

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1900.

ART. I.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY
SINCE THE RESTORATION.

I. JUXON (SEVENTY-FIFTH ARCHBISHOP).

A GREAT measure of success was given to the design of Dean Hook when he undertook to write the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury from the beginning. He carried his work uninterruptedly down from Augustine to the Reformation period. Then, after breathing-time, he began again, calling his fresh work "New Series," and continued it to the next great crisis in the history of the Church of England. With the death of Laud came the temporary overthrow of the Church, Independency being established in its place. But in less than three years after the death of Cromwell the monarchy was restored amid such an outburst of national enthusiasm as rarely occurs in any country, and with it was restored the ancient Church of the nation.

Nine of the Bishops who had been driven out of their sees still survived, and were forthwith restored. These were: Juxon, of London; Pierce, of Bath and Wells; Skinner, of Oxford; Warner, of Rochester; Roberts, of Bangor; Wren, of Ely; Duppa, of Salisbury; Frewen, of Lichfield and Coventry; King, of Chichester. Canterbury, which had remained vacant since Laud's martyrdom, was filled by Juxon, and Gilbert Sheldon succeeded him as Bishop of London. Brave old Hook added Juxon's life to his series, but it was too evident that his power was gone. It is a performance very much poorer than any of the preceding lives, and almost immediately after its publication the good Dean died, full of years.

Juxon has up to the present time had eighteen successors, men of widely differing character and attainments. Some

have been able and learned, more have been commonplace and of little mark. But the period during which they have lived has been big with stirring events in the history of religion. It is a period of transcendent interest to ourselves of to-day, because the destinies of our nation have been ceaselessly shaping themselves, and our kinsfolk have been colonizing every quarter of the world.

After the royal line was again seated on the throne, John Milton, who had been one of the foremost leaders of the rebellion, and who was now old, poor, and blind, continued to put forth his political doctrines in some of his prose writings. In doing so he seemed to many, as he did to Johnson a century later, to be making himself ridiculous, dreaming unpractical theories, spinning cobwebs which time would sweep away. But the sturdy old Puritan knew that it was not so, that he held doctrines and principles which would yet bear fruit. Green, in his "History of the English People," says that England emerged Puritan from the Great Rebellion and has remained Puritan ever since. The statement is profoundly true, though it has to be qualified and guarded. In politics the doctrine of absolute monarchy was cast out, and the responsibility of the Government to the nation was affirmed. The Church had suffered heavily by being bound to the Tudor and Stuart theory of kingly right, and even yet found itself more or less in antagonism to the voice of the popular will. The political struggles of the days of the later Stuarts, ending with the expulsion of James II., was the triumph of the Puritan principle.

In religion, also, it has prevailed unto this day, even when it has taken the external form of High Church doctrine. The battle fought by men like Bunyan and Baxter against the prevalent laxity of their time was really the same battle as Newman fought when he was holding undergraduates spell-bound from the pulpit of St. Mary's, and using all his endeavours to promote personal religion within the walls of Oriel. The responsibility of the individual soul, the tremendous issues of life, and the realities of eternity, flash out alike in Baxter's "Saint's Rest," in Law's "Serious Call," in the sermons of Whitefield, of Spurgeon, and of Liddon.

What was merely outward in Puritanism, the hatred of innocent festivity (too frequently identified with the riotous living of the vicious), and of the beautiful in public worship, has largely passed away, as experience has taught men deeper wisdom and wider sympathies. And where these things are still viewed with suspicion it is because there lingers in the public mind the fear that they may be identified with doctrines and principles which the nation has rejected for ever.

