

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

FEBRUARY, 1900.

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

SANCROFT.

WILLIAM SANCROFT was born at Ufford Hall, Fressingfield, Suffolk, January 30, 1617. His father, Francis Sancroft, came of an old family which had possessed land in the village since the time of Henry III. His mother, Margaret, was the daughter of Thomas Butcher, or Boucher, of Wilby. He was the eldest of eight children, and was educated at Bury School and at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where his uncle William was master. He took his degree in 1637 (his uncle having died meanwhile), and his M.A. in 1641, in which year he was ordained. The death of a college friend in his undergraduate days had a lifelong effect upon his religious character. In 1642 he got his Fellowship. He was always a diligent student; among the Lambeth MSS. are four of his academical orations, somewhat metaphorical and inflated in style. In the Bodleian also is a commonplace book filled with poems which he has transcribed with his own hand, among them Milton's "Hymn on the Nativity." Advantageous offers were made to him of private tutorships, but he remained at his College, engaged in its business and following his studies.

Troubles were thickening around the Church. In 1643 the famous Covenant brought things to a crisis; sixty-five Fellows were ejected at Cambridge by the Earl of Manchester, the Parliamentary visitor; among them was Dr. Holdsworth, Master of Emmanuel, Sancroft's particular friend. The following letter from the latter to him is worth quoting, as an example of his style:

“MUCH HONOURED SIR AND STILL OUR WORTHY MASTER,

“I have formerly troubled you with my desires, and they met with acceptance from you. I hope I may now take leave to sigh out my griefs before you, and pour my sorrow into your bosom. You have not thought good as yet to give a check to my former impertinences, and so I dare be confident your goodness will be a sanctuary for this offence too, which yet, if it must be called so, is no other than an offence of love, or, if that be too bold a word, of deepest regard and respect to you. We live in an age in which to speak freely is dangerous, *immo nec gemere tuto licet*; faces are scanned, and looks are construed, and gestures are put upon the rack and made to confess something which may undo the actor; and though the title be ‘liberty,’ written in foot and half-foot letters upon the front, yet within there is nothing but perfect slavery, worse than Russian. Woe worth a heart, then, oppressed with grief in such a conjuncture of time as this! Fears and complaints, you know, are the only kindly and gentle evaporations of burthened spirits; and if we must be bereaved of this sad comfort too, what else is left us but either to whisper our griefs to one another in secret, or else to sit down and sink under the burthen of them? I do not *paratragædiare*, nor is my grief so ambitious as to raise *fluctum in scrupulo*. You know, I dare say, what it is that must needs make me cry out, since it touched me in the tenderest part of my soul. We live in times that have of late been fatal in abating of heads. Proud Tarquin’s riddle is now fully understood; we know too well what it is—*summa papaverum capita demere*. But I had not thought they would have beheaded whole colleges at a blow—nay, whole Universities and whole Churches, too. They have outdone their pattern in that, and ’tis an experiment in the mastery of cruelty far beyond Caligula’s wish. Ah, sir, I know our Emmanuel College is now an object of pity and commiseration; they have left us like John Baptist’s trunk when his head was lopped off, because of a vow or oath (or covenant, if you will) that went before, or like Pompey’s carcase upon the shore; so *stat magni nominis umbra*. For my part, *tædet me vivere hanc mortem*. A small matter would prevail with me to take up the resolution to go forth any whither where I might not hear *nec nomen nec facta Pelopidarum*. Nor need we voluntarily give up our stations. I fear we cannot long maintain them. And what then? Shall I lift up my hand? I will cut it off first. Shall I subscribe my name? I will forget it as soon. I can at least look up through this mist and see the hand of my God holding the scourge that lashes, and with this thought I am able to silence all the mutinies

of boisterous passions, and to charm them into a perfect calm. Sir, you will pardon this disjointed piece ; it is the production of a disquieted mind, and no wonder if the child resembles its parent ; my sorrow as yet breaks forth only in abrupt sighs and broken sobs."

