

THE  
HAMPTON COURT  
CONFERENCE

A THESIS

presented to the faculty of the  
University of Edinburgh  
in candidacy for the degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Harold F. Humbert



# C O N T E N T S

FOREWORD	Page ii
CHAPTER I	
THE BACKGROUND OF HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE	Page 1
CHAPTER II	
THE KING AND THE CONFERENCE	Page 20
CHAPTER III	
HAMPTON COURT : THE CONFERENCE SETTING	Page 36
CHAPTER IV	
PRIMARY SOURCES OF CONFERENCE INFORMATION	Page 41
CHAPTER V	
THE PERSONNEL OF THE CONFERENCE	Page 60
CHAPTER VI	
THE DISCUSSION AT THE CONFERENCE	Page 107
CHAPTER VII	
THE PROCEDURE OF THE CONFERENCE	Page 146
CHAPTER VIII	
THE OUTCOME OF THE CONFERENCE	Page 164
REFERENCES	Page 190
BIBLIOGRAPHY	Page 202

## FOREWORD

At Hampton Court Palace during three January days in the year 1604 a gathering of ecclesiastical and political leaders of England was faced by problems which were disrupting national unity. Although the implication of the issues involved was far reaching, the men in power were not aware of the deeply rooted significance of what was being discussed, because their primary concern was to quiet ministers and educators whom they considered troublesome.

The pivotal person was the new monarch, James I. If the king had been less desirous of displaying his intellectual, literary and theological skill, the conference would not have been held. If he had been of the disposition to seek understanding of other men's minds rather than to impose his will, a larger measure of conciliation might have been attained. Because his interests were scholarly, one result of enduring value eventuated. Hampton Court Conference was what it was because James was what he was.

The king, however, was only one factor in a complex situation. The gathering was the outgrowth of long-evolving historic processes, out of which were emerging sharply differentiated religious parties.

This dissertation begins with an epitome of ideas and events that converged at Hampton Court, showing the unsettlement in the Church of England which James inherited from his enigmatical predecessor, the rival hopes which confronted him upon coming to the throne, and the grievances which impelled men to petition the monarch for ecclesiastical changes. It proceeds

with an attempt to present a consistent characterization of a baffling king, many of whose verbal portraits are out of focus, distorting the impression made by a personality that was unattractive at its best. The thesis utilizes mingled elements in James' background and character to explain his summoning and conducting the assembly at Hampton Court. A brief description of the palace where the gathering was held is designed to aid in visualizing the conference setting in the light of historic events which occurred there.

Following an evaluation of primary source documents, written by men who were present at Hampton Court, a chapter on personnel is included, with the purpose of lifting participants out of the category of mere names into the actuality of vital persons, including the heir to the throne, the Primate of the Church and his associated bishops, deans and doctors, the lords of the Council, a visiting Scotsman, and four Puritans. The specific contribution of each individual is indicated as well as his general point of view on ecclesiastical questions.

An exposition of the issues raised at Hampton Court, with a point-by-point explanation of the discussion that occurred, is followed by a critical analysis of the conference procedure, an interpretation of the varied attitudes of participating groups, a listing of the underlying issues in comparison with those actually considered, a contrast with other ecclesiastical gatherings of the century, a critique of the behavior of the king during the assembly, and an inquiry into why so important a gathering was so brief.

The final chapter shows the paradoxical quality of the conference, its immediate effects, its outreach in English, Irish and American history, and the world influence that resulted from an unanticipated proposal made at Hampton Court.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE BACKGROUND OF HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE

Descriptive terms applied to individuals and parties sometimes cling so tenaciously as to become definitive. James VI and I was dubbed by Henry IV 'the wisest fool in Christendom' and the phrase became permanently attached to the memory of the monarch through whom Scotland and England were united. When the king came to his new throne he faced three religious groups, each with a distinguishing label that has become embedded in history. The people who were dedicated to purity in doctrine and life and to further cleansing of the Church of England were called Puritans. The followers of the Church of Rome, who refused to conform to the establishment under Queen Elizabeth, were called Recusants. The occupants of the seats of the mighty and their adherents in the established church were Episcopalians, believing in the government of bishops, organized with a gradation in clerical orders, and recognizing the monarch as supreme governor of the church.

The ecclesiastical policy of James' predecessor in England, like her character, was a thing of contradictions. Elizabeth's enigmatical person combined discretion and indiscretion, prudence and imprudence, terseness and verbosity, ostentation and niggardliness, cruelty and kindness, indecision and dominance. The precarious balance between opposites in her own soul was reflected in the church. Maintaining within herself a kind of unity through daring energy and the will to rule, she was a force in holding the church together by means of her subtle understanding of folk psychology, her glamorous personality, her stress upon elements which were inherently attractive to the English mind, and her utilizing the striving creativity of the times.

The influences that had pressed upon the mind of the

queen during her youth came from contradictory religious backgrounds. Sired by a father who sponsored a revolt against the Church of Rome, reared in a Catholic nursery, directed by a Protestant guardianship, preceded on the throne by a Protestant brother and a Catholic sister, Elizabeth sought middle ground.

(1) Her secretary, the calculatingly cautious Lord Burghley, advised her to pursue a central course between divergent influences, on the one side, the Catholic officials and clergy, who were dominant during the reign of her sister, Mary, and on the other, the Puritans, who desired more sweeping changes than had come to pass under Elizabeth's father and brother and who were certain to call her policy "a cloaked papistry or a mingle-mangle." (2)

In veering away from both Roman and Genevan models, and in attempting to find middle ground, the Elizabethan religious policy, although designed to bring about a settlement, actually resulted in unsettlement. While it was the outgrowth of policy more than of conviction, yet it did spring from patriotic impulses deep in the soul of the queen. She longed for the church to be inclusive rather than exclusive, the summation of the total Christian spirit of her realm. (3) She wished for as little change as possible, believing that innovation would bring about dissatisfaction. She passionately desired the English church to be a profoundly English institution, took delight in elaborate ceremonial, insisted that the services be in the language of the people, and asserted royal supremacy over the church as an instrument of national unity. (4)

Haller has written a pointed summary of the situation, "Her father may be said to have seized the church. Her brother and sister before her had in contrary ways and with unhappy results

tried to reform it. She perceived that she must govern it or be ruined. Her people were divided in faith. The majority perhaps, especially about London, were Protestant, but a considerable number were still Catholic, and of these there was no telling how many might prove hostile to her authority. There were, in addition, differences within the ranks of both parties. Practically everybody agreed that there could be but one true religion and that the church should be maintained by the state. The continuance of ordered society was as yet inconceivable without the Christian church, and the church was inconceivable except as a single comprehensive institution uniform in faith and worship. But since in fact her subjects could not agree as to what religion ought to be enforced as true, Elizabeth's policy was to maintain at least the semblance of uniformity and the framework of the church without at the same time wrecking her government. . . . What she chiefly wanted, after all, was to be queen of England and live . . . without troubling to be either logical or zealous, she made herself safe. She affirmed the independence, the Protestantism, of the English church. As head of the nation, she asserted her control over church government. She insisted that her bishops be men she could depend upon, and she saw to it that they asserted their authority and her own. She required them to bear hard upon the disobedient when disobedience seemed a menace to the successful maintenance of her rule and policy. But she seems personally to have preferred not to disturb people for the supposed good of their souls. When repressive measures seemed necessary, she made, if possible, someone else bear the onus of them. The only religious test she unfailingly insisted upon was willingness to swear allegiance to herself as the church's governor." (5)

The Elizabethan compromise drew forth conscientious opposition from the Puritans, who, at first, resented the name by which they were designated, though the term aptly described a people devoted to purity in doctrine and conduct, adhering to simplicity in worship, detesting ceremonials, and demanding loyalty to Scripture rather than tradition or ecclesiastical enactment. In the sense of dissatisfaction with the existing church, Puritanism had been in England during the days of Wyclif and Tyndale, but the name was not coined until "soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth," and "it was not much in use for ten years afterwards." (6)

"Originally in England," Drysdale has explained, "the terms 'Puritan,' 'Precisian,' 'Presbyterian,' though not synonymous, were applied to the same ecclesiastical party. The three words were in use within a few years of each other. 'Precisians,' or precise folks, came first, introduced apparently by Archbishop Parker. 'Puritan,' which soon outstripped it in popular phraseology, had its origin from the same quarter in 1564, and frequently recurs in the Archbishop's letters." (7)

The hope of a purified church, frustrated by Elizabeth, came to focus in Thomas Cartwright, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. He maintained that as God's will was revealed in the Bible, including the form of church government, it was unscriptural for the English church to be ruled by bishops, and asserted that ministers should be chosen by the people themselves, rather than being controlled by the episcopacy. On an occasion when John Whitgift, then Master of Trinity College and later Archbishop of Canterbury, was absent from Cambridge, Cartwright spoke so powerfully against the surplice that "all the members of his college, with the exception of three, appeared at

the evening service in chapel without their surplices." (8)  
Expelled from the university because of his Puritan convictions, harassed into exile, imprisoned upon his return, released and allowed to go into retirement, Cartwright was the major advocate of the cause to which he had dedicated himself. He continued to express his cogent views and had a host of followers.

Through the influence of Cartwright the Puritans came to an overmastering conviction concerning the speaking function of the clergy. They declared that "a dumb minister" was "a contradiction in terms. Each one should be fit to preach . . . . The campaign against the reading of homilies, and the importance attached to catechisms arose from the Puritan belief in an enlightened ministry and an enlightened people." (9)

The earliest meetings of English Puritans were "for Christian culture and edification, apart from the formalities of established worship . . . one neighbor conferred with another, and 'did win and turn his mind with persuasive talk.'" (10) To cultivate understanding of the Bible and skill in preaching the Puritans evolved gatherings known as "propheesyings," in which the procedure was to begin with prayer by a minister, who then spoke in explanation of an appointed passage of Scripture, applying it practically. After his address of three-quarters of an hour, another minister would talk for fifteen minutes, carrying forward without repetition the exposition of what had been discussed, or opposing the first speaker wherever he believed him to have spoken contrary to Scripture. A third speech of fifteen minutes' duration was delivered by an older minister, under conditions identical with those applying to his predecessor, after which the moderator concluded the meeting. (11)

Archbishop Grindal encouraged propheesyings, as did many

of the bishops. The gatherings stimulated religious thinking among the laity and careful study of the Bible among the clergy. The archbishop affirmed to Queen Elizabeth that these meetings increased the number of men who were able to preach. Objections were raised that speakers' unorthodox views were aired, differences of opinion caused disturbances, church leaders were denounced, and the laity were permitted to speak. The archbishop drew up rules to regulate the prophesyings, but the queen did not like them and, as a result of the Primate's correspondence growing out of the prophesyings, he was suspended, kept a prisoner in his own house, and summoned to appear before the star chamber. In the midst of the illness which prevented his complying, though, even if he could, he doubtless would not have done so for conscience's sake, the archbishop resigned and soon afterward died. (12)

In Elizabethan times the Puritans protested not only against a dumb ministry, but also against the service book, vestments and bishops. With the prayer book the Puritan conscience developed deep dissatisfaction. An act passed during the queen's initial year on the throne crystallized the service book into the form substantially of the second book of King Edward's reign, strictly requiring objectors to comply with prescribed forms and ceremonies. Twenty years later an even more rigorous act of conformity was passed.

Uniformity was required on both political and ecclesiastical grounds. Not only were prophesyings repressed but also minute details of ceremonies and clerical garments were imposed. The queen commanded "that an exact order and uniformity be maintained in all external rites and ceremonies." (13) Puritanical opposition to existing requirements was heightened through the influence of men who, exiled during the reign of Queen Mary, had observed the

striking contrast between elaborate English ceremonies and simple reformed services on the continent. (14) The Puritans, convinced that it was contrary to genuine religion to seek to coerce the mind by outward forms, argued that imposition of vestments was an infringement of Christian liberty, a distraction to worshippers, a harking back to Jewish customs, an imitation of popish ways and a source of disagreement likely to cause a breach in the church. The extreme emphasis of the objectors irritated the queen, who believed that they were concentrating upon marginal rather than central matters. She wrote, ". . . the use of the habits is enjoined only for the sake of order and due obedience to the laws," (15) but, in her thinking, the wearing of vestments was a test of loyalty.

Many Puritans adhered to the conviction that presbyterial church organization was directly derived from the Word of God, which, they maintained, did not warrant episcopalian government. Those in political authority in the realm were convinced of the necessity of bishops as administrative and disciplinary agents. Gardiner has asserted, ". . . the Bishops, who were regarded by statesmen as guarantees of peace and order, were looked upon by Presbyterians as traitors to the cause of Christ and of the Church. All this obloquy they (the bishops) were ready to endure in order to save the nation from falling away once more to the Pope," maintaining that Christ had left forms of church government flexible, so as to be adaptable to varying needs. (16)

As a means of eliminating non-conformists among the clergy, Archbishop Whitgift devised fifteen requirements, to which ministers must subscribe or be deprived of their posts. Under such rigor the Puritans had a profound sense of injustice and grief. "A loud and bitter cry arose," said Drysdale, "from many parts

of the country, for, as the Earl of Leicester complained, multitudes of the most faithful and laborious among the clergy were deprived of their ministry, and the people were deprived of their preaching." (17)

The method of disciplining persons who did not conform to ecclesiastical requirements was to bring them before the Court of High Commission, which dealt out severe punishment. (18) This court, inaugurated with the purpose of "exterminating Popery" and "checking Puritanism," had a constitution devised by Whitgift. The act of uniformity gave to Elizabeth and her successors power "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences and enormities whatsoever, which, by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought, or may be lawfully reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended." The queen authorized her forty-four commissioners, of whom twelve were bishops, to inquire into heretical opinions, schisms, absence from church, seditious books, contempts, conspiracies, false rumors and slanderous words, besides offenses such as adultery, punishable by ecclesiastical laws. Any three members had authority to execute the commission. The penalties which this body inflicted included deprivation, fines, and imprisonment. Among the actual accusations which the records of the court show to have been charged against Puritans were: "holding heretical opinion, contempt of ecclesiastical laws, seditious preaching, scandalous matter in sermons, using invective speeches unfit for the pulpit, non-conformity, publishing fanatical pamphlets, profane speeches, schisms, blasphemy, raising new doctrines, preaching after deposition and simoniacal contract." Individuals who were brought before the court were examined under oath in such

manner that they were compelled to incriminate themselves, and likely to bring trouble to their friends, being punished as a result of extorted evidence as well as for refusing to take the oath. The harsh treatment and severe sentences of the court caused a rising tide of indignation. (19) The Puritans had kept hope alive in their hearts only by the expectation that, after the passing of the aged queen, a new monarch might be favorably disposed to their cause.

On the March day in 1603 when Queen Elizabeth lay dying, she was pressed to express her wish as to a successor, since fourteen rivals for the throne were advancing claims of more or less plausibility. She declared her desire for a king, adding, "And who should that be but our cousin of Scotland?" A few hours after her death a proclamation drawn up by Lord Cecil and approved by the privy council gave to James VI of Scotland the added title of James I of England. (20)

On April fifth the king began his progress from Edinburgh to London. Wherever he went he was greeted tumultuously. "The towns through which he travelled vied with each other in the magnificence of their entertainments," Smollett wrote. "The roads were crowded with innumerable multitudes, who came to see their new sovereign. . . the air rung with repeated acclamations." (21) While the self-satisfied monarch revealed himself as susceptible to adulation, he gave evidence of irritation over the press of people about him and occasionally acted as an arbitrary autocrat. James' fear of sudden death, such as came to his father, was the cause of his reaction against crowds.

From the moment that the choice of James as king had been made public, the atmosphere around the Puritans had become electric with anticipation. "Men had held their hands from active

agitation during the last years of the old queen's life," said Henson, "partly out of deference to her venerable years, and partly from a consciousness that her disappearance from the scene of public life must needs precipitate changes in the system which she embodied. Puritans, moreover, cherished the belief that a 'covenanted king' could not but be favorable to them, and awaited with strangely mistaken complacency the first disclosures of his religious policy. The wisest man in England, Francis Bacon, thought that the time had come for a serious effort to satisfy the reasonable demands of those who pointed to grave practical defects in the Establishment. James had been more worthy of his description as 'the British Solomon' if he had taken to heart the little tractate on Ecclesiastical Reform which Bacon placed in his hands on his arrival in England. Time would woefully disappoint the 'devout and fervent prayer' with which the author concluded his recommendations, that as the king had been made 'the corner stone in joining his two kingdoms, so he might be also as a corner stone to unite and knit together the differences in the Church of God.'" (22)

This treatise by Lord Bacon, dedicated to the new monarch, was called "Certain Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England." The philosopher wrote on behalf of spiritual freedom guarded by law, adding, "It is good we return unto the ancient bonds of unity in the Church of God, which was, one faith, one baptism; and not, one hierarchy, one discipline; and that we observe the league of Christians, as it is penned by our Saviour Christ, which is in substance of doctrine this: 'He that is not with us is against us;' but in things indifferent and but of circumstance this: 'He that is not against us is with us.'" (23)

Before the king had left Edinburgh Archbishop Whitgift had sent the Dean of Canterbury (24) to give official assurance of the loyalty of the Church to the monarch and to ascertain his attitude toward ecclesiastical affairs. Dean Nevill brought back the reassuring report that James favored neither Puritan nor Presbytery. (25) These ecclesiastical advocates of the status quo were determined to maintain existing conditions, in which the church was governed by the crown and the crown was counselled by the upper ranks of the clergy, whose administrative power was significant in both church and state.

Like the Puritans and the Episcopalians, the Catholics of England were turning toward the new monarch. The ecclesiastical policy of Elizabeth had "outraged" all the "cherished traditions" that had long been "a sacred part" of their lives. (26) Saying or hearing mass had been made a crime punishable by fine, imprisonment, or even as high treason. "Elizabeth and her Parliament," wrote James Mackinnon, "having deliberately chosen to remain Protestant, had no alternative but to disown the papal jurisdiction, and debar all subjects from acknowledging it under penalty of high treason. To respect the liberty of the subject in this matter would have been to encourage rebellion on behalf of a foreign potentate, and would have been . . . suicidal . . . On the other hand, the conscientious Catholic, like the conscientious Puritan, had ample reason to object to the Act of Uniformity as needlessly tyrannic. To compel men to go to church under penalty of censure and fine was to make them either hypocrites or rebels. The conscientious Catholic might well have been allowed to stay at home and repeat his paternoster, without incurring the charge of irreligion or treachery to the constitution." (27)

Since James was the son of a Catholic queen, people of

her faith had convinced themselves that he would be favorable to them, recalling Mary of Scots' words that the one thing in the world she most desired was to see her son a Catholic, "affecting a great deal rather the salvation of his soul than to see him monarch of all Europe." (28) The Scottish monarch himself gave reason for thinking that he would be tolerant toward recusants. In a description of the king's attitude in Scotland, Hallam has depicted James as engaging in "a little clandestine coquetry with the pope, which he fancied to be a political means of disarming enmity. Some knowledge of this, probably, as well as his avowed dislike of sanguinary persecution, and a foolish reliance on the trifling circumstance that one if not both of his parents had professed their religion, led the English Catholics to expect a great deal of indulgence, if not support at his hands." (29)

The new monarch was approached by lay recusants with petitions requesting the privilege of private worship according to Catholic rites. The basis of their appeal was "their loyalty, their efforts to secure James' succession, their past sufferings, and the venerable and continuous character of their religion." (30) The kindly words with which James received these men caused hope to burn in Catholic hearts.

When various groups of politically and religiously minded people were presenting requests to the king, it was natural that the Puritans should lay their case before him. As James was on his way to London, he was presented with a significant Puritan document called the "Millenary Petition," which was the direct cause of the Hampton Court Conference. Fuller has given this account of how the petition came to be: "And now, because there was a general expectation of a parliament suddenly to succeed, the presbyterian party, that they might not be surprised before they had

their tackling about them, went about to get hands of the ministers to a petition, which they intended seasonably to present to the king and parliament. Mr. Arthur Hildersham, and Mr. Stephen Egerton, with some others, were chosen, and chiefly intrusted to manage this important business. This was called 'the Millenary Petition,' as one of a thousand; though indeed there were but seven hundred and fifty preachers' hands set thereunto: but those all collected only out of five-and-twenty counties. However, for the more rotundity of the number, and grace of the matter, it passeth for a full thousand; which, no doubt, the collectors of the names, (if so pleased) might easily have completed." (31)

Gardiner has presented a well sustained thesis that no actual signatures were appended to the Millenary Petition, but that seven hundred and fifty letters of assent had been received and that the document represented the point of view of at least two hundred and fifty others. (32)

The preamble to the petition read,

"Most gracious and dread Sovereign,

"Seeing it hath pleased the Divine Majesty, to the great comfort of all good Christians, to advance your Highness, according to your just title, to the peaceable government of this Church and Commonwealth of England: We, the ministers of the gospel in this land, neither as factious men, affecting a popular parity in the Church, nor as schismatics, aiming at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical, but, as the faithful servants of Christ and loyal subjects to your Majesty, desiring and longing for the redress of divers abuses of the Church, could do no less, in our obedience to God, service to your Majesty, and love to his Church, than acquaint your princely Majesty with our particular griefs. For, as your princely pen writeth, 'the King, as a good physician, must first

know what peccant humours his patient naturally is most subject unto before he can begin his cure.' And although divers of us that sue for reformation have formerly, in respect of the times, subscribed to the book, some upon protestation, some upon exposition given them, some with condition, rather than the Church should have been deprived of their labour and ministry, yet now we, to the number of more than a thousand of your Majesty's subjects and ministers, all groaning as under a common burthen of human rites and ceremonies, do, with one joint consent, humble ourselves at your Majesty's feet, to be eased and relieved in this behalf." (33)

The Millenary Petition was a statesmanlike document, straightforward, specific, diplomatic. The Puritans showed tact in quoting the king's previous utterances and in referring to the "good taste" already had of his "Christian judgment." They subtly indicated their faith in the royal realization of strategic opportunity, using an apt scriptural allusion, "You are come to the kingdom for such a time."

The petition appealed to the better nature of the king, and its results indicated that the appeal struck home. He was urged to do what would be acceptable to God, bring the favorable judgment of history, strengthen the Church of England, and contribute to the happiness of individuals who had been suspended, silenced, disgraced and imprisoned, not for doing and saying what was contrary to Scripture, but for opposition to men's traditions.

The Puritans indicated that their motive in petitioning was three-fold, obedience to God, service to the king and love of the church, and explained that they previously had subscribed to the prayer book, although it prescribed human rites and ceremonies that were a burden to their souls, in order that they might continue to serve the divine institution to which they were devoted.

The petition explained the Puritans' view of themselves, disavowing that they were factious or that they aimed at dissolution of the church, and describing the group as "faithful servants of Christ and loyal subjects to your majesty." The purpose of the petitioners was declared to be to acquaint the king with the nature of the ailments within the church, so that he, as its skilful physician, might work a cure.

The document was a combination of humility and confidence. The phrases, "dread Sovereign," "beseech," "we humble ourselves" and "all dutiful submission" were an indication of the genuine loyalty of the petitioners. On the other hand, a consciousness of strength was manifest in the expression, "joint consent," making evident the power that was felt in a common protesting group, not an isolated few but a considerable company of conscientious objectors, whose position was fortified by appeal to the authority of the Bible.

The petitioners showed no disposition to insist that the king follow any one procedure in solving the problems that they presented. In fact, they proposed four possible alternatives: first, an oral presentation of the Puritan case to the king - "further to hear us;" second, a written argument to be prepared for the king's detailed deliberation and decision - "more at large by writing;" third, a conference of scholarly men to face the crucial problems and come to a solution - "by conference among the learned to be resolved;" fourth, the king's use of data already at hand to decide disputed points - "without further process . . . judge the equity of this cause."

The first group of Puritan petitions concerned "The Church Service." The petitioners requested that use of the cross in baptism, interrogatories to infants and confirmation be eli-

minated; baptism be not administered by women; the cap and surplice be not urged; examination precede the communion, which should be administered with the sermon; certain terms, such as "priests" and "absolution," be corrected; the ring in marriage be omitted; the church service be abridged; church-songs and music be modified; the Lord's Day be not profaned; rest upon holidays be not so strictly urged; uniformity of doctrine be prescribed, with elimination of popish opinions; ministers be not charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus; only canonical Scripture be read in the church. (34)

Concerning "Ministers" the second article urged that none be admitted but able men who should preach diligently, especially on the Lord's day; those now in the ministry who could not preach be either removed and "some charitable course taken with them for their relief, or else forced, according to the value of their living, to maintain preachers;" non-residences be not permitted; King Edward's statute for the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy be revised; ministers be not obliged to subscribe but, according to the law, to the articles of religion and the king's supremacy only. (35)

Concerning "Church Livings" the third article requested that bishops leave their commendams; impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges be given to preaching incumbents only; lay impropriations be charged with the sixth or seventh part for the maintenance of the preacher. (36)

Concerning "Church Discipline" the fourth article urged that administration be "according to Christ's own institution;" excommunication and censures be not in the name of lay persons; "men be not excommunicated for twelpenny matters, nor without consent of their pastors;" the length of suits in ecclesiastical

courts be restrained; licenses for marriages without banns be granted more sparingly; use of the oath ex-officio be limited. (37)

The Millenary Petition concluded, ". . . referring ourselves to your Majesty's pleasure for your gracious answer as God shall direct you, we most humbly recommend your Highness to the Divine Majesty, whom we beseech for Christ's sake to dispose your royal heart to do herein what shall be to his glory, the good of his Church, and your endless comfort." (38)

After the king's arrival in London, which occurred on May seventh, he had cumulative evidence that the Episcopalians opposed concessions to the Puritans. Cardwell has attributed opposition to the proposal of a conference of persons selected from each side, to discuss the several points at issue, as due to the idea that such a discussion was in itself "an imputation of error, and likely, if granted, to lead to no other result than an increased and embittered discontent." (39) Other motives were mingled with this fear of deeper cleavage: desire to maintain existing privileges, dread lest Presbyterianism gain a foothold, and resentment against the incipient spirit of democracy.

On June 9 the University of Cambridge in public congregation passed a Grace in specific reply to the Millenary Petition, "that whosoever in the university should openly oppose by word or writing, or any other way, the doctrine or discipline of the church of England established by law, or any part thereof, should be suspended ipso facto from any degree already taken, and be disabled from taking any degree for the future." (40)

From Oxford University was issued, "An answer of the vice-chancellor, doctors, proctors, and other the heads of houses." The document upbraided the Millenary petitioners for subscribing and then complaining, argued in behalf of existing ecclesiastical

arrangements and urged the king not to permit these men to disturb established policy. The Oxonians inquired, "Does it become the supereminent authority and regal person of a king, to subject his sovereign power to the overruling and all-commanding power of a presbytery?" (41)

A letter was sent from the University of Cambridge to the University of Oxford commending the "Answer" and stating that the divines connected with that institution and "many thousands more of the judicious and obedient Ministers of this land, were ready to give them the right hand of fellowship in this work, namely, their Apology, and would willingly subscribe unto the same, if the cause did require it, or the time would permit." (42)

Despite clerical opposition to Puritan requests for a conference, King James desired to conduct it, so as to appear magnanimous and to display his own theological learning. Lord Bacon advised the gathering, saying, "Your Majesty, with the advice of your council, will discern what things are intermingled like the tares amongst the wheat, which have their roots so enwrapped and entangled, as the one cannot be pulled up without endangering the other; and what are mingled but as the chaff and the corn, which need but a fan to sift and sever them." (43)

Although the king decided soon after arriving in the capital that he would summon leaders of his own choosing to a discussion of ecclesiastical differences, the proclamation calling the conference into session was not issued until autumn. Due to prevalence of the plague, the gathering did not actually convene until the following January. In a characteristically grandiloquent proclamation, issued at Wilton on October 24, 1603, King James asserted that he was "persuaded that both the constitution and doctrine" of the Church of England were "agreeable to God's

word, and near to the condition of the primitive church. Yet, forasmuch as experience did shew daily, that the Church militant was never so well constituted in any form of policy, but the imperfections of men who had the exercise thereof did with time, though insensibly, bring in some corruptions: and also, for that informations were daily brought unto him by divers, that some things used in this Church were both scandalous to many seeming zealous, and gave advantage to the adversaries: he conceived, that no subject could be so fit for him to shew his thankfulness to God, as, upon serious examination of the state of this Church, to redeem it from such scandals, as, both by one and the other, were laid upon it." (44) Indicating that his purpose to understand the state of the Church and to amend whatever was necessary had been "misconstrued by some men's spirits, whose heat tended rather to combustion rather than reformation," he demanded cessation of public invective, gathering signatures to petitions, and contemptuous behavior to authority, assuring his people that he would preserve the established ecclesiastical and political estate, "reforming only the abuses which he should find apparently proved," acting upon "mature advice and deliberation." (45)

Thus, the Hampton Court Conference occurred because a sincere group of Christians, desiring to bring about changes that would enable them to devote themselves whole-heartedly to their ministry in the Church of England, petitioned a new monarch for a gathering in which differences could be discussed and adjusted. The request was granted, not because the king, much less the bishops and ecclesiastical educators, desired change, but because James I saw an opportunity to display his intellectual prowess and theological learning.

## CHAPTER TWO

## THE KING AND THE CONFERENCE

When Henry IV referred to James I as "the wisest fool in Christendom" he tersely described contradictory traits in a ruler who occupied a crucial place in history. The first Stuart to reign in England received unrestrained praise and extravagant detestation, both because his personality had unblended elements and because the complex circumstances in which he lived drew forth distinctive qualities but demanded statesmanship beyond his strength, perhaps beyond the potency of any man. Abbe Reynal contemptuously declared, "James wanted to be pacific, and he was only indolent; wise, and he was only irresolute; just, and he was only timid; moderate, and he was only soft; good, and he was only weak; a divine, and he was only a fanatic; a philosopher, and he was only a pedant." (1) On the other hand, Dean Barlow wrote that at Hampton Court Conference James showed himself "in points of divinity. . . as expedite and perfect, as the greatest scholars and most industrious students there present might not out strip him." (2)

Sir Anthony Weldon's often-quoted description caricatured James as a person of corpulently quilted appearance, rolling eyes, over-large tongue and tottering legs. (3) The king himself drew a verbal sketch of the way he wished to be remembered when he wrote to Prince Henry, "In your garments be proper, cleanly, comely and honest. . . In your language be plaine, honest, naturall, comely, cleane, eschewing extremities." (4) The pathos of James Stuart's life was that events combined with his own attitudes to cause the monarch to bury under protective mannerisms, as his most recent biographers observed, his "love of laughter, his native shrewdness and good memory, his skill with

words and his mental agility." (5)

From boyhood James had been aware that he was not as handsome or physically vigorous as other lads; consequently he reached out for compensations, desiring to dazzle and stun people by demonstrations of intellectuality, finding emotional outlet in authorship, withdrawing from crowds to be with individuals who knew how to insulate him from trouble and make him feel expansively happy, trying to forget his unsatisfactory digestion and weak legs by plunging vigorously into horsemanship and hunting, and asserting his kingliness in displays of power that were not always regardful of consequences. He became a man "too quick to give, because in the act of giving he could feel himself superior." (6) He remained persistently adolescent, carrying himself pompously, often "playing with ideas instead of facts," (7) veering from poignant loneliness to emotional impulsiveness, and swelling with a heady sense of being "better, braver, and loftier than other men." (8) His consciousness of kingship enabled James Stuart to think of himself, not in terms of personal limitations, but as a man of power, carrying into action the divine will. From this fixed idea he received sustaining vigor. From weakness he was made strong by megalomania.

Who were the people that helped to mould James' character? He had no opportunity to be influenced directly by the sparkle of his mother's personality. She looked into his face for the last time when he was nine months old. Four months later, the crowned king of Scotland, he lay under a coverlet of cloth of gold brocaded in red by her hands, and during his troubled boyhood he read a book that was her gift, Virgil's "Bucolics." (9) Though his mentors turned the boy's mind against his mother, and though their lives were lived apart from each other, Mary Stuart made

her own impact upon her son. She was, as Conyers Read wrote, "tall and graceful, with dark brown eyes, chestnut hair, and a pale delicate complexion. . . Although she excelled in courtly accomplishments and conformed in the main to courtly conventions, she was at heart a free spirit with much of the freshness, simplicity and abandon of a wild thing about her. Court life never tamed the primitive woman in her, a woman quick of wit and nimble of body, sensitive, proud, passionate." (10) Without the simplicity and quickness of his mother, James shared her sensitive pride and passion, which he expressed as distinctively in his way as she did in her way.

"My lord," said James' mother in Edinburgh Castle to his dissolute father, when the baby was a week old, "here I protest unto God, as I shall answer for it at the Great Day of Judgment, this is your son and no other man's son. I am desirous that all here, both ladies and others, bear witness, for he is so much your son that I fear it may be the worse for him hereafter." (11)

James recoiled from the memory of the blond drunkard who was his sire. Lord Darnley was one of the conspirators in planning the murder of his wife's private secretary, Rizzio, who was dragged from the expectant mother's dining room and stabbed to death. The shock to Mary inevitably affected the unborn son. Darnley's alternate sulking and raging, arrogance and slinking, quarreling and returning made him the kind of man of whom no son could be proud. In the document that James wrote for little Prince Henry he expressed loathing for the qualities of his own father, without naming the man. Darnley's violent death left in James a life long fear of assassination. (12) Mary's fear for her child proved true in this respect: James was so much the son of his father in his arrogance that it was the worse for him.

The king never got away from the influence left in his life by two tutors. Rasping-voiced George Buchanan was a severe old partisan, whose stern stoicism and blunt speech made the boy tremble. He gave his pupil heavy intellectual diet and a mastery of languages. Buchanan's resentment of the idea that a ruler was the Lord's anointed had the unanticipated effect of shoving the boy into a conviction of the divine prerogative of a king. (13) The other tutor was Peter Young, gifted, gentle, youthful, Geneva-trained, who won the king's enduring admiration and shaped his bent toward pedantry and theological argument. (14)

The regents during the monarch's minority also left their impression upon his mental make-up. James could not forget that the Earl of Moray, rapacious half-brother of Mary of Scots, was murdered when the little king was three and a half years old. He was succeeded by the Earl of Lennox, the boy's doddering, colorless grandfather, who prompted the child and held his hand when he delivered his first speech as king. (15) After Darnley's father's assassination, the Regent Mar was James' guardian for a year and died "worn out by trying to rule a seething Scotland." (16) The Regent Morton, Scotland's master for five ruthless years, was a man of bold, broad face and remorseless repressiveness, with a canny conviction that the English ecclesiastical policy strengthened monarchy. This leader of Rizzio's assassins was "one of those self-sustained personalities that are almost without need of external approval." (17) His fierce vigor brought the relative calm which enabled James' tutors to cram the boy's memory and cultivate his capacities, but the lad hated Morton.

In James' almost loveless childhood Lady Mar was the one gentle soul who gave him genuine affection. Even when he was taken from under her care she remembered him with keepsakes

and called him "little sweet angel." (18)

The companion who brought the thrill of contact with the world of romance and action into the king's lonely boyhood was his debonair cousin, Esme Stuart, Lord of d'Aubigny, from France. He was "an aesthete who appealed to the Stuart love of music, of life, of colour," (19) and the first man to whom the hungry-hearted orphan could display his own ability. "To a starved ego," wrote Steeholm, "this was nothing short of bliss." (20) James made his cousin Duke of Lennox and was flattered into believing he had won d'Aubigny from the Catholic to the Protestant faith. The Frenchman's example impressed upon James the way to be agreeable and persuasive to those whose favors he wished to win and arrogantly exacting toward those whom he wished to snub. When the anti-Lennox lords were responsible for the return to the continent of the fifteen-year-old-king's favorite, James missed the dash and gaiety which he had experienced with his comrade. The adolescent monarch could scarcely believe the truth when word arrived that his life-loving cousin was dead. (21)

The meaning of the loss of Lennox has been described poignantly by Steeholm: "Good-bye to laughter, and light-heartedness, good-bye to carefree days in the forest, good-bye to the last sparkling, insouciant nature that he would know, good-bye to the last spontaneous frivolity and joy of boyhood. There was no one about him now who was not blunt-tongued and heavy-witted. . . . James now found himself most utterly alone, without a single kindred soul to whom to turn." (22)

Here are psychological factors that explain the attitude of James in the Hampton Court Conference. All his life this man had hungered abnormally for appreciation, but all his life his unattractive personality had compelled him to struggle for the

recognition that some people win without trying. Those about him in his boyhood and manhood had been quicker to tell him what he ought to do than to speak of the gifts that he was certain he had. He craved the flattery of being heard with rapt attention. In his youth, Lennox fulfilled that fervent desire. At Hampton Court the ecclesiastical leaders of England turned his heart to them by means of the adulation which he craved, and, as a result, he let loose his crude humor and argumentative assertiveness upon the Puritans.

