

G.D. 11

The Relations between the English and Scottish  
Presbyterian Movements to 1604.

The

Abstract of Thesis.

The relations between the Scottish reformed church and the English were at first entirely cordial, mainly because the reformers did not differ in their views on ecclesiastical polity. The forms of government and of worship in the two countries were less dissimilar than has sometimes been supposed, and for a time the constitution of the Scottish church showed a tendency to approximate to that of the Church of England. The later divergence was due to the appearance of ideas on church government which were formulated by Beza and introduced into Britain by his disciples, Cartwright and Melville. In each country a vigorous party demanded equality among pastors and government by a system of courts, and their programme was widely accepted because it promised to remedy many undeniable abuses. Both presbyterians and episcopalians soon became aware that an identical struggle was in progress in the two countries, and the first evidence of this consciousness appeared about 1580, as a result of personal contacts made in the preceding years. In 1584 the archbishops of Canterbury and St. Andrews became allies in their defence of episcopal government, and in 1584 and 1585 a number of Scottish presbyterian ministers, exiled in England, associated closely with their English brethren. In 1586 and 1587 the English presbyterians were encouraged by the success of the Scots in overthrowing episcopacy, and in the succeeding years Scotland provided a refuge for English ecclesiastical rebels - Udall and Penry. Meanwhile, Bancroft, with greater zeal and less discretion than Whitgift, continued the policy towards Scotland which the primate had initiated, and the last decade of the century was a period of increasing tension. While the Scottish ministers were suspicious of the English bishops, the English puritans looked forward to the accession of a monarch who had sometimes been the ally of their Scottish friends.

**THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH  
PRESBYTERIAN MOVEMENTS TO 1604.**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D.**

**by Gordon Donaldson, M.A.,**

**April 1938.**

LONDON UNIVERSITY

C O N T E N T S

## PREFACE.

Page ii.

<u>SECTION I.</u>	The English and Scottish Churches between the Reformation and the rise of presbyterianism.	1.
Chapter 1.	Reformation Thought on Ecclesiastical Polity.	4.
2.	The Polity of the Scottish Reformed Church, c. 1560-72.	28.
3.	The relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, c. 1560-1572.	68.
<u>SECTION II.</u>	The rise of presbyterianism in England and Scotland.	97.
Chapter 4.	The aims and sources of the presbyterian movement.	99.
5.	The introduction of presbyterianism to England and Scotland.	125.
<u>SECTION III.</u>	The relations between the English and Scottish presbyterian parties down to 1604.	147.
Chapter 6.	Early contacts and the beginnings of co-operation, 1570-1584.	147.
7.	Scottish presbyterians in England, 1584-1587.	178.
8.	Bancroft and the Scottish church; English presbyterians in Scotland, 1587-1591.	209.
9.	Later events, down to the Hampton Court conference, 1591-1604.	242.
10.	Conclusions - the influence of each party on the other, and the results of the contacts between them.	265.
APPENDICES.		278.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.		320.
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		321.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

- p. 22, n. 3. For "C" read "E".
- p. 95, n. 2. Add "In September 1577, Richard Bannatyne, who had been Knox's secretary, complained that he had not heard from Goodman for three years, although he had often written to him (C.S.P. V. 244)".
- p. 96, n. 1. Add "Willock preached in London in 1565 or 1566 (Bodleian Library, Tanner MSS. 50, folio 18)".
- p. 126, n.4. For "question" read "questions"; delete "Field's book...Glamis".
- p. 142, l.12. For "kernal" read "kernel".
- p. 172, n.1. After "Calthorpe MSS." insert "(which belonged to Beale)"; delete "Bernard, Catalogi...Scottish items", and substitute "cf. Bernard, Catalogi, Yelverton MSS. vol. LIV".
- p. 191, n.2. After "Herbertson" insert<sup>e</sup> "(who was one of the envoys sent by James)".
- p. 218, n.1. Add "The "form of prayers" which was published in 1584 was not, strictly speaking, an edition of the Scottish book, although it owed a great deal to it (Cowan, Bibliography of the Book of Common Order, p. 57)".
- p. 233, l.4. For "thereon" read "thereof".
- p. 259, l.2. After "intimate with" insert "Essex and with".
- p. 259, n.1. Before "D.N.B." insert "H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. VIII. 467-8".