He escaped the storm himself ; we know not how. Certainly he did not take the Covenant ; probably his quiet, unobtrusive life and also his abilities as a teacher recommended him to the forbearance of the other side, and they let him alone. When the Liturgy was prohibited, and the Directory substituted for it, there can be no doubt that he did not comply within his College, though he did not go out of his way to court martyrdom. Dr. D'Oyly prints a letter of his to a friend, dated 1645, in which he rebukes him for not standing more firmly, and declares that he goes on with his Prayer-Book, to do otherwise "would be to throw a foul aspersion on the whole Church of God in England since the Reformation ; as if the public worship of God here used, which, for aught I know, was the most complete piece which any Church upon earth had, were unlawful and anti-Christian." The same biographer gives another letter, written just after the King's death, expressing the most passionate sorrow, and alarm for the religion of the nation. Within ten days of this a heavy personal sorrow fell upon him, namely, the death of his father at the age of sixty-eight.

Attendance upon him in his last days brought on a severe illness. Before he had recovered he was called upon to accept "the Engagement," an oath "to be true and faithful to the Government without King or House of Peers." To escape it he left the University, was adjudged to have forfeited his Fellowship, and his successor was even named. But still those in authority hesitated to go on. They were told that they "might as well think to remove a mountain as Mr. Sancroft," and he went back to Cambridge. However, in July, 1651, he was expelled. He retired to Fressingfield, where his brother had succeeded his father as the Squire. He had saved some money at College, and he now proceeded to earn something by literary labour. His first book was "Fur Prædestinatus," a satirical attack upon Calvinism : a thief condemned to immediate execution holds a dialogue with a Calvinistic preacher who has come to urge him to repent. The thief, though he has been guilty of the vilest enormities, is entirely self-satisfied ; he was irresistibly compelled to his crimes, and therefore was not responsible, and now is one of the elect, and is assured of salvation. The dialogue is skilful, because all the criminal's statements are taken from the actual

writings of Calvinist authorities. It went through many editions, and kindled great anger among the religionists attacked. Next he wrote "Modern Policies, taken from Machiavel, Borgia, and other choice Authors," in which he held up to contempt persons who were holding authority. It is written in a tone of light good-humour, but underlying it is a vein of keen irony. He says in his Introduction: "I brand not persons, but things; and if any man's guilt flashes in his face when he reads, let him mend, and he is unconcerned." And, in addition to these occasional works, he collated the Vulgate with the Latin translations of Beza and others, and published the result in 1655.

A good many letters to and from him during this time have been preserved. Some are literary discussions, which show he was always ready to advise and assist young authors. There is one from Dr. John Cosin, who, like himself, had been despoiled of his preferments, and was living in exile at Paris, ministering to an English congregation there. The letter is interesting, as showing what a very high opinion Cosin had of his friend's character and consistency, and how steady was his conviction that the Church would yet be triumphant. It was written in 1656. After the Restoration Cosin was made Bishop of Durham, and had a large hand in the Savoy revision of the Prayer-Book.

In 1657 Sancroft was offered a chaplaincy in the family of Lord Herbert, "to live in the house; the salary will be £40 per annum, and all other accommodations; the work, a service in the forenoon on Sundays and prayers every day." He declined the offer, having made up his mind to travel abroad. He went to Holland (November, 1657), which had now become the centre of union for English Royalists. In August, 1658, he preached before the Princess of Orange, the eldest daughter of Charles I., and her son, the future William III., who was born in November, 1650, nine days after his father's death. Soon afterwards Sancroft left Holland, and travelled leisurely to Geneva, Padua, Venice, Rome. It was at Rome that he received the news of the Restoration, and was summoned to return to England. He arrived in September, and was appointed to preach the consecration sermon of his friend Dr. Cosin and six other Bishops at Westminster Abbey on November 18.¹ His sermon is curious, and very unlike our present style of pulpit oratory, with abundant quotations from the classics, and with somewhat unrestrained

¹ They were Cosin to Durham, Lucy to St. David's, Laney to Peterborough, Lloyd to Llandaff, Sterne to Carlisle, Walton to Chester, Gauden to Exeter.

sarcasm on Presbyterianism. We cannot apply our own standard of measurement to circumstances so entirely different from our own.

