UNTIL recent years Cranmer suffered from indiscriminate praise, Bancroft from neglect, and Laud from unreasoning dislike and suspicion. The last has now

1 I find much difficulty in obtaining any satisfactory account of the origin of the name Laud. S. Lô in France gave rise to Senlow. Baring-Gould says, "Slow is S. Lô, in Latin Laudus, that gives us the surname of the Archbishop, Laud." Lower (Patronymica Britannica) says, "Sancto Lô, as the surname is latinised in charters as De Sancto Laudo, it is probably the origin of Laud." There is a surname Lewd, i.e. untaught, ignorant, a layman, thus "lered and lewed," i.e. clergy and laity (Piers Plowman). The name occurs thus, William le Lewed (1300), afterwards Roger Lude, county Somerset. The word Lewd occurs in two groups of forms, (1) one retaining the "e" of the old English "Laewede," and (2) the other the "a." These latter forms are chiefly northern and Scottish, but not exclusively, and are written Lawed, Laued, Laud and Lawid. In the fourteenth century we have "Ye clerkes rounde (of shaven crowns) and ye lawed men fourcornered." In the thirteenth century, "To laud and Inglis man I spell That understands that I tell." In the fifteenth century, "both to lawd man and to clerk." The word then connoted layman as opposed to cleric, thence unlearned and so low and vulgar, and finally ill-bred and base.

I am inclined to the opinion that Laud's name came from this old word for layman, and has no connection with S. Lô in France. In the poem written in the Vestry Book of All Hallows Barking, in 1663, which records the removal of his body to S. John's College, Oxford, the name is spelt "Lawk." The coffin plate has "Lawd."

been called the greatest Archbishop who has sat in the chair of Augustine since the Reformation, and one who, amid the apparent failure of all his aims, re-laid firm and deep the old foundations of the English Church.\(^1\) He was the only son of a wealthy merchant, or clothier, at Reading, and was born there in 1573. When Laud was in later years taunted with the meanness of his origin, he described himself as "a man of ordinary but very honest birth." He was educated at the Free Grammar School of the town, and went at sixteen years of age to S. John's College, Oxford. Reading school possessed certain privileges, \(i.e.\) Fellowships and Scholarships at S. John's, and this doubtless determined the choice of a College.\(^2\) His tutor was Buckeridge, afterwards President, who taught him to ground his studies "upon the noble foundation of the Fathers' Councils and the ecclesiastical historians." Here then we have the beginnings of that learning which in subsequent years was to be turned to such good account

---

\(^1\) William Laud, by W. H. Hutton, B.D., 1895, p. 3.

\(^2\) A London merchant, Sir Thomas White, founded the College with great munificence "to the honour of God, the Virgin Mary and S. John the Baptist." This was in 1555. The buildings were partly those of a Cistercian Monastery founded in 1456 by Archbishop Chicheley. Two fellowships were reserved for students from Reading.
against Rome. Oxford was largely Calvinist in doctrine when Laud matriculated, and the new foundation of S. John’s played the part of Oriel in the nineteenth century in being the home of Churchmanship. When Laud became a Fellow he soon gathered disciples round him, and by the time he graduated as B.D. (1604, i.e. at thirty-one years of age), he was sufficiently important to be proceeded against by the Vice-Chancellor for maintaining the Catholic doctrine and position of the English Church. On proceeding to D.D. his thesis affirmed that “episcopatus” is “jure divino.” His chaplaincy with Charles Blount, Earl of Devon, was marked throughout his life by a painful memory. He married his patron to a divorced lady, Lady Rich, who had been her new husband’s mistress. Laud kept the day for the rest of his life as one of penitence and humiliation, and never forgave himself for a too ready compliance with an unrighteous demand.

In these early days of study and comparative obscurity, Laud laid the foundations of his knowledge and principles, and when he was called upon in later years to put these into practice, he was only giving expression to his long-cherished thoughts. A time of crisis was coming in the earlier years of the seventeenth century upon the English Church and State, and in the then close relationship between the two a like fate awaited both. Moments of crisis reveal character but do not create it, and Laud must be regarded as the exponent of principles then generally accepted, but not necessarily inherent in the Church’s position and rights. It is possible to imagine an archbishop who would have acted with greater wisdom, and while defending the Church’s faith would have been a mediator between an obstinate king and an enraged people. History, however, records a different story, and Laud was the willing agent in all things for the royal will. His decision involved the Church in the common ruin, and gave a political bias to Churchmanship which identified it with absolute government. The result has been to call down upon his head the vials of wrath and indignation and
to make him the chief scapegoat to carry the sins of the Stuart dynasty. The historians of the nineteenth century revelled in unqualified abuse. Hallam says of him: "Though not literally destitute of religion, it was so subordinate to worldly interest and so blended in his mind with the impure alloy of temporal pride that he became an intolerant persecutor of the Puritan clergy, not from bigotry, which in its usual sense he never displayed, but systematic policy." Macaulay uses of him more contemptuous language: "The mean forehead, the pinched features, the peering eyes of the prelate suit admirably with his disposition. They mark him out as a lower kind of Saint Dominic, differing from the fierce and gloomy enthusiast who founded the Inquisition as we might imagine the familiar imp of a spiteful witch to differ from an archangel of darkness." All this is graphic and spiteful writing, but it is not history, and few men now turn to Macaulay for well-balanced judgments of any historical personage. This excess of abuse has produced a reaction, and the real Laud must be rescued from these caricatures of his mind and actions. Mr. Gladstone, Dr. Mozley¹ and Bishop Creighton,² no mean authorities, have expressed their opinions upon Laud and his times, and have done much to set the maligned Archbishop in true historical perspective. "Laud saved the English Church," says Dr. Mozley. "That any one of Catholic predilections can belong to the English Church is owing, as far as we can see, to Laud. He saw the good element that was in her, elicited, fostered and nurtured it, brought the incipient Church school to size and shape, and left it spreading over the Church and setting the standard. Let us be historically just. Let the dead have their due. Let us acknowledge facts and allow their true stamp and authorship to remain upon them. The English Church in her Catholic aspect is a memorial of Laud." Bishop Creighton's witness is similar: "So far as Laud is concerned (the disasters) only emphasised

¹ Archbishop Laud (1845), by Dr. Mozley.
² Lectures delivered at All Hallows Barking, in 1895.
the truth that he who undertakes to do God’s work with the world’s weapons will stand or fall according to his worldly prudence and not according to the excellence of his intentions. Laud chose to work through power rather than through influence, his power failed him and he fell before his foes. That they were relentless and pursued their triumph to the utmost, we can only regret for their own sake.