## PREFACE.

"Two kingdoms are drifting together ... but two Churches are drifting apart into dissension and antagonism. The attractions and repulsions that are involved in this process fill a large page in the annals of Britain; they have become plain in the age of the Bishops' Wars and the Westminster Assembly, but they are visible much earlier".  
- F.W. Maitland in the Cambridge Modern History (II. 590).

The association of the English presbyterian party with Scotland is important mainly for what it achieved between 1637 and 1651, and the aim of the central part of this thesis is to examine the anticipations in the sixteenth century of some of the elements which later produced the Solemn League and Covenant. The questions which had to be answered are clear enough. How far were the two parties, each engaged in a struggle against the crown and the bishops, conscious of their common aims? Did the triumphs of the Scottish presbyterians serve to encourage their less fortunate English brethren and did the Scottish general assembly show any disposition to use in the interests of the English presbyterians the political influence which it sometimes possessed? Did Scotsmen in the sixteenth century already regard episcopacy as "English", and was presbyterianism condemned in England as "Scottish"?

Whatever might be the answers to these questions, a slight study of the history of the relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland in the years

immediately following the reformation showed that the antagonism so marked in later generations did not exist in the decade 1560-1570, and it became necessary to discover how far the friendship between the two reformed churches had its roots in agreement among the reformers. A study of reformation thought on church government, and an examination of the character of the first polity of the Scottish reformed church, although they were preliminary to the main part of the subject, proved to be essential in the interests of definition. The original organisation of the Scottish church was not presbyterian, and it showed for a time a tendency to develop into a kind of episcopacy - the episcopal constitution approved in 1572 and sometimes called the concordat of Leith. The divergence between the two churches was due, not to differences among the reformers, but to the rise of the presbyterian movement, and the second section of the thesis deals with the formulation of presbyterian theories and their introduction into England and Scotland. It is not intended to be comprehensive, as it aims merely at showing what was parallel or identical in the two countries.

The first and second chapters of the thesis ( in a more copious form than they appear here), and some portions of the third, fourth and fifth, formed an essay on "The polity of the Scottish reformed church, c. 1560-1580, and the

rise of the presbyterian movement" which was awarded the David Anderson-Berry prize by the Royal Historical Society in February 1938.

A concluding date could, it seemed, be chosen almost arbitrarily. My original plan was to carry the story only to 1592, but the Hampton Court conference was later chosen as the finishing point, partly because the events before 1592 have a bearing on the state of opinion when James VI. became king of England, and partly because 1604 is only a generation distant from the eventful years beginning in 1637. The decade after 1592 is less fully treated than the preceding period, and the ease with which I found it possible to show the continuance until 1604 of the mental atmosphere created before 1592 possibly indicates that it continued until a much later date. After all, men already adult in 1604 were still active in 1637.

The material, although not extensive, is adequate to support the argument, and, unless a corpus of MS. material comes to light unexpectedly, it is unlikely that much can be added to what appears here. Some fruitful investigation, to increase our knowledge of the extent of the intercourse between the two presbyterian parties, might be conducted along biographical lines, and a little in this direction is done in the first appendix.

## SECTION I.

### THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH CHURCHES BETWEEN THE REFORMATION AND THE RISE OF PRESBYTERIANISM.

The struggle between episcopalians and presbyterians has played so large a part in the history of Britain that historians have found it difficult to visualise a period when British protestants were not divided into these two parties, and when English and Scottish churchmen were at one in their opinions on ecclesiastical polity. Yet, unless we admit that opinions on church government are not necessarily static, we must fail to discern the character of the English and Scottish churches immediately after the reformation, and must underestimate the significance of the presbyterian movement. In 1560 there was virtual unanimity on polity, and even on liturgical matters, but the appearance of presbyterianism so soon after the reformation has obscured the resemblances at first existing between the Scottish reformed church and the English. (1) That there were resemblances merely, and not identity, is accounted for by the difference in political conditions between the two countries, for it was the political situation rather than the ideas of ecclesiastics which determined the

