6-1-1956

The Policies and the Practices of Archbishop Laud

Stephan John Korinko
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_korinkos@csl.edu

THE POLICIES AND THE PRACTICES OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Stephan John Korinko

June 1956

Approved by: Carl S. Meyer
Advisor

Arthur Kenick
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS OF LAUD

William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of all England, has been heralded, on the one hand, as the champion of the Anglican Church by the high churchmen. On the other hand, Laud has been maligned, convicted and condemned by the Puritans. He has been defended for his tolerant attitude toward religious matters; he has been accused of popery. He has been defended for his attempts to preserve the unity of the Church of England; he has been accused of precipitating the Puritan Revolution. Controversy has been the theme of the writing about this man. Whenever the name of Laud is mentioned, this problem faces the student of the seventeenth century Anglican Church.

As a figure in the Anglican Church, Laud has stood out as a much controverted figure. In the days of his own lifetime, Prynne, using stolen notes of the Archbishop and motivated by bitter personal hatred, wrote Canterburies Doome[1] in 1643 to serve as a biography of condemnation for the imprisoned Laud. Fuller's Church History of England[2] was a furthering of the idea that Laud was evilly intentioned toward the Puritans, although it was not as bitter an attack as Prynne's on the executed Archbishop. After the death of Laud, Peter Heylyn, Laud's Chaplain,

---

[1]Prynne, Canterburies Doome (London: n.p., 1643).

[2]T. Fuller, The Church History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until 1648 (3rd edition; London: William Tegg, 1868).

wrote a favorable biography of the Archbishop, in which he printed many of the official acts and articles which caused much of the hatred over-against Laud.[3] In the early nineteenth century John Lawson wrote his biography of Laud with more evidence available to show the justification of Laud's actions.[4]

As late as 1878 Peter Bayne in The Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution could condemn and maintain his hatred for Laud.[5] A. C. Benson in 1887 tried to present a factual biography which displayed neither bitter hatred nor extreme sympathy for Laud.[6]

In his work, The English Church From the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714), William Hutton, attempting to give a factual account of the activity of Laud, granted him the position of the great ecclesiastical figure during the reign of Charles I.[7] From the position of a great figure, Laud was promoted to the position of martyr by George Hodges in Saints and Heroes Since the Middle Ages.[8]

---

[3]Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or The History of the Life and Death, of The Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (London: A. Siele, 1671).

[4]John Parker Lawson, The Life and Times of Archbishop Laud (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1829), 2 vols.

[5]Peter Bayne, Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution (London: James Clarke and Co., 1878).

[6]Arthur C. Benson, William Laud Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, A Study (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1887).

[7]William H. Hutton, The English Church From the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714) (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1927).

[8]George Hodges, Saints and Heroes Since the Middle Ages (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1912).

Robert Coffin in his book, Laud, Storm Center of Stuart England, presented the tailor's son, the unofficial king in the days of Charles I.[9] Duncan-Jones wished to write a sympathetic account of Laud and his trials as the Archbishop of Canterbury.[10] Adair's article in Church History tended toward a middle ground of interpretation of Laud, in which he was pictured neither as a saint, nor as a devil.[11] Trevor-Roper, in Archbishop Laud 1573-1645, wanted to maintain a balanced opinion of the Archbishop.[12]

With such a differing of opinion from the Anglican to the Puritan position, the tendency is to choose a particular side and maintain that position. The writer of this paper has tried not to formulate a value judgment or an opinion pro or con about Laud's activities; rather, he has attempted to present a factual account of the policies and practices of Archbishop Laud. Nevertheless, as a tragic figure, Laud sways one to sympathize with him. Since many of the writers of church history have worked in the Puritan Revolution and have dedicated their efforts to the Puritan side of the question, the present writer has turned to a side less known and less glamorous, the Anglican side of the question.

---

[9]Robert P. T. Coffin, Laud, Storm Center of Stuart England (New York: Brentano's, 1930).

[10]A. S. Duncan-Jones, Archbishop Laud (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927).

[11]E. R. Adair, "Laud and the Church of England," Church History, V (June, 1936), pp. 121-40.

[12]H. R. Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud 1573-1645 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1940).

The purpose of this investigation was to discover, if possible, the actual policies and practices of William Laud while he was the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is unfair to have only accusations leveled against Laud. It is, likewise, just as unfair to have only a glowing account of Laud's life. For these reasons the writer has attempted to discover what the policies of Laud were concerning the church and the state, as well as his method and practice in applying these principles to the church of his day.

Handicapped with the lack of Laud's personal writings, the present writer has attempted to discover those available sources which would cast a light on the policies and practices of Archbishop Laud. The sources for this study were limited to the volumes which contained the writings or quotations from the writings of Laud and the legal documents pertinent to the areas of investigation. Hutton and Heylyn offered the most material in these areas, and consequently, the paper leans heavily on them. Duncan-Jones and Lawson presented some material in summary form which has also been utilized.

The scope of this paper has been limited to a study of Laud's concept of the church, the episcopacy, and the state. The area of his practices covers some of the major incidents in his reign as Archbishop: namely, his visitation in England, his visitation overseas, his political activities in behalf of the Church and the Crown, and, finally, his attempts to preserve his position. Briefly, the writer has tried to close with the result of these policies and practices, the execution of Laud.

The paper did not attempt to cover all the interesting side-lights in the interdependent relations of Laud and Charles I. Many of the

claims of the Puritans were not considered. The emotional background and Laud's part in precipitating the Puritan Revolution were not considered. There is merely a slight look at the issue of Laud's death at the hands of Parliament. Another area of investigation might be Laud's relation to Parliament throughout his lifetime. An entire study might be made of just the Short and the Long Parliaments.

Briefly, then, this paper will attempt to show the early formulation of Laud's policies as he rose to power. Concerning the policies of Laud as Archbishop, the writer has limited himself to Laud's concept of the Church, the episcopacy, and the "Divine Right of Kings." Since practices are usually consistent with character, the writer has spent some time on the personality of William Laud. The practices which this paper will consider are: the visitation of England, the visitation overseas, Laud's political activities, and his activities to preserve his position. In the closing chapter we have dealt with the trial of Laud and his execution, which was the direct result of his policies and practices.

Though in the case of William Laud such policies and practices could lead only to execution, they were not condemned to oblivion. With the Restoration of Charles II to the throne in the year 1660 there was a return to the High Anglican practices. These practices again came to the forefront of the Anglican Church during the nineteenth century. John Henry Cardinal Newman brought them to the attention of all the clerics of the Anglican Communion once again in connection with the Oxford Movement.

The result of this study, therefore, has been the discovery that Laud was consistent throughout his reign as Archbishop to the policies which he formulated early in life. His practices were the results of his policies. In his day these policies and practices would lead only to his execution.

CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF WILLIAM LAUD TO THE PRIMACY

The Early Life of William Laud

William Laud was born on October 17, 1573. His birthplace was the fashionable town of Reading, noted for its wealth and its beauty and its "magnificent Abbey, founded and liberally endowed by King Henry I."[1] Reading was known, too, for its manufacture of textiles. Laud's father was engaged in this trade. There were many looms in the Laud household; and many weavers, spinners, and fullers were employed by Laud's father.

Early in his youth Laud was stricken by a very serious illness, and though he recovered from the illness, it left its marks on him. Throughout his life he was sickly, pale, and weak. His early schooling was at the Free Grammar School at Reading. Here he showed signs of being a precocious youngster and advanced rapidly through the school. At the age of sixteen he was sent to Oxford to continue his studies. "His mind, his character, his whole life was moulded and formed by his long connection with Oxford."[2] The college of the university which Laud entered was Saint John's College. His tutor at Saint John's was John Buckeridge, a disciple of Lancelot Andrewes, whose breadth of vision in ecclesiastical matters Laud also imbibed. The reviving and adopting of what the early

---

[1]Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or The History of the Life and Death, of The Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (London: A. Siele, 1671), p. 42.

[2]E. R. Adair, "Laud and the Church of England," Church History, V (June, 1936), 126.

Church Fathers had said, the abandoning of the errors which had crept into the Roman branch of the Catholic Church, the gentle reverence and transparent honesty, the desire not to enforce ceremonial issues were all part of the heritage of Andrewes left to men like Buckeridge and Laud.[3] In 1589 Laud completed his work at Saint John's College for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

The town fathers of Reading heard of the good record of Laud while at Saint John's College. For this reason he was nominated to a scholarship from the town of Reading. The scholarship had been made available to students of merchant or tailor parentage through the constitutions of Sir Theodore White. Though initially the scholarships had been limited to those eligible from London, White, who was public-spirited, allowed other towns to nominate men to the scholarships. The Merchants-Taylors School in London was designated the chief Seminary of Laud's college. According to the custom of Saint John's College, Laud was allowed to study for his degree in Divinity before he had completed all the requirements for a Doctorate in the Arts. Laud completed his Master of Arts in July of 1599.

In 1601 Laud entered the holy orders of the Anglican Church. He became a chaplain to Charles Blount, Earl of Devonshire, in the year 1603. During this period, while Laud was preparing himself for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, he was almost dismissed from the University. In a sermon in 1605 before the students of the University Laud maintained that the Roman Catholic Church was part of the visible church. Doctor Abbott, Vice-Chancellor of the University, attacked this sermon, for he was of

---

[3] Ibid.

the Calvinistic branch of theology. Abbott had defended ably the Calvinistic tenets of religion, and the view that the church came through the Berengarians to the Albigenses, to the Wickliffists, to the Hussites, to Luther and Calvin in his book, The Visibility of the Church. After the stir and commotion of this quarrel between Abbott and Laud, Laud was allowed by the authorities to continue his work for the Divinity degree, which was prepared in 1604.

For the Exercise of Bachelor of Divinity Laud maintained two points: "First, the necessity of Baptism: Secondly, that there could be no true Church without Diocesan Bishops."[4] The second thesis brought the whole wrath of the leaders of the University down upon the young candidate. The men in responsible positions were Calvinistic in background. Laud's thesis was attacked because he had taken, supposedly, much of his material from the works of Bellarmine, "as if the Doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God, or any necessary truths, were to be renounced because they were defended by that learned Cardinal."[5]

Though the commotion which the thesis aroused was very great, Laud defended them admirably and showed that they were tenable theses. He was permitted to continue his studies in Divinity, and he completed them in 1608. Laud also received his Doctorate of Divinity in the same year.

The Earl of Devonshire, whose chapel was Laud's first charge, died in the year 1608; and Laud turned to his friend and tutor Doctor Buckeridge, who commended him to the services of Doctor Richard Niele, then Bishop of Rochester. Laud received his first ecclesiastical

---

[4]Heylyn, op. cit., p. 49.

[5]Loc. cit.

preferment from the University to the vicarage of Stamford in Northamptonshire, which he refused. Since he had placed himself in the hands of Bishop Niele, Laud was preferred by Niele to the Rectory of Cuckstone in Kent toward the latter end of May, 1610.