In the "Life of Sheldon" we noted that Sancroft acted as a kind of secretary and editor at the Savoy Conference. He took his D.D. at Cambridge, and Cosin the same year preferred him to the valuable rectory of Houghton-le-Spring and a canonry at Durham, and they remained in closest friendship until death divided them. Two letters of Cosin's hint at a love attachment to a "gentlewoman," unnamed; but it never came to a head, and Sancroft told Cosin he had determined to live and die a celibate, which he did. During the short time that he lived in the north he busied himself with archæological researches; but in August, 1662, he went back to Cambridge, having been elected Master of his old College. He prepared a design for the new chapel, and gave £600 towards it; but in January, 1664, he was made Dean of York, which in the same year he exchanged for that of St. Paul's. He was anxious to restore his cathedral, which had suffered so heavily both from neglect and irreverent usage, but his plans were all upset by the Great Fire of 1666. It was he who fixed on Wren first to restore the ruined structure, and, when this was found impossible, to remove it, and build the present cathedral. He gave £1,400 towards it, and subscribed £100 a year whilst he was Primate. He was appointed to the Archdeaconry of Canterbury in 1668, but resigned it in two years, apparently finding the duties of the two offices incompatible. He had undertaken to edit Laud's Diary, at the request of Archbishop Sheldon, when the latter died (1677); and Sancroft, who at that time was prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, was, to the surprise of himself and the public, raised to the Primacy. Burnet says that this was through the Duke of York's influence, he hoping to find Sancroft a mere puppet in his hands, and to keep out Compton, the Bishop of London, whom he detested; but there seems no reason to question that it was his pious life and conversation which marked him out. Charles II. admired in others the virtues which he did not practise. Sancroft was consecrated at Westminster on Sunday, January 27, 1678.

We have already seen how the latter days of Archbishop Sheldon were disquieted by the angry feeling which was rising in the nation against the favour shown by the Court to Romanism. The Parliament, which was altogether hostile to the sectaries at the Restoration, was now exerting itself in the other direction, and Churchmen and Nonconformists were united against the claim which the King was making of a power to "dispense" with the law. The Nonconformists

had declared in 1672, when the offer was made to them of indulgence, that they would sooner go without it than have it in a way destructive of the liberties of the country and of the Protestant interest.¹

The secret treaty of Dover in 1670 bound Charles II. to make public profession of the Roman Catholic religion, and to assist Lewis XIV. in seizing the United Provinces and also in claiming the throne of Spain for the House of Bourbon, and bound Lewis to pay Charles an annual stipend of £200,000. The treaty was kept secret, but suspicions of it were abroad. When Sancroft came to the Primacy the agitation was strong and threatening. He was in hopes of winning back the Duke of York to the Church of England, and communicated his design to the King, who expressed his approval, and suggested that he should ask Morley, Bishop of Winchester, to join him in the endeavour. Evidently King Charles, who cared not a jot about the religion, was cowed by the rising disaffection. Sancroft thereupon applied to Morley (the letter is given in the Sancroft MSS.), and the old Bishop (he was eighty-two) came up. The interview was held by appointment, February 21, 1678, and Sancroft's address is given at length by Clarendon. It is a little stiff and formal, but not without pathos. Witness the following extract :

“If there be now in the world a Church to whom that eulogium that she is a lily among thorns is due and proper, it is this Church of which we are members, as it stands reformed now and established among us; the purest, certainly, upon earth, as being purified from those many corruptions and abuses which the lapse of time, the malice of the devil, and the wickedness of men had introduced insensibly into the doctrine and worship and government of it. But then, withal, this lily of purity hath for these many years, by the malicious and subtle machinations of her restless and implacable enemies, been surrounded with thorns on every side; and even to this day she bears in her body the marks of the Lord Jesus, the scars of the old and the impressions of new and more dangerous wounds, and so fills up daily that which is behind of the sufferings of her crucified Saviour.