1. They were noticed by F.W. Maitland in his chapter in the Cambridge Modern History II. MacMillan's The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church and Miss L.B. Taylor's thesis (see bibliography) deal with aspects of the matter. Heylin (Aërius Redivivus p. 157) noted that in 1560 the Scots used the English liturgy and accepted the episcopal principle.

form of government and the form of worship adopted in each country. The study of these resemblances must be approached through an examination of the views on church government which were prevalent among protestants about 1560. The reformers did not dogmatize on polity, but certain conceptions which appear in their writings and seem to have been influential can be examined, and the contrast between these ideas and the opinions of the two parties of later generations can be made clear. The manner in which the conceptions current among the reformers found expression in the organisation of the Scottish church requires special study, because that organisation has often been confused with the presbyterian polity which was afterwards substituted for it. The history of the Scottish church in the years after 1560 shows that with the approximation, after the revolution of 1567, of the political situation in Scotland to that in England, there was a tendency towards a closer resemblance to the anglican polity. The approximation, both political and ecclesiastical, was incomplete, and the process was interrupted by the rise of presbyterianism, but not before the Scottish church had accepted an episcopate resembling in form the English model and some progress had been made in fusing it with the institutions already in existence. The relations between the two churches had been entirely cordial, and each gave the other complete recognition. The substantial agreement on

both liturgy and polity is illustrated by the use in Scotland at the beginning of this period of the English prayer book, and by the adoption in Scotland at the close of the period of the anglican oath of supremacy and other formulae.

## Chapter 1.

### Reformation Thought on Ecclesiastical Polity.

In the middle of the sixteenth century there was in a very real sense an intellectual commonwealth of which the reformers in all European countries were members, and although, as the divergencies on doctrinal points show, this did not mean that there was unanimity, it does imply that men in any one country knew the views of those in all others. Not only were there men who virtually changed their nationality, like Machabeus and Alesius, and illustrious international figures such as John à Lasco and Martin Bucer, but a large number of individuals and even of groups - English exiles in Germany and Switzerland and French and Dutch exiles in England - who were absent from their native land for years. Wherever a few reformers were together, there must have existed a mass of information about the state of religion all over western Europe. Ideas about which controversy had not yet arisen, and the results of experiments based on them, were common property.

The conception of a divinely appointed form of government, essential to the being of a church, seems to have been entirely absent, and none of the reformers can be regarded either as presbyterians, holding that there is scriptural authority for the absolute equality of pastors and

government by a hierarchy of courts, or as episcopalians, maintaining that succession of bishops and episcopal ordination of priests are indispensable. In the absence of a claim of divine sanction for any particular polity, the reformers recognised that within the very broad limits laid down by the ideas current at the time - ideas never dogmatic and sometimes hardly articulate - there was complete liberty for national churches to organise themselves as they thought fit. This is indicated by the vagueness of the expressions about church government in the writings of theologians, by the absence of censure or criticism of any church because of its polity, and by the extent of the authority which reformation thought gave to each "godly prince" as governor of the church in his dominions.

These indications are confirmed by explicit statements in the writings of Calvin and Bullinger. (1) English churchmen believed that the Church of England could insist on certain forms of government and worship without condemning foreign churches which, although differently organised, agreed with it in doctrine, and they were prepared to recognise in

1. Calvin urged that one church should not despise another because of a difference in "external discipline" (Inst. IV. x. 32; Beveridge III. 225). Bullinger wrote, with reference to methods of ordination: "sunt enim aliis regionibus alia iura, alii ritus et instituta" (De Episc. Inst. et Funct. f. 99 verso).

other countries any polity which was established by law. In  
 their own country, too, they considered that the choice of a  
 form of government for the church pertained entirely to the  
 civil authority. So Matthew Parker informed Burghley:

"I refer the whole matter to her Majesty and to your  
 order; for myself I can as well be content to be a parish-  
 clerk as a parish-priest. I refer the standing or falling  
 altogether to your own considerations, whether her Majesty  
 and you will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will  
 have them ordered".