Another incident which occurred in this year had a great effect on the Church of England. On November 2, 1610, Archbishop Bancroft died.[6] This important vacancy had to be filled. Through much pressure at the Court by the Earl of Dunbar, the position was filled by Abbott. This is the same man who had opposed Laud at the University; likewise, he was a staunch supporter of the Calvinistic doctrines circulating at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. With the appointment of Abbott to the Primacy there came a definite break with the past. Andrewes, a man with the understanding and breadth of Whitgift and Bancroft, was passed by in favor of a man with Calvinistic leanings. The Puritans now had a man in office who would not attempt to stifle their movements—Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury.

A third incident occurred in the year 1610 which also played a part in the life of William Laud. With the death of the Earl of Pembroke, the President of Saint John's College, a vacancy was also created which had to be filled. Buckeridge and Niele both pushed their young friend Laud to the front and suggested to the college of presidents of the University that he be appointed to the post. However, this did not go uncontested. Abbott, Laud's former adversary and also former Vice-Chancellor of the University, captured the ear of Thomas Lord Elsmer,

---

[6]John Parker Lawson, The Life and Times of Archbishop Laud (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1829), I, 136.

who had much prestige at the court and influence at the University. Abbott held up the old cry of papist against Laud. After a rather dismal election in which Rawlinson, another candidate for the presidency, tore up the election returns, the matter was referred to the King, James I. The King decided the matter in favor of Laud on August 29, 1611.[7]

The influence of Bishop Niele in gaining the Presidency of Saint John's for Laud was also valuable in a few months for gaining a position for Laud even nearer the Court. Bishop Niele had made it possible for William Laud to preach before the King as early as 1609, and during the year 1611 Niele had aided in getting Laud closer to the King by suggesting him for the Presidency of Saint John's. The culmination of these early efforts in behalf of Laud was his appointment as "one of his Majesties Chaplains in Ordinary on the third of November, 1611."[8]

The Preferments under King James I

For four years there were no more preferments. Other chaplains had been appointed and risen rapidly in the eyes of the court and the church; however, Laud had been passed by. Abbott, Laud's old enemy and now Archbishop of Canterbury, constantly brought up the old charges against Laud's papistic outlook. Laud was discouraged and was about to leave court. He informed his old friend Bishop Niele about this and gave him his reasons for leaving. Bishop Niele went into action in behalf of Laud. Niele brought to the attention of the King the fact that Laud had not received any new promotions in the church. Through the influence of

---

[7]Heylyn, op. cit., p. 56.

[8]Ibid., p. 59.

the King on Laud's behalf, Laud was appointed to the Prebendary of Buckden in 1614. Soon after this in early 1615 Laud was given the Deanry of Glouster, an appointment which did not pay well but showed to the world that Laud had not lost all esteem in the eyes of the King.

The King recognized the cathedral church at Glouster as one which needed reform in its practices. The clergy had been very lax in using the forms of worship in the Book of Common Prayer. This situation was conveyed to Laud, who, being appraised of the situation, set out immediately for his new charge. In short order Laud had convinced the prebends that there was reform necessary in their church worship practices. Special repairs on the church were ordered where necessary; the altar table was removed to its proper position along the east end of the choir. Laud then attempted to get the choir to reverence while coming before the altar and also when presenting themselves for communion. This last suggestion, though in harmony with the practices suggested in the Book of Common Prayer, raised a great stir among the prebends, who brought the matter to the attention of the Bishop. Miles Smith, the Bishop of Glouster, was an outstanding Hebrew scholar; but he was also a member of the Calvinistic party of the Church of England. Smith wrote to the prebends that they ought not stand for such treatment.[9] This letter merely stirred up matters more. Libelous letters were spread about Laud. Laud was forced to appeal to the High Commission, standing on his just claim that he was acting in accord with the established and practiced canons of the Church of England. Jones, one of the Aldermen of the city and a Justice of the Peace, sent a few of the agitators against Laud to

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 64 ff. The letter of the Bishop is quoted partially.

prison and informed the Bishop that such reform was needed. He complimented Laud on his activities, and soon the commotion died.

Having placed things in order at the church of Glouster, Laud attended his duties as President of Saint John's College. During May of 1617 Laud accompanied the King to Scotland in the company of the other chaplains of the court. While Laud and the chaplains were at Edinburgh, a rabid fanatic, Struthers, began to preach against the rites and the ceremonies of the Church of England. He went so far as to pray that they would never be established in Scotland. James was informed of this sermon and its contents by Laud and other of the chaplains. James delivered a speech in which he stated "that it was a power of belonging to all Christian Princes to order matters in the Church."[10] The Scots demanded an Assembly in which to bring up the reasons why he ought not order things differently in Scotland. The Assembly met, but the charges and reasons for not changing the ceremonies of the Church of Scotland were never brought up. All that James gained from the Assembly was the ill-will of the Scots and the contempt of his authority.

In August of 1617 the clergy of Scotland, in sympathy with the Episcopal form of church government and its practices, met in an assembly at Perth. Without prompting on the part of the King or Laud, these Anglican clergymen passed five articles which dealt with the communion of members, kneeling as being the proper form of receiving the sacrament. The clergy could administer communion to anyone who was ill in the presence of two or three witnesses. Baptisms could be performed in the homes if public declarations were made. On the holidays sermons

---

[10] Ibid., p. 68.

with suitable texts were to be preached. Children of eight years should be presented to the Bishop after they had been duly catechized and taught "to repeat by heart the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. . . ."[11] Such a move, spontaneous from the clergy of Scotland, shows that not all the clergy were opposed to conformity of practice in the Church of Scotland.

The year 1621 was an eventful one in the life of Laud as he rose in prestige and power under the benevolent hand of James I. During this year, Laud was appointed the Bishop of Saint David's. In order to keep himself clear of the charge of pluralities, Laud resigned his position as President of Saint John's College. An unfortunate accident occurred on July 27, 1621, which occasioned the questioning of the validity of the ordination and conferring of the title of Bishop on Laud and several others appointed to new sees. While on a hunting trip with his friend, Edward Lord Zouch, Archbishop Abbott accidentally shot and killed a fellow huntsman while shooting at a deer. According to Canon Law, Abbott was forfeit of all his lands and titles to the King and was suspended from all ecclesiastical functions, including that of ordaining the newly elected Bishops. In a special meeting of the Bishops it was decided not to impose the strict penalties of the law because of the accidental death. However, a commission of Bishops, not merely the Archbishop, ordained the Bishops elect. Peter Heylyn has recorded the names of the men involved thus:

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 72-3. The articles are quoted in full.

> And on the Sunday following, by virtue of a like commission directed to the Bishops of London, Worchester, Chichester, Ely, Landaff, and Oxon. Doctor Laud Lord Elect of Saint David's, Doctor Davenant Lord Elect of Salisbury, and Doctor Cary Lord Elect of Exeter, received Episcopal consecration in the chapel of London-house.[12]

The unforeseeable and disastrous misfortune of Abbott led to his disgrace at Court, from which he had to retire. Soon his position as the active head of the church was being filled by others. For Laud an opportunity to be of service to the church and the King presented itself during the early part of 1622. A Jesuit had tried to convert one of the leading noblewomen of the realm. Abbott, because of his disgrace, was not asked to present the Anglican position. The honor of debating with the Jesuit was given to Laud, who by this time had ingratiated himself further with the King. By invitation of James, Laud was asked to dispute with the Jesuit before Lady Buckingham, the mother of favored Buckingham who had great influence with Prince Charles. The Jesuit was known as Fisher; however, his real name was Percy. The result of the debate was that Lady Buckingham confessed before Bishop Laud and received communion on the sixteenth of June, 1622.

In the course of the debate with Fisher, Laud acknowledged that the Roman Catholic Church was a true church; however, there was peril involved with willingly associating with error. Laud also maintained that the acceptance of all the Thirty-nine Articles was not necessary for salvation. The success which he made of this dispute endeared him to the Earl of Buckingham. Laud benefited from this because his name was mentioned more and more at court by a man of influence with the king to be, Charles.

---

[12] Ibid., p. 82.

Fighting on the one hand the forces of a resurgent Roman Church, Laud and the King were also faced with the problem of the Puritans, who ranted and raved against the Roman Church and the liturgy of the English church. The Puritans not only objected to the liturgical practices of the Anglican Church, they also sent out unlicensed preachers who preached against the person of the Roman Catholics as individuals. In order to combat this type of behind-the-scenes action, Laud drew up six articles: (1) against unlicensed preachers; (2) against preaching on controversial themes; (3) against invectives anti-Puritan and anti-papist; (4) against the preachers imposing matters of State in their sermons; (5) against not giving the general outline of the sermon before it is preached; (6) against not catechizing the youth of the congregation.[13] The king signed these articles on August 4, 1622. This marked the close of the preferments under James.

The Preferments under King Charles I

When King James I died in the close of 1625, a commission was formed to investigate the rites and ceremonies used in the coronation of the king. The commission included Archbishop Abbott and Bishop Laud. It met for its first consultation on January 4, 1626. Some alterations were made in the form of the ceremony, and some additions were made, namely:

> The alteration in it was, that the unction was to be performed in forma crucis, after the manner of the cross, which was accordingly done by Abbott when he officiated as Archbishop of Canterbury in the coronation. The additions in the form consisted chiefly in one prayer or request to him in behalf of the clergy, and the clause of another prayer for him to Almighty God;

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 93-4. The articles are quoted in full by Heylyn.

> the last of which was thought to have ascribed too much power to the King, the first to themselves, especially by the advancing of the Bishops and the clergy above the laity.[14]

Laud did not become a forgotten man during the early reign of Charles, for soon he was asked by the king to perform a task which showed the king trusted Laud. Soon after the coronation Laud was asked to prepare for the guidance of the king a list of eligible men suitable for promotion in the Church of England. Laud submitted a list of men available. He placed behind each name either a "P" for Puritan, which meant that the individual ought not be promoted, or an "O" which meant Orthodox and this person ought to be promoted.[15] Laud was also asked to preach before the king, which he did on June 19, 1626, at Whitehall. In this sermon Laud set forth the unity of the church on the basis of Psalm 112, verses 3, 4, and 5.[16]

During the year 1626 occurred the trial of the Duke of Buckingham in which Laud played an important part. The Duke had been one of Laud's staunchest supporters since the debate with the Jesuit Percy in which Laud convinced the Duke's mother to retain her membership in the Anglican Church. The charges which the House of Commons brought against the Duke of Buckingham were:

> First, whether the King had not lost the regality of the Narrow Seas since the Duke became Admiral? Secondly, whether his not going as Admiral in this last fleet, was not the cause

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 136-37. The prayers and the oath are quoted in full.

[15] A. S. Gardiner, "William Laud," Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Sidney Lee (London: Oxford, 1892), XXXII, 189.

[16] Heylyn, op. cit., p. 139. Portions of the sermon are printed out.

