MATTHEW PARKER died in 1575, forty years after the Reformation movement began. The hope of Papal supremacy in England perished with the accession of Elizabeth, and new questions rapidly arose within the English Church. The Puritan objective was destruction of episcopal government and abolition of liturgical worship according to the Prayer Book. The penal laws

1 With Bancroft as a surname compare Meadowcroft, Rye-croft, etc. It signified originally "of the bean-croft," i.e. the man who lived at the beancroft. Other authorities trace it to Bankcroft, i.e. the croft on the slope, but the former is more probable. It is still common in Cheshire and Lancashire, and in the sixteenth century was spelt Bancrofte, a form always used by Bancroft himself. The later spelling Banckcroft may have given rise to its association with "Bank," but later spellings are always untrustworthy as to the origin of a name. Both Bank and Croft are common as surnames, and a croft is a field enclosed for pasture. The earliest form was Atte (at the) Beancroft and de or del Beancroft.

The parish register at Prescot in Lancashire contains this entry, "1544 September Ric. Bancroft sone unto John Bancroft bapt. the XII dai." Little can be discovered about the father, John Bancroft, whose position in Lancashire was not one of any public note.

prevented open rebellion, but secret organisations worked incessantly at Cambridge and throughout the country to effect the revolution. Parker dealt with the movement firmly but often reluctantly. The Queen rebuked him for want of success, and laid much of the odium of action upon him. At his death Grindal of London was sent to Canterbury in the hope that his puritanical sympathies would conciliate opposition. The eight years of his primacy were ineffective, and only contributed graver difficulties after he was gone. Stern and honest in character, he failed in administration. The Queen ordered him to suppress the secret "prophesyings," and he replied by a long letter of protest defending their value and asking the Crown to refer all religious matters to the bishops and divines. Elizabeth was least of all weak in government, and she could not brook weakness in the Primate. Grindal was therefore sequestrated for six months and suspended from his ecclesiastical functions. The Queen suggested his resignation, and this would have been sent in if death had not relieved the embarrassing position. Almost blind and sick at heart he lay down to die, and the sceptre of power passed from hands too feeble and paralysed to deal with the great problems of Church government. On days of storm and tempest the captain of the ship must not leave the bridge to consult with his officers what course to steer.

Whitgift succeeded to the vacant throne of Canterbury. His loyalty to the Church had been proved on many occasions by his actions and writings, and the task before him demanded courage and decision. Robert Browne set up the first secession on the principle of substituting for the old Church a new organisation consisting of saints, "the worthiest were they never so few." The massacre on S. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, had its reflex influence in England and the spirit of the nation rose in bitterest opposition to the "recusants." The Puritan plots within the Church made defence a necessity, and Whitgift became a stern disciplinarian against his natural bent. A life and death struggle was forced
upon the Church, and the Primate bore the brunt of the battle with unflinching firmness. For many years his right-hand man was Richard Bancroft, who brought to his task gifts matured by long experience and information such as he alone could obtain or know how to use. Our story therefore now proceeds along the life of Bancroft. An American writer, Dr. Usher, has produced the most complete extant account of what he calls the “Reconstruction of the English Church,” and this lecture will be largely indebted to his most thorough investigation of this period of English Church history.

Bancroft’s Early Life.

Bancroft was born in September, 1544, at Farnworth in the parish of Prescot in Lancashire. His family was of no note, but the boy possessed the elements of success in an intellect keen and industrious and a resolve to make his way in life. The battle between the new and old faiths was fought in Lancashire with an intensity which reached every home, and Bancroft’s boyhood was spent amid Radical politics and Protestant faith. All this gave him a knowledge of Puritanism, which he turned to good account in later years. His enemies called him a traitor, but this term belongs to the man who from motives of self-interest betrays a cause to which he is pledged, and not to the natural development of mind and convictions which comes from new surroundings and increased knowledge. The charge is constantly brought in political and Church life and is generally of no force. In the nineteenth century Gladstone began his political life “as the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories,” and Chamberlain was the dreaded Radical who was expected to ruin the constitution and the Empire. Bancroft had no education but that of the local grammar school until he entered at Christ’s College, Cambridge, in 1564. Most of the men in college were studying for the ministry, and the University strife, if more refined and intellectual, was about the very things, chiefly the externals of worship, which were
disputed in the rough Lancashire village. Some of the chief national disputants were in Cambridge at this time, Whitgift as Master of Trinity, Cartwright as Fellow of S. John's, and Travers, Hooker's opponent, as Fellow of Trinity. Bancroft is not alone as a young man whose University career has changed the current of his thoughts, and probably his admiration for Whitgift, which soon changed into a friendship destined to be life-long, largely influenced his mind. By the time he took his degree in 1567 the Calvinism of his boyhood had lost its charm. At the age of twenty-three his uncle, Archbishop Curwen of Dublin, made him a Prebendary in S. Patrick's, Dublin, and a royal licence secured for him six months' leave of absence each year. At Cambridge he migrated to Jesus College and became engaged in tuition, at the same time laying the foundations of his knowledge of theology by a careful study of the great Fathers of the Church.

He was ordained a priest at Ely in 1574, and soon afterwards became Chaplain to Bishop Cox of Ely, Prebendary of the Cathedral, Rector of Teversham near Cambridge and one of the twelve University preachers. He was frequently in London in attendance upon Bishop Cox, who initiated him into the details of episcopal administration, requiring him to examine candidates for Orders, to assist in the Consistory Court and at Visitations, to interview "recusants" and to transact a hundred other duties. The path to Church preferment then often lay through a bishop's household, where a larger acquaintance with public affairs was possible than in a parish or at the university. From the beginning of his ministry he showed those powers of industry, ability and study which later made him so valuable a servant of the Church and State.

In 1579 the Bishop of Ely died, and his young chaplain at the age of thirty-three passed into the household of Christopher Hatton, afterwards Lord Chancellor, by what influence I know not, but probably because of his powers and usefulness. This step sealed his Church views, as Hatton was hostile to the Puritans,
and opened out for him a career in statesmanship. His opportunities of public service now came freely. Whitgift made him administrator in a visitation of the vacant see of Ely. The University nominated him special preacher to combat the sect of Independents in Norfolk. His uncle chose him as his representative to plead with Cecil, Lord Burghley, for the maintenance of the revenues of S. Patrick’s Cathedral when Trinity College, Dublin, was founded. Every task he undertook was performed with ability and tact, and Church preferments came to him. Whitgift wanted him to be made Dean of Worcester, but at that time Hatton was in disgrace with Elizabeth, and so his chaplain was passed over. In 1584 he became chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, and three years later was made a member of the High Commission. He had to wait yet ten more years before Whitgift could secure for him high preferment, and he entered upon the great Bishopric of London in 1597. “Good Mr. Secretarie (Cecil),” wrote the Archbishop, “you have bownd me unto you in this action for ever. Nether by God’s grace, shall you at any time haue cause to repent you of your most faithful and kinde dealings with me. And as for Dr. Bancroft, I dare assuer you that you shal finde him an honest, suer, and faythfull man.”