When the ancient Church of England again became the Church of the Nation, Juxon was seventy-eight years of age. It will be well to summarize the facts of his previous life. He was born, probably at Chichester, in 1582, educated at Merchant Taylors' and St. John's College, Oxford, was intended for a lawyer and entered at Gray's Inn, but was ordained and was presented by his college to St. Giles's, Oxford, in 1609. His character as a preacher rose high, and in 1615 he was preferred to the living of Somerton, Oxon, and in 1621 he was made head of his College. In 1626 he became Dean of Worcester, through the influence of Laud; and it is to the credit of them both that Laud trusted him to the end, though Juxon was by no means so fervid as Laud in matters of ritual. Several times he appears as the composer of differences by his counsels of moderation. In 1663 he succeeded Laud in the Bishopric of London, and again it is to be noted that, though he was Laud's nominee, because of his simple piety, he incurred none of the hatred which gathered round Laud. He seems to have been always loved. He bravely and wisely exhorted Charles I. not to agree to the execution of Strafford. When the war broke out, and London remained in the hands of the Puritans, he was suffered to live unmolested at Fulham. His memory remains enshrined in the pathetic record of the last hours of Charles I.; he administered the Holy Communion to him on that solemn morning, walked with him from St. James's to Whitehall, received his last injunctions on the scaffold, and saw him die. It is little wonder that it was thought fitting that he should fill the vacant throne of Canterbury. But he was enfeebled by age and infirmity, and his primacy was little more than nominal. When he and Charles II. met again, at the time of the Restoration, Juxon was shocked at the King's libertinism, and they did not at all take to each other. During his primacy the resettlement of the Church took place, but Juxon's part in the arrangements was little more than nominal.

The great event of his primacy, the Savoy Conference, for that reason will be best treated in the succeeding biography. The Archbishop was too feeble to attend, and the presiding spirit of the Conference was his successor, Sheldon, at that time Bishop of London. No wonder that Juxon's thoughts and affections went back to his old See of London, and such energy as still remained to him was exerted in carrying on the restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral, which he had begun in the early days of his episcopate, and which was all to be destroyed by the Great Fire within three years. He also rebuilt the Great Hall at Lambeth Palace, which is now used as the Library, and he exerted himself for the augmentation

of the poor benefices of his see. He died in June, 1663, at the age of eighty-one, and was buried, by his own desire, in the chapel of St. John's College, Oxford.

II. SHELDON.

Gilbert Sheldon was born at Stanton, near Ashbourne, Derbyshire, June 19, 1598. The house of his birth is still carefully preserved, and a wooden tablet marks the chamber. His father, though descended from an old county family, was then a menial servant to Gilbert, Earl of Shrewsbury, who became the babe's godfather, and after whom he was named. At fifteen he matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, graduated B.A. in 1617, and M.A. 1620. Two years later he was elected Fellow of All Souls, and was ordained. Lord Coventry, Keeper of the Great Seal, appointed him his chaplain, gave him a prebend at Gloucester, and recommended him for his general ability and knowledge of politics to Charles I. The King gave him the vicarage of Hackney, and he also received the livings of Oddington, Ickford, and Newington (Oxon). In 1634 he took his D.D., and next year was elected Warden of All Souls.

Though belonging to Laud's party in the Church, he was by no means an obedient follower. There is a long and very interesting account in Wood's "Athenæ" of his (unsuccessful) resistance to the Archbishop's nomination of Jeremy Taylor to a Fellowship of All Souls. The King intended to make him Dean of Westminster, but the outbreak of the Civil War stopped this. In the negotiations between King and Parliament he incurred much odium for his uncompromising adherence to the cause of his master; and in 1647 he was ejected from All Souls, and imprisoned for about six months in Oxford, being liberated only on condition that he would neither come within five miles of Oxford nor go to the King in the Isle of Wight. He retired to Snelstone, in Derbyshire, close to his birthplace, where he gave himself to fishing in the river Dove. Izaak Walton says that his skill as a fisherman was "above all others," and that the poor who dwelt near him reaped the benefit of that skill. Here he remained until the Restoration, constantly subsidising the exiled Charles from his own purse and from collections which he made from his royalist neighbours. A strong indication of his royalist zeal is found in the fact that after the Restoration, when petitions poured in from clergy who had been deprived,¹ most of them referred to Dr. Sheldon for testimony to character and loyalty.

¹ In the Calendar of State Papers there are 143 in August, 1660.

In March, 1660, when the Restoration was seen to be imminent, the Wardenship of All Souls again became vacant, and Sheldon was reinstated. In May Charles II. returned. Sheldon met him at Canterbury, and was from the first high in favour. Juxon was translated from London to Canterbury, and Sheldon succeeded him in London,¹ and was also made chaplain of the Savoy. From that day he was virtually Primate, Juxon being worn out with old age and infirmity. He crowned the King, and married him to Catherine of Braganza.