Laud’s conception of the Church was sounder, larger, more practical than that of his opponents. Events justified his wisdom. Presbyterianism was tried and failed. Independency was tried and failed, efforts at ecclesiastical combination proved to be impossible. When England had again to consider the matter nothing was vital except the system of Laud, which was practically accepted at the Restoration. It was after all the most possible, because it was the most intelligible. Laud had laid down its main lines. The Church of England was part of the Catholic Church holding the Catholic faith, maintaining the historic Episcopacy, dispensing the sacraments according to primitive ordinance. “I die,” said Laud in his will, “I die, as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, a true member of His Catholic Church within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England.” This was the position of the English Church, and nothing subsequently altered it. Compromises might be urged by politicians, but nothing could be accepted which threatened to destroy the order of the English Church as a part of the continuous Church of Christ. This was the original basis of the English Church. It had been passionately attacked from the beginning. It had been inadequately expressed in practice. Laud asserted it clearly and definitely, and showed how it was to be set forth and what it involved.¹ When Laud wrote to Wentworth in

¹ For a more recent opinion upon Laud see England under the Stuarts, by G. M. Trevelyan. The writer's traditional point of view is one of the old hostility, and yet justice is done to motives and actions. See the following sentences. “Laud, who feared the anger of the rich as little as he respected the feelings
Ireland, "I am alone in those things that draw not profit after them," he was scarcely exaggerating the truth, and the old Oxford tutor had not the courteous art to conceal from his selfish and venal coadjutors his dislike of their proceedings. Laud and Wentworth were almost the only honest men at the head of affairs, though they were also the two most earnest contrivers of despotism in Church and State.

From Oxford to Canterbury.

From these general remarks upon Laud's career we return to his days at Oxford. The scholar of Reading, like scores of others who have risen to power and influence through the English Universities, had no friend but his own ability. His tutor, John Buckeridge, directed his studies in a channel which ran opposite to the dominant Calvinism at Oxford. Whilst there is no just comparison between the characters of the two men, there is a very close analogy between the studies and circumstances of Laud in the seventeenth century and Pusey in the nineteenth. Each found Oxford given up to theology and worship wholly opposed to the historical and Catholic side of the English Church. Each became the dangerous young man to be suspected by the heads of colleges and professors. Through all this opposition Laud fought his way, and the spirit of controversy which it engendered left its permanent marks upon his character.

At the time of his ordination as Deacon, in 1600, Young, Bishop of Rochester, "found his study raised of the poor, used the same tribunals which punished the conventicles to chasten the adultery of influential men, who might otherwise have been his powerful friends," p. 175. "Rural villages, seldom furnished with any other public buildings, transacted parish business in the church. Laud reformed this altogether. Breaking with both medieval and Protestant tradition he originated a new view as to the use of sacred buildings, which was imposed in his own day by order and coercion alone, but which won its way into popular custom after his death as public halls, clubs and secular institutions of every kind rose to serve instead of the church as places of assembly," pp. 175–6.
above the system and opinions of the age, upon the noble foundation of the Fathers' Councils and the ecclesiastical historians, and presaged that if he lived he would be an instrument of restoring the Church from the narrow and private principles of modern times.” A few years later Dr. Abbot, brother of the Archbishop and Vice-Chancellor, fiercely attacked Laud by name from the University pulpit, but he behaved himself then and at other times with singular coolness and self-restraint. He pursued his studies and held to his opinions. At his own College of S. John the Baptist he rose high in favour, but not without previous opposition. The next ten years brought him several pieces of ecclesiastical preferment, and in 1610 he resigned his Fellowship to give himself to the twofold duties of chaplain and parish priest. His enemies rejoiced over what they regarded as his banishment from the University and their own triumph. In the following year the President of S. John’s, Buckeridge, was made Bishop of Rochester, and Laud was chosen President after a contested election, followed by an appeal to the King, who confirmed the appointment. Upon leaving the College in 1621, Laud is able to say: “I governed that College in peace without so much as the show of a faction all my time, which was near upon eleven years.” The defeated candidate was taken into favour by Laud, and subsequently owed to him the office which he had lost by Laud’s election.

By this time, through the good offices of Bishop Neile of Lincoln and other friends, Laud had become known to James I. The King knew well his ability, and there was nothing unusual in his appointment in 1616 as Dean of Gloucester. He was then forty-three years of age, with a reputation for profound learning and great administrative capacity. Bishops and Deans were until quite recent times frequently chosen from the heads of colleges at the Universities. He was appointed for the express purpose of reforming and setting in order what was amiss. Miles Smith, the Bishop, was a Calvinist and indifferent to Church order and forms. The new Dean went down and presided at the Chapter in January
1617, when it was agreed that the necessary repairs should be undertaken and the Holy Table be placed at the east end of the choir. “The city,” says Heylin, “was at that time much perturbed with the Puritan faction, which was grown multitudinous and strong by reason of the small abode which the Dean and Prebendaries made amongst them, the dull connivance of their Bishop and the remiss government of their Metropolitan, so that it seemed both safe and easy to some of the rabble to make an outcry in all places that popery was coming in.”¹ Such was Laud’s first experience of Church administration in a prominent position. The Bishop declared he would never enter the Cathedral again. The storm subsided, as the Dean had the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth on his side, and for the next five years he regularly presided at the Chapter meetings, though his public duties elsewhere made him largely non-resident.