1 “No Elizabethan bishop had ever wrought in so many fields of ecclesiastical activity as Bancroft. Parker had been an admirable and learned theologian; Whitgift shone in controversy; Grindal and Aylmer had been gifted with administrative capacity of no mean order. Yet not one of them had possessed that particular union of theological learning and controversial skill with practical experience, that would enable him to see in the complexity of the situation itself those elements of latent strength from which the remedy must proceed. Each of them lacked a personal knowledge of the problems they were to meet. Parker and Whitgift were brought from the seclusion of academic life to assume the control of a great organisation. Grindal gained his administrative experience in the North of England; Whitgift obtained what little he had in trying to reduce the borders of Wales to order and uniformity; but the conditions and problems of the Catholic North or of the unruly West were entirely different from the actual administrative problems of a Church which concerned mainly England south of the Trent and east of Gloucester.
Whitgift’s sense of Bancroft’s services to the Church is described in a memorandum which he prepared giving his reasons why Bancroft should be made Bishop of London. This I give in an Appendix. The Primate had abundant reasons for valuing his chaplain’s assistance. Charged as he was with administering the Church’s laws, he found a zealous and efficient helper in Bancroft. A series of Mar-Prelate tracts were issued from the press and no one knew who wrote them or printed them. Their ribald humour gave them wide circulation. The Bishops and Church dignitaries were attacked personally as “petty Anti-Christs, proud prelates, intolerable withstanders of reformation, enemies of the gospell and most covetous wretched priests.” Martin, in whose name they were written, would publish every one of their mistakes and put a “young Martin in euerie parish ... euerie one of them able to mar a prelate.” Various writers tried the effect of replies written in a like strain, but the fun-making degenerated into mere bespattering of each other with mud. At last Bancroft entered the lists, and in a notable sermon at Paul’s Cross on February 9, 1588, exposed the motive and aims of the whole agitation. Starting from the text, “Believe not every spirit but try the spirits whether they be of God,” he discussed the whole question of Church government, illustrating his subject with the

Indeed, at the time of their appointment, each of the three attempted to refuse the Archbishopric on the plea that his previous life had not fitted him for so great a responsibility. It was a fact of vastly more consequence that none of them had ever lived in close enough touch with the people, or with the great bulk of the country gentry, to understand their aspirations, their hopes and their fears. Those prelates had been attempting to solve problems of which they had little personal knowledge for a people whom they knew only by hearsay. Bancroft, on the other hand, had acquired by an intimacy of thirty long years an unrivalled comprehension of the people’s actual religious beliefs. No small part of the progress made toward reconstruction in the years 1583-1603, no inconsiderable reason for its success, was to be found in the work of Richard Bancroft, as High Commissioner and Bishop of London.”—Usher, vol. i., p. 37.

1 See Appendix H, p. 234.
methods of early heretics, and showing how law and order were being assailed in the name of a new divine scheme of Church polity. "Her Majesty is depraved. Her authority is impugned and great dangers are threatened. Civil government is called in question. Princes' prerogatives are curiously scanned. The interest of the people in kingdoms is greatly advanced, and all government generally is pinched at and condemned. The Church is condemned, the ancient Fathers are despised, your preachers are defamed, and yet these men are tolerated." "The Doctrine of the Church of England is pure and holy; the Government thereof, both in respect of her Majesty and of our Bishops, is lawful and godly; the Book of Common Prayer containeth nothing in it contrary to the word of God." The printing press was at last discovered in a private house in Northamptonshire. The workers escaped with their type to Coventry, and were caught finally in Manchester. Cartwright and other prominent men were arrested, and Bancroft took a leading part in their trial by supplying information in his possession. In 1593 the legal advisers of the Crown reported that no illegal practices could be proved, but the power of the movement was destroyed. One of the writers of the tracts, Udall, was condemned to death but pardoned. Bancroft then unearthed a conspiracy to kill the Queen as a prelude to introducing the "Discipline." Three men suffered death for this treason. Two, Greenwood and Barrow, were executed for printing seditious books, and later Penry for a like offence. We are shocked now at such things. The freedom of the press permits almost any outrage upon authority, whilst by its publicity it dooms violent agitations to a natural death. At the same time law and social order still rest upon force, though the smooth working of the police system and the courts of law obscure this fact from the public eye. Every violent social eruption shows us how little we are removed from the final appeal to force and imprisonment for the continuous maintenance of common order. In the days of Elizabeth death was regarded as the readiest and most
expeditious way of expiating public crime, and neither Bancroft nor the High Commission did anything which was not demanded by the Crown, the Parliament and the public opinion of the country.

Through all these years Bancroft was perfecting himself in the arts of diplomacy and Church defence. To some of his enemies he seemed to combine the habits of a ferret, the mind of a Jesuit and the instincts of a wily politician. But this was because by assiduous industry and carefully prepared action he laid bare their secret plans and checkmated their most astute moves. He had information from the very centre of the hostile camps, and little escaped him or failed to come to the knowledge of his accredited agents. The cause for which he contended was the very existence of the Church's continuous life. Defeat would have changed the character of the English Reformation and destroyed the history of the Church.

Dr. Bancroft as chaplain had been the watch-dog protecting the Church's rights, but as Bishop of London he was wanted for State affairs. In fact Lord Burghley and his son had stipulated for this, and had bound him to their polity before he was nominated to the Queen. They well knew his administrative and diplomatic

1 Dean Hook in his Life of Bancroft defends him against the unworthy insinuations of Puritan historians. "It seems strange that the Puritan historian (Neal) should object to the simplicity of his life. . . . Bancroft was indeed stern to the Puritans, but against whom was this strictness exhibited? Those who were the objects of severity were persons who having sworn to obey the law of the Church, objected to adhere to their oath. We do not under these circumstances wonder at his being maligned, but we may question the justice of the charge brought against him of being too strict and severe. . . . (The preachers at his death) could not indeed have found a better illustration of conscientious work in the service of God and for the well-being of His Church on earth than the energetic work of England's Primate, Richard Bancroft."

Dr. Hook was in the nineteenth century a kindred spirit in fearless Church defence, though his greatness of heart overflowed in loving kindness to friend and foe alike. He described himself as the Church's watch-dog, which barked at naughty Church children who went to play in conventicle alley.
powers, and henceforth he was entrusted with difficult and delicate political negotiations which had often been entrusted to the Bishop of London. His Church problems were sufficiently perplexing to occupy all his time, and he set himself to the task of reforming the shameful irreverence which had gathered around and within the walls of S. Paul's Cathedral. The Privy Council put into his hands the task of censoring the press and controlling the Romanish priests in London. Of this latter duty we shall speak presently. University discipline gave him more trouble, and the preachers at Paul's Cross had to be watched so that nothing was said in opposition to the Government policy. He soon found how uneasy lay the head which wore the episcopal mitre. He writes to Lord Burghley, "I am grieved that takynge so great paynes for the discharge of my dutye (as I dare assume to profess) I am so often depraved unto her Majestie." He asks Cecil "not to believe anything against me or to be offended with me untill I may be heard what I am able to say in myne own defence."