> of the ill success? Thirdly, whether the King's revenue had not been impaired through his immense liberality? Fourthly, whether he had not ingrossed all offices, and preferred his kindred to unfit places? Fifthly, whether he had not made sale of places of Judicature? Sixthly, whether the recusants have not dependence on his mother and father in law?[17]

Laud helped to write the speeches of Charles and also the reply of the Duke which were delivered before the House of Commons. This action was later used as an accusation against Laud. It might be pointed out that as early as March of 1626 there was opposition to those of the party of the king.

The first preferment which Laud received at the hands of Charles was the position of Bishop of Bath and Wells. Laud was duly elected and confirmed to this position on September 18, 1626. Soon after this appointment the king requested that Laud draw up a set of instructions for the clergy of the realm asking for contributions to finance the war in the Palatinate.[18] The clergy were also asked to help finance the Thirty Years' War by bringing gifts for the King of Denmark. This was not an unusual situation, that is, using the pulpits for the benefit of the Crown. The very close ties between the Church and State in England made it a necessity to offer support to the Crown in times of difficulty and danger. The furor began in earnest when Parliament was recalled. It had been disbanded after the trial of the Duke of Buckingham, but now it was asked by the king to help supply funds for carrying on this war on the continent. Parliament was not interested in what it considered the war of Charles, it was more interested in matters at home, particularly

---

[17] Ibid., p. 141.

[18] Ibid., pp. 154-56. The Instructions are printed out in full.

matters which pertained to religion. Thus the House of Commons set its talents to use in ferreting out opponents to the Puritan faction. Charles had no other recourse than to disband this Parliament also, since it did not offer any assistance. He had to turn to the clergy for contributions.

In 1627 the King decided to nominate Laud to the See of London and thus give Laud more authority in the Church of England. Laud was to replace Mountain, "whom he (the king) looked on as a man unactive, and addicted to voluptuousness, and one that loved his ease too well to disturb himself in the concernments of the Church."[19] Several moves had to be made in order that this be accomplished. Bishop Niele was to be moved to the See of Winchester, made vacant by the death of Andrewes; Mountain was to be moved to Durham; Laud than would be moved to the See of London, which was known as the hot-bed of the Puritan faction. Charles wanted to make an example of London, where obedience was necessary, if he were to actually rule his kingdom. The final formalities of installation were completed on July 15, 1628.

During the year 1628 there was a great commotion among the Puritans about the doctrine of predestination. Charles did not want this controversy to part the ranks of the Church of England; therefore, he instructed Laud to draw up a declaration concerning preaching on this controversial subject. The essence of the declaration reads as follows:

> And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside in any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: And shall not put his own

---

[19] Ibid., p. 165.

> sense or comment to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.[20]

This declaration aroused the comment and the ill-will of the Puritans, whom it was designed to silence. A petition was formulated in 1628 to have the king withdraw this declaration; however, the petition was referred to the Parliament, where it caused more furor and less action by this group in furnishing aid to wage the war against the Catholic forces on the continent.

Another preferment was soon to come upon Laud, namely, the Chancellorship of Oxford University. On April 10, 1630, William Lord Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, Lord Steward of his Majesty's Household, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford, had died suddenly in his house at Baynards-Castle. In a meeting soon afterwards Laud was chosen by a majority vote of the college of presidents to fill the position. He was officially nominated to the post by the presidents and appointed by the king on April 12, 1630. Laud was installed in his office as Chancellor of the University of Oxford on April 28, 1630.[21]

During this period Laud was also appointed to the Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission.[22] While Laud served on these bodies, several cases were brought before them which aroused his wrath. In 1628 Felton, a fanatical Puritan, assassinated the Duke of Buckingham, Laud's friend and valued man of the king. Felton was brought before the Star Chamber and tried. During the trial Bishop Laud threatened Felton with

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 178-79. The entire declaration is printed out.

[21] Lawson, op. cit., I, 508; Heylyn, op. cit., p. 197.

[22] Infra, p. 48.

the rack unless he confessed. Another incident occurred in 1632 when Henry Sherfield was brought before the High Commission for destroying and defacing a stained glass window and other articles in the church at Saint Edmonds. Lest the notoriety of these actions serve to augment the religious turmoil in the church already, Sherfield was deprived of his recordership, fined one thousand pounds, and compelled to make public confession both in the church of Saint Edmonds and in the Cathedral Church.[23] Laud played a part in obtaining this sentence, for he was vitally concerned lest others decide to take similar action in his diocese.

The final step to the primacy and highest appointment in the Church of England was possible for Laud in the year 1633. On August 4, 1633, George Archbishop of Canterbury died at Croydon Palace.[24] Throughout his life Abbott had befriended the Puritan faction in the Church of England; thus, his death was not grieved very much by the high churchmen. The vacancy was filled by William Laud, a staunch supporter of the high church party. The king nominated Laud to the Bishops on the sixth of August. His election by the Bishops was made sure on the twenty-first of the month, and his translation and installation took place on September 19, 1633.[25] Thus Laud was brought to the position of most authority in the Anglican Church through the influence of friends like Niele and Buckingham, and through the good graces of James I and Charles I.

---

[23]Heylyn, op. cit., pp. 215-17. The entire trial is recorded here.

[24]Lawson, op. cit., II, 33.

[25]Ibid., II, 35; Heylyn, op. cit., p. 236.

CHAPTER III

THE POLICIES OF WILLIAM, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Laud's View of the Office of Archbishop

To this point Laud's steps have been traced through which he was enabled to become the Primate of all England. It is necessary now to consider the actual policies and practices of Laud during his term of office as Archbishop of Canterbury.

Briefly, this position of Canterbury as the seat of the Metropolitan had under its jurisdiction twenty-one Bishops. As a Diocesan seat it had 257 parishes which were in the Diocese of Rochester and several other parishes dispersed throughout other Diocese.

> The other privileges of this See are, that the Archbishop is accounted Primate and Metropolitan of ALL England, and is the first Peer of the realm: having precedency of all Dukes, not being of the Royal blood, and all the great officers of the State. He has the title of Grace afforded him in common speech, and writes himself Divina Providentia, where other Bishops only use Divina Permissione.[1]

According to an act of 25. Henry VIII. caput 21. the Archbishop was to grant all the licenses and dispensations which were formerly sued for to the Roman See. Furthermore, according to 1. Elizabeth caput 2:

> . . . by the advice of the Metropolitan or Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Queen's Majesty might ordain and publish such rites and ceremonies, as may be most for the advancement

---

[1]Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (London: A. Siele, 1671), p. 256.

> of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy sacraments.[2]

To this high dignity Laud succeeded at the death of Abbott. His final installation took place on September 19, 1633. Prior to the actual election many of the decisions in the church which rightly belonged to the prerogatives of the Archbishop were written by Laud; for George Abbott had fallen from the King's grace after the unfortunate accident of July 27, 1621, mentioned above.[3] S. R. Gardiner writes concerning this appointment thus:

> As Archbishop of Canterbury Laud had at his disposal not only whatever ecclesiastical authority was inherent in his office, but also whatever authority the king was able to supply in virtue of his royal supremacy. The combination of the two powers made him irresistible for the time.[4]

With the inherent power of the office of Archbishop and the support of the king, Laud also brought to the office his personal convictions concerning the authority of the office. Laud believed the office of Bishop "was an office instituted by Christ Himself for the right government of His Church."[5] This government of the Church did not exist in a vacuum but leaned on the support of the State. Both were closely allied, and the Church could not subsist without the Commonwealth.

---

[2]Ibid.; Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896), p. 466. The wording is slightly different in the official version of Gee and Hardy.

[3]Supra, p. 15.

[4]S. R. Gardiner, "William Laud," Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Sidney Lee (London: Oxford, 1892), XXXII, 189. Hereafter this volume will be referred to as DNB.

[5]A. S. Duncan-Jones, Archbishop Laud (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), p. 40.

In his effort to maintain the ancient usage of the Prayer-Book and the observance of the royal injunctions for the maintenance of order in the Church, Laud did not try any innovations. He merely returned to ancient canons and found his justification in the past injunctions. As he tried to make the Church conform to these old practices, Laud knew he could not do this by his own power; rather, "he must depend largely upon the friendly assistance of his collegues in the Episcopate."[6]

Laud depended on other Bishops greatly in order to execute his desire for conformity in the Church. By Laud's instigation Bishop Hall wrote his treatise, Episcopacy by Divine Right, &c. This volume was published in 1639 when the affairs of Scotland had come to a head and the Bishop's War was in progress.[7] Laud not only read the copy before it was printed, but also made suggestions which Bishop Hall later incorporated into the tract.[8]

Laud's Concept of the Church

Laud laid the basis for his views concerning the catholicity of the Church as early as 1603. In a sermon which was attacked by Abbott,[9] Laud placed himself in opposition to the view of the church held by the Puritans. "Laud believed in continuity of fact, the Puritans in a continuity of doctrine. Laud's view was rooted in history, the

---

[6]W. H. Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714) (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1903), p. 55.

[7]Infra, p. 52.

[8]Heylyn, op. cit., pp. 374-77. A copy of the letter by Laud to Bishop Hall is printed out.

[9]Supra, p. 7.

alternative in theological speculation."[10] This view was simply that the Church of Christ is visible and is derived from the Church of Rome. Nothing new was added to the concept of the Church, for this view had been held by many eminent leaders of the Anglican Church; namely, Jewel, Parker, Hooker, and during Laud's day Bancroft and Lancelot Andrewes.[11]

In his thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity taken in 1604, Laud again maintained the continuity of the Church through the Roman Church.[12] With such a view of the continuity of the Church, it is not surprising to find that Laud's great aim was "simply to restore to the Church of England a dignified simplicity of worship and a loyal obedience to the formulations which had come to her from the past through the age of her Reformation."[13]

Though Laud worked with the view of the past, he was not forgetful of the present. He was greatly concerned with the preservation of the unity of the Church in his own day. In his sermon before Charles I at Whitehall on June 19, 1626, he said:

> And for the Church, that is as the city too, just so, doctrines and disciplines are the walls and towers of it: but be the one never so true, and the other never so perfect, they come both short of preservation, if that body be not at unity in itself. The Church, take it catholic, cannot stand well, if it be not compacted together into a holy unity with faith and charity. And as the whole church is in regard of the affairs of Christendom, so is each particular Church in the nation and kingdom in which it sojourns. If it be not at unity in itself, it doth

---

[10] Duncan-Jones, op. cit., p. 18.

[11] Ibid., p. 48.

[12] Supra, p. 8.

[13] Hutton, op. cit., p. 31.