In 1616 Laud accompanied James I to Scotland, who with execrable taste told his old friends, the Scotch

¹ Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 70. Laud, like Dr. Johnson, had his Boswell. Dr. Heylin is thus described by Dr. Mozley in his essay upon Archbishop Laud—

“Heylin’s biography, however, only gives one side of the Archbishop; it exhibits the shrewd tactician, the active indefatigable man of business, the spirited Church champion. Heylin realizes acutely the religious politics and party aspects of the times; he catches phrases, watchwords, party notes: a cant term, a piece of abuse that he has treasured up, lets you into the whole feeling of the time being, like a newspaper. Laud, the ecclesiastical combatant and schemer, figures in strong colours throughout; but we are not let into the inner and deeper part of his character: the homo interior was not in Heylin’s line. We read through his book and have barely a glimpse of a whole inward sphere of thought and feeling in which Laud’s mind was moving all the time. We go to another document for this: the Diary reveals a different man from what the active scene presented; and a fresh and rather opposite field of character appears. Heylin’s portrait has a new colour thrown upon it by the connection; we look on the stirring features with another eye when we have seen the quiescent ones; the bustle of State and Church politics covers an interior of depth and feeling; the courtier, statesman, and man of the world kneels before the cross; and we gain a different idea of him altogether,” p. 109.
divines, that “he had brought some English theologians with him to enlighten their minds.” In 1621, at the age of forty-eight, Laud was nominated by the King as Bishop of S. David’s. He resigned the headship of his college in accordance with the statutes, and embarked as a statesman-ecclesiastic upon the adventurous voyage which was to end in shipwreck and death. His consecrators were six bishops, not including Canterbury (Abbot), who was under suspension for the accidental shooting of a keeper. For five years—until in 1626 he was translated to Bath and Wells by Charles I—he administered his diocese as a non-resident bishop. The condition of the house was deplorable. Laud added a chapel designed after the fashion of a college chapel, and did what he could for a remote and neglected diocese. As Bishop he was head of the Chapter, and at the first meeting he attended the minute-book records: “Whereas the Reverend Father in God William Laud Bishop of S. David’s hath taken offence that the muniments of the said Church are in such shameful confusion and so much neglected he hath with the consent of the precentor and chapter ordered and decreed as follows viz. that all and singular instruments deeds etc. be transcribed and kept in safe custody by the Chapter clerk.” This characteristic action bespeaks the reformer, and whether at Gloucester or S. David’s there was need enough for setting right things that were amiss. Charles I, between whom and Laud a friendship had begun, was not likely to allow the Bishop to be too far from him, and so after a brief story of two years at Bath and Wells Laud came to the see of London and plunged himself deeply into Court life and political affairs.

We must cast a glance at the Court at the time Laud came there as Bishop of London in 1628. Archbishop Abbot was out of favour and mistrusted. He had long been opposed to Laud, and could not interpret his advent to power as anything less than the repudiation of himself as chief adviser in Church matters. The saintly Bishop Andrewes of Winchester was dead, leaving behind him a memory fragrant with piety and wisdom.
Bishop Williams, the Lord Keeper, was smarting under the defeat of his influence caused by the rise of Laud. Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, had made Laud at once his friend and his confessor. Between the two there existed a firmly cemented friendship and alliance. Lord Strafford and Laud were sworn friends. Everything, therefore, combined to put power into Laud's hands. There was no really great man left among the bishops to dispute the supremacy with Laud, and he entered upon his new career of ecclesiastical statesman with field of victory already won. When the throne of Canterbury was vacant by Abbot's death in 1633, no one was surprised that Charles I should greet the Bishop of London two days later in the words: "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury, you are very welcome." Thus did the Reading scholar, the Oxford tutor and head of his house, the zealous Church reformer and the devoted servant of the King come at last to that perilous height of power and dignity in which he aided his King to ruin, at least temporarily, both Church and State.

Laud as a Scholar and Controversialist.

We have seen that when Oxford official theology was confined to the study of Calvin's Institutes, William Laud was busy with the Fathers, the Councils, and ancient Church History. Up to the time of his leaving Oxford he was above everything else the scholar and the student. In 1622 Laud was in his fiftieth year and in the fullness and ripeness of intellectual power. A champion was needed to defend the position of the Church of England as against that of Rome. James I could not have found a worthier man in England than the new Bishop of S. David's. Andrewes, now nearly seventy years of age, was too old. Ussher, equally learned, though a frequent visitor to England, belonged to the Church of Ireland. The need for such a champion arose from the course of events at Court. The King had set his heart upon gaining the Infanta of Spain as a wife for Prince Charles. With this object in view he suspended
the laws against Roman Catholic priests, and allowed
the Jesuits to reside in England under a nominal
restraint. Soon a number of men and women at Court
joined the Church of Rome, and the mother of Villiers,
Duke of Buckingham, as well as her son, were begin­
ning to waver in their allegiance to the English Church.
Amongst the most successful of the Jesuits was a north­
country Englishman, named Percy, who is known in
controversy as “Fisher the Jesuit.” A full-dress debate
was held at York House between Laud and Fisher.
Buckingham and his mother, together with Lord Keeper
Williams, were present, and the proceedings of the Con­
ference were reported to the King. There was no
intention at first to publish the proceedings, but in 1624
they were made public in the name of one of Laud’s
chaplains. Later, in 1639, Laud published a restate­
ment of the Conference and the subsequent discussions,
setting all out as his ripened judgment upon the con­
troversy between England and Rome. The immediate
effect of the Conference is immaterial, but the perma­
nent advantage is undoubted. As regards the subject
matter it might belong to the reign of Henry VIII and
to the present time. The arguments are the same as
are used at the present time; the questions of the
Primacy of S. Peter, of the sense in which the Church
is said to be built upon him, whether or no he was a
universal pastor, the infallibility of the Church, the
adoration of images, who is to judge in controversies of
faith and conduct, that Kings are not to be tyrannised
over by the Pope. All these and many like subjects
were treated on both sides. Laud proved himself a
worthy champion of the English Church, and the array
of weapons is ready to the hand of any one who enters
the same lists. By this work alone Laud has earned
the lasting gratitude of the Church of England. The
whole discussion centres round the Roman claim to
infallibility, which Laud answers by showing that the
Roman Church has fallen into many errors, and that
there is no particular infallible Church. Laud sums up