In 1600 Bancroft was sent, after vainly protesting against undertaking the task, as head of an embassy to Denmark. The ostensible object was to settle some disputes between the two countries about privateering and fishing in each other's sea reserves. The secret object was the question of James VI's succession to the throne of England. He had married the daughter of the Danish King. France wished to control the son of Mary Stuart, and the Danish King's influence with his son-in-law was wanted as a counterpoise to the dreaded Romish plan. No one was better fitted than Bancroft for such a mission. He knew the innermost secrets of the Roman priests, and he was also known to James VI of Scotland. He fulfilled his embassy with accustomed success, and nothing more was heard of James's alliances with the Continent. Nothing of importance was concluded about the fishing rights, and the bishop brought Cecil a present of "a vatt of Rhenish wynne conteyninge six score gallons." Thus pleasantly ended the embassy on privateering and fishing rights!
years later Elizabeth died, and James VI came to a throne of which he was the only possible occupant.

In their effusive welcome of James the people of England thought of the Crown as they had known it during the more than forty years of the last great Tudor sovereign, and as yet they were ignorant of the narrower spirit of the Stuart dynasty and of its obstinate resolve not to bend to the popular will. The politicians welcomed James because his coming gave hope of a cessation of age-long hostilities between Scotland and England. The Puritans, who knew little or nothing of the friction between James and the Scottish Kirk, welcomed him because he came from Presbyterian Scotland. The Roman Catholics hoped for great things from the son of Mary Stuart, and English Churchmen knew his secret and yet firm adhesion to their form of Church government. So all hailed his accession with enthusiasm. James adroitly accepted every one’s flattery, made vague and grandiloquent replies to each party and kept to himself his own views and intentions.

The Hampton Court Conference.

The Millenary Petition raised the Church question at once. It purported to come from “more than a thousand of your Majesty’s subjects and ministers,” though it is now proved never to have been signed at all. It begged “their dread sovereign” to release them of the burdens under which they groaned—for example, the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, the ring in marriage, too much music in public worship, the wearing of the square cap and surplice and the reading of the Apocrypha. It asked for able and learned men who would hold no pluralities and reside in their parishes and preach every Sunday. Excommunications and ex-officio oaths, the length and costliness of suits in the ecclesiastical courts were protested against. They asked for no change of Church government, but that “discipline and excommunication may be administered according to Christ’s own institutions,” and that no man
shall be “excommunicated without the consent of the pastor.”

To remedy these and other complaints the petition requested a conference of learned men. The movement was astute and clever, because it asked for many things which Whitgift and Bancroft had been striving after for years, and it forestalled in the eyes of the King any official action. To James himself, who loved religious disputation, it was doubly welcome. Whitgift and Bancroft were busy the next few months in gathering evidence and compiling complete statistics about communicants, recusants, pluralities, non-residence and impropriations. The two universities stepped into the breach and showed what questions were raised by the petition. Who was to decide what was an “able” man? Were men persuaded that the (Puritan) discipline, under the Presbytery, which was the life and being of their discipline, was of Christ's institution? The petition asked that no man should be excommunicated without the consent of his pastor, “thereby intending the utter overthrow of the present Church government, and in steede therof the setting up of a Presbitery in every parish; or rather that which is worse (if worse may be) the innobling of every particular pastour to excommunicate by himself alone.” James was no sooner settled on his throne than he entered upon these matters. Bancroft told him the long story of the secret history of Puritan and Roman Catholic plots which he had himself exposed and frustrated. One day in particular, July 22, 1603, is recorded on which James spent many hours at Fulham with Bancroft, after which he called the Privy Council together and told them how he took it to heart “that all things should be duly performed which might tend to the preservation of the trew religion whereby we have euer lived and resolved to dye.” The words were non-committal. In October they were followed by a proclamation against “such as seditiously seek reformation in Church matters.” The King declared that he had studied the constitution in Church

1 *The Millenary Petition*, A.D. 1603 (Gee and Hardy, p. 508).
and State and "since we have understood the form and frame we are persuaded that both the constitution and doctrine thereof is agreeable to God’s word and near to the condition of the primitive Church." He then two days later desired the Archbishop to collect information, and meantime ordered that all who used the new forms not prescribed by authority should be repressed. Bancroft showed him enough of the Romish plots to cause the King to stay his hands and to be prudent. Thus were the hopes of many destroyed. The throne was not to be carried by assault, and James had declared himself on the side of established order. Churchmen and Puritans both awaited the result of the coming conference anxiously. When the conference met on January 12, 1603, at Hampton Court, James presided in person. He had many splendid qualifications for the office of president, and the divinity that hedged his kingly office shaped the debates. The report is not pleasant reading, there is too much obsequiousness on the one side and too great timidity on the other. The original list of those to be called together contained eight bishops and eight Puritans, but the Puritan champion Cartwright died the previous month. Hildersham and Egerton, two leading Puritans, were left out because Lord Burghley had discovered some secret actions of theirs. Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was the chief Puritan speaker, and Bancroft, Bishop of London, the leader of the Church party.¹

¹ An anonymous account of the Conference written at the time gives the names thus—