The Scottish Book of Discipline (1560) seems to imply that, if  
 provision is made for preaching, the due administration of the  
 sacraments, instruction of the ignorant and correction of the  
 wicked, all other matters of organisation are at the discretion  
 of each particular church. When the presbyterian claims were  
 first advanced, they were met, not by a counter-assertion of  
 the divine right of episcopacy, but by the argument that, since  
 there was not "one certain and perfect kind of government  
 prescribed or commanded in the scriptures", therefore a  
 particular form of polity could not be indispensable. Whitgift

1. This point of view is set forth in "Considerations touching the church discipline of Scotland" (Cotton MSS., Calig. B. IV. f. 272), a document belonging to the last decade of the century. Another late expression of the reformation standpoint is in Saravia's letter to the ministers of Guernsey (Bernard, Clavi Trabales p. 140). Defending episcopacy, Saravia says: "In Scotland for the time the State hath otherwise provided, but not in England, and therefore ye ought not to take example by them, as though your State were like theirs".
2. Parker, Correspondence p. 454.
3. Knox, Works II. 237-8.

described as one of the "false principles and rotten pillars" of Cartwright's work the notion that "we must of necessity have the same kind of government that was in the Apostles' time, and is expressed in the Scriptures, and no other"<sup>(1)</sup>.

A particular application of this general principle was the idea that, although episcopal government under the direction of the crown was usual in a church established by law, yet in a church not recognised by the state (and perhaps persecuted by it) popular election of ministers took the place of episcopal ordination, and congregations were ruled by elderships. The practical reason for the difference was that in the first case the civil power could persuade holders of benefices to conform, or replace them by professors of the reformed faith, whereas in the second case the reformed church could not obtain possession of the existing structure of ecclesiastical government. In theory, the difference was justified by arguments drawn partly from the power of the laity in the church (exercised either by the "godly prince" through his lieutenants the bishops, or by the Christian community through lay elders), and partly from the necessity for the correction of sinners. The entire problem of the relationship between the church as a body which wished to see the wicked punished and the civil power which, if Christian, would punish most sin as crime, was a very difficult one. It.

1. Whitgift, Works I. 6, 184; III. 214.

was at first widely accepted that elderships were necessary only when the magistrate was not godly, and that where a church was established the episcopal courts and the civil power could be trusted to correct the wicked. The appearance of the view that elderships should exist in all churches led to a controversy in which Erastus advanced the opinion that "wherever the magistrate is godly and Christian, there is no need of any other authority, under any other pretension or title, to rule or punish the people - as if the Christian magistrate differed nothing from the heathen"<sup>(1)</sup>. The question whether one polity was suited to an established, and another to a persecuted, church, was debated by Whitgift, who held the older view, and Cartwright, who held the presbyterian view. Whitgift argued that "in the apostles' time there was no church established, being then no Christian magistrate, and therefore the state of the Church was popular", and Cartwright demanded why "the difference of having a Christian magistrate and having none ought to bring in a diversity in the choice of the pastor by their church". Whitgift, maintaining "the inconvenience of the seigniory in the time of Christian princes", wrote: "I say there may be sessions in the time of persecution, when there is no Christian magistrate, not that there ought of necessity to be. God hath provided the civil magistrate and other governors, to punish and correct vice and

1. Erastus, Explicatio gravissimae questionis, Thesis LXXIV.

other disorders in the Church"<sup>(1)</sup>. The opinions of the English reformers are illustrated by the organisation of the congregations of exiles in Mary's reign. At Frankfort, although liturgical questions led to the formation of an "anglican" party and a "puritan" party, there was no controversy about polity, and men like Cox, Sandys, Grindal and Horne (all afterwards bishops) joined in the election of ministers, elders and deacons.<sup>(2)</sup> The English congregation at Geneva, although more "puritan" than that at Frankfort, had an identical organisation.<sup>(3)</sup> When the English reformed church was no longer persecuted, but was once more established and under episcopal government,<sup>(4)</sup> churchmen did not brand as irregular the system which had been in use at Frankfort and Geneva. Whitgift recognised the validity of the orders conferred on William Whittingham at Geneva on the ground that "hee in tyme of Persecution was ordeyned Ministre by those which had authoritie in the Church persecuted".<sup>(5)</sup>