1 On “Infallibility,” see Appendix K, p. 240.
Laud as Archbishop.

Laud’s tenure of Canterbury lasted from 1633 to 1645, but this period must be shortened by nearly four years. He was committed to the Tower in March 1641. The actual trial did not begin until March 1644, and he was beheaded in January 1645. He knew as early as 1629, through the vindictive libels freely circulated against him, how bitter was the hatred with which his actions were followed. But these experiences taught him nothing, nor did he deviate a hair’s breadth from the line of policy adopted. Neither the King nor Strafford nor he understood the temper of the age. The threefold combination had decided to punish sullen rebellion, and to make their authority supreme against all opposition. The picture of Laud’s private life has its attractive side. Unmarried and raised above all family ties, he lived the life of an ecclesiastic at Lambeth. His mind was steeped in Church tradition. His devotions every day took place at the ancient canonical hours, and were without doubt sincere.1 He bore all abuse and slander

1 “Laud’s devotional character was of the peculiarly ecclesiastical mould—formal and systematic, simple and penitential. The Bible in his study, with the five wounds of Christ upon the binding, the gift of a religious lady, which was brought up against him at his trial; his feeling for the crucifix; his chapels, oratories, consecration of churches and altars, sacramental chalices; his bowings, prostrations before the altar; his constant references
as his appointed lot. When his enemies called him "a raging wolf and blood-sucking tyrant," or "Beelzebub," he patiently reflected, "They have called my Master by the worst name they have given me, and He has taught me how to bear it." Whilst Heylin has given us a picture of the Archbishop's life as seen by his chaplains and intimate friends, his own diary reveals most clearly his innermost soul. This was his daily confessional. Here he poured forth his complaints, his hopes and his trust in God. Here, too, we learn by what strange limitations his mind was encircled. He attached great importance to omens and signs. He recorded his dreams in all their quaint imagery and grotesque fancies. For these things he has been called a man of mean understanding and repellent bigotry. Every life has its arcana, its sacred things which no human eye is expected to examine, but Laud's private diaries were exposed to public gaze, and the worst interpretations were put upon every sentence. Besides, the charges during his trial cannot be sustained. Philosophers have long made sleep and dreams the subject of scientific inquiry, and why should Laud be judged by history to be either a fool or a bigot because he recorded for his own interest those midnight fancies which most men have described to their friends in private, and which are still amongst the strangest happenings to the human mind?

The daily life at Lambeth was worthy of commendation. An impatient suitor would take away an unfavourable impression of the Archbishop, who had answered him sharply, because, as he said in self-defence, "he had no leisure for compliments." We regret such words on account of their bad manners. Courtesy, at least, would have done no harm, but much good. In justification of this brusqueness, for it was nothing more, we

to saints' days; his almsgiving, fasting, canonical hours of devotion; his prejudice for clerical celibacy—show that peculiar religious shape of mind. 'Seven times a day do I praise Thee, because of Thy righteous judgments.' The seven hours of the Church were his hours of prayer, and gave constantly recurring short respite and pauses to his life of intense activity."—Mozley: *Archbishop Laud*, p. 145.
must remember the countless details of the daily life. S. Paul was probably equally busy, and yet he commended the rule of suffering fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise. Heylin, who knew the life at Lambeth, thus describes it: “Of apprehension he was quick and sudden, of a very sociable wit and a pleasant humour and one that knew as well how to put off the gravity of his place and person, when he saw occasion, as any man living; accessible enough at all times, but when he was tired out with multiplicity and vexation of business, which some who did not understand him ascribed unto the natural ruggedness of his disposition... constant not only to the public prayers in his chapel, but to his private devotions in his closet.” The time has come when all the wicked slanders against Laud’s private character should be buried in oblivion. Those which did duty in his trial have been repeated ever since. His devotional habits have been caricatured and his prayers ridiculed. Laud’s tastes were naturally simple; he cared little for dignity and pomp, though too much for power. He loved music, his garden and the birds. His bitterest enemies might well pause in reverent admiration of the man during his imprisonment of nearly four years. It is something to discover constancy which will adhere to principle and truth even to death, and Laud had this power of witnessing to his convictions. We may regard him as obstinate, but all martyrs have been the same. History can inquire how far Laud was justified in maintaining against well-known enemies his conception of the Church’s nature and life, but you cannot dismiss him as a bigot or brand him as an enemy of the cause for which he cheerfully and patiently went to the block. As a patron of learning Laud stands high. He loved books, and his greatest pleasure throughout life were those of the scholar. Costly manuscripts and choice editions were his delight, and when his position enabled him to secure them, he bestowed them with lavish generosity upon public librarians or gave them to private friends. At Oxford he was Chancellor in more than name. He felt he had
come to the office to reform the seat of learning. “The outward and visible form of the University,” he writes, “is utterly decayed, so that strangers that come have hardly any work by which they know it is a University.” The reformer must count the cost before he begins, and no dread of opposition could deter Laud in his work. To the Vice-Chancellor he writes: “I pray call the Heads of Colleges and Halls together, together with the Proctors, and with my love remembered to them all, let them know I am welcomed unto my Chancellorship with many complaints from very great men”; or again: “Put the tables of statute observance on S. Mary’s doors and proceed to the execution of them.” Oxford was to Laud a place of “ancient and religious foundations.” He will have no riding-school, no going up and down in boots and spurs, “as for Mr. Crofts and his great horses, he may carry them back if he pleases as he brought them.” The Principal of Brasenose was to have his cellar better looked to. Instructions were issued upon reverence at the chapel services, upon the times of morning and evening prayer and upon the revival of Holy Communion at the beginning of term. The Chancellor rules every College from his library at Lambeth.  