| Puritans Actors in thes Pointes. | Dr. Reynolds. Oxon. the principall mouthe and speaker. |
| Anti-Puritans. | Dr. Sparke. spake verie sparingly. |
| Mr. Chaderton. mute as any Fyshe. |
| Knewstubbes feirce against the Crosse. |
| Patrick Galloway. silent in all things. |
| Supervisors of this Conference. | Bishop of London (Bancroft). |
| Bishop of Winchester (Billson). |
We are surprised at the reasonableness of the Puritan demands. All the plots to overthrow the constitution of the Church with which Bancroft had been familiar for twenty years were kept in the background, and Reynolds appeared as a man of tender conscience who sought the removal of a few objectionable items in public worship. The five Puritans knelt before the King and expressed their grievances under four heads. (1) That the doctrine of the Church might be preserved in purity according to God's word. (2) That good pastors might be planted in all Churches to preach the same. (3) That the Church government might be sincerely ministered according to God's word. (4) That the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety. Reynolds amplified these objections. Certain passages of the Prayer Book and in the Thirty-nine Articles they wished to be made less Catholic inasmuch as they connoted some beliefs and ceremonies of the pre-Reformation Church. Bancroft, into whose soul the iron of controversy had entered, interfered and begged the King not to listen to heretics. He urged that their intentions were not so pacific as they appeared, and that they desired not the reformation but the utter overthrow of the orders of the Church. He had good reason for his words because of his complete knowledge of many years of secret plotting, but the King reproved him and told him he disliked the interruption and was there to hear both sides fully discussed. As the debate proceeded more important questions than those of small ritual acts emerged, and Reynolds asked for the establishment of the prophecies and that the bishops should settle questions in the diocesan synods in conjunction with grave and learned presbyters. The changes in the Thirty-nine Articles were intended to bind Calvinism upon the English Church, and the request to allow the parish priest to decide all questions of discipline himself would have made him absolute and independent of episcopal control in his own parish. It was now the King's turn to show impatience and irritation, and as the Conference drew to a close he broke out into
language redolent of his past days in Scotland. "This was rightly the presbytery of Scotland wherein John and William and Richard and such like must haue theyr censure and John will giue his vote, as William for he is a godly man, and so all the matter is ordered by simple ignorant men. Whereto sayd Mr. Knewstubbes if it please your Majesty he meaneth a presbitery only of ministers, and not of lay men. To whom sayd his Majesty, I kenne him well enoughe. And when I meane to liue under a presbitery, I will goe into Scotland agayn. . . . Till then I will haue the bishops to gouern the Churche." The memory of many humiliations received at the hands of Knox and his friends speaks in these words. The conference draws to its close and the King is now the one member who speaks unadvisably with his lips. As he dismissed the assembly a personal passion long pent up and at last finding utterance spake thus: "How they used the poor lady, my mother, is not unknown, and how they dealt with me in my minority. I thus apply it. No Bishop, no King. If this be all your party has to say I will make them conform themselves or else will harry them out of the land." These ill-advised words bore bitter fruit a few years later, when in 1620 the Mayflower sailed from Plymouth with its 101 persons in search of a new home in a new country, and the stream of emigration began to flow towards the West. Bancroft and Lord Burghley were greatly pleased with the conference, and steps were at once taken to carry out some of the decisions.¹ The bishops were formed into a committee to alter some rubrics of the Prayer Book, to add the section in the Catechism upon the two Sacraments, "the addition," says Cosin, "was first penned by Bishop Overall (then Dean of S. Paul's) and allowed by the Bishops," and to make arrangements for a new translation of the Bible.

The Book of Discipline was definitely rejected by

¹ James's Proclamation, 1604, says, "We cannot conced that the success of that conference was such as happens to many other things which moving great expectation before they be entered into, in their issue produce small effects."
the conference, and the Book of Common Prayer again affirmed by the King by and with the advice of the Privy Council. The Privy Council acted upon the advice of the Bishops, and amongst these Whitgift, but still more Bancroft, led the rest. The King explained that he had issued a commission under the Great Seal to the Archbishop of Canterbury and others according to the form which the laws of the realm prescribed, that is, under the Act of Uniformity, 1559, to cause the whole Book of Common Prayer as newly printed to be authorised, and the Archbishops and bishops were required to do their duty in causing the same to be obeyed. The chief administration of the Church now soon fell into Bancroft's hands. On February 29, 1604, Whitgift died. He was a scholar and a theologian who had unwillingly been summoned from the tranquil courts of his College at Cambridge to deal with complex administrative problems for which he had little training. Bancroft was much more effective in all he had done, and so there could not be any serious question as to who was to go to Canterbury. As Whitgift had sought London for him, so now he desired to have him as his successor at Lambeth. The tired old man, whose care for the welfare of the Church had been constant and whose watchfulness had been untiring, breathed his last breath with the words "pro ecclesia Dei" upon his lips. They expressed his motives, his hopes and his justification.

Bancroft as Archbishop.

Bancroft's primacy extended over only six years, from 1604–1610, and his greatest work for the Church was done before he came to Canterbury. We have spoken of his long-continued efforts to defeat the Puritans, and we must now look at the equally important services he rendered in unmasking many Romish plots. When

1 See James's Proclamation for the use of the Book of Common Prayer, A.D. 1604. This was issued under letters patent which specified the alterations and ordered the publication and exclusive use of the amended Book. (See Gee and Hardy, p. 512.)
Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth in 1570, many Roman Catholics felt themselves called upon to destroy her government and plot against her life. The loyalty of many English Roman Catholic families was tested and proved more than once in her reign, but the plots were stirred up from without, and the newly formed society of Jesuits found a fruitful field in England for exploiting its methods and principles. This world-wide society had its origin in Spain under Ignatius Loyola, and was formed to reconquer Christendom for the “true faith,” that is, for the Roman Church. The innumerable hordes of Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Minorites and others had all lost their influence and a new militant society came into existence to fight with the secret weapons of deceit and with the poisoned arrows of half-truths.\(^1\) It received its formal ratification at Rome on September 27, 1540, under the name of “Societas Jesu,” surely a strange perversion of the name of Him who was Truth itself. It was founded “ad majorem Dei gloriam.” The world was to be its sphere of action, and its agents were soon busy in every country under the inexorable laws of its general. Parsons and Campian arrived in England in 1580. The former was born in Somersetshire and brought up in Calvinistic theology at Oxford. Five years later in 1585 an Act of Parliament was passed against Jesuits and Seminaries. “Whereas divers persons called or professed Jesuits seminary priests and other priests what have been and from time to time are made in the parts beyond the seas by or according to the order and rites of the Romish Church have of late years come and been sent and daily do come and are sent into this realm of England... not only to withdraw her highness’s subjects from their due obedience to her majesty but also to stir up and move sedition rebellion and open hostility... to the great endangering of the safety of her most royal person and to the utter ruin desolation and overthrow of the whole realm.” The Act then requires that all such

\(^1\) See *The Jesuits*, by Gresinger, English translation, 1903, and *Pascal’s Provincial Letters*. 

priests shall quit the realm, and that those born in England or ordained by Roman authority shall not come to or remain in the country. If any Jesuit or seminary priest shall before the Archbishop, bishop or some justice of peace take the oath set forth by act in the first year of Elizabeth, he shall be exempt from the penalties of this act. Bancroft was engaged for years in negotiations with and about the position of these priests. The Roman Catholic population in and about London was only five per cent. of the whole people, and yet rose as high as seventy and eighty per cent. in Durham, Northumberland and Cumberland. These were ministered to in secret by from three to five hundred Jesuits and priests. The noblemen and squires, where they were Roman Catholic, sheltered the priests and encouraged the people to come to services in private. Bancroft urged Lord Burghley to keep a sharp outlook over these local gentry. "Your Lordship knoweth," he wrote, "that the people are commonly carried away by gentlemen Recusants landlords and some other ring-leaders of that sort. So as the winning or the punishing of one or two of them is a reclaiming or a kind of bridling of many that do depend upon them." As the administration of the law was in the hands of the country gentry, it is not difficult to understand that the position of the Roman Catholics varied much in different localities. Traditions of disguised priests and secret worship lingered for generations in the North of England. Bancroft's task was rendered easier by the dissensions and jealousies which existed between the secular clergy and the Jesuits, and these quarrels carefully reported to Bancroft's agents enabled him to thwart many a well-laid scheme of aggression. Robert Parsons was for long the stormy petrel of English Roman Catholic life. Bancroft and he were well matched in energy and restless vitality. Each possessed the power of diplomatic finesse and administrative capacity, and from his home in Rome Parsons directed the warfare, ever urging the Roman Catholics in England to bolder aggression and more definite claims. The secular priests in England
asked for a bishop and had to be contented with an arch-priest. Blackwell, who held this office, had been in past years an Oxford Fellow and was a man of learning and of a mild and peaceful disposition. Parsons intrigued against him at Rome, and unseemly accusations touching the administration of funds kept up the bitterness between the two men for long years. Bancroft was wise enough to turn all this to his own account and to profit by the disunion. All these plots culminated in 1605 in the famous Gunpowder Plot, which was designed to destroy the Houses of Parliament and to subvert the throne. Its very audacity led to its defeat.