The ecclesiastical history of this period is not a record to be read with unmixed satisfaction. There can hardly be a more unprofitable speculation at any time than that on what might have been, compared with what is. Whether the steps taken for the peaceful settlement were all wise is a question which every student of the proceedings will judge for himself. This much is certain, that persecution was not confined to one side. Men had not learned the principles of toleration, as events showed.

Much of the trouble that followed must be set down to the character of the King. His vicious life had drawn forth strong remonstrance from Sheldon during the exile, and was a terrible grief now to all pious men. But his falseness also soon made itself felt.

When the Restoration was decided upon there was content, if not actual joy, even with the Independents. When Monk summoned the remains of the Long Parliament to assemble once more, the greater part of them were men who had been opponents of the late King. But their experience had wrought a change; the military despotism of Cromwell had horrified many whose sympathies had been altogether with Hampden, and their congratulations to the coming King were honest and sincere. And whilst their religious foundations were precious to them as ever, much of the old bitterness was gone; they were ready to welcome, as things indifferent and harmless, much that in the days of heart-burning had exasperated them. On the other side, the old Church party, trained in the school of Laud, were warmly attached to the Episcopal form of government and to the Liturgy which had been cast out. The Presbyterians in their hour of victory had persecuted, sometimes with downright brutality.² There was little tenderness for them now, even though they saw their error, nor was there in the minds of the nation at large. It is evident from manifold signs that a bitter resentment filled the popular

¹ He was consecrated in Henry VIIIth's. Chapel, October 28.

² See Perry's "History," pp. 481-483.

mind against the fervid, but narrow, sectarianism which had supplanted the calm and beautiful services of the Prayer-Book. And to all this must fairly be added the hatred of the worldly and profane, who detested the Puritans for the protest they had made against the open irreligion which had found favour among the courtiers and the rich, and had been imitated as usual by their poorer fellow-citizens.

In sending to Charles II. whilst he was waiting in Holland an assurance of their loyalty and of the sincerity of their welcome, the Puritans took the opportunity of stating their views about the religious settlement. Some were reasonable, others not so. They knew that public opinion was strong against them, and the men they sent to represent them, such as Calamy, Reynolds, Manton, were men of learning, piety, moderation; but there was an element of narrowness, too. Charles received them graciously, and it was this perhaps which emboldened them to go further in their demands than was wise or fair. Thus they pleaded that as the Book of Common Prayer had been so long discontinued that many people had never heard it, the King might abstain from using it in the Royal Chapel, and that its use might at furthest be permitted, but not enjoined. The King replied that he thought it the best Liturgy in the world, and did not mean to have his own liberty interfered with; but that for the rest, the point was open to consideration, and for his own part he was not inclined to rigorous measures against other congregations. They requested the disuse of the surplice. Charles replied that he had always been used to it, and considered it a comely garment, but that he would hold it an open question whether it should be enforced universally.

After the Restoration the Puritans again professed their loyalty, and dwelt strongly on their points of agreement. But the bitter exasperation of the High Church party was so evident as they thought of the old intolerance, that moderate Churchmen wrote to the bishops counselling forbearance, and even Sheldon, preaching before the King, took the same line. "Let us," he said, "consider and bemoan one another for what we have mutually done and suffered from each other." It was with the profession of moderation that the King bade the Presbyterians put their proposals in writing, and they did so, stipulating, first, that the document should be taken "without prejudice," as lawyers say, not committing their clients, the great body of Dissenters; and, secondly, that the Church clergy, on their side, should deliver a like statement, stating what concessions they were ready to make. This stipulation unfortunately was not observed, but the Presbyterians put in their paper. They were satisfied, they said, of the lawfulness

of a form of prayer, provided it were consonant with the Word of God. They held that it should not be too tedious on the one hand, nor composed of too short prayers or responses on the other; that it should be as far as possible like the reformed liturgies of the Continent; and that the minister should be allowed a certain license, "that he might make use of his gifts of prayer and exhortation." They held that the Common Prayer-Book was "in some things justly offensive," and needed revision "at the hands of godly, learned, and moderate divines of both persuasions." Ceremonies they were willing to leave to authority, but still requested that kneeling at the Lord's Supper and observance of such holy days as were only of human institution might be made optional; bowing at the name of Jesus and towards altars, and the use of the surplice and the cross in baptism, to be abolished.