A man who understood human nature better, would have visited Oxford and held inquiries. The evidence as to the actual state of affairs would have brought conviction to the minds of others and secured their co-operation in reform. But these were not the ways of Laud or of the Stuarts. Too absorbed in exercising authority, they never paused to conciliate opponents or to secure their help after convincing them of the wisdom of the things proposed. The good that men do, as well as the evil, lives after them, and to-day Laud is held in honour at Oxford, and most of all at his own College, as one of her greatest sons.

Under the Archbishop’s fostering care the Church began to be reformed on its financial side. A royal injunction ordered that the Lords the Bishops be commanded to their several sees, there to keep residence,
excepting those which are in necessary attendance at Court. None of the bishops were to reside upon their land nor in their town houses, but in one of the episcopal houses, and not to waste the woods thereof. "He saw the Church was decaying," says Heylin, "both in power and patrimony; her patrimony dilapidated by the avarice of several bishops in making havoc of the woods to enrich themselves . . . her power he found diminished partly by the bishops themselves in leaving their dioceses unregarded and living together about Westminster to be in a more ready way for the next preferment." His brethren bore him no good-will for such drastic measures, and Bishop Williams, the great Lord Keeper, an ecclesiastic only in name, when suspended from office for revealing the King's secret and for mendacity, attributed his misfortunes to the "little meddling hocus-pocus" and the "little urchin." On the other hand Laud was the generous patron and friend to the poorer clergy. George Herbert, Cosin, Donne and the Little Gidding community had to thank him for many favours. The Archbishop's administration was gradually creating a new conception of the clerical office. The preachers and lecturers were being replaced by many with higher views of their duties. Attention to reverence in public worship produced a new type of clergyman, and speaking generally the priest was replacing the prophet. In modern democracies the priest with his twofold ministry of the Word and Sacraments has held his own and gained power. There is the same innate dread of popery or sacerdotalism which wrought Laud's ruin, but the Church wins its greatest triumphs in ministries in which the two sides, the ministry of the Word and that of the Sacraments, are blended into one whole, and the Christian faith is presented in definite and reverent order. This was all that Laud contended for, though every effort to introduce reverence into public worship was met with passionate resistance and insane charges of disloyalty to the Church and sympathy with Rome.

When we turn to Laud's share in State affairs there
is much to regret. None of the Stuart Kings liked Parliaments, and all of them stretched the royal prerogative to breaking-point. In 1629 Charles issued his memorable proclamation, refusing to meet Parliament again until the people had come to a better understanding of him and themselves, and no Parliament met for eleven years. For four years thus before Laud became Archbishop the government of the country was a personal one. Charles I, Strafford and Laud ruled without constitutional criticism. While the gathering clouds of discontent were preparing to break in a deluge of revolution, the trio were too much of the same mind to warn each other. A more discerning man than Laud might have saved both the Throne and the Church, but he had never any doubt in his mind as to the wisdom of what was done, and at his trial he pleaded in vain that his actions had legal sanction and were not his own personal acts. Laud was a disciplinarian from his college days upwards. Order was to him Heaven’s first law, more imperative than freedom of conscience. He was never cruel, nor did he suggest the older methods of torture and death. After systematic inquiry men must conform or be deprived. The power of the Crown in ecclesiastical affairs was exercised through the High Commission, which was a mixed body of clergy and laity with the Archbishop as chief ruler. Laud would have uniformity. He governed the Church himself, nor would he allow any diocesan independence. “He is at

1 The words of the proclamation are—

“Whereas for several ill ends the calling again of a Parliament is divulged, however we have showed by our frequent meeting with our people our love to the use of Parliaments; yet the late abuse having for the present driven us unwillingly out of that course, we shall account it presumption for any to prescribe any time unto us for Parliaments, the calling and continuing of which is always in our own power, and we shall be more inclinable to meet in Parliament again, when our people shall see more clearly into our intents and actions, when such as have bred this interruption shall have received their condign punishment, and those who are misled by them and by such ill reports as are raised in this occasion, shall come to a better understanding of us and themselves.”
home," says Dr. Mozley, "in every diocese of the three kingdoms. With the deepest reverence for the office, the man—the concrete bishop—never once seems to have come before his imagination in any other aspect than as a person who was to be told to do things and to be made to do them if necessary." And yet the effect of this administration was to exalt the order of the clergy. Many had become much dishonoured in public esteem. Laud raised their status by giving them power and proclaiming the authority of their priesthood. A new race of clergy arose and a new theology spread over the land. The Archbishop became popular with the inferior clergy because he maintained their rights and protected them from ill-usage.