The attitude of James towards the Roman Catholics was indirectly responsible for this plan of murder. Before he came to the throne of England he held out hopes of toleration which were soon interpreted at Rome as preludes to a coming submission. In 1603 a secular priest, named Watson, organised a plot to seize the person of James, but the Jesuits betrayed him to Lord Burghley, and by doing so gained a momentary triumph for themselves. James tried to effect a reconciliation with the Roman Catholics upon the condition that they transferred their allegiance from the Pope to himself. Fines were remitted, and recusants grew more bold and absented themselves from the parish churches. The Protestants throughout the country took alarm and demanded vigorous action. James grew frightened and issued his Proclamation of 1604, ordering all priests to leave the country. The judges on circuit hanged several recusants, the fines were reimposed and a new reign of terror began for all Roman Catholics. Under these circumstances the Gunpowder Plot was secretly hatched. Its promoters were men of position and wealth. Robert Catesby and Guy Fawkes were men of good families and great personal influence. Garnet, the Provincial of the English Jesuits, was informed that some great violence was in contemplation. Afterwards he shielded himself under the seal of confession, but he took no steps to prevent the outrage. When on his trial he prevaricated, saying that he had a general knowledge of
Catesby's intention which he had received not in confession and that he was highly guilty and had offended God by not revealing it. A second plea was that he had learnt the full details not in confession but by way of confession. The plot was betrayed by Tresham to his brother-in-law, Lord Monteagle, in order to save that nobleman's life. Guy Fawkes, who had been left in the cellars of Parliament in charge of the powder barrels, was arrested on November 4, the night before the explosion was to take place. Under torture he revealed the whole plot. Catesby was shot in a house in Staffordshire, and in the next few days the whole elaborately planned rising fell to the ground. Guy Fawkes and Garnet expiated their crimes on the scaffold and the arch-priest Blackwell addressed a letter to his fellow-religionists declaring his abhorrence of the plot.

1 The letter to Lord Monteagle ran thus—

"My Lord,

"Out of the Love I bear to some of your Friends, I have a Care of your Preservation. Therefore I would advise you, as you tender your Life, to devise some Excuse to shift off your Attendance at this Parliament: For God and Man have concurr'd to punish the Wickedness of this Time. And think not slightly of this Advertisement, but retire your self into your Country, where you may expect the Event in Safety. For though there be no Appearance of any Stir, yet, I say, they shall receive a terrible Blow this Parliament, and yet they shall not see who hurts them. This Counsel is not to be contemn'd, because it may do you Good, and can do you no Harm, for the Danger is past so soon as you have burnt the Letter. And I hope God will give you the Grace to make good Use of it: To whose holy Protection I commend you."

2 Blackwell's letter—

"To my Reverend Brethren the Assistants and other Priests, and to all the Catholics whosoever, within the Realm of England.

"Since my late Letters publish'd, (declaring the Unlawfulness of the late desperate Attempt against our gracious Sovereign, the Prince, Nobility, and other Estates of the Realm; as also the inward Heart-grief conceiv'd amongst us, that any Catholics should be Instruments in so detestable and damnable a Practice, so odious in the Sight of God, and horrible to the Understanding of Men) some uncertain Rumors have lately been spread of Intentions against Persons of special Honour and State (which, how true they be, God best knows) yet my self in tender Discharge of my Duty, (with the First to fear the Worst, and hoping charitably..."
ended the "fifth of November Gunpowder treason and plot," the annual commemoration of which lasted to our own generation but which has now happily died out. The immediate effect of the plot was to establish a new compact between Bancroft and the secular priests against Rome and all Jesuits, amongst whom Parsons was especially conspicuous. I give in a note both the new oath of allegiance required and the form offered by the Roman priests as a substitute.\(^1\) The permanent effect

of the best, that they are rather Untruths or Reports, than true Suggestions) have thought it good to signify unto you my Assistants, and all other my Brethren, Priests, and Catholicks whatsoever in this Realm: That no violent Action to Attempt against the Person of our dread Sovereign the King, his Royal Issue, Nobility, Counsellors, or Officers of State, can be other than a most grievous and heinous Offence to God, scandalous to the World, utterly unlawful in it self, and against God's express Commandment. The which I desire you, my Assistants, to communicate to our Brethren the Priests; and we and they, as heretofore we have done, to instruct our Ghostly Children accordingly: Assuring my self, that as his Holiness has already in general to me, prohibited all such unlawful Attempts: So undoubtedly, when Notice of such shall come unto him, he will by his publick Instruments manifest and declare to the World, his utter Dislike and Detestation thereof, with as deep Ecclesiastical Censures, as are in his Power to impose upon such, as shall so wickedly and malitiously contrive such devilish Devices. In the mean Time, by the Authority I have, and so much as in me is, I do humbly intreat, and straitly charge, and injoin all Catholick Persons, that live under obedience of mine Authority, upon the utter Pain that can, or may ensue thereby, that none of them dare, or do presume, to attempt any Practice or Action, tending in any Degree to the Hurt or Prejudice of the Person of our Sovereign Lord the King, the Prince, Nobility, Counsellors, or Officers of State: But towards them in their several Places and Degrees, to behave themselves as becomes dutiful Subjects, and religious Catholicks to their Royal King, his Counsellors, and Officers, serving in Place of Authority under him, the 28th of November, 1605.

"Vester Servus in Christo Blackwellus,

"Archpresbyter."

1 1606.

The Oath of Allegiance.

(3 and 4 Jac. I. c. IV. sect. IX.)