“But yet, sir, in the multitude of the sorrows which she hath in her heart, give us leave to tell you (for so it is), scarce anything hath so deeply and so sensibly wounded her as that your Royal Highness should think fit, even in her affliction, to forsake her. Hers is the womb that bare you, sir, and hers the pap that gave you suck. You were born within her then happy pale and communion, and baptized into her

¹ Neale's "History of the Puritans," iv. 445.

holy faith; you sucked the first principles of Christianity from her, the principles of the oracles of God, that sincere milk of the Word, not adulterated with heterogeneous or foreign mixtures of any kind. Your royal father, that blessed martyr of ever-glorious memory, who loved her and knew how to value her, and lost his all in this world for her, even his life too, bequeathed you to her at the last. When he was ready to turn his back upon an impious and ungrateful world, and had nothing else now left him but this excellent religion (which he thought not only worth his three kingdoms, but ten thousand worlds), he gave that queen in legacy amongst you. For thus he bespake the King your brother, and in him all that were his—words that deserve to be written in letters of gold, and to be engraved in brass or marble: ‘If you never see my face again, I require and entreat you, as your father and as your king, that you never suffer your heart to receive the least check or disaffection from the true religion established in the Church of England. I tell you I have tried it, and after much search and many disputes have concluded it to be the best in the world.’

“And accordingly, sir, we hereupon enjoyed you for many years, to your, we hope—we are sure to our—exceeding great comfort and satisfaction. We saw you in those happy days constant and assiduous in the chapels and oratories of the palace.

“Like the bright morning and evening star, you still arose and set with our sun, and shined with him there in the same heavenly orb. You stood, as it was meet, next to the throne, the eldest son of this now despised Church, and in capacity to become one day the nursing father of it; and we said in our hearts, It may so come to pass that under his shadow also we shall sit down and be safe. But, alas! it was not long before you withdrew yourself by degrees from thence (we know not how, nor why: God knows), and though we were loath at first to believe our fears, yet they proved at last too mighty for us; and when our eyes failed with looking up for you in that house of our God, and we found you not, instead of fear, sorrow filled our hearts, and we mourn your absence ever since and cannot be comforted. And then in that other august assembly in the House of the kingdom (the most sacred of any but the house of God Himself), think, we beseech you, sir (and sure it will soften and intenerate you into some pity when you have thought), how you stab every one of us to the heart, how you even break our hearts, when we observe (as all the world doth) that we no sooner address ourselves to Heaven for a blessing upon the public counsels (in which you have yourself

so great, too, and so high a concern), but immediately you turn your back upon us.

"Have we forgotten the name of our God, or do we stretch our hands to a strange God? Would not God search this out? Or if, indeed, we worship the same one God, and go to Him by that one mediator of God and man, whom you cannot refuse, is there anything in the matter of our requests which can be justly blamed by any Christians?"

There is much more of it. The Duke listened attentively, then said, a little ungraciously, that, though he acquitted the two Bishops of sinister intentions, he believed that they were led on by people who wanted to injure him; and then added, naturally enough, that he had not changed his faith hastily, and they must not take it amiss if he declined to discuss the subject with them. And it does not appear that from that time the matter was reopened between them.

Sancroft's correspondence shows how deeply he felt the need of curbing the laxity which was marking the clerical life of the period. He sent a circular to his suffragans (August 23, 1678) complaining that not enough vigilance is observed to keep out unworthy candidates for Orders, that testimonials should only be given from immediate and personal knowledge, and that the rules laid down in the Canons of 1603 should be strictly observed. He returned to this in the following reign, and made wise and stringent rules on the subject. And he even suspended Wood, Bishop of Lichfield, for two years for non-residence and neglect of his diocese. An Archdeacon of Lincoln having been convicted in the courts of simony, presented a petition for pardon to the King, who referred it to the Archbishop. The characteristic reply was that simony was a pestilence walking in darkness, very difficult to discover, all the more reason why the penalty on detection should not be remitted. One act of his primacy was characteristic of the time. He found that many of the clergy were wretchedly poor, and cast about to relieve them. Evidently at his instigation King Charles sent orders to the Bishops and other Church dignitaries to set aside a part of their incomes for the augmentation of poor curates. Parliament objected to this high-handed proceeding, which was obviously unconstitutional. But it was so popular in the country that an *ex post facto* Act was passed ratifying it, and Sancroft set to work with a will to see it carried out, and where there were some difficulties and obstacles he summarily got rid of them. It was an anticipation of the Ecclesiastical Commission of to-day.

Let us name one other act of Sancroft, visible to this day. During the Puritan desecration of Lambeth, Archbishop

Parker's bones were dragged from the grave and cast into a dunghill. Sancroft had them diligently sought out, and they were reverently buried near their former grave, with the inscription on the floor, "Corpus Matthæi Archiepiscopi tandem hic quiescit." And he had the broken tomb repaired which had formerly stood over them, and placed in the ante-chapel with a Latin inscription which he himself wrote, and which may still be read there.