The King laid this document before the Bishops, whose reply certainly savoured little of conciliation. The Prayer-Book, they said, was "altogether unexceptionable," and could not be too strictly enjoined, especially considering that ministers already exercised the right of praying extempore before and after the sermon. But they were content that the Liturgy should be reviewed if His Majesty saw fit. As for the ceremonies, they were unwilling to part with any of them; the satisfaction of some private persons should not be allowed to overrule the peace of the Church, and any concessions would only encourage discontent.

This was not promising, and there were some who, like Clarendon, saw that the peace of both Church and State was menaced by the hardness thus displayed. It was evident, too, that the temper of Parliament was rising, and the consciousness of this led the King to issue a Royal Declaration (October, 1660), in which he promised that the whole question should be laid before Convocation and Parliament, and meanwhile no proceedings should be taken against the objectors. The Presbyterians were delighted, and some of the leaders accepted Church preferments. Reynolds was consecrated Bishop of Norwich, and Manton, though he refused the deanery of Rochester, accepted the rectory of St. Paul's, Covent Garden.

A message from the Crown, March 25, 1661, appointed a conference to be held between twelve Bishops on one side and the same number of Presbyterians on the other, with nine coadjutors on each side. It was to meet at the house of the Bishop of London, in the Savoy, and to report within four months. For some unknown reason the first meeting did not take place till April 15. Juxon, as we have said, was too infirm to attend, and Sheldon presided at the meeting. His

name seldom occurs in the discussions, but he was from the first the ruling spirit. At the first meeting he stated that, as the Nonconformists had sought for revision, and not the Bishops, it was incumbent on the former to state what they wanted, and that nothing could be done till they had delivered their exceptions in writing, as well as the additions which they desired. They demurred to this course, which was not, according to their views, a conference at all; but in the end they consented, and commissioned Baxter to draw up the paper.

Burnet charges Sheldon, not altogether unfairly, with having herein set a trap for Baxter. He saw that a big heap of demands would disgust the nation and make the objectors unpopular. If they had been equally sharp-witted, and confined their demands within the limits of a true policy and a tolerant spirit, much might have been conceded. As it was, Baxter was insatiable and narrow. Instead of filling up gaps, he drew up a new form altogether, showing no respect either for primitive models or established customs. This, having with some difficulty obtained the consent of his fellow-religionists, he presented with the request that it should be left open to the clergy to use which of the two they chose. Unhappily there was something of menace in his language. He bade the Bishops "exercise a little charity," not make men offenders by passing laws which their conscience would not allow them to keep, and told them that if they rejected his proposals he should appeal to all the Protestant Churches to judge them. The documents are given in Cardwell, and show that both sides were in angry mood. Certainly the language of Baxter is that of indignation rather than of brotherly conference.

But another factor comes in at this point. The Convention Parliament had been dissolved, and a new House of Commons met in May, 1661. It is known as "the Cavalier Parliament," heart and soul devoted to the King (see Green's "Larger History," iv., pp. 356, 357). The Presbyterians had sunk to a handful of fifty members. All idea of concession to them was treated with scorn, and before the conference could even report, a Bill of Uniformity was introduced, enjoining the use of the old Book pure and simple. Ten days before the allotted four months expired the Nonconformists in despair begged for a personal conference. Two days were spent in discussing whether they should have it, then it was conceded. Three members met on each side, and those the most eager and uncompromising. Cosin, the learned Bishop of Durham, proposed that they should write down what they thought absolutely sinful and what they judged inexpedient. But it

was all too late now. Frivolous objections and unreasonable demands on one side prevented concessions which should have been made on the other, and peace and brotherly love were driven away.