I, A.B. do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify and declare in my conscience before God and the world, that our
of the plot has been irrevocable. To the Jesuits is largely due the undying suspicion of Rome, which has been transmitted from father to son through successive generations. When James II tried to bring the English Church back to Roman allegiance and lost his throne

sovereign, lord King James is lawful and rightful King of this realm and of all other his Majesty’s dominions and countries; and that the Pope neither of himself nor by any authority of the Church or See of Rome or by any other means with any other hath any power or authority to depose the King, or to dispose any of his Majesty’s kingdoms or dominions, or to authorise any foreign prince to invade or annoy him or his countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his Majesty, or to give license or leave to any of them to bear arms, raise tumult or offer any violence or hurt to his Majesty’s royal person, state or government or to any of his Majesty’s subjects within his Majesty’s dominions. Also I do swear from my heart that notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted or to be made or granted by the Pope or his successors or by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from him or his see against the said King his heirs or successors, or any absolution of the said subjects from their obedience, I will bear faith and true allegiance to his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and him or them will defend to the uttermost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his or their persons, their crown and dignity, by reason or colour of any such sentence or declaration or otherwise, and will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and him or them will defend to the uttermost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his or their persons, their crown and dignity, by reason or colour of any such sentence or declaration or otherwise, and will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto his Majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which I shall know or hear of to be against him or any of them; and I do further swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever: and I do believe and in my conscience am resolved that neither the Pope nor any person whatsoever hath power to absolve me of this oath or any part thereof, which I acknowledge by good and full authority to be lawfully ministered unto me, and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary: and all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation or mental evasion or secret reservation whatsoever: and I do make this recognition and acknowledgement heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian: so help me God.
in the attempt, the memory of the fifth of November, though eighty years old, was still potent and played its part in the revolution of 1688.

The English Bible of 1611.

Our so-called Authorised Version of the Bible came out of the Hampton Court Conference. Dr. Reynolds asked for a new translation of the Bible, "because those which were allowed in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI were corrupt and not answerable to the truth of the original." The language of the educated people in England from the time of the Norman Conquest until the middle of the fourteenth century was largely French, and whilst certain portions of the Bible had been translated there was no complete edition until 1380. Before the days of printing there could be no translation which, as Tyndale said, "not merely merchants but ploughboys could buy and read." In the early years of the

1606.

Form Offered by the Priests as a Substitute for the Oath of Allegiance.

(Tierney's Dodd's Church History, IV, cxcii.)

I, A.B., as concerning my allegiance towards his Majesty, do, in all points, acknowledge as dutifully, and as far forth, as any good subject ought to do to his prince; and I do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, and testify, and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our sovereign lord King James is lawful king of this realm, and of all other his dominions and countries: And that I do and will bear true faith and loyalty to his Majesty, and him will defend, to the uttermost of my power, against all unlawful conspiracies and attempts, which shall be made against his person, crown and dignity: And will also do my best endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which I shall know and hear of, to be made against him: and I do also think and verily believe that princes, which be excommunicate, ought not to be murdered by their subjects nor any other. And all these things I do plainly express, and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, by the true faith of a Christian.

So help me God.
sixteenth century Tyndale and Coverdale produced translations. By the injunctions of 1559 the Great Bible was ordered to be set up in churches. In 1568 the Bishops’ Bible, so called from the number of bishops engaged in the preparation of it, appeared. The revisers were to follow the Great Bible and “not to recede from it but where it varyeth manifestly from the Greek or Hebrew original.” Parker in sending a letter of commendation of this translation to Cecil for presentation to the Queen wrote, “This printer hath honestly done his diligence; if your honour would obtain of the Queen’s Highness that this edition might be licensed and only commended in public reading in Churches to draw to one uniformity, it were no great cost to the most parishes and a relief to him for his great charges sustained.” This translation met with scanty support, and so the matter stood in 1604. James readily acquiesced in the proposal for a new translation, and a large committee was soon at work, which did not complete its task until 1611. Bancroft sent out a circular letter to the other bishops on July 31, 1604, stating that the King had appointed “certain learned men to the number of four and fifty for the translating of the Bible and that in this number divers of them have either no ecclesiastical preferment at all or else so very small, as the same is far unmeet for men of their deserts.” The King asks for vacancies in parsonages or prebends to be certified to him, that he may commend to the bishops or patrons “some such of the learned men as we shall think fit to be preferred.”¹ Very strict rules were laid down to govern the work of the translators, who were not to be allowed to introduce new theology or new Church schemes under the cover of a new translation.² The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept, and no marginal notes explaining passages according to individual interpretations were allowed to be affixed. The title-page of the Bible, which has been admirably

¹ For the names of the translators, see the Preface to A Reprint of the Edition of 1611 (University Press, Oxford, 1911).
² For the rules, see Appendix I, p. 238.
reproduced in the reprint, calls the book, "The Holy Bible conteyning the Old Testament and the New. Newly Translated out of the originall tongues and with the former Translations diligently compared and reuised by his Majesties speciall commandement. Appointed to be read in Churches." Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the King’s most Excellent Majestie. Anno Dom. 1611." This great edition gradually won its way to acceptance by its intrinsic merits, and for nearly three centuries has helped to shape the English tongue, nor is it yet displaced from its position of influence by the Revised Version of 1881.

**Canons of 1604.**

We turn now to some of Bancroft’s administrative acts. Though Whitgift died on February 29, 1604, Bancroft was not confirmed in the see of Canterbury until December 10. As Bishop of London he performed the duties which should have belonged to the

---

1 No authority has ever been discovered for the phrase “appointed to be read in Churches,” for this and not “Authorised Version” is the official title. In 1881 Lord Chancellor Selborne wrote thus, “if the version was ‘appointed to be read in churches’ (as is expressly stated on the title-pages of 1611), at the time of its first publication, nothing is more probable, then this may have been done by Order in Council. If so, the authentic record of that order would now be lost, because all the Council books and registers from the year 1600 to 1613 inclusive were destroyed by a fire at Whitehall, on the 12th of January, 1618 (O.S.). Nothing, in my opinion, is less likely than that the King’s printer should have taken upon himself (whether with a view to his own profit or otherwise) to issue the book (being what it was, a translation unquestionably made by the King’s commandment to correct defects in earlier versions of which the use had been authorised by Royal injunctions, &c. in preceding reigns) with a title-page asserting that it was ‘Appointed to be read in Churches’ if the fact were not really so.”

In any case, as the present Archbishop of Canterbury proved in *Macmillan’s Magazine* (October, 1881), the authorisation was “permissive and not compulsory.” The Homilies were authorised in the same words “appointed to be read in Churches” (1562).