Whilst all this must in justice be recorded, it availed nothing when the day of reckoning came. The personal government of the Crown brought about an impasse in 1640. A Scotch army held the northern counties and Charles, defeated and disgraced, had no choice but surrender to the Scotch Commissioners at Ripon. He then yielded, and at last called together Parliament to save England from bankruptcy and invasion. We are not concerned with the proceedings of the Long Parliament, except in so far as they affect Laud and the Church. On November 11, 1640, Strafford was impeached, and in March 1641 Laud was committed to the Tower charged with high treason by the Commons. The King's own turn came later, but this is outside our present subject. 1 From March 1641 until January 1645

1 Whether Charles's execution was a crime or a blunder is still debated.

"When the bleeding head was held up, the shout of the soldiers was drowned in the groan of the vast multitude. If there was any chance that the establishment of a more democratic form of government could gradually win the support of the people at large, that chance was thrown away by the execution of the King. The deed was done against the wish of many even of the Independents and Republicans; it outraged beyond hope of reconciliation the two parties in the State who were strong in numbers and in conservative tradition, the Presbyterians and the Cavaliers; and it alienated the great mass of men who had no party at all. Thus the Republicans, at the outset of their career, made it
Laud lay a prisoner in the Tower, and the story of these days will atone for much wilfulness and unwisdom at Lambeth. He who had shown no pity in the days of power exhibited every sign of a Christian spirit in the hour of his defeat. The story is too long to tell here, but Laud's imprisonment constitutes his greatest claim to be regarded as a martyr for the Church of England. He employed his time in writing the pathetic memoir, the history of his troubles. An affecting incident occurred on the day of Strafford's execution. His old and faithful friend sent word to him that "I would not fail to be at my chamber window at the open casement the next morning when he was to pass by it as he went to execution, that, though he might not speak to me, yet he might see me and take his last leave of me. I sent him word I would, and did so. And the next morning as he passed by he turned towards me and took the solemnest leave that I think was ever by any at distance taken one of another." The Archbishop fainted as he gave his blessing to his friend. From that day Laud expected a like end to his own life, but his courage remained unabated, and he strove only to prove his innocence to posterity and to meet death as became a true servant of Christ.

The articles of impeachment charged him with traitorously publishing canons contrary to the King's prerogative and the people's rights, with assuming a papal and tyrannical power in contempt of the Royal Supremacy, with endeavouring to alter God's true religion by law established in the realm and setting up impossible for themselves ever to appeal in free election to the people whom they had called to sovereignty. Their own fall, involving the fall of democracy and of religious toleration, became therefore necessary to the re-establishment of parliamentary rule. The worship of birth, of pageantry, of title; the aristocratic claim to administrative power; the excessive influence of the large landowner and of inherited wealth; the mean admiration of mean things, which has ever since the Restoration been at the root of the worst evils of English society—all these gained a fresh life and popularity by the deed that was meant to strike them dead for ever."—England under the Stuarts, by G. M. Trevelyan, p. 290.
popish superstitions and idolatry, and with other like charges. Parliament was too busy to deal with him, and in defiance of all principles of law and justice left him in prison for three years before the trial began. After many preliminaries the actual trial began on March 12, 1644. No semblance of judicial impartiality was observed. Laud's counsel was not heard until October 11. The impeachment was finally discarded, and Parliament resolved to proceed by a process of attainder. The Lords hesitated and caused delays. On January 2, 1645, a conference between the two Houses was held, at which the Commons declared that Parliament could rightly judge any charge it pleased to be treasonable. On January 4 the Lords assented. Laud produced a royal pardon, which had been in his possession since April 1643, but the Commons rejected it, and arrangements were made for carrying out the sentence on January 10, 1645. The only concession granted was the substitution of beheading for hanging. The scene on the scaffold has been often told. To the executioner Laud said, "Honest friend, God forgive thee and I do, and do thy office upon me without mercy." Then he knelt down and prayed. "Lord, I am coming as fast as I can. I know I must pass through the shadow of death before I can come to see Thee. But it is but umbra mortis, a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature; but Thou by Thy merits and passion hast broken through the jaws of death. So, Lord, receive my soul, and have mercy upon me; and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be this effusion of Christian blood among them: For Jesus Christ His sake, if it be Thy will."

A moment more of silent prayer, and he said, "Lord, receive my soul," and laid his head upon the block. Nothing in his life became him as well as his leaving it.¹

¹ "Laud's is an instance of a great career founded upon a dream; a great, practical, powerful, political mind, that pursued a visionary object. The high feudal idea of Church greatness which led him through his course was an impracticable, unreal
From Laud’s Death to the Restoration.

The execution of Laud has been regarded as an unnecessary and malicious blunder. The Long Parliament had already invaded the rights of the Church and destroyed her national position. In 1641 twelve of the bishops were committed to prison for their protest against the validity of the Acts of the Parliament. In 1642 bishops were excluded from the House of Lords. In one, in the great revolution of society which had taken place. When the Church has once lost her hold upon the mass, and fallen from her power, she must be restored from below and not from above. She has to begin from the bottom again, and must be raised by the slow advance and gradual inoculation of the mass. She must rise again by a popular movement, and by influences and efforts upon the open area and level. Laud’s movement was not a popular one, and we know not whether it could have been made so. The age was set one way, and he took perhaps the only engine there was for him. But to erect a high medieval prelacy and priestly power upon such a puritanised basis as the Church then presented was, in strict ordo naturae, beginning at the wrong end. We are criticising the movement, and not the man. The man is dependent on his age, and must take what weapon comes to hand. It was better doing something than nothing; using an awkward and inaccurate instrument than none at all. Great men upon their historical stage—it is not, we hope, a morbid sentiment to utter—are objects of compassion. The worldly machinery and the state of things they are in force them upon incongruities, and allow them only some one crooked weapon, some one angular posture, some one effective elbow thrust. Their own minds even become appropriated and naturalised by the sphere they work in, and see that one mode of acting only and no other. It remains for some clearer day to determine what minds really are in themselves, and what is the genuine intrinsic man apart from the hodiernal influences and moulding. Such a question would only take us wandering now into the shadowy region of moral metaphysics.”—Archbishop Laud, by Dr. Mozley, pp. 226-7.