The Commons read their Bill of Uniformity the third time on July 9 and sent it up to the Lords. There wiser and calmer counsels prevailed. It was pointed out that the King had announced his intention of referring the Prayer-Book to Convocation, and on this ground the Bill was dropped. Convocation had already met (May 8); Sheldon had opened it under commission from the aged Primate.¹

The first Session was largely occupied with providing the service for Adult Baptism, rendered necessary in consequence of a generation having grown up many of whom had never been baptized. Then the revised Prayer Book was taken in hand (November and December, 1661). The House accepted the Book just as Convocation had passed it, though the proposed alterations were discussed first. An official copy was ordered to be prepared under the supervision of Dr. Sancroft.

Such was the final revision of the Book of Common Prayer, until we come to the new Lectionary of 1872. The details of the revision of the Savoy Conference must be read elsewhere. On the whole, it was unfavourable to the Puritan party (see Perry's "Student's Church History," p. 500). Then the Parliament passed the Act of Uniformity, which enforced the use of the Book in all public worship, required an unfeigned consent and assent to all which was contained in it, and required every minister who had not been episcopally ordained to be so at once. St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1662, was the last day of grace to those who failed on these points. From 1,500 to 2,000 Presbyterian ministers chose the alternative of deprivation. They preached their farewell sermons on the previous Sunday. Many of them were both learned and pious, and the loss of such men could not be without evil. But the young squires who passed the Act could not forget how their fathers had been used for their loyalty, and how, to use Mr. Green's words, "the solemn petitions of the Book of Common Prayer, the words which had rung like sweet chimes

¹ Baxter complains of a piece of sharp practice of Sheldon against him. A curious anomaly (which exists still) in the Diocese of London directed that each archdeaconry should elect two proctors, and that out of this body the Bishop should select two to serve. The City chose Baxter and Calamy; Sheldon passed them both over, and so, as Baxter said, "the City had no representative." He also complains that those ministers who had not received episcopal ordination were not allowed to vote in the elections. Burnet says that Sheldon and Morley, Bishop of Winchester, overbore everything in the management of the elections.

in their ears from their first childhood, had been banned from every village church as accursed things. It had been only by stealth and at home that the cross could be signed on the brow of the babe brought to be christened. Hardly by stealth had it been possible to bury their dead with the words of pathetic hope which have so often brought comfort to the ears of mourners." And further, there was the conviction in the heart of the nation that episcopacy was of the very essence of ecclesiastical order and discipline. There can be no question that the country at large approved of the result. The City of London welcomed Sheldon on his first Visitation as Primate with bands of music and volleys of cannon.

We cannot but admit that the course thus taken, necessary though it may have been, isolated the Church of England. The severance from Rome on one side remains as it has done from the days of Elizabeth, and the insistence on Episcopal Ordination severs us from the Protestant Communion on the Continent. But the longing for the reunion of Christendom was perhaps never stronger than it is at this moment.

On June 4, 1663, Juxon died, and Sheldon was nominated by the King as his successor. Evelyn gives an interesting account of the Confirmation on August 31, "the mace-bearers in procession, eight Bishops, the Lord Mayor and sheriffs, the Dean of Arches, divers advocates in scarlet." The Archbishop was "in a private room looking into the chapel [it is the present vestry], and the Bishops sat in chairs round a table placed before the altar." When the ceremony was completed, he goes on to say, "This done, we all went to dinner in the great hall, to a mighty feast."

When Sheldon's life is viewed as a whole, it would be unjust to deny to him the character of a good and pious man. Burnet speaks of him disparagingly, but Burnet was a strenuous Whig, and Sheldon was a strenuous "Church and King" man. Here are Burnet's words: "Sheldon was esteemed a learned man before the war; but he was now engaged so deep in politics that scarce any prints of what he had been remained. He was a very dexterous man in business, had a great quickness of apprehension, and a very true judgment. He was a generous and charitable man. He had a great pleasantness of conversation—perhaps too great. He had an art that was peculiar to him of treating all who came to him in a most obliging manner; but few depended much on his professions of friendship. He seemed not to have a deep sense of religion, if any at all, and spoke of it most commonly as of an engine of government, and a matter of policy. By this means the King came to look on him as a wise and honest clergyman" ("History of his own Times," i., 247). It would be easy to