2 See the deeply interesting preface styled “The Translators to the Readers” in the reprint of 1911.
Primate. The constitutions and canons ecclesiastical are described as treated upon by the Bishop of London, President of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of the said province and agreed upon with the King's Majesty's Licence in their synod begun in London 1603. These were promulgated under the Great Seal of England by his Majesty's authority. These canons are still in force where they have not been altered by subsequent synodical legislation. Made in convocation they are binding on the clergy only. They were framed upon many constitutional precedents, and injunctions and visitation articles were used as the basis of construction. The canons were a serious attempt to enforce order and discipline into a Church which had been distracted by nearly fifty years of inward rebellion. It is worthy of notice that they distinguished between the vestments for Holy Communion to be used in cathedral and collegiate churches and in parish churches. In the former the cope is to be worn whether by bishop, dean or canon when principal minister. In the latter every minister saying the public prayers or ministering the sacraments or other rites of the Church shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves. Clergymen possessing degrees are to wear such hoods as by the orders of the Universities belong to their degrees, which the minister shall wear (being a graduate), under pain of suspension. Non-graduates are to wear some decent tippet of black (whatever that may mean), so it be not silk.

When Bancroft began to enforce these canons he had enough to do in insisting upon the use of the surplice, which was the vestment chiefly objected to by the Puritans. I cannot find any reference to the Rubric upon Vestments, which then as now stands in the forefront of the Book of Common Prayer. Dr. Usher speaks of Bancroft's administration of these canons as "justice tempered with mercy." ¹ Certain of the clergy

ⁱ See Reconstruction of the English Church, vol. ii., chaps. vii. and viii.
refused to conform and were deprived. What their number was is an old subject of dispute. The figures have to be carefully analysed, but they include not only those deprived but those "silenced, suspended and admonished." In reply to a statement in the House of Commons that three hundred had been deprived, Bancroft replied that the number was only sixty.\(^1\) The truth is difficult to arrive at when, then as subsequently, one side wished to minimise and the other to exaggerate, and both argued from different premises according as they reckoned actual deprivation or included also suspension or admonition. Whether our sympathies are with Bancroft or not, it was clear that the chartered lawlessness against which he had to contend must be ended if the Church were to continue to maintain its authority or perform its work in its constituted way.

The Consecration in 1610 of three Bishops for the Church of Scotland.

These consecrations, which must be carefully distinguished from what was done in 1637 by Laud, have assumed a new significance in consequence of the resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, which says, "It might be possible to make an approach to re-union on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610."\(^2\) It

\(^1\) Nonconformist writers sometimes speak of 746. Dr. Gardiner (History of England, i. 197) says, "It has been calculated that about 300 of the clergy were ejected," and in a note he adds, "The number has been estimated as low as 49." He concludes in favour of the larger number. Dr. Usher questions this larger number. (See vol. ii., p. 4.)

\(^2\) Resolution No. 75 (Lambeth Report, p. 65). The conference receives with thankfulness and hope the Report of its Committee on Re-union and Inter-communion, and is of the opinion that, in the welcome event of any project of re-union between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-episcopal Church, which, while preserving the faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an
will be well then to consider what these precedents were.\footnote{See \textit{Ordination Problems} (S.P.C.K.), by John Wordsworth, D.D., late Bishop of Salisbury. I pay my tribute of respect to this great scholar, this ornament of the English episcopate, and my own affectionate friend, all too early removed from the Church militant here on earth, with what confidence can we say to the Church Triumphant.} With the exception of about twelve years the titles and civil rights of bishops remained in Scotland during the latter part of the sixteenth century. James’s policy was to restore their spiritual rights as soon as possible. This policy triumphed in the Synod of Perth in 1597, and in the following year in the General Assembly at Dundee. In 1603 James nominated Spottiswood to Glasgow, in 1604 Gladstanes to S. Andrews,\footnote{Consecrated in Edinburgh on Sunday, December 30, 1610.} in 1605 Hamilton to Galloway and in 1607 Lamb to Brechin. In June, 1610, the General Assembly at Glasgow gave these bishops authority to convene synods, to excommunicate, to ordain, to suspend and deprive from benefices and to exact oaths of obedience. Nothing hitherto had been done to consecrate them as bishops, and they performed the above episcopal functions without consecration. No bishops of the old succession remained in Scotland, and therefore the King arranged for the consecration of these men, already styled bishops and to whom had been granted civil powers, to take place in England. The letters patent were dated October 15, 1610, and these claimed that the rights of nomination, presentation and dispensation belonged solely to the Crown of Scotland. The two Primates of England were to take no part, so as to avoid difficult complications and to satisfy Scottish objections. The approach to re-union on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610. Further, in the opinion of the conference, it might be possible to authorise arrangements (for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordination) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders, without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of Church order laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.
letters patent, which were addressed to the Bishop of London (Abbot) and other English bishops, declared the sees of Glasgow, Galloway and Brechin to be vacant and ignored the Scottish law by which the men were already in full possession of their bishoprics. The consecration took place in the chapel of the Bishop of London’s palace, then to the west of old S. Paul’s, on Sunday, October 21, 1610. The consecrating bishops were George (Abbot), 1 Bishop of London, Lancelot (Andrewes), Bishop of Ely, Richard (Neile), Bishop of Rochester, and Henry (Parry), Bishop of Worcester. 2

1 Abbot was fully conversant with Scotch Church affairs, and had accompanied James in 1608 on a visit to Scotland, one object of which was to reconcile the people to the idea of an episcopal Church. He had a life-long antagonism to Laud, and Bancroft, whom he succeeded at Canterbury, was little less odious to him. He owed everything to the favour of James, and was in character of ungracious temper and unbending honesty. He was obstinate without zeal and haughty without dignity. In doctrine he was a Calvinist, and, says Lord Clarendon, “He considered Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled Popery and valued those men most who did that the most furiously.”

2 See The Act of Consecration, Grindal Register, fol. 414. In the margin: Comissio et literae patentes pro consecratione archiepiscopi Glascuensis, episcopi Gallovidiensis et episcopi Brechiniensis, in Scotia.
The newly consecrated bishops shortly afterwards consecrated others in Scotland, and by this way Episcopacy