Other influences that had been poured into James' youthful mind asserted themselves at Hampton Court. When he assumed the kingly role for himself in Scotland, he summoned as adviser the dominating Earl of Arran, James Stewart, who aided him to be rid of political enemies, to incline toward Episcopalian rather than Presbyterian church government, (23) and to harry church leaders who opposed him. (24) Another shrewd politician had stood at James' youthful side, Chancellor John Maitland, who encouraged the king's excursions into writing, led him to believe he had literary genius, and accentuated the sense of well-being that James always felt in the presence of approval. Maitland translated the monarch's Latin verse into English and received from the young man a sonnet containing the lines:

"For thou, oh Maitland, does occasion take

Even by my verse to spread my name all where." (25)

The portraits of James I reveal big glowing eyes, a wistful eagerness of expression, a high forehead suggestive of intellectual interests, a prominent Stuart nose reminiscent of his mother, and the bearing of a man determined to be dominant. The brilliant Lord Bacon met the king on his way to London and wrote to Lord Henry Howard, describing James as "like a prince of the

ancient form than of the later time. His speech is swift and cursory, and in the full dialect of his country, and in point of business short; in point of discourse large." (26) The contemporary Cardinal Bentivoglio described the British monarch as "of fair and florid complexion, and lineaments very noble to behold," and the Venetian Ambassador, Nicolo Moulin, referred to the king as of "noble presence." (27)

The king's facility with words, ease in Latin and French, accurate memory for details, skill in dialectic, and conception of kingly rights accentuated his vanity. "Humility," wrote Steeholm, "was a virtue which James never felt he could afford to cultivate." (28) He took pleasure in teaching Latin to a court favorite, displayed his learning pretentiously whenever he engaged in discussion, and knew how to use judicious marginal references in his writings. He had a way of impressing people, who were seeing him for the first time, with the quality of his quaint intelligence, the adroitness of his doctrinal discussions, and the scope of his shrewdness. As a lad of eight years he was described by the Kilrenny minister, James Melville, as "the sweetest sight in Europe that day for strange and extraordinary gifts of ingyne, judgment, memorie and language." (29) As a youth "he unblushingly confessed" to his relative, Guise, that the "'fair conceit'" which the French Ambassador had of him was correct, "but courteously suggested that his 'virtues and rare qualities' were greatly traceable to his Lorraine ancestry." (30) The Hampton Court Conference was what it was largely because of James' buoyant confidence in his learning and his kingly station.

Rait has declared that while later generations can scarcely agree with the Bishop of Winchester's triumphant cry, "God hath given us a Solomon," yet "in the king's writings we

have the work of one of the best educated men of his time. Brought up under the care of the greatest living humanist, he was, if a pedant, none the less a scholar. 'Thay wald haif me learn Latin before I can speik Scots,' he had scrawled on the margin of his copy-book in his strange, dreary, motherless boyhood in Stirling Castle. . . . By nature, too, he was shrewd and capable, seeing clearly if not far. His mind was precisely fitted to appreciate the intricacies of Formal Logic, and his thought naturally ran in syllogisms. He revelled in the hard, logical, and crude discussions on Divinity, which could bear no mystery, and found superstition congenial and mysticism impossible." (31)

As a lad James relished writing and dreamed of being the mentor of aspiring Scottish authors. At the age of eighteen he issued, "Essayes of a Prentise in the Divine Art of Poesie," in which he sought to crystallize into rules the fundamentals of verse as applied to the Scottish language, recognizing, however, that "Gif Nature be nocht the cheif worker in this airt, Reulis wilbe bot a band to Nature, and will mak you within short space weary of the haill airt: whairas, gif Nature be cheif, and bent to it, reulis will be ane help and staff to Nature." (32)

What James wrote gave insight into his nature. To him the perfect poet is a person of ripe ingenuity, rich imagination, quick wit, manifest reasonableness, and retentive memory,

"With skilfulness, where learning may be spyt,

With pithie wordis, for to express you by it." (33)

The young monarch's desire to appear modest was counterbalanced by the egotism that thrust itself forward in his sonnets. Though seeking to establish himself as an authority in the poetic craft, he produced lines that limped. In his "Apostrophe to Apollo"

James wrote,

"Graunt, when I lyke the Springtyme to displaye.  
That Readers think they sie the Spring alwaye." (34)

When he addressed the Muses and Mercury, he said,

"Let Readers think, thy eloquence devyne  
O Mercure, in my Poems doth appeare:  
And that Parnassis flowing fountaine fyne  
Into my works doth shyne lyke cristall cleare.

Of all that may the perfyte Poems make,  
I pray you let my verses have no lake." (35)

Before the king was twenty years old he ventured again into literature with a "Paraphrase Upon the Revelation of St. John," containing passages of genuine beauty, and in the following year with "Meditation Upon First Chronicles Fifteen." After his journey to bring home Anne of Denmark as his bride, James composed Latin verses and sent them to the astronomer, Tycho Brahe, whose achievements had drawn the young ruler to spend seven happy hours with the scientist at his Castle of Uraniaborg. (36) In 1591 appeared "His Majesty's Poetical Exercises at Vacant Hourse." The king's writings made clear that his major interest was in religion.

In 1599 James published, "Daemonologie, in Forme of a Dialogue," explaining his persecuting zeal against witches, whom he believed to be servants of the devil. At any cost, the king averred, the sin of witchcraft must be suppressed. "It is no wonder," he remarked, "that the diuel may delude our senses, since we see by common prooffe, that simple jugglers will make an hundredth things seeme both to our eyes and eares otherwayes then they are." (37) The king's ideas deluded him into torture and execution of innocent women accused of witchcraft and into making life similarly unbearable for religious Separatists.

In 1599 seven secret copies were issued of "Basilikon

Doron," the king's book of counsel to Prince Henry, his eldest son. In the year of James' accession to the English throne this book was reprinted in London, paraphrased in English and Latin verse, and translated into French. (38) It was a compound of shrewdness and naivete, pedantry and simplicity, invective and poise. The father declared that the son was under double obligation to God, being born a man, as well as being "a little God to sit on his Throne, and rule over other men," and advised him, "Keep God sparingly in your mouth, but abundantly in your heart." He counseled the expectant king to choose for office "men of known wisdom, honesty and good conscience," adding, "Cherish modesty, banish debauched insolence, foster humility, repress pride." The king showed his contempt for democracy, expressing the conviction that bishoprics and benefices were the means by which monarchy could be maintained. "The Reformation of Religion in Scotland," wrote James, "being made by a popular tumult and rebellion, some of our fiery ministers got such a guiding of the people at that time of confusion, as finding the gust of government sweet, they began to fantasy to themselves a Democratic form of government: and after usurping the liberty of the time in my long minority, settled themselves so fast upon that imagined Democracy as they fed themselves with the hope to become Tribuni plebis: and so in a popular government by leading the people by the nose, to bear the sway of all the rule." These Puritans were described by the king as "very pests. . . whom by long experience I have found no deserts can oblige, oaths nor promises bind, breathing nothing but sedition and calumnies, aspiring without measure, railing with reason, and making their own imaginations the square of their Conscience. . . suffer not the principals of them to brook your land, if ye like to sit at rest. . . hate no man more than a proud puritan." (39)

Still extant, among the royal manuscripts in the British Museum, are thirty Psalm paraphrases in James' own handwriting. The final stanza in his version of the twenty-seventh Psalm shows the king at his literary best:

"Doe thou upon the Lord attend,  
With courage alwaies stor'd,  
For he will fortifie thy heart,  
Wait therefore on the Lord." (40)

The gist of James' ideal of kingship is in "His Majestie's Owne Sonnet," addressed to Prince Henry and printed before the prose text in "Basilicon Doron:"

God gives not kings the stile of Gods in vaine,  
For on his throne his scepter doe they swey:  
And as their subjects ought them to obey,  
So kings should feare and serve their God againe:  
If then ye would enjoy a happie raigne,  
Observe the statutes of your heavenly king,  
And from his Law, make all your Lawes to spring:  
Since his Lieutenant here ye should remaine,  
Reward the just, be stedfast, true, and plaine,  
Represse the proud, maintayning aye the right,  
Walke alwayes so, as ever in his sight,  
Who guardes the godly, plaguing the prophane:  
And so ye shall in Princely vertues shine,  
Resembling right your mightie King Divine. (41)

James had an undeviatingly firm conception of the divine right of kings, who had, as he believed, "the Majestie of God in their person and Royall Majestie," (42) Smollett wrote, "He looked upon hereditary rights as indefeasible, and the regal power as absolute and without controul." (43) When, in a later conflict, the English Parliament claimed from the king an ancient privilege, James maintained that there was none except what the crown allowed, stoutly affirming that as it is "atheism to dispute what God can do . . . so is it presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do." (44) To Lord Chief Justice Coke the king thundered, "I am not defended by my laws, but by God." (45)

James' confidence in an episcopal form of church

administration was woven into the fabric of his thought. Believing in the divine right of kings, he found it easy to believe in the divine right of the episcopacy. In his mind church and state were one. "Kings," he said, "are in the Word of God called Gods, as being his lieutenants and vice-gerents on earth, and so adorned and furnished with some sparks of the Divinity." (46) Thinking of himself as supreme in both church and state, James spoke of his function as blending the ecclesiastical and the civil. Bishops and archbishops were essential means of mediating the sovereign will to the people and enforcing acceptance of the king's conclusions. Acting upon these principles, before he was twenty years of age, James demanded and received from an Edinburgh Parliament, from which he excluded opponents and included adherents who were certain to do his bidding, an enactment that the king's authority was supreme in all causes and over all persons, that declining his judgement and that of his council was treason, that slanderous speeches against his majesty should be severely penalized, that all ministers and educators must subscribe to an agreement acknowledging the king's spiritual supremacy and submitting to the bishops. (47)

James was a theological Calvinist and an ecclesiastical Episcopalian. (48) When he talked about the "sincere kirk" in Scotland, his conception blended his own idea of theological correctness, non-Romish worship, and ecclesiastical organization headed by bishops, despite the fact that most Scotsmen did not agree to episcopacy. He insisted that his heir to the throne should be baptised by a bishop even though the Scottish ministers were deeply offended by the royal decision.

A fundamental weakness of the king was his concern with the immediate. He could keep distant objectives in view when

they involved such a personal purpose as attainment to the English throne, but his policies, as a whole, were not the long-visioned goals of statesmanship. In youth he wrote a couplet that described his procedure throughout life,

"Be careful eye for to invent  
The way to get thy own intent." (49)

Whenever the king had his own way, he showed good humor and good nature to a marked degree, particularly if he were the center of a winning argument. He did not enjoy a disputation with well-matched cases, but reveled in a debate where those who differed from him presented arguments which he and his partisans could batter down. In his youth the ludicrous embarrassment of one of his supporters so amused James that he lay on the ground in an ecstasy of laughter. He had a zest for witty conversation and for gaiety in his court as well as a keen relish for seeing opponents maneuvered into positions of humiliation. (50)

The rigidness of dominant regents, teachers and clergymen during James' unfolding years caused him to react against strong-minded men and to determine to administer affairs through pliable favorites, engaging personalities, agreeable companions, readily responding to the royal will, firm in carrying out the king's wishes. Time-servers found him pliable; opponents, pugnacious. A basic reason for the king's selection of advisers and administrators who were conspicuous in personality and appearance, but not in intellectuality, was that he wished no rival where he fancied himself preeminent. Lord Bacon never found a place near to James' throne because he was too scintillant. Royal favorites in state and church were able to have their way with the king in as far as they gave him a sense of his own power. Henderson's researches led to the conclusion that, although James was "appar-

ently an idle and careless ruler, there is now abundant evidence that he was exceptionally diligent, keeping watchful eye on the whole domestic arrangements of his three kingdoms, and busying himself with varied schemes for their welfare." (51) A comment that the king once made revealed the way he felt the weight of office, "My burden is so great and continuall, without anie intermission." (52)

"James was not the great man, nor the great ruler he imagined himself to be," wrote Mackinnon. "Nevertheless, he was by no means the sorry figure that historians have usually painted. He had, unfortunately, the faculty of making himself ridiculous in the eyes of posterity, and he has accordingly had more than his share of ridicule. . . his proneness to rough jesting has turned the laugh against himself, as a man whose jokes were at times neither very pithy nor in the best of taste. His perpetual harping on his royal rights, especially his divine rights, has presented him in the character of a bore who never knew when to hold his tongue . . . Yet he had many qualities which might honour a king. He could be shrewd enough, though he allowed himself to be easily duped, was often extremely ready and cogent in argument, could reason dextrously with the keenest intellects of the day, had very considerable learning and no small humour, was a fluent orator, could sometimes make a really sensible speech, rose to some extent above the prejudices of his time, if not above his own, was fertile in ideas if he could not translate them into action. . . With all his foibles and his egotism, the impression is borne in on us that he really meant well and tried to do well. . . He did not know himself sufficiently well to guard against his own weaknesses. . . . He cherished the belief that everything depended on the monarch when the spirit of independence had begun to stir in the nation." (53)

"Above all things," Gardiner has written, James was "eager to be a reconciler, to make peace where there had been war before, and to draw those to live in harmony who had hitherto glared at one another in mutual defiance." (54) His early impulses toward peace repeatedly had been frustrated by conflicting forces in an intrigue-ridden land. As a child his sleep was disturbed and he was driven to fits of weeping because of the plots and counter-plots of power-seeking rivals, of whom he was the pawn. He never forgave the Master of Glamis, whose rudeness in the midst of factionists forcibly detaining the young king, expressed itself in the outburst, "It is no matter of his tears: better that barnis should weep than bearded men." (55) About him in manhood swirled religious controversies in which Protestant opposed Catholic and Nonconformist was at logger-heads with Conformist. Through it all, the king sought to be a harmonizer.

When Bowes, the Ambassador of Queen Elizabeth, was at Stirling Castle, "he was witness to a strange scene of violence and brawling before the Council, in which Morton, Mar, and Lennox gave the lie to their accusers, and the King, with much feeling and good sense, exerted himself to restore peace." (56) When belligerent lords had been restrained from fighting and compelled to sit quietly in the presence of twenty-year-old James in Edinburgh, he declared, "Before God, I love nothing so much as a perfect union and reconciliation." (57)

James regarded religious war with horror, glorying in the title, "Pacific king." (58) Shortly after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, he "endeavoured to interest Elizabeth and the Princes of Germany in a grandiloquent scheme for a universal European peace; and although the scheme seemed merely Utopian,

it drew from Elizabeth an expression of her high approval of his good intentions, and a vow, on account thereof, always to assist him by her friendship." (59) Of the dispute which began the Thirty Years' War James said that it "set all Christendom on fire." (60) That is what James never deliberately would do. Loving a calm life, he would suppress but never inflame, yet his suppression ultimately would cause a furious conflagration. A longing to bring factions into agreement led James to anticipate Hampton Court Conference with singular eagerness.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### HAMPTON COURT : THE CONFERENCE SETTING

The picturesque palace which King James selected as the setting for his drama of religion had been the scene of varieties of spiritual conflict. Erected by Cardinal Wolsey during the days of his political and religious dominance under Henry VIII, Hampton Court Palace was located on a site thirteen miles from London on the banks of the Thames, because of its accessibility, beauty and healthfulness. Built of purple-crimson brick, ornamented with stone, and covering eight acres, the structure had ingeniously devised parapets, graceful gables, shapely towers, clusters of delicately moulded chimney shafts, mullioned and latticed windows, panelled walls, long galleries, commodious chambers and artistic courts.

The entire palace was planned on a sumptuous scale, to delight the cardinal's own vanity and to impress foreign embassies. The ornamental work about the building and the interior decoration were executed by the most skilled sixteenth-century carvers, gilders and painters. Then, as now, the walls were hung with exquisite tapestries depicting incidents of Scripture, mythology and romance. The quarters for guests provided beds canopied with red, green and russet velvet, satin and silk. (1)

A contemporary satirist, contemptuous of Wolsey's ostentation, wrote,

"Why come ye not to Court?

To whyche Court?

To the Kynges Courte,

Or to Hampton Court?

Nay to the Kynges Court:

But Hampton Court

Hath the preemynence." (2)

Moved by an upsurge of feeling King Henry bluntly inquired of the Cardinal, "Why have you built so magnificent a house for yourself at Hampton Court?" and the primate adroitly replied, "To show how noble a palace a subject may offer to his sovereign." Immediately the king accepted the gift. (3)

Within the palace walls occurred many potent events, among which were negotiations leading to the alliance between Henry VIII and Francis I, known as the "Treaty of Hampton Court," and later "The Truce of Hampton Court," when ambassadors of the Netherlands arranged to enter the Anglo-French alliance. At the time of Wolsey's disgrace Anne Boleyn took up her residence in the palace and in its gardens was wooed by Henry. Soon afterward Hampton Court housed a conference of clergy and lawyers to decide whether or not the Archbishop of Canterbury might decide on a divorce freeing the king from Katharine of Aragon. After Anne Boleyn was crowned at Westminster she went with Henry to Hampton Court to spend her honeymoon, presiding at banquets, masques and sports, and reveling in music. In the following year ambassadors from Lubeck, one of the free cities in the Hanseatic League, were rowed along the Thames to Hampton Court in elaborate barges, to confer with King Henry in an attempt to induce him to enter a grand northern Protestant confederacy.

At the palace occurred the birth and baptism of Edward VI and the death of his mother, Jane Seymour. The fourth wife of Henry VIII, Anne of Cleves, waited there until the decree of divorce severed her from him, and the fifth wife, Catherine Howard, arrived immediately to spend her honeymoon with the king. In

quick succession came the sixth honeymoon with Catherine Parr, whose tactful guidance brought a degree of harmony among her three step-children, Mary, Elizabeth and Edward, such as they had not previously experienced.

During the reign of Edward VI, Mary of Guise, grandmother of James VI and I, visited at Hampton Court. Queen Mary and Philip II of Spain spent their honeymoon there and, within its walls, under advice of Philip, occurred the reconciliation of the queen with her sister Elizabeth, who had been kept a prisoner at Woodstock, and who, after this event, was freed and accorded the consideration due a princess who was heir to the throne. (4)

At Hampton Court Sir James Melville was received by Queen Elizabeth, eager for detailed information concerning her young rival, Mary of Scotland. He answered question after question concerning the Scottish queen's appearance and ability. When informed that Mary was the taller of the two, Elizabeth retorted, "Then she is too high, for I myself am neither too high nor too low." The jealous Elizabeth listened with rising feeling as Melville said that the queens were equally fair and danced so that one could have no preference. She was pleased with his concession that Elizabeth excelled Mary in playing the virginals. (5) The sense of uneasiness about Mary, which came to the fore on that day at Hampton Court, continued to trouble Elizabeth. When James' mother was a deposed prisoner in England it was at Hampton Court that a council of peers decided against the two women's meeting face to face.

Another dramatic event in Elizabeth's life occurred at Hampton Court Palace, where she received the embassy from the Netherlands which came to offer her the sovereignty of the Low Countries.

Shortly after coming to the English throne James made his initial visit to Hampton Court and issued a summons opening the opportunity to knighthood, with a fee that would enrich the royal treasury, to an amazing number of people. Not long afterward in the Great Hall of the palace he created eleven new peers in the presence of Queen and Court. The attractiveness of the place brought James and his family in pomp to Hampton Court, following a tour of southern counties, to spend their first Christmas in England. Law wrote, "The whole world was flocking to Hampton Court; ambassadors to offer their congratulations, nobles and gentlemen to testify their loyalty to their new sovereign, and crowds of needy adventurers on the look out for the honours, pensions, and places which were being showered in such profusion by James on his new subjects. The crowd was so great that even with upwards of 1,200 rooms, besides outbuildings, the Palace could not contain the numbers of retainers and servants that congregated here, so that tents had to be set up in the park to shelter them. Every day there were festivities: banquets, receptions of ambassadors, balls, masquerades, plays, tennis matches, and a grand running at the tilt." (6)

Among the throng of entertainers and guests was a man with pointed beard, "who spent most of his time whisking back and forth between the tiring room and the stage in the Great Hall, since he was both actor and author of the presentation." (7) Under "the most gorgeously ornate timber roof in England" (8) a man named William Shakespeare and a man named James Stuart were near together in physical proximity but far apart in station. The one was a playwright and the other a king, but the stature of the dramatist was to increase with the centuries and the stature of the king was to diminish. James thought he was

genuinely magnanimous that Christmas time at Hampton Court when he invested Shakespeare and **his** comrades with the status of "Grooms of the Chamber."

Shortly after this yuletide merrymaking came the Hampton Court Conference. Originally it was summoned to convene on January 12, 1604, but the assembly was deferred to Saturday the fourteenth. (9) The first formal meeting occurred in "the King's Privy Chamber, one of the large rooms of Henry VIII's suite of state apartments on the east side of the Clock Tower, which were altered in the reign of George II. It seems that the Chapel had been first selected as the place of meeting; but this arrangement was afterwards changed - which was fortunate, considering some of the incidents of the subsequent proceedings." (10)

On Saturday, the opening day, the Primate of the Church of England, lords of the council, and designated bishops and deans, were with the king. On Monday, the second day, the Puritans were summoned, with two bishops, certain deans and doctors, Patrick Galloway (minister of Perth) and Prince Henry. The entire personnel of the gathering came into the conference room at various times on the final day, Wednesday, the eighteenth. (11) In this brief period of time vast controversies were presented and apparently concluded at Hampton Court.

## CHAPTER FOUR

## PRIMARY SOURCES OF CONFERENCE INFORMATION

Primary documents concerning the Hampton Court Conference include a day-by-day summary of what occurred, letters written by people who were present, comments made in an observer's diary, communications by the king to ecclesiastical commissioners, a royal proclamation, and the calendar of state papers. The digest of proceedings was prepared by Dean (later Bishop) William Barlow, with appended Puritan writings. A knight who listened to part of the conference made jottings in his diary, Sir John Harington. Four men wrote descriptive letters that are extant, Bishop Tobias Matthew to Archbishop Matthew Hutton, Dean James Montague to his mother, Patrick Galloway to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and King James to a friend in Scotland.

## I. DEAN BARLOW'S "SUM OF THE CONFERENCE"

Basic details of happenings at Hampton Court were recorded by Dean Barlow, using the title, "The Sum and Substance of the Conference, which it pleas'd his Excellent Majesty to have with the Lords Bishops, and others of his Clergy (at which most of the Lords of the Council were present) in his Majesty's Privy Chamber at HAMPTON COURT, January 14, 1603. Contracted by WILLIAM BARLOW, Doctor of Divinity, and Dean of Chester."

Educated at Cambridge, Barlow became Chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift through an introduction by a college friend of the Primate, whose recommendation led to appointment as Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, who was pleased by his sermons. From being rector of St. Dunstan's in the East by the Tower he was promoted to a post in St. Paul's cathedral and later to Westminster and Canterbury. In 1605 when Barlow became Bishop of Rochester, Harington spoke of him as "one of the youngest in age, but one of the ripest in

learning, of all that had occupied the see." (1) In 1608 he became Bishop of Lincoln. During preparation of the "King James Version" of the Bible, Barlow was a member of the company of scholars at Westminster, who translated the epistles from Romans to Jude.

Though delayed by the illness and death of the Primate, Barlow's "Sum of the Conference" appeared in 1604. In 1707 it was republished in "The Phenix," "A collection of Manuscripts and Printed Tracts, no where to be found but in the Closets of the Curious," and in 1841 was made available to modern readers by publication in Edward Cardwell's, "A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings connected with the Revision of The Book of Common Prayer; from the Year 1558 to the year 1690."

In Barlow's introduction he indicated that his summary was prepared at the request of Archbishop Whitgift, and that, since unauthorized accounts had been sent here and there, "some partial, some untrue, some slanderous" he had written with the purpose of providing an accurate record. (2) His digest of the first day's discussion was based exclusively upon his own notes, but, before the account was published, others who were present read what Barlow had written and aided in giving it brevity. For the last two days his transcript was supplemented by notes taken by the Bishop of London, the Deans of Christ Church, Winchester and Windsor, and the Archdeacon of Nottingham.

Barlow's document has a quaint flavor, blending qualities of the century and of the author himself. If the account was a trifle tedious, it was due as much to the nature of the proceedings as to the style of the reporter. It gave evidence that Barlow was no novice in assembling data. Here and there the manuscript was dotted with classical allusions. Throughout it showed Barlow's ability to

say what he intended, sometimes with excess of words, often with terseness, as when he wrote of the first day's meeting, "We were dismissed after three hours and more spent, which were soon gone," (3) and when he remarked, "Even private speeches cannot now passe without the smear of a black cole." (4)

The Dean of Chester was a man with ardent affection for the established church, a manifest advocate of a cause. Saturated by the seventeenth century spirit of flattery, he over-evaluated the king's conduct and the strength of arguments in behalf of existing policies. "Next unto God," he declared, "the king's majesty alone must have the glory." (5)

In Barlow's estimation Puritans did not rank high. He referred to Scottish Puritans as "not the learnedst men in the world" (6) and to English Puritan criticisms of the establishment as "huge pretended scandals." (7) Here and there in his account he could not refrain from throwing a barbed arrow at the people whom he considered captious.

Despite the limitations of his time and his party, the Dean of Chester made succeeding generations his debtor. Without his record historians would be baffled about the Hampton Court Conference. Puritans at first maintained that he did them an injustice but later writers of their group believed he had done their cause a service by showing the sycophancy of the ecclesiastical leaders and the weakness of the Episcopalian case.

Barlow asserted, "The vigor of every objection, with the summe of each answer, I guesse I misse not." (8) If he had distorted the actual discussion he undoubtedly would have been answered by a Puritan reply, beyond the complaint that he was partial. In the absence of a complete Puritan narrative, the dean's summary of speeches may be considered substantially correct. Barlow apparently

had a degree of regard for the scholarship of the Puritan leader, Dr. John Reynolds, though he considered him over-technical and deficient in ecclesiastical statesmanship. He had little regard for the ability of the other Puritans at Hampton Court.

Barlow appended to his published summary three copies of Puritan accounts, not written by participants, declaring that he had chosen the best from among many that had come to his hand. "I give no Censure," he wrote, "neither know I the Dispersers." (9) The first maintained that more than ten times during the Conference King James referred to arguments of the bishops as popish. (10) The second quoted the king as saying that the best state could gather corruption and that it was no argument to say they would not be cured of the pox because they had had it thirty years. The third was a purported summary of statements made by Dr. Reynolds after his return to Oxford.

In Barlow's judgement Archbishop Whitgift was not only a notable leader but also a man to be held in warm affection. The Dean described the Primate as one in whom resided, "the famousst glory of our English church, and the most kind incouragement to paines and study." (11) On the other hand, Barlow had less than warmth of feeling toward the man who became Whitgift's successor. An initial reading of the "Sum and Substance" shows the author's effort to be fair to Bancroft, while a repeated reading makes clear by a phrase here and there that Barlow was deeply aware of the Bishop of London's defects. Typical of that self-revelation of the Dean of Chester is his description of Bancroft's rudeness to Reynolds, ". . . the Bishop of London . . . all at once, cut him off." (12)

## II. BISHOP MATTHEW'S LETTER

In Christ Church, Oxford, is the portrait of a bearded, little man, with an obviously alert mind. This native son of Bristol, often called "Tobie," showed his appreciation of his home community by generous gifts of books. A prolific and effective preacher, he won a favorable hearing wherever he went.

Tobias Matthew first received royal attention in Oxford in 1566, the year of his ordination, when he took part in a disputation in St. Mary's church before Queen Elizabeth. Attracted by his intelligence, the queen showed life-long favor to him and his wife, who was the daughter of Dean Barlow. When Matthew was twenty six years old he became Elizabeth's chaplain, and in the same year was chosen President of St. John's college. Later he became Dean of Christ Church and Vice-Chancellor of the University. During his incumbency at Oxford he supported the reformation by arguments drawn from the teachings of Christ and primitive Christianity.

As Dean and then Bishop of Durham, Matthew was a popular leader, sometimes confirming as many as a thousand at a time. As political agent of the government in the north he punished those who refused to conform to the established religion. During five later years he had the custody of Lady Arabella Stuart, a claimant to the throne who brought considerable concern to the monarch. At Hampton Court Conference Bishop Matthew's sole oral contribution occurred during the discussion of confirmation. (13)

On the day after the close of the conference, Bishop Matthew, who later succeeded Dr. Matthew Hutton as Archbishop of York, wrote a letter to Hutton, in which he summarized King James' statement concerning the conference's purpose: "First, the reformation of some things amiss in ecclesiastical matters, supposed, and by some complained of. Next, how desirous he was, and we ought to be, that

the kingdom of Ireland might be reduced to the true knowledge of God, and true obedience." (14)

The bishop quoted from the king's initial hour-length oration the declaration "that religion was the soul of a kingdom, and unity the life of religion." He expressed admiration for "his majesties not only rhetorical and logical, but theological and juridical discourses," and referred to the Puritan representatives in a more mellow manner than Dean Barlow, as "certain of the best learned of the preciser sort." (15)

Matthew explained the king's assignment to council and bishops of the task of deciding how to carry out the conference's decisions, his delivering their conclusions to Lord Cecil to be recorded in the council book, and his urging the chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge Universities and the bishops not to permit any person in any college to defend any heresy. He was enthusiastic over the king's readiness to decide important matters in accordance with episcopal views. He, himself, had been honored with a request to preach for King James on the Sunday following the conference. (16)

The letter revealed the bishop's traits: urbanity, dignity, ability to concentrate on what seemed to him to be essential, tendency to take a hopeful view of the future and thoughtfulness of his friends. It also showed the gift for phrasing which made his preaching heard so readily: "contradiction and discontentment did arise long since, and increase of late, little less than to a schisme;" "wishing that you had been here at the conference, which in my opinion would have wrought in you as great comfort and joy as ever happened to you in this mortal life;" "hoping, also, that it will work, if not perfect contentment, yet much more quietness in all those that were before otherwise affected." (17)

### III. DEAN MONTAGUE'S LETTER

Another basic source is a letter dated January 18, 1603, written by James Montague to his mother and preserved in Winwood's "Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth and James I." First Master of Sidney Sussex College, later Dean of Litchfield, shortly afterward Dean of Worcester, then Dean of the Chapel to King James, Montague became Bishop of Bath, Wells and Winchester. Shortly before his death at the age of fifty, he edited the first collected edition of King James' works, (18) of whom he said in his editorial preface, "God hath given us a Solomon." (19)

During the Hampton Court Conference Montague's discussion of the right of the church to institute and retain ceremonies "satisfied his majesty exceeding well," according to Barlow, who explained that the Dean of the chapel "remembred the practise of the Jews, who unto the institution of the Passeover, prescribed unto them by Moses, had, as the Rabbins witnessse, added both signes and words, eating sowre herbs, and drinking wine, with these words to both, 'take and eat these in remembrance,' etc.; 'drink this in remembrance,' etc. Upon which addition and tradition of theirs, our Saviour instituted the sacrament of his last supper, in celebrating it with the same words and after the same manner; thereby approving that fact of theirs in particular, and generally, that a church may institute and retain a signe significant." (20)

In his letter concerning the conference the dean indicated that he knew his mother's longing "to hear what becometh of this great business, between the bishops and the ministers." He expressed his admiration of the king's "Learning, Piety, and Prudency, quoting James' statement 'that if he erred in any thing, he would suffer himself to be corrected by God's word, if they erred they

must yield to him, for he would ever submit both Scepter and crown to Christ's, to be guided by his word." (21) Montague's point of view was similar to that of Barlow, but he wrote with more delicacy of style, underlining what he considered most significant. He stressed the king's concern for Ireland, "making a most lamentable description of the state thereof," (22) and approved the ruler's hope that the action at this gathering should not be as smoke but "substantially done to remain forever." Apparently Montague was so satisfied with the conference that he failed completely to comprehend the Puritans' disappointment. "They were all," he said, "exceedingly well satisfied." (23)

#### IV. NOTES OF SIR JOHN HARRINGTON

During the days when King James was eager for certainty concerning the English succession, a shrewd Elizabethan courtier, whose delight was in shocking people by his frankness, sought to win his way into the heart of the Scottish king by letters and gifts. This man, Sir John Harrington, was a singular combination of insight and insolence. His wit brought merriment to the court, though his taste was questionable. Queen Elizabeth spoke of him as "that saucy poet, my God-son." His mother had been one of the gentlewomen imprisoned with Elizabeth in her youthful days and the queen rewarded the woman's loyalty by acting as Godmother to her son. He had studied law, but not thoroughly, expecting to win his way by his wit rather than by his vocation. When in Ireland with Essex, Harrington was knighted by that favorite of Elizabeth, who was angered by the act. Later Harrington presented to the queen a journal with recordings about Essex in Ireland and her wrath flared again. Such proceedings, coupled with Harrington's bold conversation as to personal intimacies, caused a relative to

say to him, "That damnable uncovered honesty of yours will mar your fortunes."

As Elizabeth's reign drew to a close, Harington wrote a tract arguing with Protestants, Puritans and Papists in favor of James' claims to the throne, but the manuscript did not make its way into print for nearly three centuries. He sent to the Scottish monarch a lantern as a New Year's gift. Its curious construction appealed to James' sense of humor, since it suggested the waning light of the queen and the anticipated glow of the king's glory. The audacity and cleverness of Harington were shown in his having a representation of the crucifixion upon the lantern, reminiscent of the scriptural words, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

James replied with a letter from Holyrood, "To our Trusty and Well-belovede Sir Johne Haringeton, Knight. Rhyte trustie and welbelovite Frinde, we greete yow heartily weill. We have raissavit yowr lanternne, with the poesie yow sende us be owr servande William Hunter, gevinge yow hairtie thankes; as lykewayse for yowr laste letter, quhawin we persaife the continuance of yowr loyall affectione to us and yowr servyce; we shall not be unmyndefule to extende owr princlie favoure heirafter to yow and yowr particulers at all guid occasions. We committe yow to God. James R." (24)

Although Harington was disappointed in not obtaining expected favors immediately upon James' accession, he was honored by being designated to a partial responsibility for the education of Prince Henry, with whom he was on friendly terms and through whom he received court favor. For the prince's private use he wrote a document containing stories, gossip, epigrams and character delineations of church leaders, later published (1653) under the title, "A Brief View of the Church of England."

The contact of Harington with court personalities made it possible for him to be in attendance during a part of the Hampton Court Conference. He recorded in his diary pungent comments upon happenings there. Since the jottings were intended for his own eye, rather than for publication, they expressed Harington's actual judgements. His frank mind observed the rudeness of the monarch and caught up comments that were similar to his own customary violations of good taste. Since no royal patron was to know what he wrote, Harington was free to be critical. To him there was no divine inspiration in the monarch's words, but rather a decidedly human man speaking in a manner that was not always kingly.

In the nineteenth century Harington's notes became accessible through publication by a ministerial descendant who had entree to the knight's miscellaneous papers. With direct simplicity Sir John's scribblings about Hampton Court Conference read: "I must wryte my news to my poore wife. The bishops came to the Kynge aboute the petition of the puritans; I was by and heard much dyscourse. The kynge talked mucche Latin, and disputed with Dr. Reynoldes at Hampton; but he rather used upbraidinges than arguemente; and tolde the petitioners that they wanted to strip Christe again, and bid them awaie with their snivellinge; moreover, he wishede those who would take away ther surplice, might want linen for their own breech. The bishops seemed much pleased, and said his majestie spoke by the power of inspiration. I wist not what they mean, but the spirit was rather foul-mouthede. I cannot be present at the next meetinge, though the bishope of London saide I mighte be in the anti-chamber: it seemethe the Kynge will not change the religious observances. - There was much discourse aboute the rynge in marriage, and the crosse in baptisme; but if I guess aryghte, the petitioners againste one crosse wyll finde another." (25)

V. PATRICK GALLOWAY'S DOCUMENT

A minister from Perth in Scotland, Patrick Galloway, was privileged to be a listener during the second day at Hampton Court. He had edited James' youthful writings and had served as minister in the royal household in Edinburgh as well as Moderator of the General Assembly of Scotland.

A man who knew how to combine toleration and boldness, Galloway had been both in and out of royal favor. Having opposed ecclesiastical corruption and having attracted the enmity of Scottish court favorites, he spent a period of time in hiding in his native land and in exile in England. Although he was then one of the most hated men at the Scottish court, he won a reversal of that attitude after his return.

In those early days Galloway spoke with forthright vigor, writing from England, "Our adversars are presentlie als cruell and raiging as ever they were, which proceedeth from their beastlie securitie in sinne." (26)

The preacher's enemies, so he said, persuaded the king to "conceave evill opinioun" of him and to vow that he would never hear the man preach again. The monarch's mood passed and he listened to Galloway, who wrote, "In my sermon, I desired his Highness to consider the dangerous estate wherein he was of before, and that he ought to praise God that he was delivered and freed of such pernicious persons as had been about his majestie this while bypast, who sought nothing but the overthrow and subversion of his estat and religioun, with the trouble of the commounweale." (27) Galloway's inherent worth finally attracted the king's genuine admiration, even though he rebuked James for his choice of Arran as counsellor and refused to subscribe to a document by which the monarch sought to compel agreement from



all ministers not to preach against the royal authority.