> but invite malice, which is ready to do hurt without any invitation: and it ever lies with an open side to the devil and all his batteries. So both Church and State, then happy, and never till then, when they are at unity within themselves, and one with another.[14]

Before the opening of the second Parliament session called by Charles on March 17, 1627, Laud was asked to preach the opening address. His text for this sermon was Ephesians 4:3, concerning which he said:

> That it was a very charitable tie, but better known than loved; a thing so good, that it was never broken but by the worst men; nay, so good it was, that the very worst men pretended best when they broke it; and that it was so in the church, never yet heretic renting her bowels, but he pretended that he raked them for truth: That it was so also in the State, seldom any unquiet spirit dividing her union, but he pretends some great abuses, which his integrity would remedy: "O that I were made a judge in the land, that every man which hath any controversy might come to me, that I might do him justice:" and yet no worse a man than David was King when this cunning was used, I. Samuel 15. That unity both in the Church and Common-wealth was so good, that none but the worst willingly broke it; that even they were so far ashamed of the breach, that they must seem holier than the rest, that they may be thought to have had a just cause to break it. And afterwards coming by degrees to an application, Good God (saith he) what a preposterous thrift is this in men, to sew up every small rent in their own coat, and not care what rents they not only suffer, but make in the coat of Christ? What is it? Is Christ only thought fit to wear a torn garment?[15]

Many of the seeds of contention which were to plague the reign of Charles had been sown in the first Parliament. The king hoped that this message from the leading Bishop would settle some of the differences between the Puritans and the Anglicans in Parliament. This was not to be the case. The Puritans continued to attack members of the Church and Laud's efforts were for naught.

---

[14] Heylyn, op. cit., p. 139. As quoted by Heylyn from Laud's sermon on Psalm 112, verses 3, 4, and 5.

[15] Ibid., p. 167. As quoted by Heylyn.

Although Laud was desirous of establishing unity in the Church of England, he was realistic in his view about the wide gap between the Anglican Church and the Church of Rome. The Puritans have accused Laud of being popishly inclined; but the Controversy with Fisher published in 1639 clearly defines the distinction between the two churches. Laud's arguments go to the heart of the matter and still stand as a definitive statement of the controversy between the two churches.[16] The Church of Rome has errors in her theology, and also "Rome is not infallible, and England holds to the firm faith of Christ."[17]

In maintaining this view of the Church of England, Laud breathed a spirit of tolerance which was unusual for his day. He did not believe that all the points of religion were fundamental for salvation. The soul-saving foundations of faith were the Holy Scriptures and the Creeds. Any doubts which might arise concerning the articles about the faith should be determined by a general council in accordance with Scriptures. Here Laud showed that he wished to narrow the scope of dogmatism, "and to bring opinions not necessary to salvation to the bar of public discussion by duly authorized exponents, instead of to that of an authority claiming infallibility." [18] This view was directed against the Church of Geneva as well as the Church of Rome; for Laud was opposed "not so much that their respective creeds were false, as that they both insisted upon the adoption of articles of faith which he believed to be disputable, or at least unnecessary to be enforced."[19]

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] DNB, XXXII, 186.

[19] S. R. Gardiner, Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1869), I, 195.

Laud and the Question of Divine Right of Kings

"The three, God, the King, and the Church . . . no man can serve any one of them truly, but he serves all three."[20] Laud had every desire to serve all three to the best of his ability. In his desire to do so he infuriated the Puritans who wished to be rid of the rule of the king. Though many of the claims of the Puritans were just, Laud believed they should not rebel and did all in his power to keep them beneath the subjection of the king. This was not the proper time for this action, for the temper of the times was violently opposed to this subjection.

The phrase "No Bishop, no King", which was used as a support for the claim of Divine right for the king, did not originate with Laud. This was the product of James I, who wished to use the Church as an inquisitorial power to defend the monarchy. The idea of using the Church for an investigating group was taken over by Charles I. "There is proof that every stir of the episcopal activity had its origin in the court."[21]

Although Laud did not formulate the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, he may be responsible for its clearest and completest expression, written in the culmination of his power in 1640:

> The most high and sacred order of kings is of Divine Right, being the ordinance of God Himself, founded in the laws of nature, and clearly established by express texts of both the Old and New Testaments.[22]

---

[20] Duncan-Jones, op. cit., p. 84. From Laud's sermon before Charles I.

[21] Hutton, op. cit., p. 37.

[22] Ibid., p. 26. Laud's statement is quoted by Hutton.

Hutton evaluated this statement thus:

> That this Divine Right was a right to govern wrong was a view which Laud would have been the first to reject; but to take up arms against even tyranny was as clearly in his eyes unlawful.[23]

It was such a defense of the king which placed Laud into his later plight; however, it was part of his personal creed--God, King and Church.

Such blind obedience to Charles, and such a faithful effort to carry out the projects of the Church coupled to the great authority of office, estranged many from the Archbishop. In time Laud realized that he stood alone with the king against the political and religious forces which threatened to destroy both Church and State. He wrote to his friend Strafford in Ireland during the year 1636, "But then I have nothing but the king's word to me; and should he forget or deny it, where is my remedy?"[24] Laud realized more clearly than ever, even at this early date, that he was a minister of state like Richelieu of France, wholly dependent on the king. Laud, recognizing his position of dependence believed that he had no course but to defend the doctrine of the Divine right of kings in order to safeguard his own position as Archbishop of Canterbury.

Laud's Ideal of Conformity in Things Ecclesiastical

The last of Laud's policies and indeed the one which caused the most contention among the Puritans and other groups of low churchmen was his ideal of uniformity of practice, which was "the surest propagator of the unity of the spirit."[25]

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., p. 31. As quoted by Hutton.

[25] DNB, XXXII, 188.

The best analysis and description of the meaning this ideal had for Laud is taken from his dedication of the volume on the conference with the Jesuit, Fisher. The dedication is to the king and reads thus:

> No one thing hath made conscientious men more wavering in their own minds, or more apt and easy to be drawn aside from the sincerity of religion professed in the Church of England, than the want of uniform and decent order in the many churches of the kingdom; and the Romanists have been apt to say, the houses of God could not be suffered to lie so nastily as in some places they have done, were the true worship of God observed in them, or did the people think that such it were. It is true, the inward worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world that our hearts stand right in that service of God. . . . These thoughts are they, and no other, which have made me labour so much as I have done for decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church; for of that which is inward there can be no witness among men nor no example for men. Now, no external action in the world can be uniform without some ceremonies; and these in religion, the ancienter they be the better, so that they may fit time and place. Too many overburden the service of God, and too few leave it naked. And scarce anything hath hurt religion more in these broken times than an opinion in too many men, that because Rome hath thrust some unnecessary and many superstitious ceremonies upon the church, therefore, the Reformation must have done all; not considering therewhile, that ceremonies are the hedges and fence, the substance of religion from all the indignities which profaneness and sacrilege too commonly put upon it.[26]

Such an emphatic view of the need for uniformity of ceremonies was in direct opposition to the iconoclastic and enthusiastic view of religion held by the Puritans. Laud's desire for uniformity was grounded in his firm belief that the outward ceremonies would keep the unity of the Church, which he desired so much. S. R. Gardiner evaluates this view and ideal thus:

> In this way, quite irrespectively of the value of the practices which he inculcated, Laud, by his failure to take into account existing habits, brought himself into collision with the higher Puritanism of his time as well as with the mere disorder and unruliness, of which there was enough to spare.[27]

---

[26] Hutton, op. cit., pp. 52-3. As quoted by Hutton.

[27] DNB, XXXII, 188.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRACTICES OF WILLIAM, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Laud's Personality as it was Effective on his Practices

The policies of William Laud were discussed in the previous chapter; the purpose of this chapter is to discuss his actual practices while he was Archbishop of Canterbury. Before any discussion of his practices, it might be well to note the personality of the Archbishop; for all that he did as the Primate was affected by his personality.

Laud came to the Primacy with a conscious recognition that the State tied down the Church at every point. On September 9, 1633, just after his translation to Canterbury, he wrote to his friend Strafford, then in Ireland:

> As for the Church, it is so bound up with the forms of the Common Law that it is not possible for me, or any man, to do that good which he would do or is bound to do. For your Lordship sees, no man cleared, that they which have gotten so much power over the Church will not let go their hold: but they have indeed, fangs with a witness, whatsoever I was once said in passion to have.[1]

It was because of this reason, namely, the State's hold on the Church that Laud was not able to carry out the principles of toleration, "which he himself held, while studiously obeying the law."[2]

Though Laud himself was tolerant concerning the question of holding creeds and articles of faith which might be disputable, he did not question his right to punish those who maintained publicly that their articles

---

[1] W. H. Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714) (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1903), p. 44.

[2] Ibid.

of faith were necessary for salvation. Had the Romanists expressed themselves with opinions only, this would have been one thing. Their constant protestations of the supremacy of the pope caused them to be punished for disloyalty to the Crown.[3] In this situation Laud obeyed the letter of the Law.

The tolerance which Laud advocated was rather unrealistic for his day and age. Men who would abide by the councils of the Church, or urge their objections in a quiet and peaceful way respecting the order of the Church were far and few between. Such an idea as the above "could only have commended itself to one who was better acquainted with books than with men."[4] Perhaps Laud's approach to his adversaries might have been different had he thought of the crushing effect of his policies on the independence of religious thought.

The spirit of toleration which was Laud's did not extend to the sermons which were preached on predestination at the University of Oxford. Sermons which raised controversy about the faith were violently opposed by the Archbishop. Learned discussions were tolerated, but preachers who attacked the ceremonies of the Church or the Synod of Dort were equally opposed. "It was because he desired a reasonable latitude that he disliked opinions being put forth as dogmas."[5]

Laud's spirit of toleration was actually the reason for his later downfall. Because he did not persecute the Roman Catholics to the last man, nor did he send those who would not accept the Canons of Dort to

---

[3] Ibid., p. 46.

[4] S. R. Gardiner, Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1869), II, 170.

[5] A. S. Duncan-Jones, Archbishop Laud (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), p. 147.

prison, Laud found himself before the tribunal of Parliament in 1641. Thomas Fuller, one of those present at this session of Parliament has this to say about the policy of toleration:

> As for the Archbishop of Canterbury, much was his moderation in his own diocese, silencing but three (in whom also a concurrence of other nonconformities) through the whole extent thereof. . . . The Archbishop's adversaries imputed this, not to his charity, but policy; fox-like preying farthest from his own den, and instigating other bishops to do more than he would appear in himself. As for his own visitation articles, some complained they were but narrow as they were made, and broad as they were measured; his under-officers improving and enforcing the same, by their inquiries, beyond the letter thereof.[6]

Another characteristic of Laud's personality was his temper. Sharp-witted, intelligent, and frank in his speech, Laud did not influence many people, nor did he win many friends. Although he had a temper which caused his enemies to smart beneath the lash of his tongue, he was always full of grief and usually ready to acknowledge his regret over such incidents.[7] These regrets were usually expressed to God during his prayers after such incidents such as the one with Sherfield.[8]

Not only was his temper a drawback to his success as the Primate, but also his ability to be insulted by any opposition. Anyone who opposed the will and the views of the Archbishop fell under his wrath, for "all opposition he took as a personal insult."[9] This made it extremely difficult for others to get along with the Archbishop.