Charles II. died at Whitehall, February 7, 1685. Sancroft and Ken went to his bedside, but the King made no answer to their exhortations. It was very soon known that he had been received the same day into the Roman Church, under the persuasion of his brother. James felt that his throne was not absolutely secure. The nation at large hated his creed. But Sancroft and a body of representative clergy and laity waited upon him and assured him of their loyalty to the hereditary line, whilst they entreated him to protect the National Church. James, in reply, made such an eager promise to do so that the hearers were carried away by their enthusiasm. On April 23 following Sancroft crowned him in Westminster Abbey. The one deviation from established usage was that there was no Communion. Sancroft held that as the Legislature had accepted the monarch, his duty to crown him was clear; and as the King was an avowed Papist he could not ask him to violate his conscience. But he afterwards reproved himself for consenting to the omission, while he declared, not unreasonably, that, having solemnly proclaimed him his lawful sovereign, he could not without perjury transfer his allegiance to another.

But by this time the whole conscience of the nation was in deep alarm. The Exclusion Bill of the reign of Charles II. had failed, but the exultation of the Duke of York over this had blinded him more effectually than ever, and he had become daily more offensive and impolitic. The leaders of Protestantism in England had already cast their eyes upon Holland, where the Duke of York's son-in-law, and grandson of Charles I., was not only in a strong position as Stadtholder, but was recognised as the head of the Protestant party on the Continent. Charles had no legitimate offspring, and it looked as if in the regular course of things the Stadtholder's wife, Mary, would presently succeed her father on the English throne. But this might be a somewhat remote contingency, and William was keen for more prompt action. He did not, apparently, look, at this time, to seizing the crown, but he was bent on keeping England Protestant, and on securing its co-operation with him in forming a great Protestant league, the primary aim of which should be to curb the power of France. But

the English nation was conservative. It was Protestant to the core, but it had a horror of revolutions, and was still bent on obedience to the lawful King. Accordingly, William, through his wife's chaplain, Dr. Covel, approached Sancroft with the view of effecting a league between the Church of England and the Continental Protestant Churches. Sancroft had replied with hesitation. He was a firm Protestant, but he saw his way no further. But events shaped themselves.

It was soon evident that King James, despite his professions, was bent on restoring the Roman faith. Monks were seen daily passing in and out of Whitehall. The King not only went in state to Mass, but ostentatiously paraded his brother's perversion. He sent directions to the Archbishop, bearing date March 25, 1686, to prohibit the clergy "preaching on controversial topics." Finding this unheeded, he established a "Commission" for the purpose of punishing ecclesiastical offences. This Commission could deprive offenders "notwithstanding any laws or statutes of the realm." There were four laymen upon it, three of them Roman Catholics and the other Jeffreys, who had now become Lord Chancellor, and three prelates, Archbishop Sancroft, and the Bishops of Durham and Rochester, Crew and Sprat. Sancroft declined to serve on it, and his place was filled by Cartwright, just appointed Bishop of Chester, an invariable tool of the Court.

After a little hesitation the Commission got to work, and suspended the Bishop of London (Compton) from all episcopal functions and jurisdictions for not suspending the Rector of St. Giles's for preaching against Popery. There was an intention of proceeding against Sancroft, who had determined not to admit the authority of the Commission, but to object to its legality,¹ and in the event of their passing sentence upon him, to appeal to the common law. Bishop Sprat, who soon resigned his seat on the Commission, afterwards declared that he had been largely instrumental in preventing the proceedings against the Archbishop.

Sancroft still testified his loyalty to the King. On July 29, 1686, he wrote to him expressive of it, and also recommending certain persons for bishoprics, among them Dr. Jeffreys, brother of the Chancellor. James paid no heed to these recommendations; he appointed Parker to the See of Oxford and Cartwright to Chester, of whom Burnet writes, "they were the two worst men that could be selected." They were both consecrated at Lambeth October 17.

¹ Compton had done this at first, but afterwards withdrew his objection, and pleaded. Warned by his example, Sancroft was on the alert.