The mature moderation of Galloway made him a phenomenon in an era when most men were intensely partisan. The extreme Presbyterian group in Scotland became dissatisfied with him, using the appellation, "flatterer." James Melville summarized their attitude, "Mr. Patrick Galloway glanceit verie neir the matter, in his first sermon maid thairefter at Edinbruche, but ever thairwith, according to his fashioun, flattering the king." (28)

In the basic source of information concerning Galloway's life, Calderwood's "History of the Church of Scotland," he was depicted as appearing first upon the stage of national action in 1582, among the ministers selected by the assembly to present to king and nobility written grievances and to request "in the name and feare of the Eternall God, remedie." (29) When the articles had been presented Galloway and his associates "gott no good countenance." (30)

As the result of Galloway's opposition to the tulchan bishops an order was procured by the Duke of Lennox discharging the minister from his pulpit at Perth as long as the king was in the community. The courageous preacher declared that he would not go until his flock removed him. When he and other like-minded ministers were summoned to St. Andrews to answer charges propounded by the king and his commissioners, the group formulated an answer in which they said, "Tuiching the estat of things present and to come, in uprightnes of conscience we protest that we mind nothing but quietness and peace, under the obedience of our good God, and the king's majestie, whereof we have beene and sall be procurers, according to the Word of God, our owne callings, and duetie toward his Grace and commoun wealth." (31)

From the time of James' marriage onward, Galloway had a place of increasing prominence in Scottish life. When James returned from Denmark with his bride, Galloway was the minister who preached in the royal presence. On the following Lord's Day, after another sermon by Galloway, the minister called upon the king for a brief speech in which the ruler promised to prove a loving, faithful and thankful monarch and to see the kirks better provided. He indicated a realization that all was not well in the church and that as a result of his widened experience and his marriage, "he would be more stayed." (32)

In the year of the king's marriage Galloway became Moderator of the General Assembly and, after the royal family was saved from an attack on the palace by Bothwell and his cohorts, was the minister who preached the sermon of thanksgiving. Two years later, however, Galloway was in the company of those against whom the king was angry. When a group presented certain articles to the king he showed hot indignation and in his conversation spoke indignantly of the language that had been used by John Knox concerning Queen Mary. Galloway retorted, "If a king or queene be a murtherer, why should they not be called so?" (33) Soon afterward Galloway told the king that his counselors were "verie ofscourings of the wicked," and that the king could not "continue in sinceritie with such companie as he had, if he were an angell of heaven." (34)

With the passing years Galloway's attitude tended more and more toward moderation. Calderwood wrote that in 1598 he preached "a flattering sermoun, of no learning, farre lesse sinceritie, exhorting to a confused peace, without due distinctioun between peace in God and peace in the devill." (35) Two years later, although in the meanwhile Galloway had been removed temporarily from the court as a result of the queen's displeasure, he once more was

in such royal favor that his opponents called him "the king's man," saying that in the general assembly, of which he was moderator, "If anie zealous pastor would speeke his minde, Mr. Patrik would command him silence, or the king would boast and threaten him." (36)

When James made his royal progress from Edinburgh to London, Patrick Galloway was among those who accompanied him. The English Puritans found in the Scottish preacher a person through whom they could gain access to the king. In one of the letters which they sent to the north of England, requesting petitions on behalf of their cause, they paid this tribute to the assistance given by the Scotsman, "We are much bound to Mr. Patrick Galloway for his constancie in the behalfe of the caus." (37) Documents presenting the Puritan case were sent to Galloway to be passed on to the lords of the council.

Galloway was an alert listener during the discussions at Hampton Court Conference. He had planned to send immediately to Edinburgh a detailed account of what occurred there, but was unable to dispatch his letter until February tenth, because he was delayed in securing the king's perusal and revision of his summary.

Galloway's letter was the result of an earlier letter from Edinburgh presbytery, which he had delivered to his majesty three days before the conference, when the king and the minister discussed the document's contents. One of the expressions of the Scottish ministers drew forth strong comment from the king. The words were, "The gross corruptions of this church." Galloway explained to James that the statement meant that whatever in the Church of England was "dissonant" from the scriptures, "or contrary thereto" should be changed. (38)

Galloway's narrative reflected his own personality. It had

concise directness, forceful dignity, and objective fairness. Although the sympathy of the Scotsman obviously was with the Puritans, he avoided extremes of phrasing such as appeared in the account of Dean Barlow. The data of the two records were in substantial agreement but the emphasis was distinctly different. The Scottish minister declared that when the king placed before the gathering the problems to be considered, "the bishops . . . were gravely desired to advise upon all the corruptions of this church, in doctrine, ceremonies, and discipline." He indicated that, when the king brought instances of needed reformation, the bishops "upon their knees with great earnestness craved that nothing should be altered, lest popish recusants, punished by penal statutes for their disobedience, and the puritans, punished by deprivation from calling and living for nonconformity, should say they had just cause to insult upon them, as men who had traveled to bind them to that, which by their own mouths now was confessed to be erroneous." (39)

Galloway's comment concerning the Puritan representatives was that "the brethren were called to his majesty" and after their request for changes was presented "it was very loosely and coldly answered." On the final day he said that "the parties being called together, the heads were repeated which his Majesty would have reformed at this time: and so the whole action ended. Sundry, as they favoured, gave out copies of things here concluded: whereupon myself took occasion, as I was an ear and eye witness, to set them down and presented them to his Majesty, who with his own hand mended some things, and eeked other things which I had omitted. Which corrected copy with his own hand I have, and of it have sent you herein the just transumpt word by word, - and this is the whole. At my own returning, which, God willing, shall be shortly, ye shall know more particularly the rest. So till then taking my leave, I

commit you to the protection of the Most High, and your labours to the powerful blessing of Christ." (40)

With the clear logic of a Scottish preacher Galloway outlined the results of the conference under five captions, (1) Of Doctrine, (2) Of the Service Book, (3) Of Discipline, (4) Of the Ministry, and (5) For Schools.

After his summary and accompanying letter had been read to the presbytery of Edinburgh, a silence fell over the gathering. James Melville broke it by saying that they would be grieved because of the disappointment of their godly and learned brethren in England that the expected reformation in the church had not resulted. He summoned them all to prayer and added, "seeing the presbyterie of Edinburgh had ever beene as the Sion and watchtowre of our kirk, and the ministers thereof the chief watchemen, that they would watche and take heid that no perell or contagioun come from our neighbour kirk." (41)

In the later years of his life, Galloway was minister in Edinburgh where, during religious dissensions, he tried to bring about harmony. "As for ourselves," he said, "we desire nothing but a peacable ministrie." (42) He was as ardent an advocate as any English Puritan of the obligation to follow scriptural precedents in the practice of the church, and argued that the description in the fourth chapter of Revelation of the twenty four elders falling down before the throne proved the lawfulness of kneeling at communion. (43)

#### VI. KING JAMES' LETTER TO A SCOTSMAN

After the conference the king wrote a brief letter to a person in Scotland whose name is not known. It showed James' warm regard for the individual to whom it is addressed, his crude humor, his failure to appreciate the profound earnestness of the Puritans,

his satisfaction in having had the opportunity to display himself as a theological disputant, and his serene confidence that vexatious problems actually were settled by the conference. He declared that at the conference he had "peppered" the Puritans "as soundlie as yee have done the Papists thaire," adding that he had asserted to the Puritans that if their pupils in school answered as inexpertly as they did in this discussion, the teachers would have applied the rod to the boys. James epitomized his attitude toward the Puritans, "I have such a book of thaires as may well convert infidels, but it shall never convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against thayme." (44)

VII. THE ROYAL MESSAGE AND PROCLAMATION

After the conference the king issued letters patents to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Chichester and the other Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical, indicating changes to be made in the Book of Common Prayer. The monarch requested the archbishop to have the communion book printed as the sole authorized book for the celebration of divine service and administration of the sacrament in every parish. He also issued, "A proclamation for the authorizing and uniformity of the Book of Common Prayer to be used throughout the realm." (45)

VIII. CALENDAR OF STATE PAPERS

Another source of information is the "Calendar of State Papers: Domestic Series of the Reign of James I." The first volume, covering March to May, 1603, revealed unrest among various parties, the multiplicity of petitions and memorials that were sent to the new monarch, and the hope that each group had of gaining its own ends.

Volume two, for the months of June and July, showed the king's purpose to deal rigorously with those whom he considered uncompliant. On July 8 the king sent to the Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge

a message declaring that, since the want of "competent living" was a great impediment to a learned ministry, he intended to restore impropriate tithes which had devolved upon the crown, and urged the universities to set the example to others to do likewise. On the following day came a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury remonstrating with the king for this action.

Volume three, August to September, included data concerning communicants and recusants, names of bishops and clergy summoned to the court in November, proclamations making necessary changes in plans because of the prevalence of the plague, correspondence concerning a new edition of the Book of Common Prayer, a letter from the king to the archbishops and bishops declaring his "constancy to maintain the church as he found it" and urging that they uphold the laws for the preservation of religion, "only sparing the shedding of blood, which. . . should not be exacted by diversity of opinion." The king declared Puritans to be no less dangerous than Papists and insisted that equal care be taken for their suppression. On September 24 a letter from Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Bancroft was sent to Lord Cecil, giving "particulars of factious, and ill disposed clergymen, preferring petitions to the king against the government of the church." The ecclesiastics expressed their gratitude to Lord Cecil, "for protecting the church, as reformed by the late Queen."

Volume four, October and November, contained the proclamation postponing the Hampton Court Conference and a royal letter to leaders of the church, expressing the king's desire to increase revenues for maintenance of efficient ministers and his wish that the introduction of novel ceremonies be discouraged. Volume five, for December, included Sir Francis Bacon's tract concerning "Pacification and Edification of the Church."

Volume six, January to March, 1604, listing the bishops and ministers appointed to the Hampton Court Conference, contained notes of points to be reformed as a result of the conference; a memorial of matters to be considered by the council and bishops; names of commissioners to carry out ecclesiastical matters and also to care for the borders of Wales and Ireland; royal approbation of certain conclusions reached by the Hampton Court Conference; a proclamation authorizing the Book of Common Prayer; a letter from Lord Cecil to Richard Bancroft, new Archbishop of Canterbury, communicating the king's desire that certain ministers imprisoned for refusing subscription to some Christian ordinances be reasoned with and that they be assigned time of probation; notes concerning the summoning of Convocation and approval of its proceedings by the king; and a license to several ecclesiastical leaders to confer during parliament and conclude matters of church discipline. These state papers gave documentary evidence of the king's concern to have genuinely learned men engage in translating the Bible, with financial aid provided for their work.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE PERSONNEL OF THE CONFERENCE

King James kept strictly to himself the selection of leaders in church and state to be participants and auditors at Hampton Court. He desired to be and was the central figure, with seating arrangements planned to make him dominant. "He sat down in his Chair," Barlow observed, "remov'd forward from the Cloth of State a pretty distance." (1)

The summoned Puritans proved gentlemanly and courageous, but James confronted them with vigorous and occasionally boisterous tactlessness. When the conference was over, the king exulted to a Scottish friend, "We have kept such a revell with the Puritans here ths two days, as was never heard the like." (2)

Glowing pride came to the king from the flattering speech of men in high position. At Hampton Court he heard lords and bishops refer to him as "a king wise, learned and judicious," and "such a king as since Christ his time the like had not been." (3)

### PRINCE HENRY

On the opening day James mentioned his ten year old heir, as fathers are apt to do, and on the second day Henry had a place near his father, in Barlow's words, "the noble young Prince sitting by upon a Stool." (4) The boy must have been an appealing figure in that colorful assembly, for the crayon drawing of Prince Henry by Isaac Oliver (5) shows him to have been a handsome lad with flowing hair, intellectual forehead, dreamy eyes and gracefully moulded mouth.

Born at Stirling in Scotland and christened there in a picturesque ceremony conducted by the Bishop of Aberdeen, Prince Henry was proclaimed by the identical titles- Baron, Lord, Earl, Duke, Great Steward, - that his father received in infancy. Among

the royal accounts for 1598 is a document containing a recording made by a pen held in baby Henry's hand by the king, who wrote underneath, "I will testify this is the Prince's own mark. James R." (6) Throughout the prince's life his personality made its mark upon people.

By the time the boy was five years old the father had completed, in his own handwriting, a book of instructions for Henry, "Basilikon Doron." It was bound in purple velvet, with golden thistles at the corners and the king's monogram and coat of arms in beaten gold in the center. (7)

When Queen Anne brought the prince to England with her, the Earl of Mar, James' boyhood playmate, was released as Henry's custodian. The lad and his little sister, Elizabeth, were placed in the palace at Oatlands with a retinue of seventy servants. (8)

Two days before the first Christmas that the royal family spent in England, the king, queen and prince rode to Hampton Court. Henry began the new year there by penning for his father a greeting which he concluded with a brief poem. (9)

Even though the heir to the throne did not display the clinging fondness for King James that Prince Charles did, the monarch felt regal pride in Prince Henry. His place in the king's heart was evident from the question that the ruler hurled at Guy Faulks when the privy council was gouging the conspirator with questions about the gun powder plot, which, if it had succeeded would have annihilated king, queen, prince and parliament. James cried out to Faulks, "How could ye conspire so hideous a treason against a child?" (10)

As the years passed the prince developed an independent mind. He felt kindly toward Arabella Stewart until her marriage to William Seymour, another claimant to the throne, when Henry

altered his attitude. Despite his mother's disapproval of Frederick, Elector Palatine of the Rhine, as a husband for the Princess Elizabeth, the prince heartily approved. In opposition to the king's attitude toward Puritans, Henry became interested in holding them within the Church of England. Without specific evidence, later generations cannot but speculate whether or not what the boy heard at Hampton Court drew his sympathy toward those who sought changes in the church.

Puritan hopes were to focus upon Prince Henry, only to be obliterated by his death in 1612 at the age of eighteen. Non-conformists coined a couplet:

"Henry the eighth pulled down monks and their cells.  
Henry the ninth should pull down Bishops and their Bells." (11)

The Puritan appraisal of the prince was compressed into a paragraph by Neal, "This prince was one of the most accomplished persons of his age, sober, chaste, temperate, religious, full of honour and probity, and never heard to swear an oath: neither the example of the king his father, nor of the whole court, was capable of corrupting him in these respects. He had a great soul, full of noble and elevated sentiments, and was as much displeased with trifles as his father was fond of them. He had frequently said, that if ever he mounted the throne, his first care should be to try to reconcile the Puritans to the Church of England. As this could not be done without each party's making some concessions, and as such a proceeding was directly contrary to the temper of the court and clergy, he was suspected to countenance Puritanism. To say all in one word, Prince Henry was mild and affable, though of a warlike genius, the darling of the Puritans, and of all good men; and though he lived about eighteen years, no historian has taxed him with any vice." (12)

By the time that Henry was made Prince of Wales, six years after the Hampton Court Conference, he was "adored" by all England, "had that mixture of Stuart love of beauty and Danish restraint which balanced his character perfectly, made him kind to subordinates, loving to friends, judiciously obedient and deferential to his father - but never condoning or affectionate." (13)

In an accurate assessment Henderson wrote, "Prince Henry . . . was frank, handsome and vigorous, and therefore popular with the crowd . . . his abilities and the gravely considerate view he took of his responsibilities had won him the respect of those whose opinion is the best worth considering. The nature of his illness puzzled the physicians . . . rumors were current of his poisoning, and it was even suggested, at a later period, that the King had conspired with Somerset to get rid of him. But all speculation of this kind has been disposed of by Dr. Norman Moore, who, in a pamphlet on the causes of his death, clearly shows from the recorded symptoms of his death that the case was one of typhoid fever . . . Both intellectually and physically he was evidently of a more vigorous build than his brother Charles." (14)

Prince Henry attended Hampton Court Conference with anticipation on the part of all that he would be the next king. His father was providing an object lesson in the conduct of affairs of church and state, to which the eager prince responded. The ten year old boy must have listened in wide-eyed wonder to the disputations.

#### ARCHBISHOP JOHN WHITGIFT

The aged Primate, John Whitgift, had long been a storm center in the church. A native of Lincolnshire, graduate of Cambridge, Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely, Professor of Divinity,

Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, Master of Trinity College, Dean of Lincoln, and Bishop of Worcester, he was elevated to Canterbury because the queen believed he would maintain the church establishment as it existed.

From youth Whitgift opposed Papists and Puritans, his thesis for the doctorate being, "The Pope is That Antichrist." (15) As Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge he sought to frustrate Cartwright, using then and later "the sword of discipline" toward those who did not conform, declaring ". . . if I should lose my life for it, I would, and will discharge my conscience and duty." (16)

Whitgift's conception of those who opposed the status quo was expressed in his reference to "hollow hearts within this realm, that daily gaped for the alteration of religion . . . busily devising . . . to overthrow the state both of religion and the realm . . . seeing they had a settled order, both in doctrine and government." (17) The Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber were used by the archbishop as inquisitorial instruments against those who did not conform. Although he was in doctrinal sympathy with Calvinism, his conception of church government was uncompromisingly Episcopalian. Frere has said, "Disciplinary . . . Episcopacy was with him, as with Parker, a matter of principle, not, as with Grindal . . . a matter of policy." (18)

With the accession of James, the archbishop became so concerned about Puritan influence being brought to bear upon the new king as well as Puritan efforts to "get fit men for their turn to serve as members in a Parliament," that he is said to have "prayed to God he might not live to see the next Parliament." (19)

When it became certain that the king would convene the conference, Archbishop Whitgift wrote to Archbishop Hutton, who could not come, requesting the latter's judgement upon certain

questions likely to be considered, so that Hutton's replies might be available at Hampton Court. (20) To the first query, whether appropriations should be given over to ministers or might remain in the hands where they were, the Archbishop of York answered that possessors "may keep them with a safe conscience," though one could wish "better provisions were made for godly preachers. But how it may be done, I leave that to his Majesty, (who is both learned, wise, and careful for religion,) and to the grave men of State and of the Church." (21)

To Whitgift's second question, as to whether English church government should be by bishops or by presbyteries, Hutton responded, "Presbytery is more popular, Bishops more aristocratical. Presbytery hath a resemblance with a Sanhedrim of the Jews; which being a part of the judicial law, is so abrogate. . . Bishops have their authority, not by any custom or decree of man, but from the Apostles themselves. . . they that so much do magnify the government by presbyteries, like better of a popular state than of a monarchy. . . Therefore the King's Majesty, as he is a passing wise King, and the best learned Prince in Europe, had need to take heed, how he receiveth into his kingdom such a popular government ecclesiastical. . ." (22)

To the question as to whether the Book of Common Prayer should be altered, particularly the apparent permission to laymen and women to baptize in time of necessity, Hutton replied that, though the book seemed to allow, it did not commend baptism by laymen and women, and that the convocation which approved the book had not intended it to be so. He indicated that "the blessed virgin her self was not permitted to baptize" but that many ancient fathers held it lawful for laymen. He explained that this erroneous custom arose from the conception that "children dying without

baptism could not be saved: which hath no sufficient warrant in the word. . . children of Christian parents are within the covenant before baptism." (23)

To the inquiry concerning the Puritan objection to use of the sign of the cross on the child's forehead, he replied that the sign had been abused in Popery and was unnecessary in baptism, but may be well used, and has been so used in the Church of England.

The Archbishop of York concluded his document to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

"The Lord, for his Christ's sake, bless his Majesty with his manifold graces; that he may maintain the Gospel in this Church, as his dear sister, most worthy Queen Elizabeth, did leave it; and that as he, in his golden book to the Prince his son, doth shew his dislike both of superstitious Papists and giddy-headed Puritans, so God may give him courage and constancy to withstand them both; that neither the Papists may obtain their hoped toleration, nor the Puritans their fantastical platform of their reformation." (24)

During the Hampton Court Conference the enfeebled Whitgift spoke only a few times, and the Bishops of London and Worcester found it necessary to come to his aid. Even Barlow's favorable account of his remarks revealed the inadequacy of the aged Primate.

On the final day King James spoke with such vigor on behalf of the oath *ex-officio* and its necessity that Archbishop Whitgift quavered, "Undoubtedly his Majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit." (25)

#### BISHOP BANCROFT OF LONDON

Born at Farnsworth in Lancashire in 1544, Richard Bancroft was educated at Cambridge where, as a student, he was suspected of

Puritan sympathy. Like many a man who swings away from youthful convictions, Bancroft became increasingly critical, then passionately hostile toward Puritans. After his discovery in 1583 of a libel comparing Queen Elizabeth to Queen Jezebel, suspended over a church altar, and the resultant sentence of death to two Brownists, Bancroft gained recognition as a detector of heretics. Upon receiving his doctorate from Cambridge in 1585, he issued a treatise entitled, "Discourse Upon the Bill and Book exhibited in Parliament by the Puritans for the further Reformation of the Church Principles, and soon was a member of the Ecclesiastical Commission.

As Canon of Westminster Bancroft preached at St. Paul's Cross against the Puritans, formulating the concept of the episcopacy as divinely given. Stoughton declared, "The doctrine of the divine origin of Episcopacy, which was propounded by Bancroft, when Whitgift's chaplain, probably at Whitgift's suggestion, certainly with his concurrence, though it startled some English Protestants as a novelty, and roused the anger of a Puritan privy councillor jealous of the Queen's supremacy, became a current belief of the Stuart Anglicans." (26)

The gist of Bancroft's argument for inequality among the clergy and superiority of the bishops was summarized in this paragraph from his own pen: "Forasmuch as God himself appointed an inequality amongst the priests in the Old Testament . . . forasmuch as by Christ's institution and in his own time the apostles were superior unto the seventy disciples: forasmuch as the apostles, when the gospel began to spread itself, appointed sundry Timothies and Titus to govern the churches in divers countries and territories: forasmuch as all the ecclesiastical histories do record the superiority of bishops, and do set down the catalogues of many of them, and which of the apostles and apostolical bishops

and in what cities and countries they succeeded: forasmuch as all the ancient general councils, and all the ancient and godly learned fathers, have allowed of bishops and of their superiority over the rest of the clergy: forasmuch as bishops have been accounted generally throughout the world to be the apostles successors, and have continued since the apostles' times: . . . forasmuch as all the chief of the learned men that were the principal instruments under God in this latter age for the restitution of the gospel allowed bishops and their authority. . . I see no reason why this anabaptistical dream of equality among pastors should not be sent back to the place from which it issued." (27)

In 1593 Bancroft's two most notable works were published, the first a criticism of the doctrinal textbook of the Puritans under the title, "A Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline" and the second, "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings, published and practiced within the Island of Brytaine under Pretence of Reformation."

In 1597 Bancroft became Bishop of London and virtual Primate because of Whitgift's feebleness. He was present at the time of Queen Elizabeth's death and joined with other officials in the proclamation of James as king. With his retinue he went to Royston to meet the new monarch and during the following July was honored by a visit from the king at his episcopal palace.

At Hampton Court Bancroft spoke more frequently than any other individual except King James. Barlow recorded fourteen speeches by the Bishop of London, dealing with confirmation, absolution, baptism, falling from grace, the apocrypha, unorthodox books, and the clergy. He argued vigorously for a "praying" rather than a "preaching" ministry and objected to the proposal for a new version of the Scriptures. It is to his credit,

however, that when the project of translation actually was under way he gave cooperation. When the question of ordination was raised at Hampton Court Bancroft asserted that "unlesse he could prove his ordination lawful out of the Scriptures, he would not be a bishop 4 hours." (28)

Bancroft's antagonism to the Puritans was shown during the conference by his interruption of Reynolds, (29) and his declaration that Puritans "stumble and strain at these petty quilllets, thereby to disturb and disgrace the whole church." (30) Concerning the bishop's conduct throughout the gathering, Gardiner said, "It is scarcely possible to find elsewhere stronger proofs of Bancroft's deficiencies in temper and character." (31)

A few years later when Andrew Melville of Scotland stood before Richard Bancroft of England, the intellectual sparks flew. In no uncertain terms the minister from the north told the ecclesiastic of the south just what Presbyterians thought of him. The Scotsman "burdeinit him with all thais corruptiounes and vanities, and superstitionnes, with profanatiouning of the Sabbath day, silenceing, imprisouning, and beiring doun of the true and faithfull preicheres of the Word of God, of setting and holding upe of anti-christiane heirarchie and popishe ceremonies; and taking him by the quhyt sleives of his rochet, and schalking them, in his manner, frielie and roundlie, callit them 'Romishe ragis, and a pairt of the Beastes mark.'" (32)

Bancroft had strength as well as weakness. He was learned, vigorous, ingenious and effective in encouraging ministers to be thorough in their study. While admitting Bancroft's limitations Fuller called attention to a strain of kindness in the bishop: "His adversaries character him a greater statesman than divine, a

better divine than preacher, though his printed sermon attesteth his abilities therein. . . I find two faults charged on his memory, - cruelty and covetousness; un-episcopal qualities, seeing a bishop ought to be godly and hospitable. To the first, it is confessed he was most stiff and stern to press conformity; and what more usual than for offenders to nickname necessary severity to be 'cruelty'? Now, though he was a most stout champion to assert church-discipline, let me pass this story to posterity from the mouth of the person therein concerned: - an honest and able minister privately protested unto him, that it went against his conscience to conform, being then ready to be deprived. 'Which way,' saith the archbishop, 'will you live, if put out of yon benefice?' The other answered, he had no way but to go abegging, and to put himself on Divine Providence. 'Not that,' saith the archbishop, 'you shall not need to, but come to me and I will take order for your maintenance.'" (33)

#### BISHOP BILSON OF WINCHESTER

Of Bavarian and English descent, a native of Winchester, where he later became bishop, Thomas Bilson received from Oxford University the degrees B.A., M.A., B.D. and D.D. As Fuller said, this man "carried prelate in his very aspect." (34) He returned to his home community to become master in the school in which he had been a pupil, later warden of the college and prebendary of the cathedral. Sir John Harington wrote, ". . . having been infinitely studious and industrious in poetry, in philosophy, in physic, and lastly (which his genius chiefly called him to) in divinity, he became so complete for skill in languages, for readiness in the fathers, for judgement to make use of his readings, that he was found to be no longer a soldier,

but a commander-in-chief in our spiritual warfare." (35)

Actually Bilson's writings were commonplace but later generations have found them valuable in revealing the mind of the times.

At the request of Queen Elizabeth, Bilson wrote a book in defense of the Protestant position, but, though his arguments were an aid to the queen, they contributed to the overthrow of Charles the First. The volume was entitled, "True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion, where the Prince's lawful power to command and bear the sword are defended against the Pope's censure and Jesuits' sophisms in their Apology and Defence of English Catholics: Also a Demonstration that the Things reformed in the Church of England by the Laws of the Realm are truly Catholic against the Catholic Rhemish Testament." Another volume which he issued at the queen's command was, "A Survey of Christ's Sufferings and Descent into Hell," written as a refutation of the teachings of Henry Jacob, a Puritan intellectual.

A third of Bilson's books was, "The Effect of Certain Sermons, Touching the Full Redemption of Mankind by the death and blood of Christ Jesus." In his introduction the bishop declared that, although London had many learned and religious preachers, it had too many who were addicted to novelties and conceited opinions. Against one contemporary "fancie" Bilson wrote his retort, the purpose being "to slacke inconsiderate heate" concerning ideas which the author believed had no basis in the Bible. His thesis was, "that we are sufficientlie redeemed by the death and bloud of Christ Jesus, (without adding of hell paines to bee suffered in the soule of Christ) hath the constant, full and expresse warrant of the Scriptures, and the like approbation from all the fathers without exception." (36) He described the effect

of "novel" sermons in these words, ". . . if we suffer the mayne foundation of our faith and hope in Christ to be wrenched never so little awrie; the whole building is more endangered than we are aware of." (37)

The book by which Bishop Bilson became most widely known was called, "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church." In his introduction the doctor declared, "I have been very unwilling, good Christian reader, to enter into these controversies of discipline, that have now some space troubled the church of England. . . I could not forget the saying of our saviour: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you;' and so collected how careful we should be 'to keep the unity of the Spirit in the band of peace.' . . . yet when I saw the peace of God's church violated by the sharpness of some men's humours, and their tongues so intemperate that they could not be distinguished from open enemies, I thought as in a common danger, not to sit still till all were on fire, but rather by all means to try what kind of liquor would restin- guish this flame." (38)

The Presbyterian form of church government was the object of Bilson's attack. He declared that when its "devisers" began their discussions in England he was amused, but that a sense of duty to God and ruler led him to "rip up" the Puritan arguments and to reveal "the slenderness of the stuff, and the looseness of the work, that had deceived so many men's eyes." (39) He described the Puritans as "turbulent heads, ( I speak not of them all, ) which to ease their stomachs, or to please their main- tainers, jested and railed rather like stageplayers than divines, on those whom the wiser sort among them cannot deny were ordained by God, and appointed by the voice of Christ himself." (40)

From a study of the New Testament the author of "Perpetual Government" maintained that he had discovered specific essentials in the founding of the church, though not in its continuance: (1) the apostles' vocation was immediate from Christ, not from men or by men, (2) their commission extended over the whole earth, (3) their guidance from the Holy Spirit was infallible, and (4) their operation was wonderful, in converting and confirming believers as well as punishing disobeyers. Dr. Bilson asserted that certain powers of the apostles were delegated in perpetuity to their successors: (1) dispensing the word, (2) administering the sacraments, (3) imposing of hands, and (4) guiding the keys to shut or open the kingdom of heaven. He declared that, while all pastors and presbyters necessarily preached and administered sacraments, the other two powers were reserved for bishops, arguing that "as there can be no order, but confusion, in a commonwealth where every man ruleth, so there would be no peace, but a pestilent perturbation of all things in the church of Christ, if every presbyter might impose hands, and use the keys at his pleasure." (41)

The climax of the bishop's contention concerning church government was that "the priority of one man in every province, as we see confirmed by the practice and experience of the universal church of Christ since the apostle's times, is sooner resisted and better endured, than the waywardness and headiness of so many governors as you must and would have in your changeable regiment of presbyters." (42)

Prior to becoming Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Bilson spent a brief period in the episcopate at Worcester. At Hampton Court he argued in favor of private baptism in cases of necessity, (43) and confirmation exclusively by bishops. (44) When the Puritans

urged that learned ministers be in every parish the bishop explained to the king that the ecclesiastics were not at fault in the quality of clergymen but rather that lay patrons presented "very mean men to their cures," declaring that, during his incumbency at Winchester, few masters of arts had been presented to good benefices. He deplored another hampering fact, that the law permitted legal action against a bishop who did not admit those who were presented. (45)

A declaration of Bishop Bilson that the cross was used in baptism in the time of Constantine led King James to give explosive approval of its use in seventeenth-century England. (46) His prestige with the monarch and the Primate was evident by his being chosen, from among all the bishops, with Bancroft of London, to be present when the Puritans presented their case to the king.

#### BISHOP BABINGTON OF WORCESTER

Gervase Babington was trained at both Cambridge and Oxford. Fuller wrote, "He was made bishop of Llandaff, which in merriment he used to call 'Affe,' the land thereof long since being alienated. Thence was he translated to Exeter, then to Worcester, then to heaven. He was an excellent pulpit-man; happy in raising the affections of his auditors; which, having got up, he would keep up till the close of his sermon; an industrious writer." (47)

Babington issued numerous quartos, including expositions of Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus, comments on the Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and a Dialogue, "Betwixt Man's Frailtie and Faith," all in a quaintly appealing style, revealing patiently laborious study and extensive reading. A folio edition of his works was edited by Miles Smith, issued in 1615, and re-published in 1622 and 1637.

In the mid-eighteenth century Sir Richard Hill published a volume, "On Brotherly Love," in which he included a sermon preached by Dr. Babington at St. Paul's Cross in 1590. In an introduction Sir Richard wrote, "The high repute in which he was held by the University of Cambridge, as well for his steady attachment to the Church of England as for his great learning, exemplary piety, and indefatigable zeal, in preaching the gospel of his blessed Master, speak more loudly in his favour, than anything which can now be said either concerning him or his Works." (48) The title of one of Babington's quartos, "Comfortable Notes," indicated the spirit of the man, as did another, "Fruitful Exposition." He was desirous of speaking with such simplicity that every hearer could understand and with such profundity that he would interpret the basic realities of the Christian religion. The quality of his speech is in the words, "Shall I hoist sail, and look big upon others, when only by grace I am what I am? It may not be." (49)

The Bishop of Worcester was vigorous in denouncing departure from what he considered true standards of conduct and faith. In speaking of the vices of the age he referred to "that fearful, strange, monstrous pride of apparel, and peculiarly that vain, wanton, immoderate manner of dressing ... prevalent among the female sex." (50) He detested discord among Christians and commended unity, which to him meant conformity to what was established.

The bishop had his own theory as to why the doctrine of purgatory and the preaching of "satisfactory works" had been devised by Roman Catholicism. He believed that it had arisen to comfort "a fearful uncertainty what shall become of us." (51)

Babington's attitude toward religious groups other than his own was shown in a paragraph written to strengthen the con-

viction of members of the Church of England: "Jesus Christ our Saviour is constant . . . casting not away for malice of man or devil, whom once he receiveth unto him. Think therefore of this, and let this reform our wavering wills, our tottering love, and unstable affections, together with that of Solomon, if you will . . . 'he loveth ever that is a true friend.' And let this suffice. I might note a true comfort in this constancy of our Saviour against the blustering threats and thundering excommunications of Pope and Papists, Sectaries, and Anabaptists, who shall never be able to hurt such as have their true comfort of their coming to Christ, but a lively faith in the consciences."(52)

The Bishop of Worcester's one recorded comment at Hampton Court showed a desire to be scrupulously honest. When the discussion on private baptism occurred, he declared that the phrasing in the Book of Common Prayer, which seemed to permit private persons to baptize, was ambiguous because the compilers believed such terminology to be necessary in order to secure passage of the book through parliament. After the conference, Babington, who believed sincerely in the power of preaching, adopted a more strict attitude than he previously held toward Puritan prophesyings, because it had been decided at Hampton Court that less leniency should be granted to these gatherings.

#### BISHOP ROBINSON OF CARLISLE

Henry Robinson was a graduate and fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, Principal of St. Edmunds Hall and Provost of Queen's. As an educator he showed self sacrificing interest in young men with limited financial resources. He became Chaplain to Archbishop Grindal and in 1598 was consecrated Bishop of Carlisle, where he had prominent part in solving both ecclesiastical and political

problems. "He was," wrote Wood, "a person of great gravity and temperance, and very mild in his Speech, yet, as one observeth, not of so strong a constitution of body as his countenance did promise." (53) At Hampton Court he argued "gravely and learnedly" on behalf of confirmation as an apostolic institution. (54)

#### BISHOP DOVE OF PETERBOROUGH

Thomas Dove took his ecclesiastical and civil duties seriously, being for twenty years one of the most regular attendants in the House of Lords. In his youth he attracted the attention of Queen Elizabeth, who nominated him as one of the first scholars of Jesus College. As her chaplain, he was pleased by the Queen's compliment that he was a "dove of silver wings, who must have been inspired by the grace of Him who once assumed the form of a dove." (55) From the cathedral which was his seat as Bishop of Peterborough, the body of Mary, Queen of Scots, was transferred during Dove's episcopate, by order of her son, King James, to its final resting place in Westminster Abbey. He did not speak at Hampton Court Conference and brought upon himself later criticism for allowing silenced ministers to speak.

#### BISHOP RUDDE OF ST. DAVID'S

Born in Yorkshire, trained at Trinity College, Cambridge, Anthony Rudde became Dean of Gloucester in 1584 and Bishop of St. David's ten years later. He held the deep affection of the Welsh people. When Queen Elizabeth heard him preach she told Archbishop Whitgift to tell Rudde that he would be the next archbishop. Whitgift related to Rudde what had passed between the queen and him, adding that she liked best plain sermons that came home to her heart. In his next sermon Rudde lost all chance of

advancement because he made reference to Queen Elizabeth's age and wrinkles as well as to the approach of death. Four of the sermons that he preached before the queen were published.