---

[6]T. Fuller, The Church History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until 1648 (3rd edition; London: William Tegg, 1868), III, 425.

[7]J. P. Lawson, The Life and Times of Archbishop Laud (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1829), II, 127-28.

[8]Supra, p. 20.

[9]S. R. Gardiner, "William Laud," Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Sidney Lee (London: Oxford, 1892), XXXII, 190. Hereafter this volume will be referred to as DNB.

Another characteristic of Laud was his legal mind. Wherever there was a statute or a regulation of the Church, Laud expected absolute obedience to the letter of the law. He tried to use the force of his own example as a means to move others to do things which might have helped them to conform to the general and ancient practices of the Church. He did not force on others that which had no written command or statute.[10]

Laud's Use of the Right of Visitation in England

The various rights of jurisdiction and licensing which were part of the Archbishopric of Canterbury have been discussed previously.[11] One's attention is now directed to the one privilege which caused the greatest commotion among the Puritans. This privilege was the right of visitation by the Archbishop or one of his subordinates. Almost the very first act of the Archbishop was to organize the visitation of his diocese. As early as February 22, 1634, Laud gave orders to his Vicar-generals, Brent and Lambe, about the various areas which should be investigated during the visitation.[12] This visitation was not only to be carried out in the Archdiocese of Canterbury, but also in the Archdiocese of York; for Laud's former friend and promoter at court, Archbishop Niele of York, also conducted a series of visitations in his Archdiocese. These visitations covered a period of three years, from 1634 until 1637.[13]

In his desire to have conformity of practice and by it to achieve

---

[10] Ibid., XXXII, 189.

[11] Supra, p. 21.

[12] Hutton, op. cit., p. 64.

[13] DNB, XXXII, 190.

unity in the Church, Laud issued his articles of visitation. The writer was unable to uncover Laud's articles themselves; however, various authors writing on the subject have left a general list of the areas which these articles investigated. William Hutton has recorded some of the area thus:

> Generally, attention was to be given that no school should be kept in any chancel, that strict inquiry should be made into peculiars held by prebendaries or lay persons; that order should be taken for the use of the surplice and other decent ceremonies of the church; that fonts be brought to their ancient places; inquiry as to observation of His Majesty's instructions; seats in cathedrals looked to, and chancels severed from the church or other ways profaned to be remedied.[14]

Further instructions to the Vicar-general read generally:

> Was there a font of stone set up in the ancient and usual place, a convenient and decent communion table standing upon a frame with a carpet of silk or some decent stuff, and a fair linen cloth to lay thereon at the communion time? This had been asked by Laud as Bishop of London, and similar questions with regard to the duties of clergy and churchwardens and the condition of the parishes were now put. But on the whole little was done in the parish churches. The articles of inquiry into the obligations of the cathedral chapters, on the other hand were minute.[15]

Some of the other areas investigated were:

a. Did the clergy use the Common Book of Prayer or not?

b. Did the parishoners make the proper responses?

c. Were the churches kept clean?

d. Did the churchwardens and sidesmen see to it that the people duly attended church every Sunday and holiday?

e. Was there a book in which the preachers' names were entered?

f. Did the parishoners behave themselves reverently during the service?

g. Did the parishoners kneel for the prayers?

---

[14] Hutton, op. cit., p. 64.

[15] Ibid., p. 66.

h. Did the parishoners make a reverence when the blessed name of Jesus was mentioned?

i. Did the parishoners stand when the articles of belief were read?

j. Did everyone over sixteen communicate thrice in the year, of which Easter was to be one?

k. Were children, servants, and apprentices catechised on Sundays and holy-days?

l. Were the names of the popish recusants sent in, and was care taken to reclaim these people from their errors?

m. Were the names of those who came only for the sermon sent in?

n. Were the names of those who opened their shops on Sundays sent in?

o. Was care taken to see that hospitals and almshouses were being used by the people for whom they were intended?

p. Were moral offenses inquired into?[16]

None of the above questions caused as much stir in the churches as the next two. The first of the controversial questions to be considered is the question of fixing the communion table at the east end of the church. Since Rome was making a strong attempt to reclaim England for herself, this move by Laud suggested to many that he was trying to aid the Roman Church. The fact was that Laud was not concerned with the Roman approach that the altar was a place to be worshipped. "To his mind it was not so much the symbol of the presence of the invisible God, as it was the throne of the invisible King."[17] For this reason he pressed the question of the position of the altar in the east end of the church. The requirements which Laud imposed on the churches have been recorded

---

[16]Duncan-Jones, op. cit., pp. 166-68. The list is compiled from several paragraphs concerning the visitation articles.

[17]DNB, XXXII, 196.

by Laud's biographer, J. Lawson, thus:

> It may here be remarked, that all the Archbishop required them to do in his visitation was, to remove the table to the eastern extremity of the church, to elevate it a little above the level of the pavement, and to rail it in, to protect it from profanation.[18]

Pressing for conformity in this instance was not simply a grand or noble idea of Laud. There was a previous statute concerning the position of the altar in the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth. The term Holy Table is used in the Injunctions which state that the Holy Table is to stand where the altar had, out of service-time,

> saving when the Communion of the sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the Chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministrations, and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the said minister.[19]

At the close of the service, the Holy Table was to be placed again in the east end of the church.

One of the greatest points of controversy became the use of the altar rail. The Puritans later used this as one of the principal grievances against Laud.[20] However, Laud was not without reason in issuing this order, for he hoped by it to overcome some of the profanations of the Lord's Table which Heylyn records thus:

> For should it be permitted to stand as before it did, church-wardens would keep their accounts on it, parishoners would dispatch the parish business at it, school-masters will teach their boys to write upon it, the boys will lay their hats, satchels, and books upon it, many will sit and lean irreverently against it in sermon time, the dogs will piss upon it and defile it, and glaziers will knock it

---

[18]Lawson, op. cit., II, 75.

[19]Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896), p. 440.

[20]Duncan-Jones, op. cit., p. 171.

full of nail-holes.[21]

The fact that such profanations were mentioned might indicate that this order was necessary. It seems obvious from the accounts of this regulation that these things did occur and so Laud issued the order of placing the altar rail about the chancel.

Another feature of the visitation articles concerning the altar which was a bone of contention appeared in Laud's metropolitical visitation. This statute he composed for his own Cathedral of Canterbury,

> by which it was required that the Dean and Prebendaries and other officers "at their coming in and going out of the Choir and all approaches to the altar, they should by bowing toward it, make due reverence to Almighty God."[22]

The second great point of opposition was the licensing of the clergy. Many of the Puritans were preaching without licenses. The preachers were also failing to conform to the established order of service, they were also stirring up all sorts of public debates with the content of their sermons. To combat this situation Laud reissued the Canons of 1603 which said:

> That no person should be admitted into sacred orders, except he shall at that time exhibit to the Bishop of whom he desired imposition of hands, a presentation of himself to some ecclesiastical preferment then void in that diocese; or shall bring into the said Bishop a true and undoubted certificate, that either he is provided of some church within the said diocese, where he may attend the cure of souls, or of some ministers place vacant, either in the Cathedral Church of that diocese, or of some other Collegiate Church therein also situated, where he may execute his ministry; or that he is a fellow, or in right as a fellow, or to be a conduct or Chaplain in some college in either of the universities; or except he be a Master of Arts of five years standing, that lived in either of them at his own charge.

---

[21] P. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or The History of the Life and Death of The Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (London: A. Siele, 1671), p. 272.

[22] Duncan-Jones, op. cit., p. 172.

Also added was the following commination or threat:

> If any Bishop shall admit any person into the ministry, that has none of these titles as is aforesaid, then he shall keep and maintain him with all things necessary, till he do prefer him to some ecclesiastical living; and on his refusal so to do, he shall be suspended by the Archbishop, being assisted with another Bishop, from giving of Orders by the space of a year.[23]

Another statute which was also included in the orders for 1633 was a reissuing of the statute of His Majesties Instructions of the year 1629 which read: "No private gentleman, not qualified by law, shall keep any chaplain in his house."[24] This order was provided for in the laws of the land. Laud did not attempt to bring anything new into the Church, his sole purpose was to preserve the ancient and accustomed rites of the Church. The Puritans did not see the matter as such, for Heylyn records, "yet was it as much inveighed against as if it had been a new device, never heard of formerly."[25]

Laud also attempted to extend his right of visitation to the University of Cambridge. Under the influence of the Puritans many things were done at the University which did not conform to the accepted practices of the Church of England. There had been no formal consecration of the various chapels which had been built, in many of the colleges there were no chapels at all. In the Canons of 1603 provision was made that the prescribed forms of worship be used in the colleges and halls; that the fellows and scholars should wear the surplice on Sundays and Holy-days, so that they might abide by this form in their later ministries; but these

---

[23]Gee and Hardy, op. cit., p. 509-10.

[24]Ibid., p. 517.

[25]Heylyn, op. cit., p. 241.

things were not being obeyed at the University. Laud wished to correct this by his visitation; however, when the University officials heard of it, they raised a great commotion. The University of Cambridge claimed to be outside of Laud's jurisdiction. The Earl of Holland pressed the case for the University, and finally on June 21, 1636, the case was brought before Charles I. Charles decided in favor of the Archbishop; but before much could be done, troubles arose in Scotland for Laud and the King. The end result was that some of the chapels were embellished and Saint Mary's Church had the altar raised, and "many of the Doctors, scholars, and others actually bowed."[26]

At the University of Oxford Laud's position as Chancellor was of great assistance for the visitations.[27] In this area Laud was within his rights both to visit and to make any changes which might benefit the University. Indeed, the University benefited immensely under his supervision. Some of the reforms and benefits for which Laud was responsible were:

a. The statutes of the University were collated, amended, and accommodated to the best advantage of the school.

b. The University procured a confirmation by Charles I of its privileges over the town, and also an enlargement of them to the town of London.

c. Professorships in Hebrew, Arabic and Public Orator were founded and endowed by Laud.[28]

d. Foreign and English scholars were encouraged; such as, Voss, Selden, and Jeremy Taylor.

---

[26] Ibid., pp. 296-97.

[27] Supra, p. 19.

[28] Heylyn, op. cit., pp. 297-99. Points a, b, and c mentioned.

e. The University press was founded and established under Laud's guidance.

f. The Bodleian Library received over 1,300 manuscripts from Laud and a new wing to the library in which these were to be housed.[29]

These measures increased the number of students at the University. The increased enrollment was also responsible for many new buildings which had to be erected to house them. Laud established a tradition of good government and order during his Chancellorship of Oxford.

