the white garment wherewith Herod clothed Christ in mockery; and as touching the minister, it signifies pureness of conscience.

The *girdle*, as touching the mystery, signifies the scourge with which Christ was scourged; and as touching the minister, it signifies continent and chaste living.

The *stole*, as touching the mystery, signifieth the ropes that Christ was bound with when He was scourged; and as touching the minister, it signifieth the yoke of patience which he must bear as the servant of God; in token whereof he puts also the *phanon* (*i.e.* maniple) on his arm, which admonisheth him of ghostly strength.

The *over-vesture*, or *chasuble*, as touching the mystery, signifies the purple mantle that Pilate's soldiers put upon Christ; and as touching the minister, it signifies charity, a virtue excellent above all other.

INDEX

By H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A.

Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

An Introduction to the History of the Church of England

From the Earliest Times to the Present Day.

'The most precious history of the Church of England that has ever been written, a book scholarlike, lucid, full of matter, full of interest, just and true, and inspired with faith, hope and charity, as few Church histories, or any other histories, have ever been.'—**The Right Rev. Bishop Stubbs.**

'Mr. Wakeman's book is not only scholarly and thoughtful, but is also written so easily and clearly that it will be read with interest by the large class of general readers who are interested in its subject. It is the first book which has succeeded in presenting the history of the Church of England in a clear and intelligible form.'—**The Right Rev. Bishop Creighton.**

'Mr. Wakeman's "History of the English Church" was the book that we wanted. No Churchman of average education has now any excuse for ignorance of his Church; nor any schoolmaster or mistress for omitting to teach it to their boys and girls.'—**The Right Rev. Bishop Gore.**

'Will at once and satisfactorily fill up a long-felt void.'—**The Rev. Canon W. Bright.**

'I find it a fascinating book, marked by fairness of mind and a just sense of proportion.'—**The Ven. Archdeacon W. O. Burrows.**

'It does not often fall to the reviewer's lot to be able to give such unreserved praise as can be given to this most charming book.'—**Guardian.**

'Mr. Wakeman lays particular stress upon the most critical periods, and treats them with great ability.'—**Times.**

'Will succeed not only in satisfying a great and admitted want, but will also occupy a foremost place as an accredited text-book.'—**Church Times.**

'At once acknowledged to be, for its size, the most accurate and complete work on the subject. The debt Churchmen owe to this splendid little volume can hardly be exaggerated.'—**Church Review.**

LONDON: RIVINGTONS

By THE REV. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A.

Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

The Church of the Fathers.

Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 98 to A.D. 461.

Forming a Volume of 'The Church Universal,' a Series of Eight Volumes dealing with the History of the Christian Church.

If we may forecast the merits of the series by Mr. Pullan's volume, we are prepared to give it an unhesitating welcome. We shall be surprised if his book does not supersede some of the less interesting Church histories which have served as text-books for several generations of theological students.'—**Guardian.**

Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

The Books of the New Testament.

'A work which will add a fresh charm and interest to the Study of Holy Scripture, and which supplies an adequate and trustworthy reply to the destructive criticism that has tended to unsettle and distress so many earnest minds.'—**Church Quarterly Review.**

LONDON: RIVINGTONS