In a verbose age Rudde was terse. He knew how to flay sin, even in high places, and was courageous enough to say what he believed to be right. In a sermon preached before King James, the Bishop of St. David's said, ". . . it is an evill thing under the Sunne when an errour proceedeth from the face of him that ruleth. . . a wise king is the stay of his people. And if the matter come to strokes, for the defense of honour or the kingdome, better is wisdome than weapons of warre. Yea, verily, an unwise king de-stroieth his people, but where they that be in authoritie are men of understanding, there the citie prospereth. . . Be constant . . in welldoing, but bragge not of future constancie. For without the especial assistance of God's grace, even Peter himself, notwithstanding his presumption in the morning, will deny his master in the evening." (56)

Bishop Rudde did not participate in the discussion at Hampton Court, but in the convocation which followed, he pleaded for tolerance, warning the church against undertaking the policy of repression. According to Jordan, "In speaking of the canonical requirement which enjoined the sign of the cross in baptism, he said that though he was satisfied that the usage of the Church of England was based on sufficient grounds, he feared that very many learned preachers, whose consciences are not in our custody, nor to be disposed of at our devotion, will not be drawn thereto." He urged "that reasonable answers and not force must be employed against those who dissent in conscience. There are those who may be driven from the ministry by such hard usage, and the church can ill spare them from its services, nor can it afford

to be divided in the face of the common enemy. He, therefore, proposed that 'if by petition to the king's majesty there cannot be obtained a quite remove of the premises, nor yet a toleration for them that are of more staid and temperate carriage yet at least there might be procured a mitigation of the penalty.'" (57)

#### BISHOP WATSON OF CHICHESTER

Anthony Watson was a native of Durham, a graduate of Christ's College, Cambridge, Queen's almoner, and Bishop of Chichester. He attended Queen Elizabeth on her death bed and was continued as chief almoner by King James. At Hampton Court Bishop Watson was one of the silent participants.

#### DEAN ANDREWES OF WESTMINSTER

Because of the recognized scholarship of the Dean of Westminster, who was also Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, he was requested by the king at Hampton Court, following the suggestion of the Bishop of London, to give information culled from his classical studies. Lancelot Andrewes had been Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, whose funeral sermon he preached, and Chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift. He later served as Dean of the Chapel Royal, Bishop of Chichester, Ely and Winchester, Privy Councillor for England and also for Scotland.

Andrewes' quick wit was shown in a conversation when he and Bishop Neale of Durham were at dinner with King James. The monarch asked, "My Lords, cannot I take my subjects' money when I want it, without all this formality in Parliament?" The Bishop of Durham replied affirmatively, but Dr. Andrewes adroitly answered, "I think it lawful for you to take my brother Neale's money, for he offers it." (58)

No man among the ecclesiastics at Hampton Court attracted biographers as did Lancelot Andrewes. His secretary, Henry Isaacson, wrote a little book describing a distinctive personality, who walked annually during student days from Cambridge to London to visit his parents, never once asked for honors but had them thrust upon him, quietly caused the release of many persons from prison, showed gratitude to his teachers and aided them financially in their declining years, gave generously toward the education of talented young men, remained in his study until noon each day to commune with great ideas and with God, and was bountifully hospitable to a host of guests. (59)

A book written by Lady Mary Wood toward the close of the nineteenth century emphasized the manner in which Andrewes drew great men to his home, Grotius, Bacon, Herbert and Hooker. He sought "to convince rather than to coerce" and "ceased not to pray that God would 'appease the schisms of the Churches' and 'for the establishment of the Churches of God and the union of them all.'" (60)

In "Lancelot Andrewes and His Private Devotions," Alexander Whyte related the man to his contemporaries, "Andrewes was born one year after Hooker, four years before Isaac Casaubon and Robert Bruce, six years before Bacon, nine years before Shakespeare, eleven years before James I, and eighteen years before Laud and Donne . . . Andrewes has left behind him five volumes of sermons, preached for the most part at Court, and on special occasions; two or three volumes of controversial matter, a volume of catechetical matter, and the 'Private Devotions.' . . . a perfect portrait of Andrewes' inmost soul . . . all formality, all insincerity, all mere lip-service, and all multiplying of sacred words for the sake of their sound is excluded from this

severe, sincere, and serious little book." (61)

Andrewes was a man of manifold gifts. No English preacher of his time surpassed him in mastery of languages, pulpit delivery or power in prayer. A scientific bent caused him to observe nature with intense concentration in order to understand both plant and animal life. As a teacher he knew how to guide young men in group discussion, in individual conferences, and through conversation during long walks in the open air. As a member of the company of Biblical translators he served as secretary, having part in planning the procedure by which the project was conducted, handling voluminous correspondence while it was being carried forward, and being honored by having his name placed first in the list of revisers.

Andrewes had more skill as an interpreter than as an original thinker. He was an ardent partisan of the Church of England, for which he wrote many a controversial document, and is said to have remarked about the Hampton Court Conference that the monarch "did wonderfully play the Puritan for five hours." (62)

Of Andrewes' relationship with James, Isaacson said that the king "admired him beyond all other Divines, not onely for his transcendent gift in preaching, but for the excellency and sollidity in all kinde of learning." (63) He was the one for whom James asked during his final illness, but the bishop himself was too ill to come. The king's dying advice to his children was to read Andrewes' works. The bishop so used his talents in the royal service that he prayed every night in secret, "O God, save me from making a god of the king." (64)

## DEAN OVERALL OF ST. PAUL'S

John Overall, a scholar in the classics and mathematics, held the regius professorship of theology at Cambridge. Though Dean of St. Paul's, he disliked preaching. When called to deliver a discourse before Queen Elizabeth, he spoke with difficulty in English, because he was accustomed to the use of Latin.

At the time of the Hampton Court Conference Overall was sensitive to Puritan criticism because he was one of the ecclesiastics to whom advantage accrued because of the existence of pluralities. He was simultaneously Dean of St. Paul's cathedral, Professor in Cambridge, Prebend of Totendale, and Rector of Clothall. In a few months he was to add to his income by becoming Rector of Therfield. Both his rectories, however, were served by curates.

The ability of Overall as a leader of thought was indicated by Fuller in his description of the man as "one of a strong brain to improve his great reading, and accounted one of the most learned controversial divines of the days." (65) Overall carried on correspondence with Gerard Voss and Hugo Grotius, Dutch scholars whose lives left a lasting impression upon their own and later times.

Overall had participated in a theological controversy that was brought forward anew at Hampton Court. Nine years previously the Master of St. John's at Cambridge, William Whitaker, and other scholars had met with Archbishop Whitgift at Lambeth to formulate a statement designed to settle a theological dispute. Out of that meeting came what were known as Lambeth Articles. After they were issued, John Overall joined with Peter Baro, against whose teachings the articles were aimed, in disagreement with the Lambeth formulations.

During the discussion at Hampton Court Dean Overall gave an exposition of his contention in the controversy over the Lambeth Articles, indicating his moderate interpretation of predestination. The worth of Overall was recognized by his being selected after the conference to revise the section in the catechism concerning the sacraments, and later to draw up for publication the canons formulated by the Convocation of Canterbury, which met from 1603 to 1610, and to be a member of the Westminster company of Old Testament translators. He served as Bishop of Coventry, Lichfield and Norwich.

#### OTHER ECCLESIASTICAL LEADERS

Of the seven deans officially summoned to the conference, Andrewes of Westminster, Overall of St. Paul's and Montague of the Chapel participated in the discussion. (66) Barlow of Chester did not speak but his written account and that of Montague, both source materials, made clear the authors' views of what transpired. The silent deans were of Christ Church, Worcester and Windsor. The Dean of Salisbury, though not listed among those who received letters of summons, also was present. (67)

A gifted preacher whom James invited was Dr. Richard Field, (68) whose lectures on the catechism at Oxford attracted students and faculty. He was chaplain to both Queen Elizabeth and King James, who remarked on hearing him preach for the first time, "Is his name Field? This is a field for God to dwell in." At the death of this chaplain, with whom James had delighted to discuss theology, the monarch said, "I should have done more for that man."

Another eminent preacher at Hampton Court was Dr. John

King, Archdeacon of Nottingham. He had been appointed by the privy council to preach before King James upon his entrance into London and the ruler was so impressed by the sermon that he commended the minister as "king of preachers" and retained him as royal chaplain. In 1611 he became Bishop of London. He served as Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, from which he was graduated, as well as Vice-Chancellor of the University, and contributed to many Oxford collections of poems. In "Athenae Oxonienses" Wood said that King "was a solid and profound divine, of great gravity and piety, and had so excellent a volubility of speech, that Sir Edward Coke would often say that he was the best speaker in the star chamber in his time." (69)

#### A CONTRAST

The archbishop, bishops, deans and chaplains, appearing at the conference in the ecclesiastical robes indicative of their rank, made the assembly a colorful pageant. Contrasting with them were the four Puritans, garbed in fur gowns such as were worn by Turkish merchants and professors in foreign universities. The ecclesiastics referred contemptuously to the men in "turky gowns," but these grave scholars were to make at least one proposal that would influence civilization far more than any words spoken at Hampton Court by men more highly placed.

The Puritans were not mere individuals. They were symbols of an historic movement. One of the men who had been chosen to present the Puritan case, Thomas Cartwright, had been taken by death three weeks before the conference convened, (70) but the spirit of this pioneer of Puritanism was unmistakably there, for he was quoted by the Bishop of London and his ideas were voiced by the President of Corpus Christi. (71)

## DR. JOHN REYNOLDS

The Puritan leader was Dr. John Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi at Oxford and former Dean of Lincoln, whose scholarship and sincerity were proverbial. Born at Pinhoe, near Exeter, he was educated at Merton and Corpus Christi, where his readings from Aristotle brought him youthful fame. The way in which Reynolds was able to express intense conviction with restraint is shown in a letter which he wrote, in 1579, after expulsion from his college because of Puritan views. To Sir Francis Knollys he said, "I beseech your Honour that you will desire the Bishop to let us have justice; though it be with rigour, so it be justice; our cause is so good, that I am sure we shall prevail by it. Thus much I am bold to request for Corpus Christi College sake, or rather for Christ's sake." (72) Because of the internal upheaval in Corpus Christi, under the presidency of Dr. William Cole, Reynolds found a place in Queen's College.

The high recognition won by Reynolds is evident from the fact that Elizabeth's secretary, Sir Francis Walsingham, consulted him upon important occasions. (73) "Books are but dead letters," Walsingham once remarked, adding, "it is the voice and conference of men that giveth them life and shall engender in you true knowledge." (74) Aware that this Oxford scholar possessed knowledge, the queen's secretary had conference with him. In turn, Walsingham was instrumental in "patching up a quarrel between Reynolds and the powerful Earl of Warwick." (75) A lectureship was founded at Oxford by Walsingham specifically for Reynolds, with the purpose of exposing the fallacy of Catholic tenets, and it drew large audiences.

One of Reynolds' earliest publications was, "The Summe of the Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart touching the

Head and the Faith of the Church." In this verbal exchange with a noted Romanist, Reynolds maintained that the Bible is the supreme and absolute authority, "the one and only touchstone in religion." Grosart described Reynolds in this discussion as a thinker of breadth, subtlety, verve, quaintness and good sense. (76)

When Barrow and Greenwood, leaders of the Separatists, were sentenced to death on the gallows, Reynolds was sent to attend them and report their behavior to the queen. The condemned men maintained that their opposition was not to ruler and government but to the hierarchy. Reynolds believed that if they had been permitted to live, "They would have been two as worthy instruments for the church of God as any raised up in that age." (77)

After Cole resigned the presidency of Corpus Christi, Reynolds became his successor, later declining a bishopric to remain at Oxford. Brook said, "The College had been greatly impoverished, but by Dr. Rainolds's exertions, it was brought into a state of distinguished prosperity. Besides the improvement of its statutes and pecuniary resources, he greatly beautified the buildings, improved the scholars, reformed the whole College system, and directed all its operations to provide able and learned pastors for the Church of God." (78)

The portraits of John Reynolds in the president's lodgings at Corpus Christi reveal a scholar and a seer. He was a man with a deep devotional spirit who, true to the characteristics of his age, was also a skilful disputant. Bellarmine, the public reader in the seminary at Rome, considered him "a foeman worthy of his steel." (79)

Reynolds' manuscripts were prepared in clear printlike writing, which made them a satisfaction to read. His expositions of Scripture, as well as his discussions of controversial sub-

jects, were rich with literary allusions, giving evidence of thorough familiarity with the history of Christian thought. Both admirers and opponents recognized the breadth of his learning, the accuracy of his memory, the modesty with which he bore his honors, the soundness of his judgement, the sincerity of his convictions and the strength of his character.

To be on the opposite side of a controversy from the Primate, as at Hampton Court, was not new to Reynolds, although he did not relish the situation. In a discussion at Oxford between Reynolds and the Hebrew Scholar, Broughton, Archbishop Whitgift was requested to arbitrate. Previously Broughton had published a book in which he sought to show that in the Bible "God had recorded the world's age from the promise of redemption unto his performance of it." Reynolds maintained that "there could no chronology of times from Adam to Christ be taken from the Scriptures." At the time of the publication of Broughton's book the archbishop remarked to Queen Elizabeth that "it contained but the curious quirks of a young head" but when the dispute came to him as umpire he gave a secret decision that the author's "travail and dexterity" had helped to clear "the holy story . . . against 1500 years' errors." (80)

Long prior to the Hampton Court Conference the Puritan doctor had been in reluctant opposition to the Bishop of London. On the occasion of Bancroft's formulation of the thesis that bishops are a distinct order from priests, possessing superiority by divine right, Reynolds was requested by Sir Francis Knollys to draft an answer. He did so courageously and humbly; "since it pleased his honor to request him to state his opinion, he considered it to be an incumbent duty to declare the truth without respect of persons." (81) In the mid-seventeenth century the

document was published under the title, "The Judgement of Dr. Reynolds concerning Episcopacy, whether it be God's ordinance Expressed in a letter to Sir Francis Knowls, concerning Dr. Bancroft's Sermon at St. Paul's Crosse, preached Feb. 9, 1588."

Sir Francis Knollys maintained that Bancroft's assertion of the superiority of bishops by divine right was "contrary to the command of Christ, who condemned all superiority among the apostles." "I do not deny," Knollys admitted, "that bishops may have lordly authority and dignity, provided they claim it not from a higher authority than her majesty's grant."

The historical resume of episcopacy which Reynold prepared for Sir Francis contained these sentences: ". . . it is a quite different thing to say, that by the word of God there is a difference between them (a priest and a bishop), and to say that it is by the order and custom of the church. . . all that have labored in reforming the church for five hundred years have taught, that all pastors, be they entitled bishops or priests, have equal authority and power by God's word . . . As for the doctor's saying that St. Jerome, and Calvin from him, confessed that bishops have had the same superiority ever since the time of Saint Mark the evangelist, I think him mistaken, because neither Jerome says it, nor does Calvin seem to confess it." (82)

Reynolds' interpretation of the scriptural office of a bishop was: "When elders were ordained by the apostles in every church . . . among those sundry was one chiefe, whom our Saviour calleth, the angell of the church, and writeth that to him which by him the rest should know. And this is he whom afterward in the Primitive Church the Fathers called Bishop. . . Elders. . . chose one amongst themselves, whom they called Bishop, to be the President of their company; for the better handling and ordering

of things in their assemblies and meetings, wherein they provided by common counsell and consent for the guidance of the flock of Christ committed to them." (83)

Reynolds was a believer in the power of preaching by an educated ministry. In speaking of colleges and universities he said, "I would to God these nurseries of pastors and teachers of the church were husbanded in such sort to the Lord's advantage . . . then should we not have so many raw untrained soldiers receive the Lord's pay." (84)

In Reynolds' initial speech at Hampton Court he summarized the Puritan requests: first, that the doctrine of the church might be preserved in purity according to God's word: second, that good pastors might be planted in all churches to preach the same: third, that the church government might be sincerely ministered according to God's word: fourth, that the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to more increase of Piety. (85) His specific proposals included: clarification of the book of Articles of Religion; changes in the method of confirmation to provide more satisfactory examination of candidates; a single catechism, rather than one short and one long, which could be memorized by novices; reformation of abuses of the Lord's Day; suppression of books that unsettle untrained minds; relaxation in the requirements of subscription to the prayer book; elimination of specified reading of the apochrypha in the services of the church, as well as required propounding of questions to infants in baptism and wearing of the surplice by the clergy; removal of inequities in discipline; provision of meetings for practice in preaching and for consideration of problems of the church. (86)

At Hampton Court Conference Dr. Reynolds rose to historic fame, which the ill treatment of contemporaries and the shifting

panorama of later events cannot change. He presented the project for an authorized version of the Bible, and subsequently was a member of the company that translated the prophets. The group met at Oxford and came to his lodgings once a week for his aid, though he was dying of tuberculosis.

In "Athenae Oxonienses" Wood expressed high esteem for Reynolds, despite disagreement with the man's Puritanism. He wrote, "It may be truly said of him, . . . which hath been applied to some other, that he was a living Library and a third University . . . . most excellent in all tongues, of a sharp and nimble wit, of mature judgement, indefatigable industry . . . . and so well seen in all Arts and Sciences, as if he had spent his whole time in each of them . . . . to name Rainolds is to commend virtue itself. In a word, nothing can be spoken against him, only that he with Tho. Sparke were the pillars of Puritanism, and grand favourers of Non-Conformity." (87)

One of the choicest characterizations of Reynolds is the tribute written by Fuller, ". . . . Dr. John Reynolds, king's professor in Oxford, born in Devonshire, with bishop Jewel and Mr. Hooker, and all three bred in Corpus-Christi in Oxford. No one county in England bare three such men (contemporary at large,) in what college soever they were bred; no college in England bred three such men, in what county soever they were born . . . . His memory was little less than miraculous, he himself being the truest table to the multitude of voluminous books he had read over; whereby he could readily turn to all material pages in every leaf, page, volume, paragraph . . . . as his memory was a faithful index, so his reason was a solid iudex of what he read; his humility set a lustre on all, (admirable that the whole should be so low, whose several parts were so high,) communicative of which he

knew to any that desired information herein, like a tree laden with fruit, bowing down its branches to all that desired to ease it of the burden thereof. . ." (88)

#### JOHN KNEWSTUBS

A native of Westmorland, a graduate of St. John's College, Cambridge, an eminent controversialist, John Knewstubs was rector of Cockfield in Suffolk for forty five years. Evidence of his ability is found in his being considered for the mastership at St. John's, where he founded two exhibitions for worthy young men.

One of Knewstubs' controversies was with the curious sect known as the Family of Love, founded by Henry Nicholas, a Dutchman whose works were published in English about 1575. Four years later Knewstubs issued a volume with a London imprint, dedicated to the Earl of Warwick, entitled, "A Confutation of Monstrous and Horrible Heresies taught by H. N. (Nicholas) and embraced by a number who call themselves the Familie of Love."

The followers of Henry Nicholas habitually referred to him as H. N. because they thought the name had a mystic meaning, the letters signifying "Holy Nature." They believed that the quality of life which Adam possessed before the fall might be attained through their "Family" and were convinced that their leader was the "Angel" mentioned in Revelation 14:6, "having eternal good tidings to proclaim unto them that dwell on the earth, and unto every nation and tribe and tongue and people, who said 'Fear God and give Him Glory.'"

The essence of Nicholas' writing was that the inner experience of love of God is identical with love of man and that this embracing love is designed to bring all humanity into one huge family. The irony of Nicholas' life was that the man who scorned

sectarianism became the founder of a tiny sect. (89)

John Knewstubs lashed out against the Family of Love as enemies within the church, constituting its greatest danger. He summarized the teachings of the sect as "a mass or pack of Poperie, Arianisme, Anabaptisme, and Libertisme," (90) and described the group as "the household of selfelove," who ought to be "cut off by the ministries of the word and sword." (91)

Not as a controversialist, but as a pastor Knewstubs was at his best. When he let himself be natural, he had a disposition toward a liberal mind. In preaching he knew how to plead for charity in judgement and often had an apostolic flavor in his speech, not only in quoting from Scripture but also in his own vocabulary and spirit. He spoke with free flow of language, apt illustration and penetrating phrase, revealing a sense of responsibility for handling truth. He was no dry-as-dust theologian but preached a positive religion. Even after the lapse of years his printed words appeal to the imagination, conveying the vital reality of a religion that blended faith and conduct. His soul flamed forth when he thought of those to whom injustice had been done, such as illegitimate children and people whose lives had been distorted by propaganda.

Knewstubs "Lectures," dedicated to the Countess of Warwick, convey the essential qualities of the man. He knew the value of brief headings and principles concretely applied. Here are samples of his pungent sentences, "All good Christians should rather be desirous to learne how to go forward, than to hear what good beginnings they have made;" "For as faith is weake or strong, so are prayers colde or carefull, sparing or plentiful, because true prayer receiveth life from faith, which without it is dead and nothing worth;" "It is miserie that maketh mercie to be mercie."

In the diary of a contemporary is evidence of the lofty moral character of John Knewstubs. A fellow preacher named Richard Rogers, author of a widely influential Puritan rule of life, recorded his personal spiritual struggles as an aid to others in conquering weakness, over-confidence and fear. One of the disturbances that brought him distress was the necessity of purging himself repeatedly of the love of worldly things. He expressed an ardent desire to be more like his comrade in the gospel, John Knewstubs, whose conquest of worldliness was so complete that he was described by Rogers as "littl account makeing of any thinge that he hath, or keepinge any stock." (93)

Knewstubs' own attitude concerning the relation of the material and the spiritual was expressed in a sermon, "The man therefore that boasteth of the perfection of his faith, not feeling any wante therein; denying that he trusteth in his riches, friendshippe, authoritie, or wealth, must be willed to set them a while aside in his thoughtes and considerations, imagining seriously and in good earnest that he had them not. Then let him aske his conscience, and truely searche out his spirites, whether he could be as confident, comfortable and hopefull in his heart, in the wanting, as in the having thereof." (94)

Knewstubs was so thorough a Puritan that his parish was in constant agitation against Romish practices. Here and there in his sermons were trumpet blasts against "Popery," which he defined as "idolatry." He described the period of Christian history in which the papacy was dominant as the divorced estate of the church. (95)

In the discussions at Hampton Court, Knewstubs argued against practices that were reminiscent of Roman Catholicism, the propounding of questions to infants and the use of the sign of the cross in baptism. He appealed eloquently for consideration toward

sincere ministers who could not conscientiously wear the surplice.

(96)

The attitude of Barlow toward Knewstubs is curiously revealing. The dean attempted to depict the pastor as abstruse and unintelligible in a portion of his argument, yet an admission that he unwittingly made is one of the surest evidences of Knewstubs' ability. Barlow wrote that a certain item in the discussion, "being a profound point was put upon Master Knewstubs to pursue." He further recorded that one of the lords who was standing behind Knewstubs encouraged the Puritan by calling out, "That is a good point!" "Urge that point!" (97)

#### LAWRENCE CHADERTON

The son of an ardent Catholic, Lawrence Chaderton joined the Reformation group during his student days at Christ College, Cambridge. The decision came after deep distress of mind. His father wrote, "Son Lawrence, if you will renounce the new sect which you have joined, you may expect all the happiness which the care of an indulgent father can secure you. Otherwise, I enclose a shilling to buy a wallet. Go and beg." (98)

In boyhood Chaderton's circumstances were unfavorable. A stupidly severe schoolmaster drove him away from cultural interests and he centered his ardor in outdoor sports. Happily a tutor named Lawrence Vaux, afterward warden of Manchester College, vitalized learning for young Lawrence and turned the current of his life in the direction of scholarship.

Soon after graduation at Cambridge, where the ideals that soon were to be designated by the term "Puritan" had begun their influence upon his mind, Chaderton became a fellow, later dean, tutor and lecturer in Christ College. For fifty years he was after-

noon lecturer at the Church of St. Clements in Cambridge, where he exercised phenomenal influence.

Chaderton's wife, Cecilia Culverwell, was a member of a strong Puritan family, her father having been one of Queen Elizabeth's merchants. Chaderton's closest friends were leaders with pronounced Puritan views, among them Cartwright, Perkins and Whitaker. He himself was moderate.

The man was humble. In 1584, when Sir Walter Mildmay offered funds for the foundation of Emmanuel College to train "godly ministers," Chaderton hesitated to become master. Mildmay declared, "If you will not be Master, I will not be Founder." Chaderton accepted and made an effective leader. When, in later years, he resigned from his mastership, in order that he might assure a Puritan succession to the position, Holdsworth, the new principal, told Chaderton that "as long as he lived, he should be Master in the House, though he himself was forced to the Master of it." (99)

A recognized linguistic scholar, Chaderton was not as prolific a writer as were several of his contemporaries. His literary fame rests upon his part as a translator of the King James version of the Bible. He was a member of the Cambridge committee, in which his knowledge of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Spanish and Italian was of value.

Although Chaderton declined a bishopric because of his Puritan principles, he was never aggressively antagonistic to the dominant ecclesiastical school. At Hampton Court he suffered the unjustified aspersion of being a schismatic, voiced by his former fellow-student, Bishop Bancroft. He spoke appealingly in the final moments of the conference, kneeling as he did so, on behalf of "honest, godly, and painful ministers," pleading that, if they were forced to violate their consciences, "many whom they had won to the

gospel would slide back, and revolt into popery again." (100)

Chaderton's biographer, Dillingham, asserted that he watched for repetition but never heard it in the aged scholar's conversation. When the educator-preacher was 77 years old, Prince Charles and the Elector Palatine visited him and insisted on his taking the degree of Doctor of Divinity, which he had modestly declined. Two years later King James visited and talked with Chaderton. He lived to be nearly 103 years old, retaining the respect of people of varied views.

The significance of Chaderton in the Puritan movement has been indicated in a volume of painstaking research published in 1938 by William Haller, "The Rise of Puritanism." Scattered throughout the author's three-hundred-thirty-seven pages are a dozen different allusions to the influence of Chaderton, who, although the major part of his life came during the sixteenth century, lived on forty years into the seventeenth. In listing creative educators in early Puritanism, who were steeped in the learning of the past but did not confine themselves to tradition, Haller placed first the name of Chaderton. (101)

Haller's book called attention to the fact that Chaderton was a fellow of Christ College at Cambridge when Cartwright was expelled, that he launched several distinguished Puritan preachers upon their careers, that he was so dynamic a preacher that auditors cried out, when he was ready to stop, after two hours of speaking, "For God's sake, sir, go on, go on," and that although little remains in print to show exactly why Chaderton was a man of such out-reaching spiritual vitality, yet the Master of Emmanuel College "more than any other man was responsible for the steadily increasing stream of men who went forth from Emmanuel to preach the word in plain English to the plain people." (102)

John Dod was a Puritan pastor whose pungent sayings were inscribed for a century upon English cottage walls, but Lawrence Chaderton was the man who helped to make a great preacher of John Dod and to spread his salty speech. (103) Another Puritan notable whom Chaderton inspired was William Perkins, whose name recurred more often than any other preacher in later Puritan literature. (104) An additional spiritual descendent of Chaderton, who went beyond him into separatism, was John Smyth, the strenuous, strong souled founder of the English Baptists, (105) whose pronouncement of democratic principles of church government has been called by DeBlois "the Magna Charta of the free Churches." (106) Still another of Chaderton's disciples was John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim group who migrated to Leyden in Holland. Haller has uncovered the information that "A sermon on Rom.12:3-8, attributed to Chaderton, was reissued from William Brewster's press in Leyden in 1618 and was more than once referred to in Robinson's own writings." (107)

Among the prominent preachers who felt the spell of Chaderton was Henry Burton, minister of St. Matthew's in Friday Street, author of an influential autobiography, clerk of the closet to Prince Henry as well as to Prince Charles, and active campaigner against the bishops. He wrote, "It was my happiness to be a constant hearer of Mr. Chatterton and Mr. Perkins. . . For from my first entrance in the Colledge, it pleased God to open mine eyes by their ministry, so as to put a difference betweene their sound teaching, and the University Sermons, which savoured more of humane wit, than of Gods word." (108)

To the American mind a noteworthy fact is Chaderton's influence upon education in New England. Haller wrote, "Harvard and the colleges which one after another were patterned upon it

sprang up under the inspiration of Cambridge--of the Cambridge, that is, of the spiritual brotherhood, particularly of Emmanuel, the most Puritan of the Cambridge colleges." (109) Chaderton, the first Master of Emmanuel, in making the college what it was, reached out to guide American educational and religious life.

#### THOMAS SPARKE

Born in Lincolnshire, educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, Thomas Sparke became chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, through whom he was collated Archdeacon of Stow. Becoming rector of Bletchley, at a distance from Stow, he resigned his archdeaconry "out of conscience's sake." His parishoners held him "in great esteem for his piety," and all who knew him respected his "gravity and exemplary life and conversation." (110)

As a religious writer Dr. Sparke was solid rather than sparkling. To direct people in thought and worship he issued, "A Comfortable Treatise for a Troubled Conscience," "A Brief Catechism, with a Form of Prayer for Householders," and "The Highway to Heaven by the Clear Light of the Gospel Cleansed of a number of most dangerous Stumbling Stones." He also prepared a treatise to prove that "Ministers are bound to catechise their Parishoners and Families."

In 1584 Sparke went with Walter Travers to represent the Puritans in a conference at Lambeth, - his first meeting with Archbishop Whitgift. The Bishop of Winchester, the Earl of Leicester, Lord Gray and Sir Francis Walsingham were present for the two days' discussion.

To the archbishop's comment that the Puritans had not been summoned judicially but for a free conference concerning the Book of Common Prayer, Sparke replied, "We give most humble and hearty

thanks to Almighty God, and to this honourable presence, that after so many years, wherein our cause could never be admitted to an indifferent hearing, it hath pleased God of his gracious goodness so to dispose things, that we have now that equity and favour shewed us, that before such honourable personages, as may be a worthy means to her most excellent majesty for reformation of such things as are to be redressed, it is now lawful for us to declare with freedom, what points ought to be reviewed and reformed, which our endeavour is, because it concerns the service of God, and the satisfaction of such as are in authority; and for that the good issue depends on the favour of God, I desire, that before we enter any farther, we may first seek for the gracious direction and blessing of God by prayer." (111)

Before Sparke could begin his prayer Whitgift spoke up, "You shall make no prayers here, nor turn this place into a conventicle."

Travers joined with Sparke in requesting prayer but the Primate was unyielding. Leicester and Walsingham sought to remove the tension by saying that they were confident Sparke had prayed before he came to the palace. The persistent pastor omitted the prayer that he had planned but, in the words of Neal, "made a short address to God in very few words, though the archbishop continued to interrupt him all the while."

Sparke, seconded by Travers, objected to: (1) putting the apocrypha upon a level with Holy Scripture, by reading it in the church while several parts of the canon were omitted; (2) baptism in private, particularly by laymen or women, and the doctrine that children not baptized are in danger of damnation, as well as use of the sign of the cross in baptism, on the ground that it was a human addition to the sacrament; (3) private communion; (4) ministerial

apparel, quoting Bishop Ridley that "it was too bad to be put upon a fool in a play;" (5) an insufficient ministry, nonresidence and pluralities. (112)

The conference results were variously reported, according to the predispositions of those who wrote. Strype asserted that after four hours of argument the archbishop convinced the Puritans of the weakness of their position. (113) He admitted, however, that the source document was not available when he prepared his manuscript. Neal had a transcript of the discussion in his hands and explained that the whole trend of opposing arguments and the later attitude of Sparke and Travers were proof that the Puritans did not change their minds. (114)

Though the conference ended with all parties holding the identical convictions with which it began, the thirty-six-year-old Sparke had the satisfaction of expressing his convictions with vigor to the highest ecclesiastical authority in the realm, in the presence of leading statesmen, with the support of a distinguished scholar.

During the two decades since the Lambeth conference the spirit of Sparke had changed. His appearance at Hampton Court created comment and his complete silence while there resulted in a flood of later discussion. Sparke was the one Puritan who said nothing at Hampton Court.

#### POLITICAL LEADERS

To the conference the king summoned political as well as ecclesiastical leaders. The lords of the council sat "on his right hand" (115) and occasionally made audible remarks. Among those who listened without recorded participation on the third day were the knights and doctors of the arches, Sir Daniel Dunne, Sir Thomas

Crampton, Sir Richard Swale, Sir John Bennett and Dr. Drury. (116)

### LORD ROBERT CECIL

Lord Robert Cecil was the chief political figure. Called "Little Elf" by Queen Elizabeth and "Pygmy" by King James, he was the hunchback son of Lord Burghley, and had an extraordinary background of experience, including training at Cambridge, diplomatic missions in France and Spain, parliamentary leadership, chancellorship of the University of Cambridge, membership of the privy council and secretaryship of State. In his soul lurked a deep feeling of resentment against his physical deformity, to which he never referred, and a pathetic loneliness. A man without friends, even though he had reached the heights of power, he was cautious, clever and cynical. His fundamental interests were in architecture, in landscaping, and in using people as political pawns. Although neither he nor Queen Elizabeth completely respected each other, they worked and schemed together until they arrived at a strange enjoyment in their partnership in statecraft. (117)

Cecil gave astute counsel to the queen, but in the end she revolted against his guidance. Ill almost to death, she resisted going to bed. Sitting upon her cushions, she heard Cecil say, "You must go to bed, to content the people," and retorted, "Little man, little man, if your father had lived, ye durst not have said so much, but ye know I must die, and that makes ye so presumptuous." (118)

During the period of uncertainty as to Elizabeth's successor, Cecil kept James in suspense concerning his attitude; finally he made a secret committal to the Scottish King and began preparations for his coming to the throne, carrying on a correspondence in which he sagely advised the Scottish King to insist neither upon

parliamentary recognition of title nor upon Elizabeth's declaration in his favor. Not until generations later was this secret relationship between James and Cecil fully known. The secretary was, according to Henderson, essentially the clever, prudent, time serving official, mainly concerned to choose the course that would be safest and best for himself and most discomfit his rivals. (119)

Cecil personally drafted the proclamation, approved by the privy council upon the queen's death, declaring James to be king. It was he who read that document in the presence of the nobility. It was he whom the new king continued as Secretary of State and later raised to be Earl of Salisbury. Cecil continued to hold the king's confidence, because of his evident loyalty to the monarch and his poised administration. The Bishop of Gloucester once remarked that Cecil "knew the king's disposition to an inch." (120)

In describing the attitude of Cecil on religious questions, Jordan wrote, "Cecil had been trained in the hard school of Elizabeth, and his view was eminently pragmatic. The rites and disciplines of the church are by law established and the Puritans are overtly breakers of the law. The Government is prepared to bear with moderate men who dissent from the Church, but the Puritans are men of turbulent humour, who 'dream of nothing but a new hierarchy, directly opposite to the state of a monarchy, as the dispensation with such men were the highway to break all the bonds of unity to nourish schism in the church and commonwealth. It is well said of a learned man that there are schisms in habit as well as in opinion; and that unity in belief cannot be preserved unless it is to be found in worship.'" (121)

From Scotland James had written to Cecil, "Your suspicions and your disgracing shall be mine." (122) When, therefore, James heard the voice of Cecil raised at Hampton Court he listened to the secretary's objection to the "dispensing and divulging of

Popish and seditious pamphlets," and instantly agreed that a book to which Cecil referred was dangerous in content and purpose. (123) During the deliberations the secretary spoke a good word for Bishop Bancroft and commended the attitude of the monarch with the words, "Very much we are bound to God, who has given us a king of an understanding heart." (124)

#### LORD HENRY HOWARD

Lord Henry Howard, who had been sent by the council to be near the king as he inaugurated his reign, was also at Hampton Court. His formative years were spent amid the complex shifts of religious extremes. He had a strong strain of Roman Catholicism in his ancestry but during the reign of Edward the Sixth was tutored by Foxe, the martyrologist. During the time of Queen Mary he had the guidance of John White, Bishop of Lincoln, in intensive Catholic training. The Protestant Queen Elizabeth supervised Howard's further education and he received his master's degree at Oxford.

Because of Howard's sympathy toward the mother of King James he had been imprisoned, then released and restored to court through the power of Cecil, with whom he joined in correspondence with the Scottish monarch concerning the succession. His personal letters correctly convinced James of Howard's loyalty, although the king smiled at his correspondent's intricately involved style.

James made Howard a member of the privy council, and immediately prior to Hampton Court Conference, lord warden of the cinque ports. Soon afterward he was made Baron Howard and Earl of Northampton and a few years later Lord Privy Seal. Gardiner's estimate of Lord Howard was: "Of all who gathered round the new King, this man was, beyond all comparison, the most undeserving of the favours which he received . . . He was possessed of considerable

abilities, and of no small extent of learning ... In an age when what we should call the grossest flattery was used as frequently as phrases of common civility are by us, he easily bore away the palm for suppleness and flattery." (125)

This estimate standing alone, however, does not convey a complete evaluation. Howard's humanitarianism showed itself in the endowment of hospitals. His sensitivity to artistic values was evident in patronage of notable architects and authors, Bacon choosing him to present his "Advancement of Learning" to the king and Chapman writing a sonnet to Howard to be imprinted with his translation of Homer.

Howard's religious sympathies were with the Catholics and against the Puritans. He relied upon autocracy and resented democracy. In the year that the King James Version of the Bible appeared, Howard's interest was in arranging a marriage of Prince Henry with the daughter of the Catholic Duke of Savoy.

Lord Howard once wrote of King James, "He doth wondrously covet learned discourse." (126) At Hampton Court he interpreted his own function as providing approval for the king. (127)

#### LORD BUCKHURST

Lord Treasurer Buckhurst (Thomas Sackville) had devoted his youth to literature, having shared with a collaborator in writing the first English tragedy, "Gorboduc". As the poet Spencer indicated in a sonnet prefacing the "Faerie Queene," he was influenced by Sackville's writing.