While still only the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, Laud had run into difficulty with the feoffees for impropriation. These were considerable sums of money collected to support and augment "the incomes of several worthy ministers in poor parishes."[30] Funds were also provided for the widows and orphans of other ministers. Peter Heylyn brought this to the attention of the Chancellor; firstly, because the money remained in the same lay-hands as it did before, and the lecturer had to get his stipend from the profits of another parish; secondly, the man who held the position of lecturer was noted for his nonconformity.[31] Fuller evaluated the situation thus:

> Archbishop Laud began to look with a jealous eye on the feoffees for impropriation, as who in process of time would prove a thorn in the sides of episcopacy, and by their purchases become the prime patrons, for number and greatness of benefices. This would multiply their dependents, and give a secret growth to nonconformity.[32]

Attorney General Noy investigated the situation and called the feoffees

---

[29] Ibid., p. 379. Points d, e, and f mentioned.

[30] R. P. Stearns, Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands (Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1940), p. 22.

[31] Heylyn, op. cit., p. 199.

[32] Fuller, op. cit., III, 417.

into the Court of the Exchequer. They were outlawed because they usurped the rights of the king by "assuming the power to form a corporate body and they had employed that power in a manner considered dangerous both to the church and state of England."[33] This action thwarted the attempts at congregationalism in England for a while.

By 1637 Laud's visitation had extended through the breadth of England under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Wales had been included in the Metropolitical visitation. There remained only two islands which had not been subjected to the visitation of Laud, Guernsey and Jersey. Because the islands belonged to the Dukedom of Normandy, they were considered a part of England. Since the days of Elizabeth the Genevan form of church discipline was in effect in the islands; however, there had been some disorder in the churches of Jersey during the reign of James I. To avoid a great mischief during this time, they were necessitated "to cast themselves into the arms of the Church of England."[34] Attempting to enforce the conformity of the order of worship in these islands, Laud decided to carry the visitation there and appointed a Visitor who was well acquainted with the people and their customs. The visitation was not carried out because matters went from bad to worse in Scotland.

Though the visitation of these islands never occurred, Laud was influential in establishing scholarships for those studying for the ministry in the Church of England from the islands of Guernsey and Jersey. A certain Hubbard, a citizen and alderman of London, died and left a fortune; but no heir was found to claim his estate. The estate fell to

---

[33]Stearns, op. cit., p. 22.

[34]Heylyn, op. cit., p. 335.

the king, and Laud prevailed upon him to set aside a certain portion for endowing three scholarships for as many men from Guernsey and Jersey.[35] The scholarships were for Exeter, Jesus, and Pembroke Colleges. Laud's hope was that the men would imbibe some of the spirit of Anglicanism and carry it back to their home-lands.

Nathaniel Brent, Laud's Vicar-general, was not only the chief visitor for the Archbishop, but he was also president of Merton College, which was also subjected to a visitation in 1638. The Chief Commissioner, Lambe, reported to the Archbishop that the regulations concerning bowing toward the altar was not being observed. A meeting was scheduled for October of the same year. Brent was let off with a fatherly admonition from Laud to set things in order by the coming July. This displeased the former Vicar-general; he forgot that he had been let off with only an admonition; and later, turning on Laud, Brent "expressed more readiness in contributing towards his condemnation in the time of his trial, than any of those who did most eagerly desire his ruin."[36]

The Visitation of Foreign Congregations

Conformity in England was not the only domain of the Archbishop of Canterbury; for having heard from Chaplain Johnson or another source about the Calvinistic form of liturgy and discipline in the churches of the Merchant Adventurers in France and Holland, Laud decided to make them conform to the Established Church. Included in the problem were the English Regiments abroad which likewise had chaplains of Calvinistic

---

[35] Ibid., p. 336.

[36] Ibid., p. 379.

leanings.

Laud himself did not bring the problem into the Privy Council. Sir Francis Windebanke, the Secretary of State, introduced the question of conformity in the churches overseas; but this he did not of his own accord, rather Edward Misselden, Deputy at Delft, drew up a list of abuses and moved Windebanke to bring it before the board.[37] At the instigation of the entire Board Laud was asked to investigate the problem and present a possible solution.

On March 22, 1632, Laud, then only the Bishop of London, made a list of suggestions for the Privy Council to consider. Briefly, the suggestions read as follows in resume form:

a. The colonels of the regiments in the Low Countries should not entertain any nonconforming minister, but should take the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury and York concerning appointments.

b. The company of merchants likewise should obey the rule of no nonconforming minister, but should take one commended.

c. Any nonconforming minister should be warned to conform within three months; if he does not, he should be relieved of office.

d. The common prayers are to be read, administration of the sacraments, catechising the children, and all other ministerial functions are to be in accord with the Rules of the English Church.

e. Anyone derogating from the doctrine and discipline of the Church, and in preaching, writing, or printing anything prejudicial to the State of England should be reported to the ambassador and called to trial.

f. In cases of illness, preachers called in should be conforming men.

g. Only deputy governors should be appointed who were conforming and would see to it that the above duties were enforced.

h. When renewing the patents for the companies, the above instructions should be inserted in their charters.

---

[37]Stearns, op. cit., p. 34.

i. All the King's agents should be given a copy of these instructions and should be required to report on the progress made in them.

j. The English ministers in Holland "be not suffered to hold any classical meetings, but howsoever not to assume the power of ordination. . . ."[38]

The Privy Council did not act on these recommendations until after Laud had become the Archbishop of Canterbury. Final procurement of the order did not come until October 1, 1633, after which the English Churches and Regiments in Holland and later in all foreign parts were required strictly to observe the English liturgy with all the rites and ceremonies prescribed in it.

Ambassador William Boswell found himself confronted by the Dutch authorities in the Netherlands. The Congregational ministers had filled the ears of the authorities with protestations that the attempt "to enforce conformity meant not only unwarranted foreign interference in Dutch internal affairs, but also the extension to Holland of unreformed, popish ecclesiastical ways."[39] Besides, the Ambassador had to take care because of the legal security from English and Dutch interference which the Congregationalists had obtained, namely:

> . . . by treaty, royal grant, Dutch Commission, the nature of the organization of the Merchant Adventurers, and the peculiar type of nonconformity which obligingly permitted Congregationalists to take the oath of supremacy and to admit that the Church of England was a true church.[40]

In this matter the policies of the Dutch and English conflicted. The Dutch gave sanction to the existence and the growth of the Congregationalists in

---

[38] Ibid., pp. 219-20. Heylyn had the recommendations incorporated in his text.

[39] Stearns, op. cit., p. 42.

[40] Ibid.

a manner wholly opposed by Archbishop Laud and the English Privy Council.[41]

By 1635 the tables were turned. The Court of Merchants at Hamburg was subject to the Court of London, the factory at Delft was abolished, and a new factory was established at Rotterdam which had a monoply on the woolen trade in the Low Countries. The proposals of Laud were appended to the new treaty and strictly enforced. The visitation in the Low Countries was extremely effective, for Stearns writes:

> Before the year 1635 closed, the Dutch Netherlands became even less possible for a place of refuge for the English Congregationalists. Archbishop Laud's vigorous exertions brought foreign chaplaincies under jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. Many of the Puritan officers who had patronized nonconformist preachers were removed from the army; and Stephen Goffe saw to it that the army chaplains were Church of England men.[42]

The final touch of the absolute control of Laud over the foreign congregations came on July 1, 1637. In the decree concerning the governing and licensing of printers to prevent abuses against the state and the church, Laud included this finale:

> And finally, that no merchant, book-seller, &c. should print or cause to be printed beyond the seas, any book or books, which either totally, or for the greatest part, were written in the English tongue, whether the said books have been formerly printed, or not; nor shall willingly nor knowingly import any such books into this kingdom, upon pain of being proceeded against in either of the said two Courts respectively, as before said.[43]

Not only was Laud interested in conformity in the churches abroad, but he also enforced conformity on the foreign churches in England. In the recommendations made for the churches abroad there were also added

---

[41] Ibid., p. 53.

[42] Ibid., p. 72.

[43] Heylyn, op. cit., p. 341. The entire decree is printed out in full. The courts which had been previously mentioned were the Star-chamber and the Court of High Commission.

the reasons for establishing conformity in the churches which were in England. Laud also laid down the remedies for the situation.

a. An account be made of all foreigners in the land.

b. A certificate be made of those who had the most wealth and credit among them.

c. If they continue to act as strangers in the land, they should pay all duties double as foreigners used to.

d. They should be warned to conduct themselves diligently to the parish churches and conform themselves to the prayers and sacraments on pain of excommunication.

e. Fifthly, and lastly, that if this course prevail not with them, a declaration to be made to the state to this effect, that if they will be as natives, and take the benefits of subjects, they must conform themselves to the laws of the kingdom, as well ecclesiastical as temporal; that being the likeliest way to make them capable of the inconveniences they should run into by their refusal and perverseness.[44]

The decree of October 1, 1635, which enforced conformity of the churches overseas likewise enforced conformity on the churches of the Dutch and French merchants in England.

On April 14, 1634, Laud issued three questions which had to be answered by the two Dutch congregations in Sandwich and Maidstone. They read as follows:

> 1. What liturgy do you use? or whether you have not the Dutch or French in use? 2. Of how many descendants for the most part they were born subjects? 3. Whether such as are born subjects, will conform to the Church of England?[45]

The churches were given until May 5, 1634, to prepare their written answers to these questions. They replied that they used the liturgy of the French church; the English liturgy was translated into French, but they did not

---

[44] Ibid., pp. 221-22. E quoted in full, a-d are syntheses.

[45] Ibid., p. 261. As quoted by Heylyn.

know if the liturgy was translated into Dutch. Concerning the second question they answered that only a third of the heads of families were born in England, the rest having come as strangers and many others newly arrived. Concerning the third question, they begged off answering and presented their "declinator,"

> . . . fixing themselves upon their privileges, and challenging exemption granted them by Edward VI. confirmed by several acts of Council in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, King James, and His Sacred Majesty.[46]

These answers did not please the Archbishop. On December 19, 1634, Laud issued the following two injunctions:

> 1. That all the natives of the Dutch and Walloon congregations in his Graces Diocese, are to repair to their several parish churches where they inhabit, to hear Divine service and sermons, and perform all duties and payments required in that behalf: and 2. That all the ministers and all other of the same Walloon or French congregations, which are alien born, shall have and use the liturgy used in the English churches, as the same is or may be faithfully translated into French or Dutch.[47]

As can well be imagined, these injunctions of the Archbishop created quite a stir. "Some one hundred forty Dutch families removed to Holland and the Dutch State protested against the English severity."[48] Nothing came of the protest; for the Privy Council held that it would compel all foreigners to conform, if the Dutch continued to support the congregational classis in the Netherlands. The Dutch continued to support the congregationalists and Laud continued to enforce conformity in England.

---

[46] Loc. cit.

[47] Ibid., p. 262. As quoted by Heylyn.

[48] Stearns, op. cit., p. 62.