1. Whitgift, Works I. 389-90, III. 166, 175-8. 209, 217-9; the same view is implicit in Hooker's account of the appearance of the consistory at Geneva (Ecclesiastical Polity, Preface ii. 4).
2. Troubles at Frankfort, ed. Arber, pp. 72, 76-7, 136, 185-6, 207-8.
3. Livre des Anglois, ed. J.S. Burn, pp. 12-3; Martin, Les Protestants anglais réfugiés à Genève, pp. 334-5. The Frankfort ministers were subject to annual examination, and, if necessary, deposition, while those at Geneva were elected each year. That the difference was merely formal is shown by the re-election for three successive terms of Knox and Goodman as ministers at Geneva.
4. In this way the English reformers described the change of 1559, e.g., Whitgift, Works I. 391.
5. Lansdowne MSS. vol. 50, f. 178.

Views on the nature of orders always influence ideas on ecclesiastical polity, for the two subjects are inseparable. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that the reformers laid no stress on succession, and that most of them regarded belief in it as a Romish error.<sup>(1)</sup> Holding as they did, explicitly or implicitly, the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, they thought of ordination as a means of setting apart for a special function a member of the community who had, it might be, received a supernatural call. The ordinand received his powers not by a sacramental rite from men already in orders, but by delegation from a body of Christians, and it mattered little whether these powers were given directly by the congregation or indirectly by its representatives.<sup>(2)</sup> There was, therefore, no room for a belief in the necessity of an episcopal system or of episcopal ordination. In any case, it was almost universally held that there was no difference of order between bishops and priests and that the superiority of the former was a purely human device, convenient for the sake of order and as the means by which the "godly magistrate" could exercise his

1. Hooper, Early Writings, pp. 27, 82, 138, and Later Writings, pp. 90, 121; Crammer, Remains and Letters, pp. 11, 13; Jewel, Works, III. 334; Fulke, Works, II. 118; Knox, Works, II. 110; Bullinger, Decades, IV. 28-30; Mornay, Treatise of the Church (Trans. Field), pp. 64-9; cf. Lindsay, History of the Reformation, I. 403.
2. Cf. Bullinger, Decades, IV. 134: "Neither makes it any great matter whether discreet men chosen of the church, or the whole church itself, do ordain fit ministers; and that either by voices, either by lots, or after some certain necessary and holy manner"; and his De Episc. Instit. et Funct. f. 99 verso.

ecclesiastical authority.<sup>(1)</sup> The doctrine of the equality of bishop and priest had appeared in Tyndale's work in 1528, and it had received so much support among English churchmen that it became the officially accepted view even in Henry VIII.'s reign.<sup>(2)</sup> The dependence of the English bishops on the royal authority, by which they were in successive reigns deprived or reinstated, could not fail to dislodge any remaining belief that their superiority was of divine institution, and the identity of bishop and pastor, expounded by the continental reformers Bucer and Bullinger,<sup>(3)</sup> was accepted in Edwardian England.<sup>(4)</sup> Jewel, the great defender of the Church of England in Elizabeth's reign, admitted that in ancient times idem erat episcopus et presbyter, and reiterated his belief that bishops are above priests by human appointment only, and not by scriptural or divine authority.<sup>(5)</sup> Another Elizabethan bishop, Pilkington, declared that "the privileges and superiorities, which bishops have above other ministers, are rather granted by man for maintaining of better order and quietness in

1. Cf. McCrie, Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 174-5, and Knox (edn. 1874) p. 356; Usher, Reconstruction of the English Church I. 68-9; Keble's introduction to Hooker's Works, I. lxvii-lxx.
2. Tyndale, Doctrinal Treatises, p. 229; Burnet, History of the Reformation, ed. Pocock, IV. 340; Lloyd, Formularies of Faith, pp. 105, 281.
3. Bucer, Scripta Anglicana, p. 280; Bullinger, De. Episc. Instit. et Funct., f. 143 verso; Decades, IV. 108-9.
4. E.g., Becon, Catechism, p. 319.
5. Jewel, Works, I. 340, 379, III. 272, 293, 439.