Baron Buckhurst was a patron of music and a leader of Free Masons. While visiting in Rome he once was in prison because of a comment that revealed his intense Protestantism.

Sackville's father was a cousin of the mother of Queen

Elizabeth. He was a member of parliament under her as well as Queen Mary, served in diplomatic missions on the continent, and was a member of the Privy Council. His literary and oratorical gifts often were at the disposal of his sovereign. He had a precise manner of handling business and shortly before the death of Queen Elizabeth was appointed treasurer for life. The Lord Treasurer met King James when the new monarch was on his way to London and continued in royal favor to the end of his days. As Chancellor of Oxford, to which he was generous in gifts of books, he entertained James at New College.

At Hampton Court Conference Buckhurst declared that Roman Catholic publications, which had been allowed to circulate, removed any imputation that Queen Elizabeth had put recusants to death "for their consciences only" by proving that they were "executed for treason." (128) He spoke also in favor of the oath ex-officio. (129)

#### LORD EGERTON

When Queen Elizabeth saw Thomas Egerton in action in court, she said, "In my troth, he shall never plead against me again." She appointed him solicitor general, a post which he occupied for eleven years until he was advanced to be attorney general. The queen knighted Egerton, then made him lord keeper and privy councillor. He was an intimate friend of Archbishop Whitgift and encouraged such men as Francis Bacon, Ben Jonson and Sir John Davies.

Wood's estimate of Egerton read, "He was a most grave and prudent Man, a good lawyer, just and honest, of so quick an apprehension also, and profound judgement, that none of the Bench in his time went beyond him." (130) Spectators often came to the

court to see the man and hear him speak.

During King James' first year in England he raised Egerton to the peerage as Lord Ellesmere and made him Lord Chancellor. During the new reign he became increasingly opposed to Puritans and Catholics.

At Hampton Court Baron Ellesmere participated in the discussion on dangerous books, classifying them in two groups, the Latin and the English, asserting that distribution of those in the mother tongue did major harm. At the close of the second day's conference, as the lords left the privy chamber, the Chancellor remarked to the Dean of Chester, who stood by the door, "I have often heard and read, that 'Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote,' but I never saw the truth thereof until this day." (131)

In writing of the address delivered by the King to the throne the position, Bishop Andrew described it as "the most excellent oration of an hour long," it was called referred to as a "grave and princely declaration" and the speech was given as an "extraordinary speech of an hour long at least, for learning, piety, and frequency, I never heard the like." (13)

The King indicated that in summing the occasion he was following the example of other Christian princes, that in the possession of their reign usually take the first step to the establishment of the church, with its doctrine and culture. He declared that his purpose was not to alter any of the things which he found well settled already, which were, in his view, so affected as were laws, and it seemed to him that he had

nothing to add to what he had already said, and he was content to leave the matter as it was, and to leave the

## CHAPTER SIX

## THE DISCUSSION AT THE CONFERENCE

At eleven o'clock on the morning of Saturday, January 14, 1604, in the monarch's privy chamber at Hampton Court, King James was surrounded by a group of courtiers and ecclesiastics, assembled for the official opening of the conference. At the ruler's right sat the Privy Council. At his left were the Bishops and Deans. A short while before the hour had struck, the Lord Chamberlain had ushered the chosen few into the conference room and had closed the door, leaving outside in the presence chamber a company of Episcopalian deans and doctors with the four Puritans.

Manifestly the king was in an affable mood. Upon entering he had spoken pleasantly to several of the lords and then had seated himself in a chair placed appropriately before a background of the cloth of state. He spoke with the assurance of a man conscious that he was making history.

In writing of the address delivered by the king from his thronelike position, Bishop Matthew described it as "an excellent oration of an hour long," (1) Dean Barlow referred to it as a "grave and princely declaration" (2) and Dean Montague recalled it as an "admirable Speech of an Hour long at least, for Learning, Piety, and Prudency, I never heard the like." (3)

The king indicated that in summoning the assembly he was following the example of other Christian princes, "who in the commencement of their reign usually take the first course for the establishing of the church, both for doctrine and policie." (4) He declared that his purpose was not to alter but "to confirm that which he found well settled already; which state, as it seemed, so affected his royal heart, that it pleased him both to enter into

a gratulation to Almighty God, (at which words he put off his hat) for bringing him into the promised land, where religion was purely professed, where he sate among grave, learned and reverend men . . . yet because nothing could be so absolutely ordered, but something might be added afterward thereunto, . . . and in that he had received many complaints, since his first enterance into the kingdome, . . . his purpose therefore was, like a good physician, to examine and try the complaints, and fully to remove the occasions thereof, if they prove scandalous, or to cure them, if they were dangerous, or, if but frivolous, yet to take knowledge of them, thereby to cast a sop into Cerberus his mouth, that he may never bark again." (5)

On this opening day, in addition to summarizing criticisms that he had heard concerning conditions in the Church of England, the king made inquiries about topics upon which he personally wished clarification. The Primate and bishops replied and were asked to present recommendations on the following Wednesday.

Monday was the day upon which the Puritans stated their case before the entire conference, with Reynolds as their "foreman" (6) and Bancroft and Bilson as spokesmen of the Episcopalians. Besides the official personnel a few listeners were present, among them Galloway and Harington.

At the outset the king evidently desired to be considerate in his attitude toward the Puritans, for he told the representatives in the presence of the whole assembly that he understood them to be learned and modest, and declared that he "was now ready to hear at large, what they could object or say." (7) While Dr. Reynolds was discussing his first main heading he was interrupted and not permitted to complete his case consecutively. From that moment the discussion meandered. According to Mackinnon, James "played his

part in the debate with tolerable fairness and great credit to his theological skill, until an unlucky reference by Reynolds to the word presbyter proved too much for the royal equanimity." (8) The state of mind induced in the king by the flattery of the bishops, combined with his fear of Puritan designs, took from him whatever spirit of justice he originally purposed to display.

At the opening of the session on Wednesday, January 18, the bishops, deans, privy councillors, and additional knights and doctors were present. After hearing the bishops' report concerning the liturgy, considering administrative matters, and designating groups to prepare proposed enactments, the monarch summoned the Puritans to announce the conclusions that had been reached and to insist that all ministers conform to what had been decided.

Although the Hampton Court discussions wandered, they actually centered around six issues:

I. The Book of Common Prayer and the Church Services, II. Doctrinal Differences, III. The Ministry, IV. Disciplinary Procedure, V. Pacification of Ireland, Wales and The Scottish Border, and VI. A New Authorized Translation of the Bible.

## I. THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

### CONFIRMATION

In his initial speech King James referred to the manner of confirmation of children as the first objectionable item, suggesting that if the name implied a "confirming of baptism, as if this sacrament without it were of no validity, then were it blasphemous." (9) Archbishop Whitgift maintained that confirmation had been used in the church universal since the time of the apostles "till that of late some particular churches had unadvisedly rejected it," and denied any implication in the church's teaching that without

confirmation baptism is "unperfect, or that it did adde anything to the vertue and strength thereof." (10) Bishops Bancroft and Robinson argued that confirmation rested not only upon the practice of the primitive church, but also upon apostolic precedent, citing John Calvin's exposition of Hebrews 6:2 to sustain their contention. After reading the indicated passage in the Bible, where baptism and the laying on of hands are mentioned together, King James approved the exposition. Bishop Matthew added, in support of confirmation, a reference found in the first gospel to the imposition of hands upon children. (11)

When, in presenting the Puritan position, Dr. Reynolds alluded to confirmation as "a depraved imitation of the apostles," (12) Bishop Bancroft inquired if the objector believed it advisable for every pastor in his parish to confirm, rather than the bishop. Dr. Reynolds replied that it was inconvenient to commit administration to the bishop alone, because, with the multiplicity of parishes, one man could not satisfactorily examine all who came to be confirmed. The bishop explained that it was the episcopal custom, prior to a visitation, to give advance notice to those who wished either to be confirmed or to have their children confirmed, with chaplains or other ministers appointed to examine candidates, so that no person could be lightly confirmed. Bishop Bilson challenged the Puritan group to show where in antiquity any other than a bishop performed the rite of confirmation. (13)

The king declared that it was not compatible with authority or decency for every ordinary pastor to administer confirmation and that bishops should keep what they had so long retained and enjoyed, since there was as great reason that none should confirm without the bishop's license as that none should preach without his license. (14)

As a result of this discussion the bishops consented to a slightly altered heading in the Book of Common Prayer, "Examination with Confirmation of Children." (15)

A related problem upon which the king "required satisfaction," was the need for those whose parents answered questions for them, when they were baptized in infancy, to be examined when they came to years of discretion and made their own profession, at which time they should be confirmed with an episcopal blessing. (16) On this point the conclusion was: "To confirmation shall be added the word of catechizing, or examination of the children's faith." (17)

#### ABSOLUTION

The king introduced an inquiry concerning absolution. "How we use it in our church I know not," he said, and then explained that he had heard it likened to the Pope's pardons. His own judgment was that God had provided two kinds of absolution, "the one general, the other particular: for the first, all prayers and preachings do import an absolution: for the second, it is to be applied to special parties, who having committed a scandal, and repenting, are absolved: otherwise, where there precedes not either excommunication, or penance, there needs no absolution." (18)

The Primate explained that in the Church of England the minister pronounced an absolution in general. The king examined the communion book and approved the archbishop's statement. The Bishop of London, however, added that it was becoming to call attention to another more particular form of absolution for visitation of the sick. While the Dean of the Chapel was turning to the place in the Book of Common Prayer, Bishop Bancroft asserted that the Augustinian, Bohemian and Saxon confessions retained such a form of absolution and that John Calvin approved both general

and private absolutions. When the exact words were read from the prayer book, James gave his sanction to the ordinance, "in that it was given in the name of Christ, to one that desired it, and upon the clearing of his conscience." He requested the bishops to consult whether or not the word "remission of sins" might not be added as an explanation to the rubric of general absolution. (19) On the final day the notation of alterations handed to the king contained the words, "Absolution or remission of sinnes, in the rubrick of absolution." (20)

### BAPTISM

By introducing the subject of private baptism, James precipitated a discussion of three hours' duration. (21) He declared that, as far as place was concerned, privacy accorded with the custom of the primitive church; however, he "utterly disliked that any but a lawfull minister might baptize any where," and earnestly opposed baptism by women and the laity. (22)

In replying to this royal declaration, the archbishop affirmed that administration of baptism by women and lay persons was not the practice of the Church and that inquiry with censure concerning it was made by bishops at the time of their visitation.

The king pressed the matter, calling attention to the words of the Book of Common Prayer, which could not but be construed to permit women and private persons to baptize.

Bishop Babington remarked that though the words might be interpreted in that way yet such practice was not customary and indicated that the ambiguity was due to desire of the compilers to have the book passed in parliament.

Bishop Bancroft objected, saying that the framers of the Book of Common Prayer had no intention of using ambiguous terms,

but wished to permit private persons to baptize in case of necessity. He cited letters of the men who phrased the book and argued that the practice of the ancient church served as a precedent, since baptism of the three thousand on the one day of Pentecost, by the apostles alone, was, if not impossible, at least improbable. He further insisted that although God could save a child without baptism the unbaptized infant was in an uncertain state, but that if he had been baptized his salvation was assured. "Who is he," the bishop concluded feelingly, "that having any religion in him, would not speedily, by any means, procure his child to be baptized, and rather ground his action upon Christ's promise, than his omission thereof upon God's secret judgement?"

The king replied that it was not sound reasoning to base the practice of the church upon an account so extraordinary as that recorded in the second chapter of Acts, which occurred before the church was "setled and grounded." "I also," he said, "maintain the necessity of baptism. . . . it may seem strange to you my lords, that I, who now think you in England give too much to baptism did 14 moneths ago in Scotland argue with my divines there for ascribing too little to that holy sacrament. Insomuch that a pert minister asked me if I thought baptism so necessary, that if it were omitted the child should be damned? I answered him, 'No, but if you, being called to baptize the child, though privately, should refuse to come, I think you shall be damned.'" James stressed his conviction as to the necessity of baptism, administered by lawful ministers, and not by private persons; yet he "utterly disliked all rebaptization," although either women or lay persons had baptized.

Bishop Bilson argued that to deny private persons in the case of necessity was to oppose all antiquity and that it was

"a rule agreed upon among divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament."

The king answered that though the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament, yet he is the essence of its right and lawful administration.

The upshot of the discussion was to have the bishops consider "whether into the rubrick of private baptism, which leaves it indifferently to all laikes or clergy, the word, curate or lawful minister, might not be inserted." (23) On the final day the archbishop's notation read, "In private baptism, the lawfull minister present." (24) Patrick Galloway wrote a more detailed explanation: "That the private baptism shall be called the private baptism by the ministers and curates only; and all these questions that insinuate women or private persons, to be altered accordingly." (25)

One of the "abuses" against which the Puritan doctors objected was the use of the cross in baptism, which they desired to have "utterly forborn." (26) When the king asked to be made acquainted with the antiquity of the use of the cross, the Puritans conceded that it had been used since the apostles' time, but "this was the difficulty," Barlow explained, "to prove it of that ancient use in baptism. For that at their going abroad, or entering into the Church, or at their prayers and benedictions, it was used by the ancients, desired no great proof: but whether in baptism antiquity approved it, was the doubt cast in by M. Deane of Sarum, whom his Majesty singled out, with a special encomion, that he was a man well travelled in the ancients." (27) When Dean Andrewes was requested by the king to discuss the point he quoted Tertullian, Cyprian and Origen as specific authorities for using the sign of the cross in baptism.

Mr. Knewstubs raised the question as to whether the church had power to add "significant signes" where Christ had already ordained one, maintaining that it was no less derogatory to Christ's institution than if any potentate of the land should presume to add his seal to the great seal of England. King James retorted that the analogy was not accurate since no sign was added to the sacrament, which was fully finished before any mention of the cross was made. (28)

Dr. Reynolds urged the desirability of abandoning use of the cross "because, in the time of popery, it had been superstitiously abused," pointing out the Biblical precedent of demolishing the brazen serpent "because the people abused it to idolatry."

This kind of argument was exactly what the king enjoyed. He made a characteristic fourfold reply, his first contention being that if the cross was superstitiously used in baptism in the time of popery it must have been well used previously. "By this argument," exclaimed the monarch, "we might renounce the Trinity, and all that is holy, because it was abused in popery; (and speaking to Dr. Reynolds merily) they used to wear hose and shoes in popery, therefore you shall now go barefoot." The second regal retort was, "What resemblance is there between the brasen serpent, a material visible thing, and the sign of the crosse made in the aire?" and the third assertion was, "I am given to understand by the bishops, and I find it true, that the papists themselves did never ascribe any power or spirituall grace to the sign of the crosse in baptism." In the effort to clinch his argument the monarch added, "Fourthly, you see, that the material crosses, which in time of popery were made for men to fall down before them, as they passed by them, to worship them, (as the idolatrous Jews did the brasen serpent) are demolished, as you desire." (29)

## COMMUNION

Both Chaderton and Knewstubs presented an urgent Puritan request that the practice of "kneeling at the communion" be eliminated. Though the king and the bishops completely rejected the petition, the monarch consented to an exception in the case of certain preachers in Lancashire "who had taken great pains against the Papists, and doone much good among the people." He agreed that a letter be written to the Bishop of Chester, "to bear with their weakness for some time, and not proceed over hastilie and roughlie against any of them, until, by conference between the bishop and them, they might be persuaded to conforme themselves to us, and the rest of their brethren." The monarch placed upon Chaderton and Knewstubs responsibility for urging these preachers to submit to the judgement of the church and "to avoid all singularity, the mother of schismes and disorder." (30)

Vigorous objection was voiced to methods of observing the communion which Puritans sometimes used. On the second day the king used the expression, "ambling communions," and on the final day Lord Cecil quoted the king, adding "that the indecency thereof was very offensive, and had driven many from the Church. And here Master Chatterton was told of sitting communions in Emanuel College; which he said was so, by reason of the seats so plac'd as they be, yet that they had some kneeling also." (31)

## MARRIAGE

After Dr. Reynolds expressed disapproval of the words in the marriage ceremony, "With my body I thee worship," the king called for the prayer book, read the words, then commented, "I was made believe, that the phrase did import no lesse than divine worship and adoration: but by the examination, I find that it is

an usual English tearm, as a gentleman of worship, &c. And the sense agreeable unto scriptures, 'giving honor to the wife.'" The king's sense of humor now asserted itself. Turning to Dr. Reynolds he said, with a smile, "Many a man speakes of Robin Hood, who never shot in his bow: if you had a good wife your self, you would think all the honour and worship you could do to her were well bestowed."  
(32)

The use of the ring in marriage was approved by both Dr. Reynolds and King James, who referred to his own wedding, adding "that he thought they would prove to be scarce well married who are not married with a ring." (33)

On the final day discussion was reintroduced concerning the expression, "With my body I thee worship," the explanation being given that, as St. Paul indicated (I Corinthians 7:4), the man worships his wife in appropriating his body to her alone, and as St. Peter counseled (I Peter 3:7), "the man should give honor to his wife, as the weaker vessel." At the end of the disputation it was concluded to expand the expression to read, "With my body I thee worship, and honour." (34)

#### THE CATECHISM

When Dr. Reynolds declared that the short catechism in the prayer book was too brief and the longer one too long for young novices to memorize, and requested that a single uniform catechism be made, "which, and none other, might be generally received," the prelates proposed that questions and answers concerning the doctrine of the sacraments be added to the short catechism.

The king "thought the doctor's request very reasonable: but yet so, that he would have a catechism in the fewest and plainest affirmative terms that may be," and expressed the desire for "one

to be made and agreed upon, adding this excellent gnomical and canon-like conclusion, that in reforming of a church . . . . old, curious, deep and intricate questions might be avoided in the fundamental instruction of a people." (35)

Patrick Galloway's summary included as the first item under the heading, "Of such things as shall be reformed": "That an uniform short and plain catechism be made, to be used in all churches and parishes in this kingdom. There is already the doctrine of the sacraments added, in most clear and plain terms." (36) This new section from the pen of Dean Overall was to go down as a continuing contribution to posterity.

#### USE OF THE APOCRYPHA

Another of the "divers abuses" to which the Puritans objected was the reading of the apocrypha in church services. (37) Dr. Reynolds declared that a basic reason why many capable men were backward in subscription was that the books of the apocrypha were enjoined to be read in the church, despite the fact that in some of the appointed chapters were "manifest errors, directly repugnant to the scriptures." (38)

The bishops replied to these "old cavils" and the king declared that he would take middle ground between the disputants, indicating that he would not wish all canonical books to be read in the church unless there were an interpreter, nor any apocrypha at all where there was apparent error. He added that he would have passages from the apocrypha which were clear and in accord with the Scriptures to be read. "For else," he inquired, "why were they printed?" He cited the books of the Maccabees as helpful in completing the history of the persecution of the Jews, but not to be used to teach a man either to sacrifice for the dead or to kill himself. (39)

At this moment the king retired to his own rooms and, during the interval, the lords discussed a passage in Ecclesiasticus to which Dr. Reynolds had referred. Upon the king's return he listened to the disputation, called for a Bible, and gave his own exposition. When he concluded he declared to Dr. Reynolds that it was "not good to impose upon a man that was dead a sense never meant by him." Turning to the lords with comments intended to be humorous, James inquired why the Puritans were so angry with Ecclesiasticus. "By my soul," exclaimed the king, "I think he was a bishop, or else they would never use him so!"

The outcome of this discussion was the king's command to Dr. Reynolds to bring to Archbishop Whitgift on the following Wednesday a notation of offensive places in the apocryphal books. (40) The conference conclusion was, according to Patrick Galloway, "That such apocrypha as have any repugnance to canonical scripture shall be removed and not read; and other places chosen for them which may serve better, either for explanation of scripture, or instruction in good life and manners: and specially the greatest part of such places as were given in writ." (41)

## II. DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES

### PREDESTINATION AND FALLING FROM GRACE

The first Puritan request concerning doctrine was that in the book of Articles of Religion, as concluded in 1562, obscure places be explained and defective places enlarged. Referring to the words in Article sixteen, "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace," Dr. Reynolds suggested that, although the meaning was sound, it might seem contrary to the doctrine of God's predestination and election stated in the seventeenth article and suggested that after the words, "we may depart

from grace," he added, "yet neither totally nor finally." (42)

In reply Bishop Bancroft declared that many contemporaries neglected holiness of life, presuming too much on persisting grace, basing all their religion upon predestination, saying, "If I shall be saved, I shall be saved." He termed this doctrine "desperate," declaring that the true doctrine of predestination implied, "I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbor; I follow my vocation; therefore I trust that God hath elected me, and predestinated me to salvation."

"The usual course of the argument is," continued the bishop, "God has predestinated and chosen me to life, therefore though I sin never so grievously, yet I shall not be damned: for whom he once loveth, he loveth to the end."

The bishop expounded to the king the doctrinal position of the Church of England concerning predestination, quoting Article eighteen, "We must receive God's promises, in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God."

Following the Bishop of London, King James "very singularly discoursed on that place of Paul, 'Work out your salvation with fear and trembling,'" heartily approving the article which Bancroft had quoted. He suggested, however, that it should be considered whether or not it would be proper to add such an expression as, "We may often depart from grace," in order to clear the doubt expressed by Reynolds. The royal desire was "that the doctrine of predestination might be very tenderly handled, and with great discretion, lest on the one side, God's omnipotency might be called in question, by impeaching the doctrine of his eternal predestination, or on the other, a desperate presumption might be arreared,

by inferring the necessary certainty of standing and persisting in grace." (43)

The doctrine of predestination, upon which Reynolds was insisting at Hampton Court, had a deep meaning for the Puritans. As Haller has shown, "the concept of universal depravity, by leveling all superiority not of the spirit, enormously enhanced the self-respect of the ordinary man. . . . God chose whom he would and the distinctions of this world counted for nothing. . . . Once the Calvinist preachers admitted that the only true aristocracy was spiritual and beyond human criterion, they had gone a long way toward asserting that all men in society must be treated alike because only God knows who is superior." (44)

The Puritan, thinking of himself as one of God's elect, became aware of his own part in a predestined divine victory; therefore, he set himself to work vigorously, despite opposition, toward the achievement of God's triumph. This view of life gave tremendous power to Puritan preaching, bringing a thrill of elation to humble hearers, because, they thought, "if any had the advantage, it was not the great, the rich or the learned but the multitudinous humble, poor and ignorant." (45)

#### LAMBETH ARTICLES

Another Puritan request concerning doctrine was that the Lambeth Assertions be inserted in the Book of Articles. His majesty declared that he could not "suddenly answer, because he understood not what the doctor meant by those assertions or propositions at Lambeth." He was informed of the controversy at Cambridge which had led Archbishop Whitgift to summon eminent divines to draw up propositions to be sent to the university as a means of settling the theological dispute.

The "nine orthodoxal assertions" which the Puritans desired to include in the Articles of Religion were: (1) God from all eternity has predestinated some persons to life, and others to death. (2) The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not forseen faith, or perseverance in good works, or any other quality, in the persons predestinated, but the sole will and purpose of God. (3) The number of the predestinated is predetermined and certain, and cannot be increased or lessened. (4) Those who are not predestinated to salvation are necessarily condemned on account of their sins. (5) A true, lively, and justifying faith, and the sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, is not extinguished, neither does it fail, nor does it vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally. (6) A man who is truly faithful, or endowed with justifying faith, has a certain and full assurance of remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. (7) Saving grace is not afforded to all men, neither have all men such a communication of the divine assistance, that they may be saved if they will. (8) No man can come to Christ unless it be granted to him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to Christ. (9) It is not in the will and power of every man to be saved. (46)

After hearing about these Calvinistic propositions the king declared that the quietest proceeding in the case of questions arising among scholars was to determine them in the universities and not to "stuff the book with all conclusions theological." (47)

Dean Overall of St. Paul's, kneeling, requested permission to speak because the controversy had arisen over a proposition which he had delivered in Cambridge, that "whosoever (although before justified) did commit any grievous sin, as adultery, murder, treason, or the like, did become, ipso facto, subject to God's

wrath, and guilty of damnation, or were in state of damnation, until they repented; adding here unto, that those which were called or justified according to the purpose of God's election, howsoever they might, and did sometimes fall into grievous sins, and thereby into the present state of wrath and damnation, yet did never fall, either totally from all the graces of God, to be utterly destitute of all the parts and seed thereof, nor finally from justification, but were in time renewed by God's Spirit unto a lively faith and repentance; and so justified from those sins." The opponents of this affirmation, Overall explained, maintained that, no matter what justified persons did, they continued in a state of justification before they actually repented or though they never repented.

The king expressed utter dislike of the doctrine that was held by the dean's opponents, discoursing at length on the necessity of joining repentance and holiness of life with true faith, and declaring that, although predestination depends not upon man but upon God, yet "such is the necessity of repentance, after known sins committed, as that, without it, there could not be either reconciliation with God or remission of those sins." (48)

No specific decision was registered at the conference concerning these doctrinal proposals of the Puritans, except the king's declaration of his own theological views and his opposition to having the Articles of Religion expanded.

### III. THE MINISTRY

#### GOOD PASTORS IN ALL PARISHES

One of the most urgent requests of Dr. Reynolds was "that good pastors might be planted in all churches to preach . . . the doctrine of the church . . . in purity according to God's word." (49) To the Puritan, preaching was the spiritual breath of life.

By it the souls of the people were stirred out of lethargy and sin and indoctrinated into the truth. The vivid speech which became familiar in later households through the allegory of Bunyan first became a thing of power on the lips of Puritan preachers. The President of Corpus Christi was pleading at Hampton Court that means be found to multiply the number of dynamic proclaimers of the gospel.

During Elizabeth's reign the Puritans had presented a petition to Parliament, stating, "The bishops either preach not at all, or very seldom. And whereas the Scriptures say that ministers of the gospel should be such as are able to teach sound doctrine and convince gainsayers, yet the bishops have made priests of the lowest of the people, not only for their occupations and trades whence they have taken them, as shoemakers, barbers, tailors, waterbearers, shepherds and horsekeepers, but also for their want of good learning and honesty . . . . There are a great number within the ministry that live not upon the place where they are beneficed, but abandon their flocks, directly contrary to the charge of Christ . . . . Of this sort are sundry bishops who have benefices in commendam, university men, and chaplains at court; others get two or three benefices into their hands to serve them for winter and summer houses, - which pluralities and non-residences are the more greivous because they are tolerated by law." Appended to the petition were data showing that in 590 livings in a typical shire were only 121 preachers and 154 who held double benefices or were non-resident.

(50)

In a sermon before the queen a Puritan preacher, Edward Dering, had declared that benefices were "defiled with impropriations, some with sequestrations, some loaden with pensions, some robbed of their commodities." He boldly asserted that patrons sold them out, gave them to boys, servingmen, their own children, seldom

to learned pastors. The incumbents, he cried, "are blind guides, and cannot see. . . ., dumb dogs and will not bark." (51) Elizabeth's secretary, Francis Walsingham, wrote a memorandum concerning this evil, urging that churches endowed with convenient living be furnished with learned and godly preachers, and that non-residents, who fed neither body nor soul, be ordered to reside for a definite number of months each year upon their cures or appoint satisfactory substitutes. (52)

The earnestness of Puritan desire to develop a high quality in the ministry, as well as the tendency to give meticulous attention to detail, was evidenced at Hampton Court by Dr. Reynolds' objecting to the phraseology of the twenty-third Article of Religion because its statement, that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of preaching or administering the sacrament in the congregation, implied that any man whatsoever out of the congregation might do so. (53)

Bishop Bancroft scorned this criticism as a "vain objection, because, by the doctrine and practice of the Church of England, none but a licensed minister might preach, nor either publicly or privately administered the eucharist, or the Lord's supper." (54)

The king informed the Puritans that he had consulted with the bishops "concerning the planting of ministers learned in every parish," and had found them willing and ready to second him in it. He spoke with vehemence concerning the negligence and carelessness of many ministers, adding that two difficulties stood in the way of an adequately prepared ministry: first, the universities had not trained a sufficient number for all parishes, and, second, if they were prepared, financial support was not available. James suggested that, wherever there was no hope of improvement of young ministers, they be removed and that after the death of elderly

men their successors be well prepared. He expressed himself as zealously desirous "of doing something dayly in this case, because Jerusalem could not be built up in a day." (55)

Bishop Bilson declared that the insufficiency of the clergy was not due fundamentally to bishops but to lay patrons. (56)

Suddenly Bishop Bancroft knelt before the king urging two requests:

"First, that there might be amongst us, a praying ministry another while; for whereas there are in the ministry many excellent duties to be performed, as the absolving of the penitent, praying for, and blessing of the people, administring of the sacraments, and the like; it is come to that passe now, that some sort of men thought it the only duty required of a minister, to spend the time in speaking out of a pulpit; sometimes, God wot, very undiscreetly and unlearnedly; and this, with so great injury and prejudice to the celebration of divine service, that some ministers would be content to walk in the church-yard, till sermon time, rather than to be present at publick prayer. He confessed, that in a church new to be planted, preaching was most necessary; but among us, now long established in the faith, he thought it not the only necessary duty to be performed, and the other to be so profanely neglected and contemned." (57)

If Dr. Reynolds had been privileged to reply to Bishop Bancroft he might have admitted that Puritan preachers occasionally used the pulpit as a place for theological sparring, but that fundamentally they were bearers of comfort, courage and popular enlightenment, as well as stimulators of moral conscience.

It was not the Puritan, however, but the monarch who replied to the Bishop of London. James received Bancroft's request with marked favor, declaring that "the hypocrisie of the times" placed

"all religion in the ear, through which there is an easy passage; but prayer, which expresseth the hearts affection, and is the true devotion of the mind, as a matter putting us to overmuch trouble (wherein there concurre, if prayer be as it ought, an impartial consideration for our own estates, a due examination to whom we pray, and humble confession of our sins, with an hearty sorrow for them, an repentance not severed from faith) is accounted and used as the least part of religion." (58)

The second request of Bishop Bancroft was that until such time as "learned and sufficient men might be planted in every congregation, that godly homilies might be read, and the number of them increased, and that the opponents would labour to bring them into credit again, as formerly they brought them into contempt."

The king approved this motion, "especially where the living is not sufficient for maintenance of a learned preacher" and also in cities and towns "where plenty of sermons are." He gained Puritan consent to the plan of preaching in villages where ministers were not near together and reading of homilies in the cities.

"A preaching ministry is best," said James, "but where it may not be had, godly prayers and exhortations do much good. That that may be done, let it, and let the rest that cannot, be tolerated."

Lord Chancellor Egerton added the comment, "Livings rather want learned men than learned men livings," expressing the wish that some who were in the universities prepared for the ministry "might have single coats before others had dublets" and explained his procedure in bestowing the king's benefices.

Bishop Bancroft commended "his honourable care that way, withall excepted that a dublet was necessary in cold weather."

The Chancellor replied, "that he did it not for dislike of

the liberty of our church, in granting one man two benefices, but out of his own private purpose and practice," because of the "many in the universities pining, masters, bachelors, and upwards."

Another request of the Bishop of London was that pulpits might not be made places of abusive satire, "wherein every humorous or discontented fellow might traduce his superiors."

The king instantly voiced his opposition to that "lewd custome; threatening, that if he should but hear of such a one in a pulpit he would make him an example." He insisted that the petitioners encourage their friends to make peace and that, if they had objections to any church officer, they should not give voice to it in the pulpit but complain to the "ordinary of the place, from him to go to the arch-bishop; from him to the lords of his Majesties counsel, and from them, if in all these places no remedy is found, to his own self." (59)

The procedure of Bancroft during this discussion indicated a burning desire to shift attention from criticism of the bishops to attack upon the Puritans. No more inept thing occurred in the conference than the attempt of the hierarchy to thrust aside the question of pluralities.

On the final day King James, in committing "weighty matters to be consulted of by the lords and bishops" requested that there be "provision of sufficient maintenance for the clergie; and withall, for the planting of a learned and painful minister in every parish, as time shall serve." (60)

#### THE SURPLICE AND CORNERED CAP

The mildness of the Hampton Court discussion concerning vestments contrasted sharply with the violence of previous controversy. Protestants who had returned to the homeland during Elizabeth's reign, after becoming accustomed to the clerical garb

in Frankfort and Geneva, where a surplice was not approved, were irked by the "popish wardrobe" prescribed in England, chasuble, cope, rochet, surplice, tippet, and square priestly cap. "Their opposition," wrote Frere, "was so stout that the full enforcement of the clause about ornaments in the Act of Uniformity, now become the ornaments rubric of the prayer-book, was never within the bounds of possibility." (61)

In print and in spoken word the Puritans had their say concerning vestments. One of their suppressed tracts contained this doggerel:

"The Pope's attire, whereof I talk,  
I know to be but vain;  
Wherefore some men that witty are  
To read me will disdain.

"But I would wish that such men should  
With judgement read me twice:  
And mark how great an evil it is  
God's preachers to disguise.

. . . . .

"God grant that all men may once see  
On which side truth doth stand,  
And pray to Him for such as be  
Made rulers of the land.

"That they, having before their eyes,  
The fear of God above,  
May seek to set God's word in place  
And all vain togs remove." (62)

When Dr. Reynolds voiced Puritan objection to the surplice, he did not present the complete case against vestments, or even the full reason for Puritan objection to the surplice. His attitude showed shrewd understanding of the king's psychology. A few moments before the request concerning clerical garb was presented, the doctor had used the argument of Popish superstition in opposing the use of the sign of the cross in baptism and the king had waxed sarcastic in reply. Reynolds put aside the argument that the surplice was a badge of Popery and maintained that it should not

be worn in Christian worship because it was the kind of garment that priests of Isis used to wear.

The king retorted, "Untill of late, I did not think that it had been borrowed from the heathen, because it is commonly tearmed a ragge of popery, in scorn; but were it so, yet neither do we border upon heathenish nations, neither are any of them conversant with us, or commorant amongst us, who thereby might take just occasion to be strengthened or confirmed in paganism, for then there were just cause to suppress the wearing of it: but seeing it appeared out of antiquity, that in the celebration of divine service a different habit appertained to the ministry, and principally of white linnen, I see no reason, but that in this Church, as it has been, for comeliness and for order sake, it might be still continued. This is my constant and resolute opinion, that no church ought further to separate itself from the church of Rome, either in doctrine or ceremony, than she has departed from her self when she was in her flourishing and best estate, and from Christ her Lord and Head." (63)

A little later in the day the king, reverting to the question of clerical garb, asked the Puritans what they could say to the cornered cap. They did not voice objection. Turning to the bishops, James exclaimed, "You may now safely wear your caps: but I shall tell you, if you should walk in one street in Scotland with such a cap on your head, if I were not with you, you should be stoned to death with your cap." (64)

#### PROPHESYINGS AND PRESBYTERY

The discussion of prophesyings, which had been a source of widespread controversy, was introduced by Dr. Reynolds, who petitioned that "according to certain provincial constitutions,

they of the clergy might have meetings once every three weeks." He requested that in rural deaneries there be "prophecyings, according as the reverend father Arch-bishop Grindall and other bishops desired of her late majesty," and cited I Corinthians 14:29 as Biblical authority for such meetings, "Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discriminate." He proposed further that whatever could not be determined at these gatherings of ministers and laymen should be referred to the Archdeacon's visitation, and if not decided there, carried to the "episcopal synod, where the bishop with his presbytery should determine all such points as before could not be decided."

No word was spoken about the merits of the prophesyings. "There was room and call enough for such services," wrote Drysdale. "Whatever possible dangers or mischiefs may have lurked under their operation, it seems to be allowed, even by their most adverse critics, that they had in them elements of the highest value. . . . whetting the national intellect, . . . stirring the religious susceptibilities of the multitudes. . . ." and rousing the clergy "to study Scripture and add to their efficiency as public instructors." (65)

When Dr. Reynolds used the term "presbytery," a picture of Scottish organization came into James' mind, a surge of emotion was loosed within him, and he gave vent to one of the most quoted speeches of the conference. "A presbytery," he cried, "as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the Devil. Then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me and my council, and all other proceedings: then Will shall stand up and say, It must be thus; then Dick shall reply and say, Nay marry, but we will have it thus. And therefore, here I must once reiterate my former speech, Le Roy S'avisera: stay, I pray you,

for one seven years, before you demand that of me: and if then you find me pury and fat, and my wind pipes stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you: for let that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath, then shall we all of us have work enough, both our hands full." (66)

#### IV. DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE

##### SUBSCRIPTION AND SUPREMACY

One of Dr. Reynold's earnest declarations was that subscription had proved "a great impeachment to a learned ministry." He entreated that it "might not be exacted as heretofore, for which many good men were kept out, others removed, and many disquieted." He indicated Puritan willingness to subscribe to the Articles of Religion and the king's supremacy but reiterated the explanation that use of the apocrypha, interrogatories in baptism propounded to infants, and the cross in baptism were requirements to which they could not conscientiously subscribe. (67)

The king opposed the suggestion that continued leniency be shown to conscientious objectors, blurring out, "How long would they be weak? Are not forty five years sufficient for them to grow strong?" (68)

Reverting to Dr. Reynolds' two references to the king's supremacy the monarch inquired, "Dr. Reynolds, you have often spoken for my supremacy; and it is well: but know you any here, or any elsewhere, who like of the present government ecclesiastical, that find fault or dislike my supremacy?" (69)

"No," Dr. Reynolds replied simply.