Laud and his Political Activities

With the appointment to the See of London in 1627 by Charles I, Laud was also given positions on the Star-chamber and the Court of High Commission. The Star-chamber was to judge cases which were believed to be outside the competence of the common law, and furthermore:

> . . .through the condition of the parties concerned, or some special difficulty in the case itself, unlikely to be satisfactorily treated in the ordinary courts. Here then were brought a number of cases of libel, which touched upon ecclesiastical matters.[49]

The Court of High Commission were members of the Privy Council. The task of this court was to judge matters of heresy. Many times the clergymen of the Court were members of the both courts, and this has often caused confusion. The Court of High Commission had been often criticized by the Puritans for its handling of matters of heresy. Hutton explains the reason for the criticism thus:

> Its great defects were, in an exaggerated form, those of the other law courts of the time. They were chiefly, the exercise of the ex-officio oath, by which persons holding office in the church or under the crown could be required to give evidence, in certain cases, against themselves; and the general style of browbeating and unfairness in the treatment of evidence which seems to us to be characteristic of all the tribunals of the time.[50]

Laud was accused by the Puritans and their sympathizers of bringing in a harsh sentence against Alexander Leighton in June of 1630. Leighton had been accused of seditious slander and was tried by the Star-chamber. For this crime he was whipped, had one ear cut off, had his nose slit, was placed in the pillory, and imprisoned until he would be released by

---

[49] Hutton, op. cit., p. 62.

[50] Ibid., p. 69.

the king. "With respect to Leighton's trial, there is not the slightest evidence that Laud was present at the trial."[51] The incident was recorded in Laud's Diary, but Laud recorded many things in which he took no part. Furthermore, the incident was not brought up at his trial. When Brent, Laud's Vicar-general, had turned state's evidence, nothing should have deterred Leighton, who then was serving as the jailor at Lambeth Palace which had been turned into a prison.[52]

In the area of judging heresy Laud complained at the Council of the favors shown to some Roman Catholics who were outspoken in their religious beliefs. He suggested that Walther Montague, the Earl of Manchester's Roman Catholic son, be prosecuted before the Court of High Commission. Since Queen Henrietta was a Roman Catholic and a supporter of Montague, Laud's action drew down upon his head the wrath of the Queen.[53]

On March 14, 1635, the king appointed Laud to the Commission of the Treasury. Two days later his appointment to the Foreign Committee was also confirmed. In actuality, Laud was the guiding hand of the kingdom, being placed on all the major committees in the government. One of his first actions with respect to the Treasury was suggesting Juxon, then Bishop of London, to the post of Treasurer. Juxon was a man of the Church, had no family to enrich, and was well-tempered for the job.[54] Other treasurers before Juxon had drained the coffers of the king for

---

[51] Lawson, op. cit., I, 550.

[52] Ibid., I, 535.

[53] DNB, XXXII, 191.

[54] Heylyn, op. cit., p. 285.

themselves. Laud's choice proved exceptional. Of the many tried and prosecuted during the early days of the Commonwealth, Juxon was the only one to escape without persecution.

The trial which created the most resentment against Laud occurred on June 14, 1637. Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton were brought to trial for libel before the Star-Chamber. Prynne published in 1636 a book entitled, News from Ipswich, "in which he reflected on Bishop Wren, the learned and pious Bishop of Norwich, who resided in that city, and other prelates, in a most scandalous manner."[55] John Bastwicke attacked the government, especially the Star-Chamber and High Commission Courts, with great virulence and also abused the Church, charging the Bishops with introducing popery in his Letany of John Bastwicke, Doctor of Physicke, London, 4to. 1637.[56] On November 5, 1636, Burton preached two sermons in Saint Matthew's Church. He had always been known as a Puritan zealot. The sermons were published, entitled, For God and the King, "for which he was summoned in December before the Commissioners for ecclesiastical causes."[57]

The actual reason that these men were called before the Star-Chamber has been recorded by Fuller thus:

> But the fault-general, which at this day was charged on these three prisoners at the bar in the Star-Chamber, was this: That they had not put in their effectual answer into the Court wherein they were accused, though sufficient notice and competent time were allowed them for the performance thereof.[58]

Since the accused made no reply to the questions, the Star-Chamber found

---

[55]Lawson, op. cit., II, 143.

[56]Ibid., II, 145.

[57]Ibid., II, 154.

[58]Fuller, op. cit., III, 431-32.

them guilty, reckoning the self-conviction of the three men. Prynne was fined five thousand pounds, condemned to lose the remainder of his ears, had his cheeks branded Slanderous Libeller, and was imprisoned in Caernarron Castle for life. Bastwicke and Burton were fined the same amount, were condemned to lose their ears, and were imprisoned separately, one in Launceston, the other in Lancaster Castle.[59]

It is important to note that though Laud played a part in the trial, he did not cast a vote in the matter.[60] In fact, it was at his instigation that Prynne was allowed to have pen, paper, and ink in his cell. Evaluating this action Gardiner writes:

> There was a kind of official severity in Laud, a belief that severe punishments were needed to deter men from resisting constituted authorities, but a certain amount of personal kindliness underlying it can occasionally be detected.[61]

Another trial in which Laud played a prominent role was the trial of Bishop Williams. Williams published The Holy Table, Name and Thing, in which he formulated a compromise concerning the dispute about the position of the communion table. Williams was prosecuted on August 30, 1637, by the Star-Chamber. He was suspended from his office. Laud did not wish Williams to be disgraced and offered him a bishopric in Ireland if he would resign from the see of Lincoln, acknowledge his guilt in the crimes imputed to him, and acknowledge his error in publishing his book.[62]

---

[59] Lawson, op. cit., II, 160.

[60] Ibid., II, 174.

[61] DNB, XXXII, 190.

[62] Ibid., XXXII, 191.

The Final Attempts to Preserve Order

Scotland had been a trouble spot for James before his visit in 1617. After this visit there had been trouble between the Presbyterians and the Anglicans. During the 1630's the Anglican clergy of Scotland had decided to enforce a similar type of conformity in the churches of Scotland as Laud had done in England. On their own accord they undertook a revision of the Book of Common Prayer which would be suitable for use in the Scottish churches.

On July 23, 1637, the Scottish Book of Common Prayer was to be used in the congregations of Edinburgh. When the Dean of Edinburgh began to use the service, a great commotion broke out; cudgels and stools were thrown at the Dean. The service was stopped. The rabble were thrown out of the church and the doors were barred to keep them out. The end result of all the labors of the Scottish Episcopal party for three years was the beginning of the First Bishop's War.

The Presbyterians accused Laud of bringing in this popish book. Though Laud served as the editor of the new liturgy, the book was the work of the Scottish Episcopal clergy. Laud had suggested corrections in the manuscripts before they had been published; however, many were not accepted by the Scotsmen. The Bishops of Scotland did all the compiling, and as Laud said, "carried it against me, not withstanding all I could say or do to the contrary."[63]

A real criticism might be laid against Laud for taking into his confidence the Earl of Traquaire, whom he promoted to the position of

---

[63]Lawson, op. cit., II, 8.

Lord Treasurer and Privy Counsellor of Scotland. Having been informed that the new liturgy would be used in Scotland, Traquaire gave this information to the Presbyterians. Heylyn records his actions thus:

> But being a Hamiltonian Scot (either originally such, or brought over at last) he treacherously betrayed the cause, communicated his instructions to the opposite faction from one time to another, and conscious of the plot for the next days tumult, withdrew himself to the Earl of Morton's house of Dalkeith, to expect the issue.[64]

An assembly was called for the purpose of stopping the war, establishing order, and presenting to the king a list of grievances. By command of Charles I the meeting was to be held at Glascow on November 21, 1638. The Assembly was packed with Presbyterian lay elders and ministers and many others who had refused to take the Oath of Supremacy. Officially, the meeting was dissolved on November 29, 1638, by command of the king; however, once having met, the leaders had no desire to stop the issue. They excommunicated the Episcopal Bishops, abolished the Established Church, censured the Service-Book, condemned the Arminian doctrines, and subjected all who refused their acts to excommunication. This was the beginning of the Second Bishop's War. In this case the blame did not lie with Laud, but with the king. Heylyn reminds us:

> For having lost the opportunity of suppressing them in their first insurrection in the year precedent, and afterwards of reducing them by force of arms in the year next following, he was forced to shuffle up such a pacification in the Parliaments of both kingdoms, Anno 1641, as left his party destitute of all protection . . . .[65]

Charles called for a meeting of Parliament to begin on April 13, 1640, in order to obtain funds for fighting the war against Scotland. Charles acquainted Parliament with the problem of the war and requested a grant

---

[64]Heylyn, op. cit., p. 329.

[65]Ibid., p. 353.

of money to wage the war. The House of Commons answered that their grievances must be heard first, "and the safety of religion provided for before the matter of supply was to be considered."[66] Laud could have expected an investigation into his conduct before any action would be taken on the war issue. The king pressed Parliament for funds again and again, but Parliament was interested in settling its grievances with Laud. The king decided to dissolve Parliament on May 5, 1640, because they merely raised objections to Laud and did not provide funds to fight the Scots who were moving into English territory.

With the decree for an assembling of Parliament also went a decree for convocation of the Church. The convocation which assembled on April 14, 1640, began with an address by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Laud acquainted the clergymen with the general grievances of the day, he also reminded them of the great favor shown them by Charles in allowing them to alter old canons or make new ones.[67] This assembly met and had its power to act through the licensing of the Commission of which Laud was a member. Its right to sit in convocation was not legally affected by the dissolution of Parliament by Charles on May 5, 1640.[68]

With Laud issuing the commands and outlining the various areas in which the Convocation ought to have directed its attention, this group passed seventeen canons and issued the controversial et cetera oath. A simple listing of the titles of the several canons will give the reader a general idea of the areas in which the Convocation worked.

---

[66] Ibid., p. 395.

[67] Fuller, op. cit., III, 456.

[68] Heylyn, op. cit., p. 395.

The list of titles of the canons passed in 1640 reads thus:

> 1.) Concerning the regal power. 2.) For better keeping of the day of his Majesty's most happy inauguration. 3.) For suppressing of the growth of popery. 4.) Against Socinianism. 5.) Against Sectaries. 6.) An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government. 7.) A declaration concerning some rites and ceremonies. 8.) One book of articles of inquiry to be used at all parochial visitations. 9.) Concerning recusants. 10.) Concerning the conversation of the clergy. 11.) Chancellor's patents. 12.) Chancellors alone not to censure any of the clergy in sundry cases. 13.) Excommunication and absolution not to be pronounced but by a priest. 14.) Concerning the commutations, and disposing of them. 15.) Touching concurrent jurisdiction. 16.) Concerning licenses to marry. 17.) Against vexatious citations.[69]

The clause in the et cetera oath, which caused the greatest controversy because according to the Puritans they did not know whom they were sworn to defend, reads thus:

> . . . nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c. , as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand, nor yet ever subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the see of Rome. . . .[70]

The real weakness of the oath was not the et cetera, but rather that it was imposed not only on the clergy, but also on physicians and schoolmasters. Furthermore, it was encroaching on the privileges of Parliament to impose this oath without their consent.[71]

The sitting of the Short Parliament did not accomplish anything for the waging of the war against Scotland. The Scottish army invaded England; Charles was faced with a vexing problem. He wished to settle the war and draw up a peace treaty or else have Parliament supply the necessary funds for carrying on the war. Charles called Parliament together for

---

[69]Fuller, op. cit., III, 459; Heylyn, op. cit., pp. 399 f. Heylyn records in full the Canons which caused the greatest controversy; Gee and Hardy, op. cit., p. 535.