draw from contemporary records proof of the untruthfulness of this portrait. Sheldon hated unreality and canting professions, and sometimes spoke against them with sharpness (see Burrows' "Worthies of All Souls," p. 251). But Charles I. had a very high reverence for his religious principles, and it was he who brought back Chillingworth from Romanism, into which he had lapsed. He had a most difficult task in reconstructing the Church after the troubles, and was no doubt a man of strong convictions. But his influence with the King went down because he not only rebuked him for his scandalous life, but (according to Burnet himself) refused him the Sacrament. At the time of the Great Plague of 1665 he remained in London the whole time, was unceasing in his labours to relieve distress, and begged money from all the Bishops of his province for the same object. In 1667 he was elected Chancellor of the University of Oxford, with only one dissentient voice. He held the office for two years, then, pleading his "crazy head and infirm health," he resigned, and his nominee—the Duke of Ormond—was chosen as his successor. His great love for his University took practical shape when he built the noble Sheldonian Theatre for the annual "Acts" (now called "Commemorations") which had previously been held in St. Mary's Church. So much scandal was caused by the ribaldry and profanation which went on at these times that he took this step for the prevention of sacrilege (Burrows, p. 227). It is an additional feather in Sheldon's cap that he fixed on a man for his architect previously unknown—Christopher Wren. Sheldon contributed a large sum to the rebuilding of St. Paul's after the Fire. We have not space to tell how bravely he fought against corrupt practices connected with the elections to All Souls Fellowships, in some of which the King himself was concerned.

Sheldon's Registers contain some interesting instructions which he issued to the Bishops of his province with a view of raising the standard of clerical character. Thus, on July 7, 1665, he writes to all the Bishops, urging them to be very careful whom they admit to Holy Orders, not to ordain any man out of their own diocese without license of the Archbishop. Each Bishop is "within 30 days after the Feast of the Annunciation of our Blessed Lady St. Mary the Virgin" to send the Archbishop the names, degrees, titles and orders of all men ordained by him within the year ending Candlemas last. Then, concerning pluralities: before next Lady-Day each Bishop is to send full particulars of each man holding more than one benefice or ecclesiastical dignity, with or without cure, whether in the same or in different dioceses; the distances between such preferments; the tenure on which they hold

them; where they reside; whether they keep and maintain able, orthodox and conformable curates upon the benefices in which they do not reside; the names and degrees of such curates; and whether they be properly licensed. And, concerning lecturers: a list is to be sent of "lectures sett up," and of the lecturers filling them; "names, degrees and qualities"; whether they are lawfully licensed by the Bishop, and how they appear affected to the Government of His Majesty and the doctrine and discipline of the Church. He also requires a return of all free-schools in each diocese; where and by whom founded, and how endowed; the names and degrees of the master and ushers; "and also the names, surnames and degrees of all other publique schoolmasters and ushers or Instructors and Teachers of youth in reading, writing, grammer or other literature and whether they be lycenced and by whome. As allsoe of all publique mistresses of Schools and instructors and teachers of young maydes or women, and of all other men or women that keep scholleres in their houses to board or sojourn and privately teach them or others within their houses"; and whether these teachers regularly attend Church, or cause their scholars to do so; and whether they appear well affected to Government and Church. Then he goes on to call for a return of the "names, surnames, degrees and qualities of all practisers of physicke" in each diocese, "whether they be lycenced and by whom and whether they too are well affected," etc. And lastly, he inquires concerning Nonconformist ministers, the names and degrees of all "who have been ejected from ecclesiastical Benefices for Nonsubscription and Inconformity." If any have moved from one diocese to another, the fact is to be returned (Sheldon's Register, p. 206).