With a dramatic gesture the king addressed the bishops, "My lords, I may thank you that these men do thus plead for my supremacy: they think they cannot make their party good against you, but by

appealing unto it; as if you, or some that adhere unto you, were not well affected toward it. But if once you were out and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy. No bishop, no king!" (70)

One cannot but wonder in reading those words of James whether or not he was thinking of John Knox's words, "Our religion from God has full power and needeth not the suffrage of man." (71)

At any rate, the king had recent experience in mind when he continued, "Neither do I thus speak at randome without ground, for I have observed since my comming into England, that some preachers before me can be content to pray for James King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, but as for supream governor in all causes and over all persons (as well ecclesiastical as civil), they passe that over with silence." (72)

#### EXCOMMUNICATION

A disciplinary problem which the king himself presented for consideration was the abuses that had crept in under the title of excommunication through the corruption of officials, against which, said Bishop Matthew, "his Majesty did argue and dispute at large." (73)

The Puritans also censured excommunication for small causes as well as "corruptions in the bishops' and archdeacons' courts, committed by their chancellors, commissaries, officials, registers and such like officers; together with their immoderate exactions and fees." (74) Dr. Reynolds took exception to committing ecclesiastical censures to lay chancellors, pointing out that the authority which had been given them in the time of King Henry was abrogated during the reign of Queen Mary and not revived under Queen Elizabeth. He also cited action of the bishops against lay excommunication. (75)

Dean Barlow reported that the king desired to know whether or not excommunication was executed, as had been complained, in light causes and whether or not it was used too often. He also inquired why laymen should do it and why the bishop should not, in cases of excommunication as well as other censures and giving of orders, be assisted by the dean and chapter, or other ministers, and "chaplains of gravity and account." (76)

The king specifically suggested that, instead of excommunication "in causes of lesser moment," the name might be altered and the censure retained, or, as an alternative, an equivalent coercion be devised. An agreement was reached quickly because church leaders had desired a change previously but it had not been obtained from Queen Elizabeth, who was resolved, as Barlow said, "to alter nothing which she had once settled." (77)

Patrick Galloway reported the form of the alteration,

"1. The bishops are admonished to judge no ministers without the advice and assistance of some of the gravest deans and chaplains. 2. That none shall have power to excommunicate, but only their bishops in their dioceses, in the presence of these aforesaid; and only upon such weighty and great causes, to which they shall subscribe. 3. The civil excommunication now used, is declared to be a mere civil censure; and therefore the name of it is to be altered; and a writ out of the chancellery to punish the contumacy shall be framed. 4. That all bishops, nominated to that effect, shall set down the matters and manner of proceeding, to be followed hereafter in ecclesiastical courts, and modify their fees." (78)

#### THE COURT OF HIGH COMMISSION AND OATH EX-OFFICIO

In introducing the oath ex-officio, used by the Court of High Commission, the Puritan doctors compared it to the Spanish

Inquisition. It was employed, they insisted, to entangle preachers with "many and sundry catching articles." (79)

When the king declared that he understood that in the Court of High Commission "the parties named therein were too many and too mean. . . . the matters they dealt in were base, and such as ordinaries at home in their courts might censure. . . . the branches granted out to the bishops in their several dioceses were too frequent and large," (80) Archbishop Whitgift explained that the number in the Court of High Commission must be large because the varied duties of bishops and privy councillors made it impossible always for them to be present, so that it was necessary to have deans and doctors of divinity and law included in its composition. He asserted that, though he himself had often complained of the matters handled by the court, the existing situation was necessary because delinquent persons were so prominent and so willful in contumacy that the ordinary was forced to crave help from the high commission. The archbishop further declared that commissions granted to bishops often were against his will.

Chancellor Egerton suggested that commissions be granted only through the bishops who had the largest dioceses.

The king approved, specifying, "those bishops who have in their dioceses the most troublesome and refractory persons, either Papists or Puritans," and expressed the wish that certain persons from the conference be appointed to "review of the commission," (81) including "the quality of persons to be named, and the nature of the causes to be handled." (82)

On the second day a courageous lord dared to speak out—"I think verily, rather upon misinformation than set purpose," wrote Barlow. This lord's name is unknown to history, but his encouragement of the cause of conscientious Puritans appears in

perspective as a high moment in the conference. He asserted that proceedings in the Court of High Commission were similar to the Spanish Inquisition, "wherein men were urged to subscribe more than law required; that by the oath ex-officio, they were inforced to accuse themselves; that they were examined upon twenty or twenty-four articles upon the sudden, without deliberation, and for the most part against themselves." (83)

Later historians have confirmed the judgement of this anonymous lord. Mackinnon wrote that the inquisitorial process devised by the archbishop for use by this irresponsible court "constituted a veritable searchlight, which flashed its rays into every recess of the life and conscience of the accused. . . . to the prying questions of their judges the accused were compelled to return a direct answer on oath, whether it was to their detriment or not. . . . Against this remorseless tyranny it was useless to appeal to the common law and the right to a legal trial. Whitgift could instance his commission under the royal seal, and play the tyrant in virtue thereof, in spite of any law or legal right to the contrary. . . . persecution by the High Commission was . . . a crime and a blunder, for the powers of the Commission, as wielded by Whitgift, were fatal to civil as well as religious liberty." (84)

On the final day the chancellor, treasurer and king declared the oath ex-officio to be a disciplinary necessity. Barlow's description of James' speech and the flattering reaction of ecclesiastics and politicians to it constituted one of the astonishing sections of his account: "and here his Majesty so soundly described the oath ex-officio: first, for the ground thereof: secondly, the wisdom of the law therein: thirdly, the manner of proceeding thereby, and the necessary and profitable effect thereof, in such a compendious but absolute order, that all the lords and the rest of

the present auditors stood amazed at it: the arch-bishop of Canterbury said that undoubtedly his Majesty spake by the special assistance of God's Spirit. The bishop of London, upon his knee, protested that his heart melted within him (as so, he doubted not, did the hearts of the whole company) with joy, and made haste to acknowledge unto Almighty God the singular mercy we have received at his hands in giving us such a king, as since Christ his time the like he thought had not been; whereunto the lords with one voice did yield a very affectionate acclamation. The civilians present confessed that they could not in many houres warning, have so judicially, plainly, and accurately, and in such a brief manner, have described it." (85)

The decision of the conference as recorded by Patrick Galloway was, "That the oath ex-officio be rightly used, id est, only for great and public slanders" and, "That the High Commission be rightly used, the causes to be handled, and the manner of proceeding therein to be declared; and that no person be nominated thereto, but such as are men of honour and good quality." (86) Dean Montague's report said, "The High Commission to be reformed, and to be reduced to higher Causes, and fewer Persons, and those of more Honor and of better Quality." (87)

#### PROFANATION OF THE LORD'S DAY

When Dr. Reynolds voiced the Puritan disquiet concerning "prophanation of the Sabbath Day, and contempt of his Majesties proclamation, made for the reforming of that abuse; of which he earnestly desired a straighter course for reformation," he was met with assent. (88) The conclusion was, "That the sabbath be looked to, and better kept throughout all dioceses." (89) The Puritans, in requesting an unprofaned Lord's Day, were showing their genuine

desire to reform the reckless living of the time by a purer discipline.

Evidently James did not desire to enter into discussion of Sunday recreation at Hampton Court, but he crystallized his ideas in a "Declaration of Sports," issued a few years afterward, maintaining that barring people from Sunday afternoon sports was objectionable on two grounds: first, because it gave Catholic priests opportunity to persuade people that recreation is not "tolerable in our religion" and second, because it kept the lower classes from healthful exercises and sent them to ale houses. He insisted that church officials convince those misled in religion, constraining Puritans and Precisians either to conform or to leave the country. He continued, "And as for our good people's lawful recreation, our pleasure likewise is, that after the end of divine service, our good people be not disturbed, letted, or discouraged, from any lawful recreation, such as dancing, either men or women; archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreation; nor from having of May-games, Whitsonales, and Morrice-dances, and the setting up of May-poles and other sports therewith used, so as the same be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or neglect of divine service; and that women shall have leave to carry rushes to the church, for the decoring of it, according to their old custom. But, withal, we do here account still as prohibited, all unlawful games to be used upon Sunday only; as bear and bull baiting, interludes, and, at all times, (in the meaner sort of people by law prohibited) bowling." (90) To encourage church attendance the king required that all who did not attend divine service be prohibited from Sunday afternoon recreation.

## TROUBLE-MAKING PERSONS AND BOOKS

Whenever the king referred to adherents of Roman Catholicism his implication was that they were trouble makers. In his opening address he mentioned the "superstitions" of the Catholic Queen Mary and said that he had received complaint since entering the realm of a great falling away to Popery. (91) He expressed abhorrence of the "abuse in popery" by which confirmation was made a sacrament. (92) In a pompous speech at the beginning of the second day, he declared that one of his objectives in the conference was "to plant unity for the suppressing of papists and enemies of religion." (93) In his bracketing of Papists and Puritans together as "troublesome and refractory persons," and his insistence that factious Puritan behavior drove many persons into Papistry (94) the king revealed that in his mind the important thing was not the essence or the sincerity of people's convictions but the fact that they made trouble. He did not like to have his peace disturbed.

The Puritans went beyond the king in desiring to crush Catholic influence. Dr. Reynolds urged suppression of books which unsettled youthful minds and corrupted the realm, particularly those by Papists. The Bishop of London inferred, however, that he was being criticized and declared that there was "no such licentious divulging of those books," as the Puritans imagined, that such books came into the realm from abroad "by many secret conveyances" and that only men who could refute them had authority to buy them. Both king and chancellor commended Bancroft for what he had done to suppress dangerous books. (95)

In assigning responsibilities to the ecclesiastics, the king mentioned three kinds of Papists, those who came to sermons but not to service and prayer, those who attended sermon and service but

not communion, and those who abstained from all. He ordered that recusants be classified according to these groupings and that "the weak" "be informed" and "the wilful" "punished." (96)

"Here," wrote Barlow, "my lord chancellor mentioned the writ De excommunicato capiendo, which his honor said did most affright the Papists of all other punishments, because by reason of that they were many wayes disabled in law: therefore he would take order, if his majesty so pleased, to send that writ out against them freely, without charge, and if they were not executed, his lordship would lay the under-sheriffes in prison, and to this the King assented." (97)

Patrick Galloway reported the agreed method of handling recusants to be that "the bishops be careful to cause the ministers note in every parish of their dioceses the names of all recusants; as also the names of such as come to church and hear preaching, but refuse to communicate every year once; and to present the same to the bishop, and the bishop to the archbishop, and the archbishop to the king." (98)

#### V. PACIFICATION OF IRELAND, WALES AND THE SCOTTISH BORDER

Both Bishop Matthew and Dean Barlow stressed the concern that the king displayed to pacify Ireland, Wales and the Scottish Borders, through providing them with able ministers and teachers. Matthew wrote that James "imparted to us. . . . how desirous he was, and we ought to be, that the kingdom of Ireland might be reduced to the true knowledge of God, and the true obedience. To which latter, without the former, he could never hope to find among them." (99) The bishop said that on the final day "his Majesty assigned his council and all the bishops forthwith to go and consult together in the council-chamber, as well as upon the premisses that needed any amends, as also how religion might be

planted upon the borders of England and Scotland, and likewise in Wales, but especially in his kingdom of Ireland; wherein he made demonstration of his exceeding princely care and godlie zeal, with most vehement and deep impression in all our ears and hearts, for the salvation of the souls of that forelorn people, and for the discharge of his own and all our Christian duties. Naming withall some whom he thought fittest to be employed, to take care for the expedition of that principal design." (100)

Barlow indicated that the climax of the king's initial speech was concerning "the providing of fit and able ministers for Ireland," (101) and his summary of the final day included the paragraph, "The fourth thing to be consulted of was for the sending and appointing of preachers into Ireland, whereof, saith his Majesty, I am but half a king, being lord over their bodies, but their soules seduced by popery he much pittied, affirming, that where there is not true religion, there can be no continued obedience: nor for Ireland only, but for some part of Wales, and the northern borders, so once called, though now no borders: the men to be sent not to be factious, or scandalous, for weeds will be weeds, wheresoever they be, and are good for nothing, but to be piked over the wall, therefore they should single out men of sincerity, of knowledge, of courage." (102)

Patrick Galloway's letter to the presbytery of Edinburgh recorded the decision, "That the kingdom of Ireland, the borders of England and Scotland, and all Wales, be planted with schools and preachers as soon as may be," (103) and Dean Montague's message to his mother used identical language. (104)

## VI. A NEW AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

One request made by the Puritans at Hampton Court, which is stressed by historians whenever the gathering is mentioned and often considered in popular thinking as the sole outcome of the conference, was the proposal for a new translation of the Bible. "Those which were allowed in the reign of King Henry the Eight and Edward the Sixt," said Dr. Reynolds, "were corrupt, and not answerable to the truth of the original." He stated, as examples, that in Galatians 4:25 the word translated "bordereth" failed to express the force of the word, the thought of the apostle, or the location of the place, and that in Psalm 105:28 the original meaning was, "They were not disobedient," but the translation said, "They were not obedient." In Psalm 106:30 the original Hebrew meant, "executed judgement," whereas the translation read, "prayed." (105)

When the request was presented, there was, according to Dean Barlow, "no gainsaying, the objections being trivial, and old, and already in print, often answered; only my lord of London well added, that if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no end of translating."

The king bestirred himself to a leaping response to this petition. Why was it that the royal resister heartily approved the proposal of a new English version of the Bible?

Long ago as a lad, James Stuart had a genuine interest aroused by his tutor, Buchanan, in the process of translation. In those far off days in Stirling Castle, he would go each morning to the school room in the east wing, study a chapter in the Bible, strive to master his Greek lesson and engage in composition in English, Greek and Latin. "The odd little boy," wrote Steeholm, "with the weak legs and the queerly crooked face with the mouth

too big for it, . . . was an apt pupil . . . in the dead languages." (106) When he became old enough to publish his productions James issued paraphrases of Old and New Testament passages and meditations upon their meaning. The soil in the mind of the king was prepared years before by George Buchanan to receive and give quick growth to the proposal of a new Biblical translation.

The Puritan request piqued the king's vanity. From the days when he issued his boyish essays on poetry he conceived of himself as a patron of literature. The project of gathering together a company of the greatest scholars in the land under the royal patronage stimulated the king's imagination. In saying to the company at Hampton Court that he never yet had seen a Bible well translated into English, (107) he was making it apparent that the monarch knew exactly how a translation ought to be done.

The proposal appealed to James' bookish nature. When he later descended upon Oxford his most enjoyable hours "were those he spent in the beautiful old oak stalls of Duke Humphrey's library. This was the atmosphere he loved; here he felt at home. Lennox and little Henry, Cecil, and the Earl of Dorset, Chancellor of Oxford, with all the rest of the royal train, stood about bored and hot, while James picked up volume after volume, scanned it, and gave lightning critiques upon the spot." (108) At Hampton Court he visualized his name connected with a book, the Book, and said, "Let special pains be taken for one uniform translation." (109)

Yet another motive moved through James' mind, resentment. The Geneva version called forth his bitter comment that it was the worst of all translations in English. He described the marginal notes as "partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous, and traitorous conceits," referring to a comment on Exodus 1:19, which allowed disobedience to kings, and another concerning II Chronicles 15:16, which "taxeth Asa for deposing his

mother, only, and not killing her." The king insisted that the new translation should have no marginal interpretations.

James showed sound sense in specifying the procedure to be followed in preparing the new version, saying that it should be done by "the best learned in both the universities." After their translation had been completed it was to be scrutinized by the bishops and the leading scholars of the church. After this review, the Privy Council was to examine the work. Finally, after all this evaluation, the translation was to be ratified by the king's royal authority. When the translation was issued the "whole church" was "to be bound unto it, and none other." (110)

The summarized decisions approved by King James, in Patrick Galloway's letter, included the item, "That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek; and this to be set out and printed without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England in time of divine service." (111)

#### THE END OF THE CONFERENCE

In the closing moments at Hampton Court, after the Puritans had done all in their power to obtain leniency for sincere ministers, who, they were sure, would continue to have scruples, "they jointly promised to be quiet." (112) They must have felt deeply the pathos of the situation, knowing how little they had been able to accomplish for their conscientious friends.

During the king's final speech tears were in the eyes of some of the Puritan group and some of the Episcopalian group. Barlow attributed the emotion to the fact that the king's "gracious conclusion was so piercing, as that it fetched tears from some on both sides." (113) The inference, however, is inevitable that the stirring within the souls of the Puritans was due partly to realization of how far away the day of their high dreams for the church must be under

existing leadership.

The conference was concluded by Bishop Bancroft, who "ended all, in the name of the whole company, with a thanksgiving unto God for his Majesty, and a prayer for the health and prosperity of his highnesse, our gracious queen, the young prince, and all their royal issue." (114)

The Bishop's prayer was a model of the devotion of the Church of England at that time. He desired enlightenment of the people and the support of the King and Queen. He prayed for the health and prosperity of the royal family and for the unity of the Church. He also prayed for the success of the King's wars and for the peace of the world. The prayer was a beautiful example of the devotion and loyalty of the English people to their King and Queen.

The Bishop's prayer was a beautiful example of the devotion and loyalty of the English people to their King and Queen. He prayed for the health and prosperity of the royal family and for the unity of the Church. He also prayed for the success of the King's wars and for the peace of the world. The prayer was a beautiful example of the devotion and loyalty of the English people to their King and Queen.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

## THE PROCEDURE OF THE CONFERENCE

Divergent conceptions of a conference were evident at Hampton Court, the ideas of King James, of the Puritans and of the Episcopalians. The monarch had three fundamental purposes in summoning the gathering. First, it was an occasion for him to confer with the prelates to discover exactly the customs of the Church of England and its doctrinal position. He desired enlightenment on questions raised in his mind by the Puritans and by his own background in a country whose ecclesiastical history was different from that of England. Second, the king sought an opportunity to overpower the Puritans with the verbal onslaught in which he believed himself to be supremely gifted. He had no thought to learn from them but a strong will to conquer them. The third purpose that loomed like a mountain in the king's mind was to provide a spectacular occasion for asserting the royal prerogative. In the presence of leaders of the church he wished to give unforgettably eloquent expression of the divine right of the king and to display his own worthiness as God's representative, heading both church and state.

The Puritan conception of the conference was as an opportunity to explain grievances, to make abuses obvious, to obtain reforms that seemed to them imperative, to attain justice for the wronged, and to bring about the unity of the church by removing offenses to conscientious ministers. They desired a renovation of the church in order that it might conform more nearly to their conception of the church described in the New Testament and to give sincere ministers the opportunity of preaching the truth as they discovered it in the Bible as well as to develop their ability to serve their divine Master.

The third conception of the conference was held by men in positions of authority in the church. They did not want it to convene at all, because the act of discussing alleged grievances appeared a weakening of their position and an admission that the Puritans had an element of justice on their side. If the conference had to be held, they were determined to silence their critics and to prevent change. When James heartily supported their major contentions, the ecclesiastics gave vent to their relief from anxiety in fulsome flattery of the king, whose "interlocutory conference" had given them a specimen of government that would "beautifie" the church. (1)

The normal modern mind finds itself critical of the fawning ecclesiastics at Hampton Court. Until recently the tendency has been to attribute this adulation to the times and to assume that the enlightenment of passing centuries had banished such attitudes. Now it is becoming clear that sycophancy is the concomitant of a system and not the trait of a century.

In contemporary Germany people are saying about Hitler exactly the kind of things that seventeenth century laudators were saying about James. An English lord said at Hampton Court that the king spoke by the instinct of the spirit of God, and a mother in Unterammergau wrote for the "Schwarze Korps" edition in honor of the fuehrer's fiftieth birthday, "My children know the Fuehrer as a man, who orders all things, rules all things, who built the world. The Fuehrer is for my children that visible Being, which we as children were taught to recognize as God." The Dean of Chester declared that the greatest scholar might not outstrip King James, and a lawyer from Dortmund wrote of Hitler, "The most revered father, the most deeply loved mother, the most loyal wife and the most trusted friend rouse in our hearts music far less

exalted than the song our souls sing to the Fuehrer." The Bishop of London asserted that since the time of Christ God had given no other people a ruler such as James, and a Nazi in Frankfort wrote, ". . . the word 'Fuehrer' . . . should only be applied to Adolf Hitler himself and we should impregnate our people from youth up with reverence for this word as the Christian Church reveres the name of God." (2) Adulators are the outgrowth of authoritarian regimes, whatever their date. Wherever there is a dictator, there are sycophants.

Although the Hampton Court assembly was called a conference, in reality it violated the basic principles upon which a conference is built. Analysis of procedure in other gatherings designated by this term reveals them to be characterized by: (1) a presiding chairman who moderates rather than dominates, (2) selection of participants whose expressed convictions provide a fair formulation of the issues involved, (3) provision of adequate opportunity for those present to voice their judgements, (4) mutual willingness to listen to opposing arguments, (5) frank facing of fundamental differences, (6) adequate time for deliberation, (7) full discussion of points at issue, (8) appointment of sub-committees to prepare reports on perplexing problems, and (9) concessions for the sake of unity.

King James presided at Hampton Court in his own way, not as a moderator but as a dictator. At the beginning of the session with the bishops and deans he himself expounded the issues, without calling upon the ecclesiastical leaders for their analysis of contemporary religious needs. "When the Puritan ministers stood before him," wrote Neal, "instead of being moderator, he took upon him the place of respondent, and bore them down with his majestic frowns and threatenings, in the midst of a numerous crowd of

courtiers." (3) The Puritans were not permitted to lay their case in its entirety before the conferees, because of interruption, though the king did rebuke the Bishop of London for the passion of his verbal attack upon the President of Corpus Christi. James veered from laughter to anger, from high-sounding sentiment to crudity, in his attitude toward the Puritans, and showed himself a partisan of the Episcopalians.

In five words Bacon had described the king, "In point of discourse large." James was exactly that. He loved to listen to the sound of his own voice. The rolling r's and the resonant vowels seemed to react intoxicatingly upon him.

The king's essential failure was in his fixity of mind. He had, so Tarkington wrote, "a kind of sensibleness, . . . founded on what he has learned long ago and not to be enlarged by what he will learn henceforth; for he will never more discover anything of such value that it could change his convictions - no matter how mightily some of them need to be changed. Long since, he has made up his mind as to the nature of everything; he weighs all men and all matters in a little old pair of scales that he has, and never doubts that all is so to be weighed." (4)

If James had not loved so to talk, he might have increased his learning at Hampton Court, for the Puritans had somewhat to say that would have been good for his soul, but he heard their words only as arguments to be refuted. What they said he utilized as a springboard from which to leap to a splashing speech.

Whenever James referred to the Puritans he did so slightly. On the opening day, with bishops and deans, he made it clear that "howsoever he lived among puritans, and was kept, for the most part, as a ward under them, yet since he was of the age of his sonne, ten years old, he ever disliked their opinions;

as the Saviour of the world said, 'though he lived among them, he was not of them'". (5) On the second day in the presence of the petitioners the monarch reiterated the declaration, adding a comment concerning his detestation of the peremptory Puritan manner. (6) On the final day he said that experience had shown him how "ticklish and humorous" many Puritans were, laboring "to pervert others to their fancies." (7)

Not only in presiding but in selection of personnel, the king was unfair. The gathering did not represent the varieties of religious views which actually prevailed. The summoned Puritans were moderate scholars who did not present the position taken by the majority of their school of thought. They did not urge, for example, as their associates desired, that vestments were sinful, having no warrant in Scripture and being remnants of popery, but rather referred to the surplice as undesirable in Christian worship because of its being derived from the garment used by priests of Isis. No Catholics were invited to the discussion, although they desired an opportunity to state their case, as was evidenced by a document posted at Wigan Cross requesting a disputation to decide whether recusants deserved the treatment being accorded to them. (8)

Apparently the age was so bound by prejudice that complete representation of divergent convictions was impossible. Even forty years later at the Westminster Assembly it did not occur; however, there was distinct advance. In 1604 certain leaders were not present because they were not invited. The Puritans themselves had no choice as to who should represent them at Hampton Court. In Westminster Assembly were advocates of presbytery as divinely instituted, others who argued for its expediency, proponents of congregationalism, supporters of episcopalian government, and still

others who sought a compromise to blend the various forms. The sparse number of Episcopalians there was not because they were excluded deliberately, but because they chose not to participate, on the ground that the assembly was sanctioned by parliament only and not by the king. The Westminster personnel was selected, not by the monarch as at Hampton Court, but by members of parliament. Twenty were chosen from the House of Commons, ten from the House of Lords, and one hundred twenty from the clergy in England and Wales, to whom were added five ministers and three laymen from Scotland. (9) Here was another gathering called to consider similar problems of faith and order, which was more thoroughly representative numerically, theologically, geographically and organizationally. At the Savoy conference of 1661 a commission of twelve Episcopalians and twelve Presbyterians, with nine coadjutors for each, was appointed to consider revision of the Book of Common Prayer and to have four months for deliberation. These two other seventeenth century conferences show that the times did not wholly preclude a more democratic representation than was assembled in 1604.

No adequate provision was made at Hampton Court for the conference personnel to voice their judgements; nor was there mutual reasonableness in listening to opposing arguments. The energies of these seventeenth century churchmen were being utilized in attacking each other more than in tackling the problems that confronted the whole church. The opposing groups seemed unaware of the differences in temperament which lead people to have divergent attitudes. As often has occurred in history, when things have not been right in church and state, leaders sought a scapegoat. The bishops pointed the finger of accusation at the Puritans and the Puritans hinted strongly that the bishops were at fault. Both

thought that the others were "eagerly set to overthrow and wast" the church. (10) With such a spirit it was impossible for either group to listen with poise to the other.

The Puritans, however, showed the more admirable attitude. They were interrupted, attacked and ridiculed, but they maintained self restraint. Their reasonable requests were received unreasonably. Their seriousness was treated lightly. Despite it all, the picture painted of these men by so intense an Episcopalian as Bancroft revealed Puritan dignity.

The treatment accorded a man of Dr. Reynolds' eminence was far below what might have been expected even in a century of partisan bitterness. His suggestion that, to the words in the articles of religion, "the bishop of Rome hath no authority in this land," be added, "nor ought to have," brought forth a roar of laughter from James, in which the king was joined by the lords about him. Other earnest requests were received as merely frivolous, being interrupted by "by-talk" intended to be humorous, but actually succeeding in wounding the sensibilities of the Puritans. (11)

Before Reynolds was a fourth of the way through his presentation of the Puritan case the king exclaimed, "If these be the greatest matters you be grieved with, I need not have been troubled with such importunities!" As the king spoke he shook his head and smiled knowingly at the lords, implying that royal wisdom was looking down upon Puritan pettiness. (12) As soon as James concluded that the petitioners were working toward Presbyterian organization in England, he blurted out, "Dr. Reynolds, till you find that I grow lazy, let that alone!" (13)

When Bancroft angrily indicated that Reynolds was singling him out for criticism, others interjected verbose comment before the Puritan leader was privileged to suggest quietly "that he

meant not to gall any man," a reply that was perfect in its aptness, since Bancroft manifestly meant to gall Reynolds. (14)

It is a loss to history that the trenchant pen of John Reynolds did not record his impressions at Hampton Court, or, at least, put into written form the requests that he presented. He said that he was wronged by William Barlow's account but did not give details. The dean did not consciously portray the doctor's forthright strength and dignified poise, but he could not conceal the cogency of his case and the depth of his sincerity.

A further limitation of Hampton Court Conference was that it did not actually confront the central problems of the church. The literature of the period and the rambling discussions of the gathering indicate the questions that cried for an answer, but the method that was utilized did not make possible a statesmanlike formulation and wrestling with these issues:

How can an adequate ministry for the whole realm be assured?

Should pluralities be restricted?

Is a non-preaching ministry a true ministry?

Are prophecyings legitimate and effective means of developing ability to interpret the Bible publicly?

Should conscientious ministers be compelled to observe regulations which violate their convictions?

How should discipline be administered?

Can a more genuinely Christian form of church organization be actualized?

Is the Bible being used to the best advantage as a guide to Christian living and Church administration?

Should non-canonical Scriptures be read in church services?

Should there be a new translation of the Bible into English?

Do the Articles of Religion, church organization and forms of worship conform to the truth of Scripture?

Should the Book of Common Prayer be revised?

During the process of the conference no committees were appointed to deliberate between sessions and formulate reports. The nearest approach was the king's request on the opening Saturday that the bishops consult about rephrasing portions of the Book of Common Prayer. On the final Wednesday Archbishop Whitgift handed to King James a notation which had been worded adroitly to avoid the appearance of alteration. The four thin items were: to explain the word "absolution" in the rubric of absolution as meaning "remission of sinnes;" to require in private baptism that the lawful minister be present; to rephrase the heading on confirmation so as to be, "Examination, with confirmation of children;" to substitute the words, "Jesus said to them," in place of, "Jesus said to his disciples." Of the numerous problems raised by the King and the Puritans, these infinitesimal concessions were all that the bishops were ready to make. (15)

On the last day the king requested appointment of commissioners from among the lords and bishops to consult concerning excommunication, the Court of High Commission, recusants, the appointment of preachers for Ireland, arrangements for clerical maintenance and "the planting of a learned and painful minister in every parish, as time shall serve." (16) The last entry in Barlow's account stated that after the abrupt termination of the conference the lords waited for a brief time, apparently congratulating each other, and then went into the council chamber to appoint these commissioners. (17) Galloway's summary of decisions, completed three weeks after the conference was concluded, indicated that the commissioners had considered the problems upon which they were assigned to deliberate. (18) Actually, however, most of their proposed activity vanished into nothingness, because the heart of the ecclesiastics was not in making constructive improvements.

A queer fact at Hampton Court was the king's allusions to Scottish history and customs. No one at the conference was properly situated to set the record straight. The English prelates were not sufficiently familiar with Scotland to do so, and they would not, if they were able, for they had no disposition to irritate the feelings of the king. Since their whole desire was to keep James favorably disposed to their cause, they were the last men in the world to imply that he was twisting facts. The Puritans, concerned with issues nearer home, had troubles enough of their own without questioning the king's supposed data from Scotland. One man was present who knew the history of the north but he - Patrick Gallo-way - was inhibited from speaking because he was merely a guest-observer who said nothing.

The king used language in referring to his opponents among the Scottish ministry, which implied that they were incompetently youthful, opinionated and disrespectful. As a matter of fact, the Presbyterian leaders were men of maturity who habitually supported their contentions with closely reasoned argument. James' contemptuous references at Hampton Court were singularly unnecessary. He spoke of Scottish ministers as "pert" and "beardlesse."

(19) Another uncomplimentary allusion was in his comparison of Puritans in the south with Presbyterians in the north. "This is just the Scottish argument," he sneered; "for when any thing was there concluded which disliked some humors, the only reason why they would not obey was, it stood not with their credits to yield, having so long time been of the contrary opinion." (20)

"A Scottish presbytery," roared the king, "as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the Devil," (21) forgetting that once he had spoken to the Assembly in Edinburgh, "praising God, that he was borne in suche a tyme of the light of the Gospell, to suche

a place as to be king in suche a kirk, the sincerest kirk in the world. 'The kirk of Geneva,' said he, 'keepeth Pasche and Yuile; what have they for them? they have no institutioun. As for our neighbour kirk in England, it is an evil said masse in English, wanting nothing but the liftings. I charge you my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your puritie.'" (22) In Scotland the king lauded the church as "pure". In England he alluded to it as having the quality of His Satanic Majesty..

James was not bothered by being consistent. When it suited his purpose to use precedents from his homeland to support what he wished, he was not above doing so. He clinched his argument in favor of questions being propounded to infants by saying that they had been addressed to him when he was crowned in his infancy in Scotland; therefore, the inference was that it must be right in England.

James' allusions at Hampton Court to his mother and grandmother, and their relationships to the Scottish Reformation, constituted the queerest reading of history imaginable. The king indiscriminately mixed events under Mary of Guise and Mary, Queen of Scots.

"I will tell you a tale," said the monarch, in the manner of a parent beginning a bed-time story. It was a romantic tale, but it disregarded chronology.

With a flourish of words James continued, "After that the religion restored by King Edward the Sixth, was soon overthrown, by the succession of Queen Mary here in England, we in Scotland felt the effect of it. Whereupon master Knox writes to the queen regent, (of whom without flattery I may say, that she was a vertuous and moderate lady,) telling her that she was supream

head of the church, and charged her, as she would answer it before God's tribunal, to take care of Christ his evangill, and of suppressing the popish prelates, who withstood the same. But how long, trow ye, did this continue? Even so long, till by her authority the popish bishops were repressed, he himself and his adherents were brought in, and well settled, and by these meanes made strong enough to undertake the matters of reformation themselves. Then loe, they began to make small account of her supremacy, nor would longer rest on her authority, but took the cause into their own hand, and according to that more light wherewith they were illuminated, made a further reformation of religion." (23)

What are the facts in this case? Reared in an atmosphere of intrigue, Mary of Guise was a woman who acted upon the principle that the end justifies the means. Her customary expedient, according to Duke, was to use "fair words to gain time." (24) From the outset of the regency, her policy was to drive a wedge between Scotland and England, maintain the Catholic Church in her realm, reduce the country to a dependency of France, and set a French king upon the Scottish throne.

Mary of Guise ruled a country that struggled with poverty. Through financial grants from France and the Church of Rome, as well as through economy, she brought a measure of strength to the kingdom. The manner in which she gave way on occasion to an apparent spirit of conciliation raised Scottish hopes, but back of the regent's moments of concession was an inflexible plan. "I am forced," she wrote to her brother, "to keep up many pretenses until I come to the proper time." (25)

When Mary of Scots married the heir to the French throne, it seemed as though the joining of Scotland and France were assured. Dramatic events followed. Mary Tudor died. Elizabeth ascended

the throne and England was once more a Protestant power. Then Mary of Guise's daughter became queen of France. Meantime the reformation spirit was rising in Scotland. The lords of the congregation protested to Mary of Guise against the tyranny of ecclesiastical authorities, bringing alarm to Primate and bishops, and the regent used the art of "dissimulation . . . . to make her profit of both parties." (26)

Mary of Guise was driven by pain as well as by dissension in the realm. "You must make allowances for my anger," she wrote to her brothers, "you know that gouty people are not patient." (27)

John Knox returned to Scotland from abroad. He had profound reason for antipathy toward Mary of Guise. She had influenced Bothwell to give up George Wishart and thus was an instrument toward the martyrdom of Knox's youthful hero. Her instigation brought the French fleet to Scotland, which in turn led to the capitulation of St. Andrews castle and the suffering of John Knox in the galleys. (28) But the cause was greater than personalities. The reformation leader wrote to the regent a respectful letter, urging her to open her mind to reformed truth, to support it, and to demonstrate her "motherly pity" for Scotsmen who were being persecuted for their convictions. A few days later she handed the letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow with the flippant words, "Please you, my lord, to read a pasquill." That remark widened the breach between the queen and the reformer, for he was a man of deep feeling. (29) Parallel with the religious struggle, these two determined leaders waged a personal conflict in which there was no compromise.

As the reformation rose in strength and the regent acted contrary to agreements, she haughtily declared that "it became not subjects to burden their Princes with promises further than it

pleased them to keep the same." (30)

When James told the story of his grandmother at Hampton Court he said, "By her authority the popish bishops were repressed, he (Knox) himself and his adherents were brought in, and well settled." Such a statement was exactly contrary to fact. Wherever Mary of Guise and her court went, the mass was celebrated. She insisted that Catholic and Protestant forms of worship could not exist side by side. (31) Knox and the reformation struggled their way into Scotland, and the "popish bishops" were not "repressed" by the Scottish parliament until after Mary of Guise breathed her last.

James took it upon himself to speak at Hampton Court of the woman who gave him birth. It was a subject upon which he was decidedly vulnerable. "That poor lady, my mother," he called her, (32) but his feeling of pity was desperately delayed.

James' controlling youthful ambition was to attain the English throne. Whenever any person seemed to stand in his way he felt surging within him feelings of irritation and jealousy. His mother's insistence upon a joint assertion of claims of sovereignty cooled whatever concern he had for her into a "cold selfishness." (33) In prison she remarked of him that he was "cunning enough" to take care of himself. (34)

The king never saw his mother after he was old enough to recall her. Deprived of personal contact with her vivacious personality, he thought of her in political rather than personal terms. Throughout her imprisonment in England, Mary of Scots was a shadowy figure to her son, who would not allow himself to love her because she might stand between him and the English throne. That eventuality was the one outcome that he was bent upon preventing.