After some other high-handed proceedings on King James's part with the object of Romanizing the country, the great crisis came. On May 4, 1688, he issued an Order in Council, directing the Archbishops and Bishops to send to their clergy the "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience," which they were commanded to read on the 20th and 27th inst. in all churches and chapels in London and Westminster, and on June 3 and 10 in all churches and chapels in the kingdom. Sancroft was prompt in his action. He saw that it was intended to humiliate the clergy by making them the instruments of their own degradation, and he at once summoned the Bishops and also some of the leading clergy to come to him at Lambeth. On May 12 there was a meeting of some Bishops and others, and after discussion it was resolved not to obey the King. Clarendon was present at several deliberations, and describes them in his Diary. It was soon known that nearly all the London clergy would refuse. On Friday, May 18, there were present at Lambeth Bishops Compton (London), Lloyd (St. Asaph), Turner (Ely), Lake (Chichester), Ken (Bath and Wells), White (Peterborough), Trelawny (Bristol), and also Tillotson (Dean of Canterbury), Stillingfleet (Dean of St. Paul's), Patrick (Dean of Peterborough), Tenison (Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields), Sherlock (Master of the Temple), and Grove (Rector of St. Andrew Undershaft). After prayers, a calm discussion of the subject was begun. The result we know, and there is no need to tell it here; how "the seven Bishops" drew up their remonstrance, how it was received, how on June 15, 1688, they were tried at Westminster and acquitted. Of all the eloquent chapters ever written by Macaulay, probably this is the most vivid. We pass on to the sequel.

The blind King, rushing to his own ruin, dismissed eight days after the trial two of the judges who had expressed opinions in favour of the Bishops, and ordered a return of all the clergy who had refused to read the Declaration. And meanwhile the Archbishop calmly returned to his work. He issued admonitions to the clergy of his province urging stricter attention to duty, strictness in all holy conversation, residence within their cures, diligent catechizing of the children of their parishes, daily services in the towns, and also in villages as far as practicable, special observance of Ember and Rogation days, Advent and Lent, exhortations of their people to frequent Communion, and celebrations at least monthly, diligent visitation of the sick, watchfulness against Popery, tenderness of action towards Dissenters. He also set on foot once more a scheme of comprehension with respect to these, no doubt as seeing how grateful and friendly

they had been towards the Church in the late struggle. Sacheverell afterwards charged him with "endeavouring to pull down the Church" by this step, and Wake, then Bishop of Lincoln, took up Sancroft's defence.

And now all eyes were turned to Holland. The Princess of Orange, Mary, had written two or three letters to Sancroft in the early part of her father's reign, in which she declared her unalterable affection for the Church of England, and Sancroft had returned thankful answers. In the middle of September James received a warning from Louis XIV. that his son-in-law was meditating invasion. In his terror he issued a Declaration (September 21) of his resolution to preserve inviolable the Church of England. He summoned the Bishops together, and took off Compton's suspension. Sancroft, conjointly with other Bishops, drew up a paper of advice, in which he urged him to dissolve the Ecclesiastical Commission; to inhibit four foreign Bishops who had recently been consecrated in the King's private chapel, and who, styling themselves "Vicars Apostolical," were exercising their functions and sending out pastoral letters; to restore charters against Corporations which he had taken away; and to issue writs for regular Parliaments. The King, who had angrily treated similar recommendations before, was now grateful, and promised compliance. He requested Sancroft to draw up "Prayers to be used in Churches" suited to the present danger, and he did so, James expressing his satisfaction. They are preserved in the Archbishop's handwriting in the Tanner MSS., and amongst other suitable petitions, emphatically pray not only for the peace of the realm, but "for the maintenance of our holy religion." Burnet, who seldom has a good word for Sancroft, is emphatic in his praise here. But it was all too late. Public confidence in the King was gone. The news still came in that the Prince of Orange was on his way. The hope of his wife's succession was dashed down by the birth of a son to the King. Then James sent for the Bishops again (October 31), and told them that the Prince had issued a Declaration, in which he stated that he received an invitation from the Bishops. Sancroft declared that there was no truth in such a statement, and that he could not believe the Prince had made it. The King accepted the repudiation, but called on the Bishops to meet together to draw up a paper for publication, stating that they had nothing to do with it, and that they held it in abhorrence. They gave no answer, but retired. This was on November 2, and on the 6th, the King having written to hurry them, they came again to Lambeth. The King asked for the paper. After a little fencing, Sancroft replied that they had already suffered severely from reading papers in the King's closet

outside Parliament; that a certain paper of theirs had been called a seditious libel, on the ground of their having no status there; that they had even been denounced as sedition-mongers and libellers by his Majesty's judges since their acquittal, and therefore they considered that they could put forth nothing except in Parliament assembled, especially as there were very few of them present. With that they were dismissed.