1 “Laud himself, too old and brave to fly, was carried to the Tower, where he lay unfared and unregarded, till four years later his enemies did all that could be done to vindicate his policy to mankind, by illustrating in his execution the malignant spirit that always haunted and sometimes possessed the temple of English Puritanism.”—England under the Stuarts, by G. M. Trevelyan, p. 198.
1643 Episcopacy was abolished, and the "Solemn League and Covenant" was accepted by the House of Commons. On the same day that Laud’s attainder was passed the Lords abolished the Book of Common Prayer, and made the Directory the legal service book in England. So that the Archbishop and the Prayer Book were condemned together. After Laud's death Parliament had still to deal with the King, who was as much a martyr for the Church of England as the Archbishop.

A Presbyterian Church was created in 1646. By this time some two thousand of the clergy had been ejected, some in 1643 for refusing to accept the Covenant, and the rest in 1645 when the use of the Prayer Book was made penal. The Presbyterian discipline, as exercised by the county committees in the name of Parliament, was too stern and inquisitive for the English nation. Cromwell came to supreme power in 1653, and he was opposed to both the clergy and the Presbyterian discipline. The Protectorate in 1654 made Independency the religion of England, with toleration for all excepting members of the Church of England and Roman Catholics. The sad story of the sufferings of the clergy need not be retold here. They shared in the general pillage of property and in the lawless ejectment of those who in any way had assisted the King. A time of revolution is always a time of robbery and injustice. The laws which safeguard the rights of individuals are suspended until the question of supreme authority is once more decided. Macaulay, who is most unjust towards Charles, Strafford and Laud, was moved to compassion by the sorrows of the clergy and the destruction of churches and works of art, and to indignation by the stern suppression of amusements with a zeal "little tempered by humanity or common-sense."  

1 "The Puritans had undoubtedly, in the day of their power, given cruel provocation. They ought to have learned, if from nothing else, yet from their own discontents, from their own struggles, from their own victory, from the fall of that proud hierarchy by which they had been so heavily oppressed, that, in England, and in the seventeenth century, it was not in the power of the civil magistrate to drill the minds of men into conformity
happened in particular parishes is a matter for local investigation in the light of Diocesan and Parish Registers. I give below the result of searching these in the case of my own former Vicarage of Dewsbury in Yorkshire. The result is representative of what

with his own system of theology. They proved, however, as intolerant and as meddling as ever Laud had been. They interdicted under heavy penalties the use of the Book of Common Prayer, not only in churches, but even in private houses. It was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians. Severe punishments were denounced against such as should presume to blame the Calvinistic mode of worship. Clergymen of respectable character were not only ejected from their benefices by thousands, but were frequently exposed to the outrages of a fanatical rabble. Churches and sepulchres, fine works of art and curious remains of antiquity, were brutally defaced. The Parliament resolved that all pictures in the royal collection which contained representations of Jesus or of the Virgin Mother should be burned. Sculpture fared as ill as painting. Nymphs and Graces, the work of Ionian chisels, were delivered over to Puritan stonemasons to be made decent. Against the lighter vices the ruling faction waged war with a zeal little tempered by humanity or by common sense."—Macaulay's *History of England*, vol. i., p. 79.

1 Samuel Pearson was presented by the Crown in 1642, and duly instituted and inducted to the Vicarage, vacant per liberam resignationem Henrici Adam; and I am inclined to believe that he remained in at least partial possession of the Vicarage until his death. His predecessor left Dewsbury for the Vicarage of Rawmarsh. He had some knowledge of the district before he became Vicar, for he officiated at Morley at a marriage in 1635 (Dewsbury Parish Church Register). In 1651 his wife died, and in the Parish Church Register is described as wife of Samuel Pierson, Vicar of Dewsbury. In 1654 he was appointed Registrar of the Parish by the parishioners. This was after the office of Registrar had ceased to belong to the Vicarage, and is evidence of the goodwill of the people to him. The Parliament of 1653 made a great revolution in almost every parish in the matter of registers. It provided that a Register-man should be chosen at a parish meeting, who was to have the custody of the registers. He was to be approved and sworn by a Justice of the Peace, and was charged with the publication of the banns of marriage, which were to be published "either in the Parish Church, after the morning exercise, on three severall Lord's Days, or in the nearest market town on three successive market days." He was appointed for three years, but might be re-elected. Births, and not baptisms,
occurred in many other parishes in England, and shows how drastic measures were tempered by local conditions.

were to be entered by him; and no marriage was valid except before a Justice of the Peace. The Vicar was succeeded as Registrar, October 25, 1655, by another Samuel Pearson, possibly his son. In the entry of his burial, October 1655, he is described as Mr. Samuel Pearson, Vicar of Dewsbury. An important lawsuit took place on September 29, 1653, to establish the right of the Vicar of Dewsbury to annual Easter Pensions from the parishes of Huddersfield, Almondbury, Kirkheaton, and Bradford. The report of this is preserved in the Record Office in London. This document does not settle the question of the origin of the pensions, but the inquiry ended in establishing the Vicar’s ancient rights. Many witnesses were examined, and one of them stated that Mr. Pearson was “yet Vicar of Dewsbury.” No doubt was raised in the evidence as to the Vicar’s right to sue for the payments, and therefore we have additional evidence of his enjoyment of the emoluments of the benefice two years before his death. There is, therefore, no evidence of his complete ejectment. A great number of the clergy were ejected in 1643, and still more in 1645, when the use of the Prayer Book was made penal. In many cases the clergy were not interfered with at all, and complied with the law by using the Directory for the Public Worship of God. Bishop Henry Tilson was living at Soothill Hall at this time, and died on March 31, 1655, a few months before Samuel Pearson. The Bishop took charge of “a place in the mountains called Cumberworth,” and went there every Sunday. “I pray,” he says, “after the Directory.” What the Bishop did at Cumberworth, Samuel Pearson might have done at Dewsbury. From 1646 to 1654 was a period of ecclesiastical anarchy, and Cromwell’s Committee of Triers, for the final ejectment of the clergy, was not appointed until March 1654, and these had to act with the County Committees, which caused some delay. It might well happen, then, that Samuel Pearson, who had probably conformed to the Directory, was left in partial possession until his death in October 1655. That he was plundered of rights is clear from the Royalist Composition Papers (1st series, vol. xxx. p. 307), where, styling himself even then (1655) as Minister of the Parish Church of Dewsbury, he addresses a petition to the Commissioners for managing estates under sequestration, praying that an augmentation of what he had been deprived of might be restored to him. An order was made by the Committee for Plundered Ministers for the payment to him of £30 a year on November 4, 1651, confirmed on November 11. As he had not received the money he presented this petition.