Shortly before Mary was beheaded James made a comment to

a Frenchman, that "he loved her as much as nature and duty bound him; but he knew well she bore him as little good will as she did the Queen of England: her practices had already nearly cost him his crown, and he could be well content she would meddle with nothing but prayer and serving of God." (35)

When news reached Edinburgh that Mary of Scots had been condemned to death by an English court, James sat and sobbed in the room in Holyrood which had been her audience chamber. (36) He wept when she was gone but while she was alive he would not lift his hand effectually to aid her. Such unfilial conduct could not but have left scars upon his soul.

"How they used that poor lady, my mother, is not unknown, and with grief I may remember it," said James at Hampton Court, conveniently forgetting how he, her son, had used her. Then the king continued with another tale in which he did not permit the facts in the case to hamper him.

"My mother," said the man who was intoxicated with his own eloquence, "because she had not been otherwise instructed (Had not John Knox attempted to instruct her?) did desire only a private chapell, wherein to serve God after her manner, with some few selected persons, but her supremacy was not sufficient to obtain it at their hands." (37)

On the first Sunday of Mary's arrival in Scotland from France to rule her realm, she had mass in her chapel. The reformers preached against it, but she continued the practice. In later months throngs came to Holyrood to join in the celebration of the mass in the queen's chapel, and the same thing occurred when she was at Stirling. With her went the mass through Atholl, Ross, Aberdeen, Dundee, and back to St. Andrews. (38) King James was scarcely an accurate historian when he talked of his mother's

being deprived of the privilege of her chosen worship with a few persons in a private chapel!

Whenever James referred to Queen Elizabeth during the conference he added "some honourable addition." (39) He had written to her, after receiving an explanation from the queen concerning the death of his mother, that he understood her "unspotted part" in "yon unhappy fact" and her "long professed good will to the defunct." (40) Eight years were to pass after the Hampton Court gathering before he was to do belated honor to Mary of Scots and bring her body from Peterborough Cathedral to Westminster Abbey, ironically to rest in the aisle opposite the burial place of Elizabeth in prestige equal to her rival. "The queen of famous memory" was what James called Elizabeth at Hampton Court. (41)

The time element was a significant factor at Hampton Court. The question inevitably rises, "Why was the conference so brief? Why were not the fateful issues, upon which depended the future of church and state, more thoroughly considered?"

One reason was that the authorities of the church, already having their minds made up, were not open to suggestions and utterly unwilling to make concessions for the sake of unity. Another reason was that the king quickly became satisfied when he found himself in accord with men in major positions of ecclesiastical power. There was, however, a still deeper reason, of which no participant consciously was aware. The king had arrived at the place in life where he found himself less and less capable of exerting energy. The man who, a decade earlier, was tired of intrigue and cares of state (42) was even more easily wearied by intellectual effort at Hampton Court. The verve of youth had left him early. When he arrived in England he was beginning to be prematurely old. As Steeholm tartly said, "With the added weight

of years upon his back and the slow decline of physical and mental alertness, this energy had ebbed and waned. In spite of prodigious prowess in the hunting field, James no longer had the physical stamina necessary for kingship in a country whose leading citizens were demons of explosive energy. He no longer had the powers of concentration necessary for kingship in a land whose best minds were trained to razor keenness." (43) Here was the reason for the swift dissolving of the conference at Hampton Court: the king became tired of discussion. To his own satisfaction he had demonstrated his understanding of theology, Scripture, church history, and statecraft. He had announced his decisions. Why should he further exert himself? He walked into the inner room and the conference was over. (44)

James here showed himself anew as belonging in the ranks of the "almost" men. All his life he was weighted with responsibilities that were just beyond him. He almost attained to the stature of statesmanship, but actually reached only a curious kingcraft. He was almost a scholar, but really a bookish boy and a pedantic man. He was almost a pioneer of tolerance in an age of intolerance, but permitted prejudices to choke his tendencies toward large mindedness. He was almost a peace maker but, despite his ardent hatred of conflict within the realm and war between nations, succeeded only in tangling affairs so badly that conflicts were increased rather than abated. He was almost an orator but actually dull. He was almost a poet but really only touched the hem of the muse's garment. He was almost a patron of literature but succeeded only in preferring Ben Jonson to William Shakespeare. He was almost a genius as a letter writer; indeed, he was greatest there, for, although many of his communications were commonplace, yet, when the king was moved by deep feeling,

he could produce a letter of distinction.

At Hampton Court James almost did something great. To have called the conference was notable. To have conducted it fairly would have brought honor through the centuries. As it was, James lived up to the description, wise fool. He was not a man whose wisdom was qualified by folly, but one whose folly was qualified by wisdom. Folly was fundamental. Enough wisdom was there to speak in a way that revealed considerable learning and to seize the suggestion for a Biblical translation. Some of his action was sheerly doltish. Some of it led to tragedy. Some unwittingly reached usefully far down the centuries.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

## THE OUTCOME OF THE CONFERENCE

Hampton Court Conference was a paradox. Its effects reached out through the centuries, but the anticipated consequences did not result and the unanticipated did. The Puritans sought fundamental changes in the church but obtained only minor alterations. They hoped for relaxation in the action of the Court of High Commission, which in Elizabeth's time they called "the filthy quavemire and poisoned plash of all the abominations that do infect the whole realm," (1) but were met by a continuation of severity. They inveighed against Catholic pamphleteering but, because of repression on of Puritan convictions, developed astonishing skill in using the identical method to which they had objected. The wisest fool in Christendom desired peace in church and state, but brought about conflict, which affected his reign and that of his successors and had repercussions in Ireland and America. He desired to display his wisdom, and did receive contemporary flattery, but left the impression upon later generations of a singular failure to comprehend the realities of the situation. He was a devotee of dictatorial rule but this gathering under his auspices played an ironical part in the ultimate democratization of the realm. No advance intimation concerning a new translation of Scripture was made to those who were to be present, yet the Puritan request led to an English version that has influenced literature and life wherever the language is read.

## I. EFFECTS AMONG PURITANS

The immediate result, among the party who had petitioned for reformation and had been rebuffed, was a sense of "humiliation and chagrin." (2) They complained, so Fuller wrote, "that the king sent for their divines, not to have their scruples satisfied, but

his pleasure propounded; not that he might know what they could say, but they what he would do in the matter." (3)

The depth of Puritan determination to persist in following the course of conscience was shown by the offer of a group of ministers to the king, after the conclusion of the Hampton Court meeting, if he would permit them to do so, "in one week's space to deliver his majesty in writing, a full answer to any argument or assertion propounded in that conference by any prelate; and in the meantime they do aver them to be most vain and frivolous." (4)

Aggressive Puritans listed three reasons why they "refused to be concluded by this conference": "1. The ministers appointed to speak for them were not of their nomination or choosing, nor of one judgment in the points of controversy; for being desired by their brethren to argue against the corruptions of the church as simply evil, they replied, they were not so persuaded. Being farther desired to acquaint the king, that some of their brethren thought them sinful, they refused that also. Lastly, being desired to give their reasons in writing, why they thought the ceremonies only indifferent; or to answer the reasons they had to offer to prove them sinful, they would do neither one nor other. 2. Because the points in controversy were not thoroughly debated, but nakedly propounded, and some not at all touched. Neither was there any one argument to the purpose pursued and followed. 3. Because the prelates took the liberty of interrupting at their pleasure those of the other side, insomuch that they were checked for it by the king himself." (5)

The one Puritan delegate who remained silent at Hampton Court conducted himself afterward in a manner that caused many of his associates to assert that they had been misrepresented.

Thomas Sparke wrote a document published in 1607 under the title,

"A Brotherly Persuasion to Unity and Uniformity in Judgement and Practice, touching the received and present Ecclesiastical Government, and the authorized Ceremonies of the Church of England." Fuller's explanation of Sparke's action is that he made "use of his hearing, not speech," and was "converted (it seems) to the truth of what was spoken, and soon after setting forth a treatise of unity and uniformity." (6) Wood is authority for the assertion that Sparke had a lengthy private conversation with the king on the day following the conference, and that when the two had come to an understanding the king "gave him his most gracious countenance." (7) He further wrote, "This Dr. Sparke was the person, who being noted for a great nonconformist, and a Pillar of Puritanism, was, by Letters from the King's Council, called to the conference at Hampton-Court, where appearing in behalf of the Millinaries . . . received then so great satisfaction from his Majesty's most ready and apt answers to the Doubts and Objections there and then purposed that he (though he spoke not one word) did not only, for the time following, yield himself in practice to Universal Conformity, but privately by word and writing, and publicly by his brotherly persuasion." (8)

Certain other Puritans decided to submit to the status quo. "Henceforward many cripples in conformity were cured of their former halting therein," said Fuller, "and such who knew not their own till they knew the king's mind in this matter, for the future quietly digested the ceremonies of the church." (9)

The majority of Puritans held their convictions with the quiet consistency of the terrible meek. They refrained from outspoken opposition to state and church but devised efficacious methods of indirection. "The Puritan preachers as a whole," wrote Haller, "after the repression of Thomas Cartwright, still more after

their failure at Hampton Court Conference, avoided direct attack upon the government of the church and confined their efforts to setting forth Puritan ideals in pulpit and press. They wisely refrained from meddling with the things that were the prelates' as well as those that were Caesar's. . . . It was, however, impossible for them to hold all their adherents to so moderate a course . . . . To some . . . separation from the church seemed as bad as prelacy itself, and they turned instead to shorter and more violent methods for the immediate overthrow of the bishops and reorganization of church government. . . . flinging pamphlets full of imprecation and ridicule in the faces of rulers. . . ." (10)

An oddity of the conference is that members of the party who there opposed the pamphleteers shortly became masters in disseminating dissenting ideas through the printed word. Although at Hampton Court they urged that control be exercised over Roman Catholics, who distributed their arguments by means of books and pamphlets, the Puritans soon loosed forces that resulted in the further freedom of the press. They converted listeners "not only to godliness but also to the appetite for reading godly books," and "created a literature in English setting forth to an increasingly restive populace a doctrine of faith and courage and a way of life calling for self-expression, self-confidence and self-exertion." (11)

Since preaching received no concrete encouragement at Hampton Court, the Puritans sought to make provision of their own, inducing patrons to establish lectureships to support preachers who spoke with constantly increasing capability, and soliciting gifts by means of which impropriations were purchased for the continuing maintenance of "a powerfull Ministry in Cities and Market-Towns." (12) To listen to these preachers people flocked

from towns and villages round about, remaining to talk between sermons about what the preacher had said, to sing psalms, and to discuss the meaning of passages of Scripture. Because the Puritan movement was cultivated by preaching it persisted. Something in the souls of the Puritan preachers communicated itself subtly to the laity of the Church of England. Their proposals for church and state might not find immediate way into administrative channels but their ideals caught the imagination of the English people and influenced English character.

## II. EFFECTS UPON ROMAN CATHOLICS

The policy of conciliation toward Catholics, which James anticipated showing, had gradually changed. After assuring a deputation of Catholic laymen that he would not enforce penal laws against recusants who were loyal to the crown, and after declaring to his first parliament that he would discriminate between moderate and fanatical Papists, the king was disturbed by Catholic plots. The stiffening of his policy was evident by his failing to summon Catholics, as he did Puritans, to confer at Hampton Court and by his references to recusants during the disputation there. On February 22, 1604, James banished by proclamation all Jesuits and seminary priests and, during the ensuing summer, approved a stringent bill against priests and recusants passed by both commons and lords. (13)

The Catholic reply was a plot, begun in 1604, carried to the verge of completion in 1605. Warned by a letter sent to a nobleman, certain privy councillors consulted, then passed the note to the king, who said, "Look you - 'they shall receive a terrible blow this Parliament and yet not see who hurts them.' It must connote blowing up with gunpowder."

Pursuing the clew a gentleman of the Privy Chamber and his trusted servants found thirty-six barrels of gunpowder in a cellar beneath the House of Lords and seized a swarthy man carrying fuse, tinder-box and dark lantern. Before dawn he was brought into the presence of king and Privy Council for questioning. Asked the purpose of storing powder beneath the Parliament House, Fawkes replied, "To blow the Scots back to Scotland." To the inquiry as to what was to be gained by so horrible a crime, he retorted, "The restoration of the true religion in England and the dissolution of the present government." (14)

The fright induced by this plot of a clique of desperate men led to increased severity toward all Catholics, who were "compelled to go to the Protestant Church," "to take the sacrament once a year at least, on pain of a heavy fine for refusal," with "a reward out of the recusant's property for the informer" and "to take a stringent oath of allegiance, which bound them to disown the authority of the pope within the realm, without equivocation or reservation whatever. . . . Refusal to take the oath rendered the person so refusing liable, in the case of men, to the penalty of praemunire; in the case of women, to imprisonment in the common gaol." (15)

III. EFFECTS WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

At Hampton Court the episcopal authority was confirmed. In the ears of the prelates James' epigram, "No bishop, no king," rang sweetly. Now they knew that the monarch was making common cause with them.

In a proclamation authorizing the prayer book, the king said, "We do admonish all men, that hereafter they shall not expect nor attempt any further alteration in the common and public form of God's service, from this which is now established." (16)

The actual changes in the Book of Common Prayer, resulting from Hampton Court Conference, were:

1. The rubric concerning private baptism was altered, with administration restricted to the clergy, either of the parish or some other lawfully qualified, the previous title having read, "Of them that be baptized in private houses in time of necessity." The statement that only in extreme emergency should children be baptized in houses, to which was added instruction as to how it should be done, was changed to require pastors and curates to warn people not "without great cause and necessity" to "procure their children to be baptized" at home. In case of necessity the minister was to perform the rite, calling upon God for his grace, saying the Lord's prayer, if time permitted, having some one present name the child, then dipping it in water or pouring water upon it, as he spoke the formula, "In the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost." Even though this baptism was to be considered lawful, it was declared expedient to bring the child to the parish minister, who was to make inquiry in these newly added words, "And because some things essential to this sacrament may happen to be omitted through fear or haste in such times of extremity: therefore I demand. . . ."

2. Lessons from canonical Scripture were substituted for Tobit, Bel and the Dragon which were "offensive" to the Puritans.

3. The Gospels for the second Sunday after Easter and for the twentieth Sunday after Trinity were to be printed with the words "Christ said" in different type from the text, omitting "unto his disciples," because the Puritans had declared that the Scripture plainly indicated that Jesus was speaking to the Pharisees.

4. "An enlargement of thanksgiving for diverse benefits, by way of explanation" included expressions of gratitude for rain,

fair weather, plenty, peace and victory, and deliverance from plague (two forms).

5. The meaning of Confirmation was clarified by placing in the rubric the words, "Confirmation, or laying on of hands upon children baptized."

6. To meet the Puritan criticism that the Catechism was too brief, the following explanation of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, penned by Dean Overall of St. Paul's, was placed at its conclusion:

#### BAPTISM AND THE SUPPER OF THE LORD

"Question. What meanest thou by this word Sacrament?

Answer. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

Question. How many parts be there in a Sacrament?

Answer. Two; the outward and visible signe and the inward and spirituall grace.

Question. What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism?

Answer. Water, wherein the person baptized is dipped or sprinkled with it in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne and of the Holy Ghost.

Question. What is the inward and spirituall grace?

Answer. A death unto synne and a new birth unto righteousness: for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.

Question. What is required of persons to be baptized?

Answer. Repentance whereby they forsake synne, and fayth whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament.

Question. Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?

Answer. Yes, they do perform them by their sureties, who promise and vow them both in their names, which when they come to age themselves are bound to perform.

Question. Why was the sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?

Answer. For the continuall remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Chryste, and the benefits which we receive thereby.

Question. What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's supper?

Answer. Breade and wyne, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

Question. What is the inward part or thinge signified?

Answer. The body and blood of Chryste, Which are verily and indeede taken and received of the faithfull in the Lord's Supper.

Question. What are the benefits whereof we are the partakers thereby?

Answer. The strengthenynge of our souls by the body and blood of Chryste as our bodies are by the breade and wyne.

Question. What is required of them which come to the Lord's Supper?

Answer. To examyne themselves whether they repent them trulie of their former sins, steadfastly purposinge to lead a new life, have a livelie faith in God's mercies through Christ, with a thankfull remembrance of his death, and be in charity with all men." (17)

The exact form of these alterations was decided by a committee composed of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Durham and Winchester, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Henry Howard, the Lord Chief Justice, the Lord of Kinlose, and Mr.

Secretary Harbert. On February ninth, following the report, King James issued letters patents, indicating the new wordings and ordering the authorized book to be printed, "that every parish may provide for themselves the saide booke so prynted and explained, to be onely used by the minister of every such parish in the celebration of divine service and administration of the sacraments." (18)

Of this procedure Proctor wrote, "The authority for this was the undefined power of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters, as well as the statutable power granted by the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in 1559. And care was taken to call the alterations by the name of explanations, to bring them under the clause in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which empowered the sovereign, with the advice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to ordain further ceremonies, if the orders of the Book should be misused. We must say, however, that these alterations had the sanction of Convocation, inasmuch as that body allowed this exercise of the prerogative, and ordered the amended book to be provided for the use of the parish churches." (19)

Not feeling bound by the Hampton Court Conference, groups of Puritans continued to request further alteration of the prayer book. Petitions were presented to members of the House of Commons and to the Canterbury Synod, which met at St. Paul's on March 20. "The document was presented to the lower house of convocation in presence of the petitioners," wrote Joyce. "Their enterprise, however, again miscarried, for the sole event of it was an admonition, from the president of the synod and the bishops, to the petitioners, which directed that they, together with their adherents, should be obedient and conform before the ensuing feast of S. John the Baptist." (20)

Some copies of the prayer book of 1604 carried the date 1603, because the proclamation of the king authorizing it was issued on March 5 and the next ecclesiastical year began on March 25. The printer was privileged to use either date. "Two editions of the Book, if not more, were published," wrote Lathbury; "yet it is of such rarity that few libraries possess a copy. One is preserved in the library at Lambeth, with the date 1603, another at Cambridge with the same date, and a third in the Bodleian with the date 1604. These are the only copies existing in public libraries. Three others, of the date of 1604, exist in private collections. It is remarkable that so few copies should be known, since of the editions of 1549, 1552, and 1559, many are to be found in both public and private libraries. . . . Though no important concessions were made to the Puritans, yet some changes were introduced. . . . They did not, however, satisfy the Puritans. As soon as the Book appeared it was fiercely attacked; and one of the main arguments was its want of due authority, because it had not been enacted by Parliament." (21)

During the month following the Hampton Court Conference Archbishop Whitgift, was stricken with paralysis at dinner in Whitehall, where he had gone for a discussion with Bishop Bancroft and King James, and died at Lambeth soon afterward. The choice for his successor was supposed to lie between Tobias Matthew and Richard Bancroft. Sir John Harington asserted that the reason for the monarch's choice of Bancroft, who became Primate about nine months after Whitgift's death, was that "the king. . . . finding him, in the disputations at Hampton Court, both learned and stout, he did more and more increase his liking to him. . . . in his learning knowing, and in his wisdom weighing, that this same strict charge . . . . feed my sheep, requires as well a pastoral courage of

driving in the stray sheep, and driving out the infectious, as of feeding the sound; made special choice of the bishop of London, as a man more exercised in the affairs of state." (22)

Among the papers of Whitgift were found appointments authorized at Hampton Court of a commission to study the ecclesiastical commission and "what process of coercion may be used in case of contumacy, instead of excommunication;" other commissioners to peruse and suppress books printed without public authority; still others to consider what should be done about the borders, Wales and Ireland. "Here was excellent matter cut out," wrote Strype, "and wise and grave men, both of the spirituality and temporality, appointed to labour in the same, for the forwarding of good religion, pacifying complaints, and putting the affairs of the Church into an unblameable order. But as far as I can learn, not much was done herein. A great let to which good purposes might be the death of the Archbishop hastening soon after." (23) Here is evidence that Bancroft had no heart to carry out reforms proposed at Hampton Court.

The popular tradition in the Church of England came to be that the conference was a decisive defeat for the Puritans and a notable victory for the Episcopalians. Since fear of Scottish influence upon the church was strong in the English mind when the king arrived, his favor toward the bishops at Hampton Court brought immense Episcopalian relief. Insight into how the story of the conference was handed down orally is found in the writings of Isaak Walton in the 1630's. In an unconsciously humorous passage, Walton referred to Andrew Melville of Scotland, whose name and position were incorrectly indicated and who was not even present at the gathering, as the leader of the Puritan group at Hampton Court!

"There was one Andrew Melvin," said Walton, "as minister of the Scotch Church, and Rector of St. Andrew's, who by a long and constant converse with a discontented part of that clergy which opposed Episcopacy, became at last to be a chief leader of that faction; and had proudly appeared to be so to King James, when he was but King of that nation, who, the second year after his coronation in England, convened a part of the bishops and other learned Divines of His Church, to attend him at Hampton Court, in order to a friendly conference with some dissenting brethren, both of this and the Church of Scotland: of which Scotch party Andrew Melvin was one: and he being a man of learning, and inclined to satirical poetry, had scattered many malicious, bitter verses against our liturgy, our ceremonies, and our church-government; which were by some of that party so magnified for the wit that they were therefore brought into Westminster School, where Mr. George Herbert then, and often after, made such answers to them, and such reflections on him and his kirk, as might unbeguile any man that was not too deeply engaged in such a quarrel. - But to return to Mr. Melvin at Hampton Court Conference: he there appeared to be a man of unruly wit, of a strange confidence, of so furious a zeal, and of so ungoverned passions, that his insolence to the King, and others at this conference, lost him both his rectorship of St. Andrew's and his liberty, too; for his former verses, and his present reproaches there used against Church and State, caused him to be committed prisoner to the Tower of London; where he remained very angry for three years." (24)

After Hampton Court the prelate who was central among the bishops at the conference carried out as Primate the procedures for which he argued there. The new archbishop enforced a rigid conformity, requiring ministers to wear cope and surplice, to

conduct kneeling communions, and to subscribe to Whitgift's three articles, with the irritating addition, made in the convocation over which Bancroft presided, that it be done willingly and ex animo. Suspension and deprivation of nonconformists became the order of the day.

#### IV. EFFECTS UPON HISTORIC PROCESSES

##### 1. THE KING'S POLICY BRINGS FATEFUL CONSEQUENCES

At Hampton Court King James made unmistakable his inexorably repressive purpose. Until that time the Puritans nurtured a lingering hope of vital concessions, but from that date they knew his blunt determination. As John Richard Green said, "James broke up the conference with a threat which revealed the policy of the crown. 'I will make them conform,' he said of the remonstrants, 'or I will harry them out of the land.'" (25)

"It was a momentous decision in English history," wrote Mackinnon, "contributed, in fact, to give that history the trend of a whole century. It involved strife, nay, revolution, in both Church and State. . . . If the umpire had not turned partisan and trembled for his throne at the mention of the word presbyter, if bishops like Bancroft had been less domineering and vituperative, if men like Reynolds had been content to curb their Calvinistic zeal, the seventeenth century of English history might, probably would, not have been a century of revolution. The factors of that revolution were as much ecclesiastical as political." (26)

The conference intensified the disputes it was called to settle. "Henceforth," said Law, "the two parties stood out opposite each other in an attitude of uncompromising hostility." (27) The Puritans, seeing that the confidence they had reposed in the king was a delusion, "ventured to dispute his infallibility," (28) their attitude toward the assembly at Hampton Court being

expressed in the succinct epithet, "This mock conference." (29)

As the result of flattery James was deluded into thinking that he had spoken unanswerably to the Puritans and that controversies had been concluded. "They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly," he wrote while the experience was still freshly in mind, (30) but he was to discover later that the Puritan conscience could not be overawed by verbal assault or autocratic command.

"Browbeaten by the Bishops," wrote Gardiner, "and rebuked in no measured or decorous language by James, the defenders of an apparently hopeless cause went back to their labours, to struggle as best they might. Yet to them the cause they defended was not hopeless, for no doubt ever crossed their minds that it was the cause of God, and it would have seemed blasphemy to them to doubt that that cause would ultimately prevail." (31) The men of the Puritan ideal were so convinced of their rightness that king and prelates "might as well have tried to lock up the wind." (32)

The attempt to compel the Puritans to conform caused severe suffering. A group with a petition for relief made their way into the king's presence while he was hunting. He requested them to "depute ten of their members to declare their grievances to the council." (33) The sequel has been described by Hallam, "The most enormous outrage on the civil rights of these men, was the commitment to prison of ten among those who had presented the millenary petition; the judges having declared in the Star Chamber that it was an offence finable at discretion, and very near treason-felony, as it tended to sedition and rebellion." (34)

The more James set his face against the Puritans the more the Puritans set their faces against him. In historical perspective Hampton Court Conference appears as a landmark in the upward

movement of opposition to the prerogative of the monarch bolstered by the power of the prelate. Increasingly the people listened to Puritan preachers and increasingly members of the House of Commons took upon themselves the Puritan cause. The day came when forces stirred into action by James' policy rose in avenging might against his heir. One of the ironies of history is that, after the Puritans had attained sufficient strength to prosecute and win a Civil War against James' son and successor, they brought the captive Charles I back to Hampton Court to see his children. (35)

Little did the first Stuart to rule in England realize that policies intimated at this conference, put into operation after the disputation, and brought to climax in the reign that followed, would lead to a masked executioner's holding up the severed head of another Stuart. Hampton Court was a preliminary skirmish leading toward a pitched battle. The feeling of outrage after the conference rose to a tumult in Puritan hearts, until it swept the Stuarts from the British throne.

## 2. CLEAVAGE OCCURS IN IRELAND

"At the Hampton-court conference the king proposed sending preachers into Ireland," wrote Neal, "complaining that he was but half monarch of that kingdom, the bodies of the people being only subject to his authority, while their consciences were at the command of the pope; yet it does not appear that any attempts were made to convert them till after the year 1607, when the act of the third and fourth of Philip and Mary being repealed, the citizens of London undertook for the province of Ulster." (36)

James resorted to plantation in the northern counties, dreaming of a happy Ulster with a reformed faith which would be "an example for all Ireland to copy. 'The plantation was, from the viewpoint of the civil administration, an effort to civilize and

bring stability into the whole country." (37) "However unpleasant it might be to the native Irish," wrote Henderson, "a strong Protestant settlement in Ireland was of immense consequence to Britain." (38) Lands of exiled Irish chiefs, which had come into possession of the crown, James personally assigned to immigrants. He erected parishes and directed that a church be built in each with a minister assigned there and provided with tithes, other emoluments, and a proper glebe. (39)

When English and Scottish planters migrated to northern Ireland, the Scotsmen organized churches after the Presbyterian model and the Englishmen were served principally by ministers of Puritan sympathy. Though King James desired to send ministers to Ireland who would develop a form of church organization in accord with his wishes, the beneficed clergy of England preferred not to risk the hazard involved, while Puritans found there a larger liberty of conscience than in England. As a result, Neal explained, ". . . the reformation of Ireland was built upon a Puritan foundation, though episcopacy was the legal establishment." When a convocation was held to frame articles of religion for the Irish church, the agreed formulation was "in a manner the same which the Puritans requested at the Hampton-court conference." (40)

Developments in Ireland, as Gleeson indicated, "laid up more trouble for the future than any planter could have deemed possible," (41) resulting in a cleavage between the northern Protestant portion and the southern Catholic section, which persisted through the centuries and remained unbridged in the twentieth.

### 3. HARRIED MEN MOVE TOWARD DEMOCRACY

Hampton Court Conference led directly to the migration of Englishmen to establish new centers of religious and political life. "The expectations of the puritans," wrote Marsden, "which

had been highly raised on the accession of James, were grievously cast down by the conference at Hampton Court, and utterly destroyed by the convocation that followed soon after. One hope alone remained; the hope of the dejected and forlorn. It was embraced with reluctance, and deep misgivings of heart; but once resolved upon, it was carried into effect with such energy as only men exert who are impelled alternately by hope and despair. A new world had lately been discovered. On shores yet unpolluted by superstition, perhaps untrod by the foot of man, they might find a peaceful asylum, and, free from the dread of dungeons and courts of high commission, worship God in truth." (42)

King James and Archbishop Bancroft carried into vigorous action the monarch's threat that men who did not conform would be harried out of the land. "What the Scotticism (harry) meant in the royal intention, may be significantly illustrated by the hunted victim with a pack of harriers in full cry after it," said Drysdale. ". . . with the Convocation of 1603-4, over which Bancroft presided, there may be said to have begun that new and untoward conjunction of absolutism in Church and State which was to be productive of such varied issues, and meanwhile led to the 'harrying' of so many godly ministers, and the driving of many more into Holland, America, and elsewhere, to found Presbyterian and other Churches that reacted with such power and influence afterwards on the mother Church of England." (43)

Although the majority of those who found themselves out of sympathy with existing conditions in the Church of England desired to remain within it, so as to bring about purification, groups of non-conformists already had separated themselves from the established church because they believed it to be out of harmony with Biblically revealed truth. Choice spirits among both Puritans and

Separatists were the objects of vitriolic persecution, which forced them into exile. "This high abuse of church-power," wrote Neal, "obliged many learned ministers and their followers to leave the kingdom, and retire to Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague, Leyden, Utrecht, and other places of the Low Countries, where English churches were erected after the presbyterian model, and maintained by the states according to treaty with queen Elizabeth, as the French and Dutch churches were in England. . . . but the greatest number of those who left their native country for religion were Brownists, or rigid Separatists, of whom Mr. Johnson, Ainsworth, Smith and Robinson, were the leaders. Mr. Johnson erected a church at Amsterdam, after the model of the Brownists, having the learned Mr. Ainsworth for the doctor or teacher . . . . This Mr. Robinson was the father of the Independents." (44)

When James declared, at Hampton Court, that he would pursue non-conformists out of the land, he announced a policy that eventuated in American democracy. Among those who were harried out, Pilgrims in Holland looked longingly back toward the land of their birth, grieving that their children could not be reared where English was the mother tongue, but realizing that under king and bishops such as those in power in early seventeenth century England they could not return to the homeland.

Gradually Pilgrim eyes turned from the homeland to North America. "We are well weaned from the delicate milk of the mother-country," said John Robinson, "and inured to the difficulties of a strange land: the people are industrious and frugal. We are knit together as a body in a most sacred covenant of the Lord, of the violation whereof we make great conscience, and by virtue whereof we hold ourselves strictly tied to all care of each other's good and of the whole. It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage." (45)

Overcoming apparently insuperable difficulties the Pilgrims won from King James a charter which enabled them to sail to the country overseas that became known as New England. Lord Bryce declared, "This was one of the great events in the annals of the English race. It was the second migration of that race. The first was made in war-ships coming from the mouth of the Elbe, manned by fierce heathen warriors, who came as plunderers and conquerors, and took nearly three centuries of fighting to complete their conquest of South Britain (except Wales). This second migration from the Old England of Angles and Saxons, across a far wider sea, to the New England in America marked the beginning of a nation which was to increase and multiply till it overspread a vast continent. It was a peaceful migration. But the Plymouth Pilgrims had the qualities which belong to the English race. They had courage, constancy, loyalty to their convictions. They stamped these qualities upon the infant colony. They gave that distinctive quality to the men of those northeastern American colonies which has told upon and determined the character of the whole American people."(46)

Hampton Court Conference was a distinct link in the chain of circumstances leading to formation of the United States of America.

#### 4. THE KING JAMES BIBLICAL VERSION INFLUENCES CIVILIZATION

When Dr. John Reynolds requested at Hampton Court that a thoroughly accurate translation of the Bible be made into English, several versions were available and two led the field. The Bishops' Bible, sanctioned for public use, was the preferred translation of the ecclesiastical group. The Geneva Bible had sold more than four times as many copies as the other, being popular with Puritans, common people and scholars.

The conference conclusion concerning a new version was: "That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek; and this to be set out and printed without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England in time of divine service." (47) If it had not been for the king's determination, however, the leaders of the church would have let the matter drop. James insisted upon a list of scholars to undertake the revision. On June 30 Bancroft wrote to Cambridge, "I am persuaded his royal mind rejoiceth more in the good hope which he hath for the happy success of that work, than of his peace concluded with Spain." On July 23 the king informed Bancroft that he had appointed fifty-four learned men (probably chosen by Oxford and Cambridge Universities) and that he desired church preferment for the translators. These men received inadequate compensation for their work, although they were given free entertainment in the colleges and advancement in the church. The king requested all bishops to ask competent scholars within their dioceses to send suggestions concerning translation to the Hebrew readers at the universities and Dean Andrewes of Westminster. (48) The completed companies of translators included Anglican ecclesiastics, Puritan scholars and laymen.

The king mentioned fifty-four translators but only forty-seven names finally appeared on the lists of those engaged in the work. Preliminary plans were made during the year in which the Hampton Court Conference occurred, and, although some of the revisers began their work at once, the full organization was not under way until 1607, with completion in 1611.

Rules laid down for the revisers included provisions for following the Bishop's Bible, as far as the truth of the original would permit, keeping names in the text as popularly used, retain-

ing old ecclesiastical words ("Church" not to be translated "Congregation"), altering chapter divisions as little as possible, and placing in the margins explanations of Hebrew or Greek words and cross references of one Scripture to another. When the translations of Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitechurch, or Geneva agreed better with the original text than the Bishop's Bible they were to be used.

The translators were divided into companies, with specific sections of Scripture assigned to each. Every translator was to take the same chapter and, when his work had been done separately, all in the company were to confer until agreement was reached. When a book was completed it was to be sent to the other translators, so that every scholar would evaluate the work of all. Differences were to be concluded at a final general meeting.

Of the personnel of the Hampton Court Conference, several were appointed as revisers. The first company, meeting at Westminster to translate the books from Genesis to II Kings inclusive, had Dr. Launcelot Andrewes, Dean of Westminster, as presiding officer, aided by Dr. John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, and eight others. Among the eight scholars in the second company at Cambridge, translating First Chronicles to Ecclesiastes, was one of the Puritan representatives at Hampton Court, Dr. Lawrence Chaderton of Emanuel College. The third company at Oxford, translating the books from Isaiah to Malachi, included in its personnel of seven the man who proposed the translation, Dr. John Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College. Meeting also at Oxford, the fourth company of eight men translated the Gospels, Acts of Apostles and Revelation. The fifth company of seven scholars, meeting at Westminster under the chairmanship of Dr. William Barlow, historian of the Hampton Court Conference, translated the Epistles from Romans to Jude.

When the various groups had completed their work, two members from each were selected to prepare the Bible for publication in London. Bishop Thomas Bilson, who had been at Hampton Court, was one of two men to have charge of the final revision and prepare the summary of contents at the head of each chapter. Archbishop Bancroft had general oversight, though he did not participate in the process of translation. After the work was completed he is said to have insisted upon altering "the translation in fourteen places" to make it "speak the prelatial language," and to have been "'so potent' in pressing his corrections that there was no contradicting him." (49)

Although the published version contained the words, "Appointed to be read in Churches," according to Dr. Brook Westcott, "No evidence has yet been produced to shew that the version was ever publicly sanctioned by Convocation or by Parliament, or by the Privy Council, or by the king. It gained its currency partly, it may have been, by the weight of the king's name, partly by the personal authority of the prelates and scholars who had been engaged upon it, but still more by its own intrinsic superiority." (50)

Dr. Ira Price said, "The Old Testament far surpassed any English translation in its faithful representation of the Hebrew text, and did it in simplicity of language admirably representative of the Elizabethan age. The New Testament is so chaste and expressive in language and form that it is even said to surpass the original Greek as a piece of literature." (51)

The version of 1611 had to win its way. The Roman Catholics took exception to the various meanings of the words being placed in the margin as a device which shook the certainty of the Scriptures. When the version's tercentenary was being observed, William Muir wrote, "Ten years after the appearance of the new translation,

which was destined to attain such a supremacy, Bishop Andrewes, himself one of the foremost of the translators, was . . . still to be found taking his texts from the Bishops' Bible, even when preaching before the King. In the community generally it was quite a quarter of a century before the Authorized Version vindicated its superiority to the Geneva version. . . . Its victory when won was complete. For more than two centuries its sway was unquestioned in the affection of the English-speaking peoples. . . . at last it was possible for the whole nation to gather round one Book." (52)

Popular reading of the King James version had its influence in driving the Stuarts from the throne. Old Testament narratives fired Puritan imaginations to think of themselves as a chosen people. In the days of Charles I, so Gleeson declared, "With ancient prophecies on their lips, they went forward to fulfil them. . . . This mob of fanatics fighting the battle of the Lord, but the old vengeful Lord of the Old Testament, rather than the Prince of Peace of the New, materially tipped the balance against the new King. . . . With words taken from the Jacobite translation of the Old Testament they prepared themselves for the great day that was so surely coming." (53)

Not the immediate but the far-flung results of Hampton Court Conference gave it permanent value. As Long said, "Shakespeare and the King James Bible are the two great conservators of the English speech," (54) and Price added, "King James' Version has become a vital part of the English-speaking world, socially, morally, religiously, and politically." (55)

Wherever this version was read in English-speaking homes something happened. The Book had such a pervasive influence that, through knowing its language and meditating upon its concepts, the people, without understanding the intricacies of theology and

of government, became articulate and powerful. A seething activity of thought arose, which worked toward democratization of home, church and state, and lifted the level of human life.