Here is another interesting circular which he issued to all the Bishops of his province in February, 1664. It deserves to be chronicled, as it is perhaps the first episcopal recognition of the need of spiritual care for our navy, which was now rising to its full importance. He calls on the Bishops "to find out and procure for the King's service two or more able clergymen, beneficed or not beneficed, such as in your judgment, as well for their good doctrine and preaching as for their sobriety of life and discretion, you shall think most apt and fit to be employed" as chaplains for the ships of the fleet about to sail, under the command of the Duke of York. "In doing this," he continues, "you will do God and His Church good service, and pay an acceptable duty to his Majesty. And for the encouragement of such as shall be willing to undertake this employment, you are to let them know that whatsoever they hold already in the Church shall be secured unto them notwithstanding their absence. And

after their return, as His Majesty recommends it to your Lordship's consideration, to reserve such benefices and promotions for them as shall be in your dispose and according as you shall think them capable. So likewise are you to assure them of His Majesty's favour in having such livings and preferments as shall fall in His Majesty's gift, according as they shall be found to have demeaned themselves and deserved in this service. When you have found out the persons, you are to give me notice as soon as may be of their names and states, and how they may be sent to, that, they being ready, I may know how to send for them to attend his Majesty's order. If any person whom you shall think fit for this employment shall, without apparent good reason, refuse or show their unwillingness to it, you are likewise to signify these names that such course may be taken with them as to His Majesty and his Council may seem good." Here let us note that with the co-operation of Clarendon Sheldon took from Convocation the right of the clergy to rate themselves. From that time they were rated with the rest of the community.

That Sheldon was very severe on the Nonconformists, or at any rate on their principles, can hardly be disputed. But he rather lagged behind the House of Commons in this respect. In 1662 the King wanted to be entrusted with a "dispensing power," such as should enable him to give more license to the Nonconformists. Parliament declared against it. He issued a Declaration of Indulgence in spite of this, and the House of Commons declared that it was encouraging schism and nullifying the Act of Uniformity. The clergy sent up a host of petitions against it, and in consequence, in 1664, Parliament passed the Conventicle Act, which enacted that every person above sixteen who should be present at any religious service other than that of the Church of England should be liable to fine, and in case of second and third offences, to imprisonment and to transportation. According to Baxter, this Act was not really put in force except as regards Quakers and Baptists. The King was angry, especially as he was known to be favourable to toleration of the Roman Catholics, and from that time he was bitter against the Bishops and clergy. But Parliament remained firm, and during the Great Plague, whilst they were sitting at Oxford, the "Five Mile Act" was passed, by which all Nonconformist ministers were required to make oath that "it is not lawful on any pretence to take up arms against the King" . . . and that they would not at any time endeavour any alteration in Church or State. If they refused, they might not come within five miles of any place where they had been ministers. Sheldon

strenuously supported this Act. He believed it would be the deathblow of political Nonconformity, the strength of which lay in the market-towns. And it would seem also that he believed that the taking the oath would secure them against molestation. It was the conduct of these Nonconformists during the Great Plague that did so much to turn the tide of public opinion. When some of the Church clergy fled from the stricken city many of the Dissenting came thither, and yielded up their lives in their pious ministrations. We have seen how Sheldon himself remained bravely. But for a while there was no sign of relaxation. A second Conventicle Act was passed in 1670, Sheldon again approving, in the belief that it would "promote the welfare of the Church and the happiness of the whole kingdom." The King secretly encouraged this Act, because he saw that it would be unpopular, and that it would give him more ground for the Declaration of Indulgence on which he had set his heart. He issued it on March 15, 1672. It suspended all penalties against Dissenters and Romanists, allowing them to hold their services in private houses. But the House of Commons sternly passed a resolution that the King's prerogative could not repeal Acts of Parliament, and they passed a Test Act requiring Roman Catholics to receive the Holy Communion according to the Anglican use before accepting any civil or military office.

This was the great turning-point. From this time onwards the Commons, seeing that the Roman party were being favoured, and that the grievances of the Nonconformists were a strength to these, passed a Bill giving them toleration, with certain safeguards. It might have brought peace, but when it was sent up to the Lords they rejected it, led by the Bishops. Thus began a fresh cleavage between the Church and the House of Commons. Titus Oates, by his ghastly perjuries, fed the rising flame, and the attempt of the Commons to exclude the Duke of York from the succession, on the ground that he was a Roman Catholic, was a most ominous sign of the times. The rank and file of the clergy, too, and the Nonconformists, showed strong signs of making common cause. Baxter was one of the leaders of a party who were desirous of finding a basis of union. The rise of the "Cambridge Platonists" was owing to the same influence; men of learning and piety—Whichcote and Henry More, joined by Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Patrick in London, all great names—set themselves to exalt piety and charity above tests and rigid conformity. The writings of some of them are very beautiful, and breathe a spirit which finds place in the minds of all modern religious men. But there was a snare in this. They

were nicknamed "Latitudinarians," and the name stuck. They were followed eagerly by men who had not their piety and genuineness—men who looked only on the hope of indifference and slackness in religious duty.