That Sancroft had nothing to do with inviting the Prince of Orange we may be certain. Among his papers was found the following, evidently intended for the King, but never presented, for the reasons we have seen :

“Whereas there hath been of late a general apprehension that His Highness the Prince of Orange hath an intention to invade this kingdom in hostile manner, and, as it is said, makes this one reason of his attempt, that he hath been thereunto invited by several English lords, both spiritual and temporal, I, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, do, for my own discharge, profess and declare that I never gave him any such invitation, by word, writing, or otherwise. Nor do I know, nor can believe, that any of my reverend brethren, the Bishops, have in any such way invited him. And all this I aver upon my word, and, in attestation thereof, have subscribed my name here, at Lambeth, the 3rd day of November, 1688.

“W. C.”

Sancroft's position is quite intelligible. He was no party to the invasion. But he could not help fearing that it might be a necessity for the deliverance of the nation from the King's evil counsellors. As things went, when it became known that the King had demanded from the prelates a public denunciation of the invader and been refused, it had a very important effect on public opinion. If they had yielded, parties would at least have been more evenly balanced, and there must have been bloodshed. The revolution would have been carried in spite of them, and the Church would probably have been overthrown. Bishop Sprat attributes the abolition of Episcopacy in Scotland to the declaration of the Scottish Bishops of their abhorrence of the Prince of Orange. So does Burnet.

The day before the interview with the Bishops, on November 5, 1688, William, Prince of Orange, had landed at Torquay. The news struck terror into many hearts, for it seemed that civil war was again at hand. The King again called some of the principal statesmen in London to advise him (November 8). They advised the calling of a Parliament to promote “peace and settlement in Church and State.” The document so counsel-

ling is signed by the two Archbishops, five Bishops and twelve lay peers. The King replied that he would call a Parliament as soon as the Prince of Orange had quitted the realm. This was really a refusal, and it was fatal to him. Had he issued the writs at once, he might have saved his throne. He left London the same evening, led his army as far as Salisbury, learned that William was getting fresh adherents every day, and turned back to town. On November 28 he issued the writs. On December 10 he fled from London. Next day the peers who were then in London, whose office it was during the vacancy of the throne to provide for the public safety and order, met at the Guildhall, and after some warm debating drew up a request to the Prince of Orange, signed by the two primates and twenty-seven other peers, to call a free Parliament together. It was the last public measure in which Sancroft took part. When the Prince appeared in London, all the Prelates in town, except Sancroft, waited on him to pay their respects, and when the House of Lords met on December 22 he was absent. How anxious he was to come to a right decision is shown by the vast heap of papers which he wrote at the time, stating the pros and cons with deep earnestness. He sums up the three ways in which peace is to be restored thus: (1) "To declare the commander of the foreign force King, and crown him." (2) "To declare Mary Queen, in which case her husband will of right have an interest in the Government." (3) "To make William Custos Regni, who shall carry on the Government in the right and name of King James." And he argues at length in favour of the last. He could not bring himself to believe that having once sworn fealty to James he could break his oath. On January 22 the Convention Parliament met. The Commons had no difficulty in declaring that the King, having violated the laws, had now abdicated, and that the throne was thereby vacant. The peers hesitated; on the question between new King and regency the former was carried by a majority of two—fifty-one to forty-nine. Sancroft still held aloof. The Archbishop of York and eight other Bishops were in the minority. London and Bristol were the only Prelates in the majority. A conference was then held between the two Houses, the result of which was that the Prince and Princess of Orange were declared King and Queen (February 13).