#### CONCLUSION

In evaluating the gathering at Hampton Court, James showed how little he and his generation understood its significance. "We cannot conceal," he wrote for all the realm to read, "that the success of that conference was such as happeneth to many other things, which moving great expectation before they be entered into, in their issue produce small effect." (56)

Many a later reader of the record of proceedings was to think of the assembly as a fiasco. History reversed that verdict. A gathering is not to be judged exclusively by what happens during the time that the leaders are together, but by what results from the conclave. The conduct of the conference at Hampton Court left almost everything to be desired. It would have been strangely ludicrous if it had not been profoundly serious. In its historic results, however, the assembly was rich with meaning.

Through the outcome of Hampton Court Conference James Stuart won the appreciation of the centuries, not in his conduct of the gathering but by means of the Biblical version inseparably connected with his name. An American put the matter into pithy words, ". . . except for his hatred of war, where's any wisdom in the man? We owe to him the King James Translation of the Bible, and there's debt enough." Then Booth Tarkington added, thinking of the personal follies of James, as he looked at the king's portrait, ". . . there's something in the dull-eyed melancholy that's like a wistfulness asking us, ' . . . Was it nothing . . . that I gave the Bible to all the people?' So, in the end, what

we see painted is the face of a 'wise foole' whose folly became nothing long ago. His wisdom has had a longer life." (57)

A conference which brought into being certain of the choicest portions of the catechism of the Church of England, led toward a plot against king and Parliament that made the nation shudder for centuries, resulted in increased Puritan devotion to preaching and the printed word, accentuated forces that led to the unseating of a dynasty, initiated action that ultimately split north and south Ireland apart, announced a policy of harrying men in ways that drove them to democracy, brought to pass the most beautiful version of the Bible ever translated into English, thus influencing speech, culture, character and institutions, - such a conference is not to be waved aside as of "small effect," even though the wisest fool in Christendom coins the description. Without the perspective of the centuries no man could know the permanent place in history that was to be taken by the Hampton Court Conference.

## R E F E R E N C E S

## CHAPTER ONE

- ( 1 ) Anthony "Queen Elizabeth" Page 145
- ( 2 ) Frere "The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I" Page 5
- ( 3 ) Anson "Looking Forward" Pages 135, 136
- ( 4 ) Anthony "Queen Elizabeth" Pages 92-94
- ( 5 ) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 6, 7
- ( 6 ) Marsden "The History of the Early Puritans" Page 3
- ( 7 ) Drysdale "History of the Presbyterians in England" Page 4
- ( 8 ) Pearson "Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism" Page 19
- ( 9 ) Pearson "Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism" Page 407
- (10) Stoughton "History of Religion in England" Revised Edition Page 39
- (11) Marsden "The History of the Early Puritans" Page 104
- (12) Marsden "The History of the Early Puritans" Pages 101-120
- (13) Drysdale "History of the Presbyterians in England" Pages 101,102
- (14) Marsden "The History of the Early Puritans" Page 19
- (15) Marsden "The History of the Early Puritans" Page 32
- (16) Gardiner "History of England" 1603-1642 Volume 1 Pages 26,27
- (17) Drysdale "History of the Presbyterians in England" Pages 187,191
- (18) Marsden "The History of the Early Puritans" Pages 62-68
- (19) Stoughton "History of Religion in England" Volume 1, Pages 20-22
- (20) Gardiner "History of England" Volume 1, Page 43  
Henderson "James I and VI" Page 136
- (21) Smollett "A Complete History of England" Volume VII Page 4
- (22) Henson "Puritanism in England" Pages 35, 36
- (23) Gardiner "History of England" Volume I Page 147
- (24) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II Page 469
- (25) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 152
- (26) Frere "The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I" Page 129
- (27) James Mackinnon "A History of Modern Liberty" Volume II, Page 328
- (28) Tytler "History of Scotland" Volume 8 Page 303
- (29) Hallam "The Constitutional History of England" Volume I Pages 404, 405
- (30) Frere "The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I" Page 287
- (31) Fuller "Church History" Volume V Page 265
- (32) Gardiner "History of England" Volume I Footnote on Page 148
- (33) Cardwell "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 130, 131
- (34) Cardwell "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 131, 132
- (35) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II Page 480 - Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 5
- (36) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 5
- (37) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II Page 480 - Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 5, 6
- (38) Cardwell "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 132, 133
- (39) Cardwell "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 134
- (40) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 6
- (41) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Pages 6, 7
- (42) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II Page 484
- (43) Cardwell "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 134, 135

CHAPTER ONE (continued)

- (44) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II  
Page 487
- (45) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II  
Pages 487, 489

CHAPTER TWO

- ( 1) Quoted in Harris "An Historical and Critical Account of the  
Life and Writings of James I" Pages 247, 248
- ( 2) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 177
- ( 3) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 297
- ( 4) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page xvii
- ( 5) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 292
- ( 6) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 291, 292
- ( 7) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 436
- ( 8) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 189
- ( 9) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 34, 52
- (10) Conyers Read "Mr. Secretary Walsingham" Volume I, Pages 42, 43
- (11) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 13, 14
- (12) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 13-20
- (13) Henderson "James I and VI" Pages 5, 6  
Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 40, 46-51
- (14) Henderson "James I and VI" Pages 6-8
- (15) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 42
- (16) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 45
- (17) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 11
- (18) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 52
- (19) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 67
- (20) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 67
- (21) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 82
- (22) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 78
- (23) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 85, 92
- (24) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 75  
Steeholm "James I of England" Page 85
- (25) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 158
- (26) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 141
- (27) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 298
- (28) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 214, 215
- (29) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 7
- (30) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 66
- (31) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Pages x, xi
- (32) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page 5
- (33) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page 8
- (34) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page 65
- (35) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page 73
- (36) Irving "The History of Scottish Poetry" Page 491
- (37) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page xxii, xxiii
- (38) Irving "The History of Scottish Poetry" Page 493
- (39) "Basilikon Doron" reprinted in Steeholm "James I of England"  
Pages 456, 457, 465, 460, 461
- (40) Irving "The History of Scottish Poetry" Pages 512-515
- (41) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page 77
- (42) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page xxxii
- (43) Smollett "The History of England" Volume VII Page 7
- (44) Plummer "English Church History 1575-1649" Page 69
- (45) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 309

CHAPTER TWO (continued)

- (46) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 160
- (47) Tytler "History of Scotland," Volume VIII Page 201
- (48) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page xxviii
- (49) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 87
- (50) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 53
- (51) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 294
- (52) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page xiii
- (53) Mackinnon "History of Modern Liberty" Volume III  
Pages 98-100
- (54) Gardiner "History of England, 1603-1642" Page 49
- (55) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 56
- (56) Tytler "History of Scotland," Volume VIII Page 67
- (57) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 107
- (58) Smollett "History of England" Book VI Page 65
- (59) Henderson "James I and VI" Pages 101, 102
- (60) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 279

CHAPTER THREE

- ( 1) Law "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume I Page 72  
The basic authority for data used in this chapter
- ( 2) Law "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume I Page 97
- ( 3) Law "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume I Page 99
- ( 4) Anthony "Queen Elizabeth" Pages 74-76
- ( 5) Anthony "Queen Elizabeth" Pages 114, 115
- ( 6) Law "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume II Pages 10, 11
- ( 7) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 252
- ( 8) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 254
- ( 9) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 169, 170
- (10) Law "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume II Page 32
- (11) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 169, 177, 204, 209

## CHAPTER FOUR

- ( 1 ) Article on Barlow in "Dictionary of National Biography"
- ( 2 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 169
- ( 3 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 177
- ( 4 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 168
- ( 5 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 168
- ( 6 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 177
- ( 7 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 167
- ( 8 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 168
- ( 9 ) Barlow in "The Phenix" Page 178
- (10) Barlow in "The Phenix" Page 179
- (11) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 167
- (12) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 179
- (13) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 173
- (14) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 162
- (15) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 163
- (16) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 166
- (17) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 162,  
165,166
- (18) Irving "The History of Scottish Poetry" Page 497
- (19) Rait "A Royal Rhetorician" Page x
- (20) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 197
- (21) Winwood "Memorials of Affairs of State" Volume II Page 13
- (22) Winwood "Memorials of Affairs of State" Volume II Page 14
- (23) Winwood "Memorials of Affairs of State" Volume II Page 15
- (24) Harington "Nugae Antiquae" Page 48
- (25) Harington "Briefe Notes and Remembrances" in "Nugae Antiquae"  
Volume I Page 181
- (26) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume IV  
Page 245
- (27) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume IV  
Page 114
- (28) "Autobiography of James Melvill" Edited by Robert Pitcairn  
Page 802
- (29) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume III Page 627
- (30) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume III Page 631
- (31) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume III Page 722
- (32) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume V Page 98
- (33) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume V Page 159
- (34) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume V Page 189
- (35) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume V Page 683
- (36) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume VI Page 185
- (37) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume VI Page 235
- (38) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 212, 213
- (39) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 213
- (40) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 213,  
214
- (41) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume VI Page 247
- (42) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume VII Page 609
- (43) Calderwood "History of the Kirk of Scotland" Volume VII Page 439
- (44) King James in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 160, 161
- (45) Document in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
217-228. See also Gee and Hardy "Documents Illustrative of  
English Church History." Pages 512-515

## CHAPTER FIVE

Data for which there are no specific references in this chapter come from articles in the "Dictionary of National Biography."

- ( 1 ) Barlow in "The Phenix" Page 142
- ( 2 ) James' letter in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 161
- ( 3 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 173, 204, 208
- ( 4 ) Barlow in "The Phenix" Page 148
- ( 5 ) Picture opposite page 230 in Henderson's "James I and VI"
- ( 6 ) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 186
- ( 7 ) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 190
- ( 8 ) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 239
- ( 9 ) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 253
- (10) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 286
- (11) Title page in Harington's "Brief View of the State of the Church of England"
- (12) Neal "History of the Puritans" Page 87
- (13) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 312
- (14) Henderson "James I and VI" Pages 230, 231
- (15) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol.I Page 15
- (16) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol.I Pages 64, 75
- (17) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol.I Page 113
- (18) Frere "The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I" Page 224
- (19) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. II Page 479
- (20) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. II Page 490
- (21) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. III Page 394
- (22) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. III Pages 395, 396
- (23) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. III Pages 397, 398
- (24) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. III Pages 401, 402
- (25) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 208
- (26) Stoughton "History of Religion in England" Volume I Page 5
- (27) Mason "The Church of England and the Episcopacy" Page 46
- (28) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 183
- (29) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 179
- (30) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 184
- (31) Gardiner "History of England" Volume I Footnote on Page 155
- (32) Diary of James Melville Page 679
- (33) Fuller "Church History of Britain" Volume III Page 244
- (34) Fuller "Church History of Britain" Volume III Page 265
- (35) Quoted from "Nugae Antiquae" in Eden's introduction to Bilson's "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church"
- (36) Bilson "The Effect of Certain Sermons" Pages A2, B1
- (37) Bilson "The Effect of Certain Sermons" Page B2
- (38) Bilson "Perpetual Government" Page 1
- (39) Bilson "Perpetual Government" Pages 2, 3, 5
- (40) Bilson "Perpetual Government" Page 17

## CHAPTER FIVE (continued)

- (41) Bilson "Perpetual Government" Pages 11, 12
- (42) Bilson "Perpetual Government" Page 583
- (43) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 176
- (44) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 183
- (45) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 191
- (46) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 198
- (47) Fuller "Church History of Britain" Volume III Pages 243, 244
- (48) Hill "On Brotherly Love" Introduction
- (49) Babington in Hill "On Brotherly Love" Page 23
- (50) Hill "On Brotherly Love" Page 32
- (51) Hill "On Brotherly Love" Page 39
- (52) Hill "On Brotherly Love" Page 41
- (53) Wood "Athenae Oxonienses" Volume I Page 724 Article 174
- (54) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 173
- (55) "Dictionary of National Biography" Article on Dove
- (56) Rudde "A Sermon Preached at the Court at White Hall"  
Pages 2, 4, 32
- (57) Jordan "Development of Religious Toleration in England"  
1603-1640 Page 25
- (58) Heaton "The Puritan Bible" Page 274
- (59) Isaacson "Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes"  
Pages 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14
- (60) Wood "The Story of a Saintly Bishop's Life."  
Pages 22, 8, 3, 19
- (61) Whyte "Lancelot Andrewes and His Private Devotions"  
Pages 1, 29, 35
- (62) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 12
- (63) Isaacson "Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes" Page 4
- (64) Whyte "Lancelot Andrewes and His Private Devotions" Page 19
- (65) Fuller "Church History of Britain" Volume III Page 286
- (66) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 169, 198, 186, 197
- (67) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 170, 197, 200
- (68) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 169
- (69) Bliss (Editor) "Athenae Oxonienses" Page 295
- (70) Pearson "Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism"  
Pages 389-392
- (71) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 180
- (72) Heaton "The Puritan Bible" Page 293
- (73) Grosart in introduction to Reynolds "Obadiah" Page ix
- (74) Read "Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen  
Elizabeth" Volume I Page 23
- (75) Read "Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen  
Elizabeth" Volume III Page 438
- (76) Grosart in introduction to Reynolds "Obadiah" Page iii
- (77) Marsden "History of the Early Puritans" Page 151
- (78) Heaton "The Puritan Bible" Page 293
- (79) Quoted by Alexander B. Grosart in introduction to  
Reynolds "Obadiah" Page v
- (80) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. II  
Pages 112-115
- (81) Grosart in introduction to Reynolds "Obadiah" Page x
- (82) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume I Pages 396, 397
- (83) "The Originall of Bishops and Metropolitans" Martin Bucer,  
John Rainoldes, James Ussher, Pages 49, 50
- (84) John Rainolds "The Prophecy of Obadiah" Page 14

## CHAPTER FIVE (continued)

- (85) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 178  
 (86) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 178-202  
 (87) Wood "Athenae Oxonienses" Volume I Section 340  
 (88) Fuller "The Church History of Britain" Volume III  
 Pages 230, 231  
 (89) Burrage "The Early English Dissenters" Pages 209-213 and  
 Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 205-206  
 (90) Knewstubs' "A Confutation of Monstrous and Horrible Heresies"  
 Page 3  
 (91) Knewstubs' "A Confutation of Monstrous and Horrible Heresies"  
 Page 5  
 (92) Knewstubs' "The Lectures upon the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus,  
 and certain other places of Scripture" Pages A6, 253, 218  
 (93) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 35-41  
 (94) Knewstubs' "The Lectures upon the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus,  
 and certain other places of Scripture" Page 27  
 (95) Knewstubs' "The Lectures upon the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus,  
 and certain other places of Scripture" Pages 39, 44, 169  
 (96) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
 Pages 195, 196, 198, 211, 212  
 (97) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 195  
 (98) Heaton "The Puritan Bible" Page 285  
 (99) Heaton "The Puritan Bible" Pages 284, 286  
 (100) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 210  
 (101) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 298  
 (102) Haller "The Rise of puritanism" Pages 54, 55  
 (103) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 57  
 (104) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 64, 65  
 (105) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 183-186  
 (106) De Blois "Fighters for Freedom" Page 103  
 (107) Haller, "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 189  
 (108) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 250-253  
 (109) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 302  
 (110) Wood "Athenae Oxonienses" Section 485  
 (111) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume I Page 343  
 (112) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume I Pages 343-345  
 (113) Strype "Life and Acts of Archbishop Whitgift" Vol. I Page 335  
 (114) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume I Page 345  
 (115) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 162  
 (116) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 204  
 (117) Anthony "Queen Elizabeth" Pages 241, 242  
 (118) Anthony "Queen Elizabeth" Pages 248, 249  
 (119) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 135  
 (120) Goodman "The Court of King James I" Page 38  
 (121) Jordan "The Development of Religious Toleration in England"  
 Volume II Page 28  
 (122) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 147  
 (123) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 189  
 (124) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 189, 204  
 (125) Gardiner "History of England" Pages 93, 94  
 (126) Plummer "English Church History" 1575-1649 Page 58  
 (127) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 189  
 (128) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 190  
 (129) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 207  
 (130) Wood "Athenae Oxonienses" Volume I Col. 418  
 (131) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 204

CHAPTER SIX

- ( 1 ) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 162
- ( 2 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 170
- ( 3 ) Winwood "Memorials of Affairs of State" Volume II Pages 11,13
- ( 4 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 170
- ( 5 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
170, 171
- ( 6 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 178
- ( 7 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 178
- ( 8 ) Mackinnon "History of Modern Liberty" Volume III Page 23
- ( 9 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 171, 172
- (10) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 173
- (11) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 173
- (12) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 179
- (13) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 182, 183
- (14) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 184
- (15) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
204, 205
- (16) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 172
- (17) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 214
- (18) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 172
- (19) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 174
- (20) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 204
- (21) Montague in Winwood "Memorials of Affairs of State"  
Volume II Page 14
- (22) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 172
- (23) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
174-176
- (24) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 205
- (25) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 214
- (26) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 163, 164
- (27) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 197
- (28) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 197, 198
- (29) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 199, 200
- (30) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 164
- (31) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 212
- (32) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 200
- (33) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 200, 201
- (34) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 209
- (35) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 187
- (36) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 214
- (37) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 163
- (38) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 193
- (39) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 194
- (40) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 195
- (41) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 214, 215
- (42) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 178
- (43) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 180, 181
- (44) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Pages 89, 178
- (45) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 261

- (46) Carwithen "History of the Church of England" Page 178
- (47) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 185
- (48) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 186
- (49) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 178
- (50) Mackinnon "A History of Modern Liberty" Volume II  
Pages 350, 351
- (51) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 13
- (52) Read "Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen  
Elizabeth" Volume II Page 305
- (53) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 179
- (54) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 181
- (55) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 190, 191
- (56) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 191
- (57) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 191
- (58) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 191, 192
- (59) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 192, 193
- (60) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 208, 209
- (61) Frere "The English Church" Page 55
- (62) Dixon "History of the Church of England" Volume VI Page 116
- (63) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 200
- (64) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 201
- (65) Drysdale "History of the Presbyterians in England" Page 127
- (66) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 201, 202
- (67) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 193-195
- (68) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 196
- (69) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 202
- (70) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 203
- (71) Percy "John Knox" Page 339
- (72) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 203
- (73) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 163
- (74) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 163, 164
- (75) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 201
- (76) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 172
- (77) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 176
- (78) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 215
- (79) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 164
- (80) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 205
- (81) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 206
- (82) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 208
- (83) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 206
- (84) Mackinnon "History of Modern Liberty" Volume II Pages 345,  
362 - Volume III Page 5
- (85) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 208
- (86) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 215
- (87) Montague in Winwood "Memorials of Affairs of State" Page 16
- (88) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 187
- (89) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 215
- (90) Kenneth Bell "Puritanism and Liberty" Pages 14, 15
- (91) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 162  
Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 171

CHAPTER SIX (continued)

- (92) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 172
- (93) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 178
- (94) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 206, 210
- (95) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 189
- (96) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 208
- (97) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
208, 209
- (98) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 215
- (99) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 162
- (100) Matthew in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 165
- (101) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 171
- (102) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 209
- (103) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 216
- (104) Montague in Winwood's "Memorials of Affairs of State" Page 15
- (105) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Page 187, 188
- (106) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 46
- (107) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 188
- (108) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 281
- (109) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 188
- (110) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 188
- (111) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 214
- (112) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 212
- (113) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 212
- (114) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 212

CHAPTER SEVEN

- ( 1 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 168
- ( 2 ) Quotations about James from Barlow's "Sum and Substance" and  
those about Hitler from bulletin "Kulturkampf" issued in  
New York, May 26, 1939, under the sponsorship of Archbishop  
Anthony Bashir, Dr. George A. Buttrick, Dr. Albert Beaven,  
the Hon. William Dodd and others
- ( 3 ) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 9
- ( 4 ) Tarkington "Some old Portraits" Page 16
- ( 5 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 177
- ( 6 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 199
- ( 7 ) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 210
- ( 8 ) Frere "The English Church" Page 291
- ( 9 ) Beveridge "History of Westminster Assembly" Pages 20-31
- (10) Pearson "Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism"  
Pages 242, 243
- (11) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 184
- (12) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 188
- (13) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 202
- (14) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
180, 184
- (15) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
204, 205
- (16) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages  
208, 209

## CHAPTER SEVEN (continued)

- (17) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 212
- (18) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 215, 216
- (19) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 176, 198
- (20) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 211
- (21) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 202
- (22) Calderwood "History of the Church of Scotland" Vol. V Page 106
- (23) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy"  
Pages 202-203
- (24) Duke "History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation"  
Page 226
- (25) Percy "John Knox" Page 239
- (26) Duke "History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation"  
Page 213
- (27) Percy "John Knox" Page 227
- (28) Duke "History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation"  
Pages 177, 188
- (29) Duke "History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation"  
Page 208
- (30) Duke "History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation"  
Page 224
- (31) Percy "John Knox" Page 310
- (32) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 203
- (33) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 65
- (34) Tytler "History of Scotland" Volume VIII Page 160
- (35) Tytler "History of Scotland" Volume VIII Page 377
- (36) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 101
- (37) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 203
- (38) Percy "John Knox" Pages 358, 373, 382, 393, 397
- (39) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 170
- (40) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 105
- (41) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 170
- (42) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 148
- (43) Steeholm "James I of England" Page 246
- (44) Barlow in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 212  
and Steeholm "James I of England" Page 262

## CHAPTER EIGHT

- ( 1 ) Frere "The English Church" Page 179
- ( 2 ) Jordan "The Development of Religious Toleration in England"  
Volume II Page 20
- ( 3 ) Fuller "Church History" Volume III Page 192
- ( 4 ) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 20
- ( 5 ) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 19
- ( 6 ) Fuller "Church History" Volume III Page 192
- ( 7 ) Wood "Athenae Oxonienses" Section 485, Column 415
- ( 8 ) Wood "Athenae Oxonienses" Section 485, Column 414
- ( 9 ) Fuller "Church History" Volume III Page 193
- (10) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 217
- (11) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 82
- (12) Gouge's "Narrative" quoted in Haller "The Rise of Puritanism"  
Page 81
- (13) Mackinnon "History of Modern Liberty" Volume III Page 25, 26

## CHAPTER EIGHT (continued)

- (14) Steeholm "James I of England" Pages 282-286
- (15) Mackinnon "History of Modern Liberty" Volume III Page 27
- (16) Cardwell "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 288  
Strype "Life of Archbishop Whitgift" Volume II Pages 523,524
- (17) "James' Letters Patents" in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 217-225
- (18) "James' Letters Patents" in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Pages 224, 225
- (19) Procter "History of the Book of Common Prayer" Pages 91, 92
- (20) Joyce "England's Sacred Synods" Page 622
- (21) Lathbury "A History of the Book of Common Prayer" Pages 131,133
- (22) Harrington "Nugae Antiquae" quoted in Price "History of Protestant Nonconformity" Pages 481, 482 Volume I
- (23) Strype "Life of Archbishop Whitgift" Pages 503-505
- (24) Walton "The Lives of John Donne, Sir Henry Walton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Heibert and Dr. Robert Sanderson" Pages 229-230
- (25) Green "Short History of the English People" Page 480
- (26) Mackinnon "History of Modern Liberty" Volume III Pages 23, 24
- (27) Law "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume II Page 43
- (28) Green "Short History of the English People" Page 480
- (29) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 18
- (30) Letter of King James in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 161
- (31) Gardiner "History of England" Volume I Page 158
- (32) Haller "The Rise of Puritanism" Page 258
- (33) Footnote in Neal's "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 23
- (34) Footnote in Drysdale's "History of the Presbyterians in England" Page 239
- (35) Gleeson "The Tragedy of the Stuarts" Page 180
- (36) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Page 89
- (37) Phillips "History of the Church of Ireland" Page 558
- (38) Henderson "James I and VI" Page 197
- (39) Phillips "History of the Church of Ireland" Page 523
- (40) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Pages 90, 91
- (41) Gleeson "The Tragedy of the Stuarts" Page 121
- (42) Marsden "History of the Early Puritans" Page 292
- (43) Drysdale "History of the Presbyterians in England" Pages 239, 240
- (44) Neal "History of the Puritans" Volume II Pages 40, 41, 43
- (45) Green "Short History of the English People" Page 507
- (46) Bryce in "Foreword" to Mathews' "The Quest of Liberty" Page viii
- (47) Galloway in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 214
- (48) Westcott "History of the English Bible" Page 110
- (49) Dr. Hill footnote in Westcott "History of the English Bible" Page 111
- (50) Westcott "History of the English Bible" Page 119
- (51) Price "The Ancestry of Our English Bible" Pages 278, 279
- (52) Muir "Our Grand Old Bible" Pages 153, 156, 157
- (53) Gleeson "The Tragedy of the Stuarts" Pages 133, 148
- (54) Long "English Literature" Page 154
- (55) Price "The Ancestry of Our English Bible" Page 282
- (56) Proclamation in Cardwell's "Conferences on the Liturgy" Page 226
- (57) Tarkington "Some Old Portraits" Page 22

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Harold Anson, "Looking Forward"  
Butler and Tanner, London, 1939
- Katharine Anthony, "Queen Elizabeth"  
Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1929
- Francis Bacon, "Letters written during the Reign of James the First"  
Benjamin Tooke, London, 1702
- Anthony Bashir, Albert W. Beaven and others, "Kulturkampf"  
A Bulletin of the American "Kulturkampf" Association  
New York, May 26, 1939
- Peter Bayne, "The Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution"  
James Clarke and Company, London, 1878
- Kenneth Bell (compiler), "Puritanism and Liberty: 1603-1660"  
G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. London, 1915
- W. Beveridge, "A Short History of the Westminster Assembly"  
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1904
- Thomas Bilson, "The Effect of Certain Sermons, Touching the Full  
Redemption of Mankind by the Death and Bloud of Christ Jesus"  
Peter Short for Walter Burre, London, 1599
- Thomas Bilson, "The Perpetuall Government of Christ's Church"  
Thomas Adams, London, 1610
- Champlin Burrage, "The Early English Dissenters: In the Light  
of Recent Research" (1550-1641)  
Cambridge University Press, 1912
- David Calderwood, "The History of the Kirk of Scotland"  
edited from the Original Manuscript preserved in the British  
Museum, by the Rev. Thomas Thomson, Volume VI  
Printed for the Woodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1845
- Douglas Campbell, "The Puritan in Holland, England, and America"  
Fourth Edition, revised and corrected, Volumes I, II  
Harper and Brothers, New York, 1892
- Edward Cardwell, "A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings  
connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer;  
from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690"  
Oxford at the University Press, 1840
- Edward Cardwell, "Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of  
England," Volumes I and II  
Oxford University Press, 1839
- J. S. B. Carwithen, "History of the Church of England"  
Baldwin and Cradock, London, 1829
- Austen K. DeBlois, "Fighters for Freedom"  
Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1929

- William Deverell, "The Pilgrims and the Anglican Church"  
Remington and Company, London, 1887
- A. H. Drysdale, "History of the Presbyterians in England:  
Their Rise, Decline, and Revival"  
Publication Committee of the Presbyterian Church of England.  
London, 1889
- John A. Duke, "History of the Church of Scotland To The Reformation"  
Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1937
- John Stephen Flynn, "The Influence of Puritanism"  
John Murray, London, 1920
- W. H. Frere, "The English Church In The Reigns of Elizabeth and  
James I"  
Macmillan, London, 1904
- Thomas Fuller, "The Church History of Britain to the year MDCXLVIII"  
Thomas Tegg, London, 1842
- Henry Gee and W. J. Hardy, "Documents Illustrative of English  
Church History"  
Macmillan, London, 1906
- Samuel R. Gardiner, "History of England from the Accession of  
James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War" 1603-1642  
In Ten Volumes Volume I 1603-1607  
Longmans, Green, and Company, London, 1887
- J. Desmond Gleeson, "The Tragedy of the Stuarts"  
Cecil Palmer, London, 1930
- Elizabeth Godfrey, "Social Life Under the Stuarts"  
Grant Richards, London E. P. Dutton, New York, 1904
- Godfrey Goodman, "The Court of King James the First"  
Published from the original manuscripts by John S. Brewer,  
Volumes I, II  
Richard Bentley, London, 1839
- J. Gregory, "Puritanism in the Old World and in the New:  
From Its Inception in the Reign of Elizabeth to the Establish-  
ment of the Puritan Theocracy in New England"  
Fleming Revell, New York, 1896
- Henry Hallam, "The Constitutional History of England"  
John Murray, London, 1854
- William Haller, "The Rise of Puritanism"  
Columbia University Press, New York, 1938
- Sir John Harington, "A Brief View of the State of the Church of  
England, as it stood in Q. Elizabeths and King James His  
Reigne, to the yere 1603"  
Written for the private use of Prince Henry
- Sir John Harington, "Mugae Antiquae"  
W. Frederick, London, 1769

- Sir John Harington, "Nugae Antiquae"  
edited by Henry Harington, Venor and Hood, London, 1804
- Sir James Harington, "Oceana and Other Works"  
London, 1736
- William Harris, "An Historical and Critical Account of the Life  
and Writings of James the First, King of Great Britain. After  
the Manner of Mr. Bayle. Drawn from the Original Writers  
and State Papers."  
James Waugh, London, 1753
- W. J. Heaton, "The Puritan Bible"  
Francis Griffiths, London, 1913
- T. F. Henderson, "James First and Sixth"  
Goupil and Company, Edinburgh and London, 1904
- H. Hensley Henson, "Puritanism in England"  
Hodder and Stoughton, 1912
- H. Hensley Henson, "Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth  
Century"  
John Murray, London, 1903
- Peter Heylin, "Aerius Redivivus: Or History of the Presbyterians  
from the Year 1636 to the year 1647"  
Oxford, 1670 Second edition, London, 1672
- Sir Richard Hill, "On Brotherly Love"  
Cadell and Davies, London, 1743
- Charles Hole, "A Manual of English Church History"  
Longmans, Green and Co. London, 1910
- Samuel Hopkins, "The Puritans: Or the Church, Court, and Parliament  
of England During the Reigns of Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth"  
Volumes I, II, III  
Sheldon and Company, New York, 1860
- David Irving, "The History of Scottish Poetry"  
Edited by John Aitken Carlyle  
Edmonston and Douglas, Edinburgh, 1861
- Henry Isaacson, "Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes"  
John Stoddard, London, 1650
- W. K. Jordan, "The Development of Religious Toleration in England"  
Volume I From the beginning of the English Reformation to the  
Death of Queen Elizabeth  
Volume II From the Accession of James I to the Convention of  
the Long Parliament  
Harvard University Press, Vol. I, 1932 Vol. II, 1936
- James Wayland Joyce, "Acts of the Church"  
J. Whitaker, London, 1886

- James Wayland Joyce, "England's Sacred Synods: A Constitutional History of the Convocations of the Clergy"  
Rivingtons, London, 1855
- W. D. Killen, "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland" Vol. I and II  
Macmillan, London, 1875
- John King, "The Fourth Sermon Preached At Hampton Court"  
Oxford, 1606
- John Knewstubb, "A Confutation of Monstrous and Horrible Heresies taught by H.N. (Nicholas) and embraced by a number who call themselves the Familie of Love"  
Thomas Dawson for Richard Sergier, London, 1579
- John Knewstubb, "The Lectures Upon the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus, And Certain Other Places of Scripture"  
Thomas Woodcocke, 1584
- Thomas Lathbury, "A History of the Book of Common Prayer and Other Books of Authority"  
Oxford and London, 1858
- Thomas Lathbury, "A History of the Convocation of the Church of England from the Earliest Period to the year 1742"  
London, 1853
- Ernest Law, "History of Hampton Court Palace" Volume I and II  
George Bell and Sons, London, 1890
- T. Lyon, "The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-1639"  
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1937
- James Mackinnon, "A History of Modern Liberty"  
Volume I "Origins - Middle Ages"  
Volume II "The Age of the Reformation"  
Volume III "The Struggle with the Stuarts 1603-1647"  
Volumes I and II, 1906 Volume III, 1908  
Longmans, Green and Company, London
- S. C. Malan, "A Vindication of the Authorized Version"  
Bell and Daldy, London, 1856
- J. B. Marsden, "The History of the Early Puritans from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War in 1642"  
Second Edition  
Hamilton, Adams and Company, London, 1853
- A. J. Mason, "The Church of England and the Episcopacy"  
Cambridge University Press, 1914
- Basil Matthews, "The Quest of Liberty"  
George H. Doran, New York, 1920
- Cleland Boyd McAfee, "The Greatest English Classic"  
Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1912
- James Melville, "Autobiography"  
edited by Robert Pitcairn, Woodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842

William Muir, "Our Grand Old Bible"  
Morgan and Scott, London, 1911

Daniel Neal, "The History of the Puritans or Protestant Non-  
conformists: from the Reformation in 1517 to the Revolution  
in 1688: Comprising an Account of their Principles; their  
attempts for a farther reformation in the church; Their  
Sufferings; and the Lives and Characters of Their  
Most Considerable Divines"  
Volumes I to V  
London William Baynes and Son, Toumlin  
Edition, 1822

John Overall, "Convocation Book of 1606"  
Walter Kettilby, London, 1690

John Henry Overton, "The Church in England" Volume II  
Gardner, Darton and Co., London, 1897

G. G. Parry, "A History of the English Church: From the Accession  
of Henry VIII to the Silencing of Convocation in the  
Eighteenth Century 1509 to 1717"  
John Murray, London, 1891

Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright and the Elizabethan Puritans"  
Cambridge University Press, 1925

Lord Eustace Percy, "John Knox"  
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1939

"The Phenix, or a Revival of Scarce and Valuable Pieces"  
A collection published by "a gentleman who has made it his  
business to search after such pieces for twenty Years past"  
J. Morphew, London, 1707

Walter Alison Phillips, "History of the Church of Ireland"  
Oxford University Press, 1934

Alfred Plummer, "English Church History, from the Death of  
Archbishop Parker to the Death of Charles I"  
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1904

Ira Maurice Price, "The Ancestry of Our English Bible"  
Sunday School Times Company, Philadelphia, 1915

Thomas Price, "The History of Protestant Nonconformity in England"  
William Ball, London, 1836

Francis Proctor, "A History of the Book of Common Prayer"  
Macmillan and Company, London and New York, 1892

Robert S. Rait, Editor, "A Royal Rhetorician"  
Constable and Company, Westminster, 1900

Conyers Read, "Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen  
Elizabeth"  
Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1925

- John Reynolds, "The Originall of Bishops and Metropolitans"  
(Martin Bucer, John Rainoldes, James Ussher)  
Leon Lichfield, Oxford, 1641
- John Reynolds, "The Prophecy of Obadiah"  
(with introduction by Alexander B. Grosart)  
Edinburgh, 1864
- John Reynolds, "The Summe of the Conference Between John Rainolds  
and John Hart"  
George Bishop, London, 1598
- Anthony Rudde, "A Sermon Preached at the Court at White Hall Before  
the Kings Majesty"  
London, 1604
- Herbert S. Skeats and Charles S. Miall, "History of the Free  
Churches of England 1688-1891"  
Alexander and Shepheard, London, 1891
- T. Smollett, "A Complete History of England" Volume VII  
Third Edition  
Rivington and Fletcher, London, 1759
- J. Paterson Smyth, "How We Got Our Bible"  
James Pott and Co. New York, 1915
- Clara and Hardy Steeholm, "James I of England"  
Michael Joseph Ltd., London, 1933
- John Stoughton, "History of Religion in England" Revised Edition  
Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1881
- John Strype, "The Life and Acts of John Whitgift" Volumes I,II,III  
Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1822
- Booth Tarkington, "Some Old Portraits"  
Doubleday Doran, New York, 1939
- Patrick Fraser Tytler, "History of Scotland"  
William Tait, Edinburgh, 1842
- Isaak Walton, "The Lives of Johne Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Rich-  
ard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert and Dr. Robert Sanderson"  
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1850
- Brooke Foss Westcott, "A General View of the History of the English  
Bible" Third Edition Revised by William Aldis Wright  
Macmillan, New York, 1905
- Alexander Whyte, "Lancelot Andrewes and His Private Devotions"  
Oliphant Anderson and Ferrier, Edinburgh, 1896
- Sir Ralph Winwood, "Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns  
of Queen Elizabeth and King James I"  
Edited by Edm. Sawyer, Volumes I, II, III  
T. Ward, London, 1725

Anthony Wood, "Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the  
Writers and Bishops who have had their education in the most  
antient and famous university of Oxford"  
Knaplock, Midwinter and Tonson London, 1721

Lady Mary Wood, "The Story of a Saintly Bishop's Life"  
Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1898