[70]Gee and Hardy, op. cit., p. 536.

[71]Duncan-Jones, op. cit., p. 235.

second time in 1640. This was the second time in eleven years that Parliament was called to convene. The date for the assembling of the members was November 5, 1640.

Laud received an anonymous letter which reminded him that Henry VIII called a meeting of Parliament on this same day. That Parliament ended with the dissolution of the monasteries and began the fall of Cardinal Wolsey. The letter suggested that Laud have the king postpone the opening of Parliament by a day or two. The Archbishop did not heed this warning.[72] It might have helped; however, the times were fulfilled. The Long Parliament composed mainly of Puritans and Presbyterians had an old score to settle with the King and with Archbishop Laud.

---

[72]Heylyn, op. cit., p. 429.

CHAPTER V

THE RESULTS OF THE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

November 3, 1640, marked the beginning of a Parliament which had many grievances against the King and the Archbishop. The entire problem of the Long Parliament is involved and complex. This study is limited to the actions it took to silence the Archbishop.

From the beginning of the rule of Laud as Archbishop, every attempt was made to silence the Puritans. Laud fought their faction with the same hatred as he fought the Roman Church. The Parliament which met in November of 1640 was full of men who were Puritans or who sympathized with the Puritans. They had been called earlier in the year to meet and had been dismissed by the king. In the interim Laud had the Convocation pass new canons and issue the et cetera oath, which infuriated them even more.

Having been called to settle the war with Scotland, Parliament turned its attention to religious questions and impeached Laud for high treason on December 18, 1640. Laud was taken from his home in Lambeth Palace and placed in the Tower. The initial steps had been made to silence Laud. He was removed from his position on the King's Councils and confined within his diocese. From the beginning of Parliament this was all that Laud expected.

The Scotch party soon brought a list of grievances against the Archbishop. The list is long and impressive as it is quoted in Heylyn. The charges read thus in summary:

1. Laud had tried to raise money without the consent of Parliament.

2. By asserting an absolute power he had caused many sermons and books to be written without the consent of Parliament.

3. He had perverted the course of justice in Westminster-Hall by threats, letters, and messages.

4. He had sold places in the judicature and accepted bribes.

5. He had caused a book of canons to be composed and published without lawful authority.

6. He had assumed a papal and tyrannical authority in matters temporal and ecclesiastical.

7. He had tried to subvert the established religion, and in its stead set up popish superstitions and idolatry.

8. He had intruded on the rights of the King's officers, and promoted only those men who were popishly inclined.

9. He had committed the licensing of books to those men who were also popishly inclined.

10. He had endeavoured to reconcile the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

11. He had silenced many godly and orthodox ministers, and made many others leave home.

12. He had tried to cause discord between the Church of England and the Reformed churches.

13. He had tried to stir up war between Scotland and England, then having accomplished his purpose, he forced the clergy to contribute to the war.

14. To preserve himself against being impeached, he maliciously had incensed the king against the Short Parliament.[1]

These charges were sufficient to keep Laud in prison from 1640 until 1645.

Prynne, having been freed from prison with Bastwicke and Burton, was given the command by the House of Commons to search the belongings of

---

[1]Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or The History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (London: A. Siele, 1671), pp. 437-39. The charges are printed out in full.

the Archbishop. The order was given on May 31, 1643. Many of the personal belongings of the Archbishop were seized, including all the papers with which he had hoped to make his defence. A mutilated life of Laud published by Prynne entitled Canterburies Doome.

In the meantime the Parliament had made a covenant with the Scots. Upon completing the formalities, the Parliament was urged by the Scots into action to try Laud again. A new set of articles against Laud were drawn up, slightly revised and only ten in number. The charges were the same with the exception that the charge of bribery was dropped and a new charge was added; namely, that he suppressed the feoffees for buying in impropriations.[2] By rewording the charges the Commons was able to keep practically all the charges made by the Scotch party in 1640 and also were able to include a new one, yet cut down the number of the charges.

This set of charges was delivered to the Archbishop on October 23, 1643. He was given a week to make ready his rebuttal. Having had his important papers seized, having had his funds sequestered for the use of others, living on the charity of friends, unable to afford proper counsel, Laud appealed to the Parliament. The House of Lords granted him until November 6, 1643, to make his reply. They granted him the counsel of Chute and Hearn to assist in making his reply, and also made available enough funds for his use to pay these expenses from his estate.[3]

Laud appealed to the House of Lords for an answer to his question, "Which articles constituted high treason?" No clear answer was given. Meanwhile, the House of Commons had added new charges to the initial

---

[2]Ibid., p. 480. The charges are printed in full.

[3]Ibid., p. 481. The reply of the House of Lords is printed in full.

charges of the Scotch Party. Laud did not answer these charges. To all the charges Laud pleaded not guilty, and to the charge of starting the war with Scotland he pleaded the benefit of the Act of Pacification. The matter was left to stand as it was until February 22, 1644.

The Scottish army pressed their advantage and advanced as far as the River Tine. When this happened, they pressed the House of Lords to set a time for Laud's trial to begin. The date was set for March 12, 1644.

At the Bar of the House of Peers the articles of impeachment were read. Laud asked again which of the articles were meant as treason and which were only misdemeanors. The House of Commons made its reply through a speech by Maynard, who held that not any one of the articles was an act of treason in itself, but taken all together they constituted a cumulative treason. This type of reasoning seems a little strange, for a treason charge is drawn as a conclusion when none of the premises constitute a treasonable charge. To this Laud made an impromptu reply answering the charges again and pleading not guilty.[4]

The trial was put off again until July during which time a committee from the House of Commons composed of Maynard, Wilde, and Nicholas drew up a new set of charges numbering only four. These new charges included all the former charges under four heads.

The Scots during the summer months pushed back the forces of Charles. Laud's trial was brought up again in the House of Commons and all the previous evidence and answers were gone over. On October 11, 1644, a dispute arose in the House of Commons. Hearn, Laud's counsel for the trial,

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 483-86. Laud's speech is printed as taken by the recorder of the court.

brought up the question, "whether any treason was contained in all or any of the articles which were charged against him?"[5] To settle the issue it was decided to issue a Bill of Attainder, similar to the one used to execute Strafford. This bill would impanel a jury to decide the case and forbid it to reveal the reason for its judgment of treason. This suggestion brought results quickly, and on November 13 Laud was condemned by the House of Commons.

The case moved to the House of Lords, who were slower to move on the new Bill of Attainder. By December 4, 1644, they had called all the pertinent material concerning Laud's trial in for consideration. The Commons began to use pressure on the Lords. The final technique to get the Bill through the House of Lords was that the Commons would bring up a petition signed by twenty thousand people in order to have it passed.[6] Since the Bishops in the House of Lords had been denied a right to vote, many of the less spirited Anglican members of the House of Lords withdrew, and the Bill of Attainder against Laud was passed by six or seven members who were present on January 4, 1645. The Lords who passed the Bill were the Earls of Kent, Pembroke, Salisbury, Bullingbrook, North, and Gray of Wark. Bruce is said to have voted for the measure, but later he denied this.[7]

The Archbishop read his own funeral sermon to the people gathered to witness his execution on Tower Hill on January 10, 1645.[8] His text was

---

[5] Ibid., p. 493.

[6] Ibid., p. 494.

[7] Loc. cit.

[8] Ibid., p. 497-501. Laud's sermon completely printed from best available copy presented to the King by Lord John Bellasis.

Hebrews 12:2: "Let us run with patience the race which is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, who for joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Completing his sermon and his prayer, Laud knelt down before the block 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 thee; but it is but umbra mortis, a meer shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature; but thou by thy merits and passion, hast broke through the jaws of death, the 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 amongst them, for Jesus Christ his sake, if it be thy will.[9]

After saying aloud, "Lord, receive my soul," Laud bowed his head on the block. The executioner speedily performed his gruesome task.

Continuing to the very end of his life to pray and ask that the Lord bless and keep the kingdom, Laud portrayed his constancy. His great desire while alive was to keep the uniformity of the Church in a bond of peace. All his actions were legally within the law. That he infuriated the Puritans is undeniable, but he did this through the just workings of the law. His trial was the result of this attempt to preserve the Church of England in uniformity. This trial was a gross miscarriage of justice, a farce of lawful proceedings. Laud was condemned by public opinion, by the bitter hatred of the Puritans, by men's passions and not their reason.

The death of Laud meant the end of the uniformly Established Episcopal Church of England for a time. The liturgy was banned about the time that Laud was condemned by the Bill of Attainder. The Presbyterian

---

[9]Ibid., p. 503.

Directory was established on March 13, 1645. Episcopacy was condemned and suppressed in an Ordinance on October 9, 1646.

The House of Commons had a taste of power when it executed Laud, who had consistently defended the monarchy. The final expression of hatred by the Parliamentarians and Presbyterians and Puritans became a fact on January 30, 1649. On this date King Charles I was led to Tower Hill and executed, to the great glee of some, and the sorrow of others.[10]

---

[10]T. Fuller, The Church History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until 1648 (3rd edition; London: William Tegg, 1868), III, 563.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Gee, Henry, and William J. Hardy. Documents Illustrative of English Church History. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.

Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until 1648. 3 vols. 3rd edition. London: William Tegg, 1868.

Heylyn, Peter. Cyprianus Anglicus: or The History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. London: A. Siele, 1671.

B. Secondary Sources

Adair, E. R. "Laud and the Church of England." Church History. Vol. 5, No. 2 (June, 1936), 121-40.

Bayne, Peter. The Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution. London: James Clarke and Co., 1878.

Benson, Arthur C. William Laud Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, A Study. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1887.

Coffin, Robert P. T. Laud, Storm Center of Stuart England. New York: Brentano's, 1930.

Duncan-Jones, A. S. Archbishop Laud. London: Macmillan and Co., 1927.

Hodges, George. Saints and Heroes Since the Middle Ages. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1912.

Gardiner, S. R. "William Laud." Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sidney Lee. XXXII. London: Oxford, 1892. Pp. 185-94.

———. Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage. 2 vols. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1869.

Hutton, William H. The English Church From the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714). New York: Macmillan and Co., 1927.

Lawson, John P. The Life and Times of William Laud, D. D. 2 vols. London: Printed for C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1829.

Sinclair, William M. Leaders of Thought in the English Church. London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1896.

Stearns, Raymond P. Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands. Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1940.

Trevor-Roper, H.R. Archbishop Laud 1573-1645. London: Macmillan and Co., 1940.