Scotie spectantes et pertinentes, Dicti reverendi patres Georgius episcopus Londonensis, Lancellotus episcopus Eliensis, Richardus episcopus Roffensis, et Henricus episcopus Wigorniensis, vicesimo primo die mensis Octobris anno domini millesimo sexcentesimo decimo, Ad perimplendum mandatum et beneplacitum serenissimi principis et domini nostri domini Jacobi dei gratia Anglie Scotie firancie et Hibernie regis, fidei defensoris &c., in oratorium sive Capellam dicti Reverendi patris domini episcopi Londonensis, infra palatum episcopale Londonense situm et situatum, intrarunt et sese congregarunt; Quibus in superiore parte Capelle sive Oratorii predicti collocatis et in diversis cathedris sedentibus, precibusque deo optimo maximo per Capellanos Reverendi patris episcopi Londonensis antedicti pie et devote factis, et Concione deinceps erudita per quendam magistrum Johannem Wicars habita, et publice perlectis litteris predictis regiis patentibus, ad consecrandum venerabiles viros, primo magistro (sic, lege magistro) Johannem Spottiswood in Archiepiscopum Glascuensem, secundo magistro Gauinum Hamilton in episcopum Gallovidensem et terto magistro Andream Lambe in episcopum Brechinensem, processere, eosdemque in Archiepiscopum et episcopos respective, iuxta formam consecracionis episcoporum in libro consecracionis episcoporum presbiterorum et diaconorum in hoc regno Anglie recept(a) et usitat(a) et publice auctoritate comunit(a), consecrarunt et confirmaverunt. Sed, antequam ad huiusmodi consecracionem dicti Reverendi patres sese accommodarunt, venerabiles viri Johannes Spottiswood Gauinum Hamilton et Andreas Lambe separatim et singuli, suis viribus et in personis suis, iuramenta de agnosendo regiam supremam potestatem in causis ecclesiasticis et temporaliis et de recusando et refutando omni et omnimode iurisdictioni potestati auctoritati et superioritati foraneis et extraneis, iuxta vim et formam statuti parliamenti huius incliti regni Anglie in ea parte edite et provisi &c., prestabant; hocque iuramento per dictos venerabiles viros prestito, predictus venerabilis vir Gauinus Hamilton iuramentum prestitit ad reverentiam et obedientiam debitam domino Archiepiscopo Glascuensi in regno Scotie et successoribus suis, quod iuramentum de reverentiam et obedientiam prestanto et solvendo domino Archiepiscopo Sancti Andree in regno Scotie, cum Archiepiscopus aliquis ibidem deinceps consecratus fuerit, et eius successoribus, venerabilis vir Andreas Lambe in persona sua similiter prestitit. Cumque hec consecracione peragenda sit in Capella sive oratorio Reverendi patris domini episcopi Londonensis sitque infra provinciam Cantuariensem, Reverendissimus in Christo pater Richardus providentia divina Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus, cupiens regio predicto beneplacito prout debuit satisfacere, Licenciam suam ad consecracione-
was restored in the Church of Scotland. There is no evidence that the existing presbyters in Scotland were re-ordained, though all the new ones received episcopal ordination. The Royal prerogative was employed to force the consecrations through, and Dr. Wordsworth points out that "this side of the 'precedents of 1610' was not for a moment approved by the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference of 1908." We are not surprised to learn that much discussion arose in London before the consecrations took place. Bishop Andrewes desired that the three Presbyters from Scotland should be ordained to the office of priesthood before proceeding to that of the episcopate. Archbishop Bancroft held that "there was no necessity of receiving the order of priesthood but that episcopal consecration might be given without it." In support of this theory there are many cases from Church history in which the episcopate has been conferred *per saltum* upon the principle that a bishop was *ipso facto* ordained a priest since the greater includes the less. Whatever arguments were used the four bishops did consecrate without any previous English orders being conferred. I know the influence exercised by Bishop John Wordsworth in securing the passage of the Lambeth Conference resolution in 1908, and therefore I give below his summary in favour of the "precedents of 1610."¹ So far from the Lambeth Conference...
ence having frowned upon proposals for re-union, its resolution (No. 75) was the most important step taken hitherto on the side of the Church of England. Without deciding any details or judging many questions which have yet to be raised, it indicated a way towards union which may yet lead to the fulfilment of what has become a hope and desire throughout Christendom. The Church in every section is well trained in methods

(1) The Anglican Communion is competent to dispense with any rules of discipline which do not touch the essentials of ordination as to matter, form, intention and minister. It has so dispensed, according to one explanation, as far as it took corporate action in the consecration of October 21, 1610. It has more distinctly affirmed its willingness to dispense with its rules of gradual ascent to the episcopate in the seventy-fifth resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1908.

(2) The Gelasian principle of the suspension of ecclesiastical rules in times of necessity is also in its favour. The great need of re-union in the face of the attack made upon the fundamental truths of Christianity, and the weakness in the aggressive work at home and in the mission-field which arises from separation, are a sufficient cause for the application of new methods. Church history has examples of something of the same sort in regard to the healing of schisms.

(3) The principle of the Apostolic canon, exemplified in the freedom of ordination not only of laymen when pointed out by a vox Dei, but of persons endowed with spiritual gifts, without any previous probation, is even more pertinent. For the highest Churchmen must recognise in many leading Presbyterian and Nonconformist ministers a remarkable exhibition of the grace of God and a ministry blessed by Him.

(4) The course proposed would avoid casting any imputation on the ordination already received, and no doubt exceedingly valued, by the ministers as consecrated bishops. Their status would be accepted as practical evidence of their fitness, while its theoretical validity would not be discussed. All that it would be further necessary to ascertain would be that they were personally sound in faith and unblamable in character, and had been duly elected to the sees for which they were chosen.

Under the circumstances contemplated, the choice of the persons to be consecrated bishops would certainly be made after most earnest prayer for the Holy Spirit and after the most searching inquiry and with the full concurrence of the people. It would be an act of the Spirit-bearing Church, conscious of its deep responsibilities, and I believe it might look for the full approval of the great Shepherd of the flock, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Easter, 1909.
of disunion, and re-union can never come until all are agreed to submit themselves to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. He alone can show the better way of unity, peace and concord. We shall make progress only so far as we study the principles common to us all and forget the controversies which separated our forefathers and still keep us apart.¹

**Bancroft's Character.**

In closing this lecture upon Bancroft I attempt a summary of his character. He was from his days in Cambridge an ecclesiastical statesman rather than a theologian. His life-long training in diplomacy and his extensive acquaintance with intrigue, which he set himself to counteract, made him keen and discerning and sometimes too suspicious. An impetuosity of nature combined with much ill-health caused him at times to be rude, and not till his latest days were there signs of gentleness in his manners. His life was one long and strenuous contending for the rights of the Church against Roman intrigue and Puritan disloyalty. Our Church owes to him its very existence in an age when its principles were challenged and its system of worship threatened with destruction. In dealing with King James he met with all the difficulties which Laud found in an exaggerated form in the King's son, Charles I. We cannot judge these Archbishops by any standard of to-day, and yet, while acknowledging all that the Church owes to Bancroft, we cannot refrain from wishing that he had been less Erastian and more devoted to the spiritual interests of the Church.² These were

¹ I was myself responsible for causing the resolutions agreed upon in 1907 by the Church of England in Australia and the Presbyterian Church in Australia to be sent to all the bishops in 1908, and whilst these were not formally before the Lambeth Conference they were in the minds of the Bishops during the discussion.

² Since the days of Henry VIII the Crown had been regarded as the depository of both civil and ecclesiastical power, and the King was held to combine these two in his person by virtue of the Consecration Service.
generally lost sight of in the daily administration of the Church’s chartered privileges and in obedience to the imperious demands of the Crown. Bancroft’s health was sacrificed to his duties. For many years before his death he suffered from ague and stone, and at last died on November 2, 1610, after agonising pain which the medical skill of his day was powerless to alleviate. He was buried at Lambeth, and under his successor, Abbot, the Church soon learnt to honour the memory of its brave and fearless champion.