The oath of allegiance to the new sovereigns was taken by Parliament in the early days of March. Very few of the House of Commons refused it; at first only ninety temporal and eight spiritual peers complied, but others were added to the list. Those Bishops who finally refused were Sancroft, Ken, Turner, Frampton, Lloyd, White, Thomas, Lake, Cart-

wright. The three last died the same year. The King did his best to conciliate Sancroft; he nominated him on his Privy Council, but the Archbishop never took his seat there. The See of Salisbury just then fell vacant; the King nominated Gilbert Burnet to it. Sancroft refused to consecrate, but allowed the Bishop of London to represent him. Macaulay is very severe about his inconsistency, but it must be remembered that the good Archbishop had a sensitive conscience, that he was, as numberless other good men of the time were, perplexed, not from motives of self-interest, but with the question of setting aside old allegiance. He had taken an oath already; small wonder that he could not see his way to set it aside, though other men could do so in good faith, believing that the exigencies of the time called for it. It was hoped by some moderate men that a discretionary power might be left to the King whereby he might dispense with the oath in certain cases, but this was quite impossible. It would have thrown a most invidious task upon him. And so the Act took effect; Sancroft was suspended on August 1, 1689, and deprived on February 1 following. With him were deprived Lloyd, Turner, Frampton, White, Ken, Bishops respectively of Norwich, Ely, Gloucester, Peterborough and Bath and Wells, and about 400 of the clergy. And still hoping against hope, the authorities left the Archbishop for a while at Lambeth, in receipt of the revenues of his see; he maintained his customary state at Lambeth, and his jurisdiction was placed in commission. The King still hoped that he would yield. But the landing in Ireland and the Battle of the Boyne showed that the Jacobites were determined on regaining the crown, and a form of prayer for the restoration of King James, which was circulated by thousands through the country, was attributed falsely to Sancroft and his friends. Burnet says that even after the Boyne, an overture was made to the deprived Bishops through Queen Mary, offering to excuse them from taking the oath, on condition that they would be loyal to the Government, and that all that they would promise in reply was that they would "live quietly," which he interprets as meaning that they would keep close till opportunity offered. But it is certain that Sancroft and his friends held it unlawful to attend public worship in which William and Mary were prayed for. And so in May, 1691, Tillotson was elected and confirmed. On May 20 Sancroft received command to quit Lambeth within ten days. On the evening of the 23rd, having in vain resisted the action of ejection, he took boat and crossed to the Temple. There he remained in lodgings for six weeks, receiving many visitors. On August 3 he left, arrived on the 5th at his native village

of Fressingfield, and never afterwards left it. Many of his letters thence are still preserved. He did not attend the parish church, but carried on his services as before in his own house, and he wrote with severity against those who remained in the Established Church. On February 9, 1691, he executed an instrument in which he formally consigned his archiepiscopal power to Lloyd, the deprived Bishop of Norwich, and in the course of the same year King James, at the request of the nonjurors, nominated two of the clergy to be consecrated Bishops and thus carry on the succession. The result was the foundation of the "nonjuring schism" of which we shall hereafter hear more.

The aged Prelate gave himself to reading and gathering together historical collections, as well as to editing Laud's Diary. Wharton, who visited him, describes him as habited like an old hermit, with a long white beard. His health declined rapidly in the latter part of 1693. He firmly believed that his cause had been the right one, and within an hour of his death prayed for the restoration of King James. He refused, but without bitterness, the ministrations of any but nonjuring clergy, and received the Sacrament from one of these, Dr. Trumbull. But he cheerfully bestowed his blessing on Wharton, his old chaplain, who had not followed him, but who came to visit him.

He died on the morning of November 23, 1693, and was buried four days later in the churchyard of Fressingfield, in a spot chosen by himself, still reverently tended.

W. BENHAM.

(To be continued.)



ART. II.—THE CHURCH CATECHISM: AIDS TO ITS USE.

"CATECHISM is," we are told,¹ "finding its way back into Nonconformist Sunday-Schools. The Council of Evangelical Churches have appointed a committee to prepare one. The Wesleyan Book Committee has prepared a 'Shorter Catechism.' Demand for catechetical teaching is a sign of the times—a distinct return to the method of former days."

The value of catechetical instruction, recognised in the Jewish and early Christian Churches, was strongly felt by the compilers of our Prayer-Book, who directed that "The curate of every parish shall diligently upon Sundays and

¹ *Manchester Guardian*, October, 1896.