Sheldon was now an old man. The earnest friendship between him and Clarendon, which had been maintained unbroken for half a century, in adverse and prosperous times alike, was brought to an end by Clarendon's death, in exile, in 1674. In his will the famous statesman bequeathed all his papers to his sons, to be used by them as Sheldon and Morley of Winchester should advise; and with simple pathos he besought the two prelates to commend his children to the King, as "having all possible need of his Majesty's charity, being children of a father who never committed fault against his Majesty." The result of this advice was that the great "History of the Rebellion," now one of our classics, was withheld from publication. This was wise. Too many persons were implicated. It was published in the time of Queen Anne, and produced a profound effect.

The old Primate was indefatigable to the last. One of his last letters was written to exhort a negligent and non-resident Bishop to a better discharge of his duty. Here is his will, which I take from Professor Burrows' "Worthies of All Souls," he having printed it for the first time:

"I, Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, being in good health of body and sound and perfect in memory and understanding (God be praised for it), doe make and ordaine this my last Will and Testament in manner and forme following. First I recommend my soule into the mercifull hands of my gracious Redeemer, my only Lord, Saviour and Master, Jesus Christ, relying wholly upon His goodness and mercy for my salvation, giving Him most humble thanks for calling mee by His gospel and grace to His knowledge and obedience, abhorring all sects, sidings and tyranny in religion, holding fast the true orthodox profession of the Catholique faith of Christ, foretold by the prophets, and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles and their successors, being a true member of His Catholique Church within the Communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, desiring God to confirme me in this ffaith, and in all Christian charity and His holy feare to my lives end. My body I desire may be devoutly buried, but very privately and speedily, that my funerall may not wast much of what I leave behind me for better uses."

He died at Lambeth November 9, 1677, and was buried at Croydon. The Episcopal Palace there had during his last years been his principal residence. He was never married,

and died very poor. But he had spent on good works for the Church £72,000, having come into some family property late in life, and some portion of his money was given to good men who had "been deprived under the Act" of 1662. There are two portraits of him in Lambeth Palace, representing him as tall and thin, with a high colour and a small, dark moustache, the whole aspect severe, almost repellent, marking stern self-reliance.

W. BENHAM.

(To be continued.)



ART. II.—A WELSH CLERGYMAN'S REMINISCENCES.

I HAVE been spared to see and help to celebrate two Jubilees of the Queen's reign. Had Her Gracious Majesty reigned as long as I have lived, and the interval between the two Jubilees been taken as a precedent, we should have had three such commemorations. The two we have kept were naturally calculated to invoke the siren Memory; it is not strange, therefore, that at each commemoration I intended to recall and put on record, were it only for my own satisfaction and the satisfaction of those immediately around me, some of the more notable events that transpired during the period of which the Jubilee formed a climax, offering as each did a vantage-ground for a compendious review. But both commemorations passed by and left my purpose still unaccomplished. But now, again, when standing so much further away from the actual scenes, and so much nearer to the frontier line of oblivion and eternal silence, but with greater leisure and facilities for the undertaking, the intention revives, and I venture here on the task of recounting a few of my reminiscences.

My first reference shall be to the agitation which convulsed the country at the time of the Reform debate. This had invaded the seclusion of my humble and remote native place. The House of Lords had rejected the first Parliamentary Reform Bill, and Earl Grey's Ministry had appealed to the constituencies. The scene on the day of the Election with us made such an impression on me that it still vividly recurs to my memory. My mother had pinned an orange rosette on my breast, and I was taken down to the adjoining townlet, where, amidst a large and excited crowd, and the discordant cries of the rival parties, I could point to my rosette with the pride of an eager partisan. Orange was the colour of the Tories, and blue of the Whigs. The term "Conservative" was then unknown, being subsequently coined and used as the substitute for that of Tory by Sir Robert Peel, whilst the