JOHN KAYE, B.A.—An authentic account of John Kaye is given by the Minutes of the Presbyterian Classes held at Wirksworth in 1657 (Greenwood’s Early History of Dewsbury, pp. 165–7).
The combination of anarchy and military despotism soon brought the English people to their right senses, and in 1660 Charles II was recalled from beyond the seas to the throne of his fathers.\footnote{James II ordered, by Royal Warrant, the 29th of May to be observed as a day of thanksgiving for the Restoration of the Throne. The Book of Common Prayer contained a special service for use on that day until it was removed in 1859. The day was also known as Royal Oak Day in memory of Charles II's hiding in an oak tree subsequently to the battle of Worcester in 1651. To this day in many parts of England the school children sing on the 29th of May—

"The 29th of May,
Royal Oak Day,
If you don't give us holiday,
We'll all run away";}

With him, and as a condition of his return, the Church of England came into her own again. The love of the Book of Common Prayer played no small part in effecting the change.

He was appointed Minister of Dewsbury on April 20, 1658, upon the approbation of the parishioners. For some time before this date he had preached the Word here. He received only Presbyterian Ordination under the Ordinance of Parliament dated August 20, 1546. He was allowed to remain in his position after the Restoration of Charles II., in 1660, and vacated his position at Dewsbury on December 19, 1664. He came to Dewsbury from Rastrick, in 1655, when merely a preacher, and before his ordination by a bishop, as he became Lecturer of Leeds Parish Church in 1665, and Minister of S. John's, Leeds, on August 6, 1667. He died in June, 1683, amid "universal lamentations." It is difficult to understand his position at Dewsbury between 1660 and 1664, though it would appear he was allowed to remain undisturbed. Archbishop Sterne's Register describes him upon his resignation of Dewsbury as Clerk of the Vicarage or Church of the Parish of Dewsbury.

The battle of Worcester was fought on September 3, and at that time of the year the foliage would be abundant enough for concealment. The discussion as to whether Charles could have concealed himself in an oak tree in May is unnecessary. Popular tradition has linked the two events of the concealment and the restoration together, and assigned them to the same day.
Nine of the English bishops survived the Rebellion, and at the Restoration either recovered their sees or were appointed to others. Juxton of London went to Canterbury, and Frewen of Lichfield to York. Seven new bishops were consecrated on December 2, 1660, four on January 6, 1661, five on October 28, 1661, and Sodor and Man was filled on March 24 in the same year. The episcopate was thus fully restored. Several of the Presbyterian ministers were invited to accept bishoprics or deaneries, including Calamy, Baxter and Reynolds, but all of them with the exception of Reynolds refused, and he was ordained and consecrated Bishop of Norwich. The triumph of the Church was complete, and the Savoy Conference yielded nothing of importance in preparing the Prayer Book for submission to Convocation and final acceptance by the Church and State. Charles II, in his Declaration of Breda, had promised toleration: "We do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom." How far the promise was kept belongs to a period of subsequent history. Toleration, as we know it now, has been a plant of slow growth, and it began its growth not so much after the Restoration as after the experiences of James II's reign, which showed once more the danger from Rome and united the Protestant feeling of the country. The Church of England has succeeded in maintaining its own doctrines only because these were not forced upon the whole people.

The claims of the Church were established after the Restoration with a wealth of learning and a soberness of judgment, which are the pride of Englishmen, by men like Robert Sanderson of Lincoln, Isaac Barrow of Cambridge, Stillingfleet of Worcester, Robert South, Bull, who made the English Church respected throughout Europe, and Jeremy Taylor, whose immortal writings are admired and neglected by our age. The devotional literature of our Church was enriched
by the distinguished names of George Herbert, Bishops Ken and Sherlock, and Comber, Nelson and Beveridge, as well as many others.

My task is now ended. With the settlement of 1662 the Reformation came to an end and the Prayer Book has remained substantially the same ever since. The Church has had its periods of neglect of the rubrics and of return to the true principles, but the Prayer Book remains to-day as the chief safeguard of unity throughout our Communion. For more than a hundred years of the Reformation period each successive attempt to force English Christianity into one mould, and to compel all to worship in the same services failed, and the Church of England discovered first the need of toleration, and afterwards the value of Christian work outside her limits. Our own generation is eagerly looking for greater unity, and in Australia especially we are feeling the wicked waste of power in country districts caused by the attempt to maintain many imperfectly supported ministries. The story of the past must enter into the discussions of the present. Let each of us bring his own contribution and boldly state his principles of faith and doctrine and worship. No union will come by the absorption of one section of the Church by another. By the power of God’s Holy Spirit unity may come in a united Church, which assimilates the many common principles underlying all sections, and, for the sake of Christ’s own prayer, learns and unlearns, seeking unity wherever it is possible and allowing diversity in things not essential to the common faith and work.

The Church of England has yet a great part to play throughout Christendom, and may shape the religious thought of many generations of English-speaking peoples.