(1)  
commonwealths, than commanded by God in his word". Even  
Whitgift admitted that there was equality among pastors  
quoad ministerium, and that rank was merely quoad ordinem et

(2)  
politiam. Probably every English churchman of the first  
twenty-five years of Elizabeth's reign would have subscribed  
(3)  
to a pronouncement like this:

"The name of Bishop, importing such superiority  
[i.e., by divine right] is not to be found in the Scriptures.  
For, by the whole course thereof, it appears, that the name  
of Episcopus and Presbyter imported one function. So as he  
that was a Pastor or Elder was also a Bishop.... the supreme  
civil magistrate, in every country, may appoint under-  
officers, in the execution of that government, which he hath  
in ecclesiastical causes".

The view that bishops were not the divinely appointed superiors  
of priests was not confined to non-Romanists. There was a  
party at the Council of Trent which maintained that the  
superiority of bishops over priests was of human institution,  
and at the colloquy of Poissy at least two catholic theologians  
(4)  
denied that bishops had a divine warrant for their office.

When John Bradford, one of the Marian martyrs, was engaged in  
controversy with Harpsfield, a Romanist, he asked "Tell me  
whether the scriptures know any difference between bishops and  
(5)  
ministers, which you call priests?", and the answer was "No".

The puritans afterwards turned against the anglican bishops

1. Pilkington, Works, pp. 493-4.

2. Whitgift, Works, II. 265, III. 535-6.

3. Strype, Whitgift, III. 221 (a document found among  
Whitgift's papers).

4. Evennett, The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of  
Trent, pp. 290, 291.

5. Bradford, Works, I. 506 and note.

some of the arguments of Roman theologians on equality.<sup>(1)</sup>

As a consequence of the current view of orders and the denial of the divine right of episcopacy, there were no assertions of the necessity of episcopal ordination either in the writings of the English reformers or in the official pronouncements of their church. It has been said that the preface to Edward VI.'s ordinal, "though suggesting and almost implying the necessity of episcopal ordination, carefully

abstains from actually asserting it",<sup>(2)</sup> and this is proved by a comparison of this preface with that in the 1662 prayer

book.<sup>(3)</sup> The relevant article (XXIII) of the Thirty-Nine is even more vague than the prayer book, as it refers simply to choice by the men to whom the church has committed the power of calling ministers. The statute 13 Eliz. c. xii. was, it has been generally admitted,<sup>(4)</sup> interpreted as permitting men in non-episcopal orders to act as priests in England, and some

1. Reynolds, in his letter to Sir Francis Knollys (Informations, pp. 78-9): "And Michael Medina a man of great account in the Counsell of Trent, more ingenious herein than many other Papists, affirmeth, not onely the former ancient writers, alleadged by Bishop Iewel, but also an other Ierom, Theodoret, Primasius, Sedulius, and Theophilact, were of the same mind touching the matter with Aerius" [i.e. in favour of equality]. Cf. Cartwright, "The Rest of the Second Reply", p. 77, citing Pigghius, an Italian theologian, against episcopal authority.
2. Child, Church and State, p. 197.
3. The effect of the change is to make quite impossible the acceptance of men not in episcopal orders. The facsimile, published in 1870, of the Prayer Book of 1636 shows the alterations, including this, made in 1661.
4. Cf. Keble, Introduction to Hooker's Works, p. lxxvi, and H.A. Wilson, Episcopacy and Unity, p. 70.

of the instances in which men lacking episcopal ordination actually did so are well known.<sup>(1)</sup> William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, had been ordained at Geneva, and it is significant that Matthew Hutton, later bishop of Durham and archbishop of York, was of the opinion that Whittingham's orders were better than those of the priests ordained according to the Roman ordinal.<sup>(2)</sup> A case less often cited than Whittingham's, but important because there is no record of any aspersions on the orders concerned, was that of the Scotsman John Morrison, who was licensed to preach and administer the sacraments in 1581. The license stated that Morrison, who had been ordained by the "synod or congregation of Lothian" and had acted as a minister in Scotland, was "admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the reformed church of Scotland".<sup>(3)</sup> Morrison's case may not have been a solitary instance, for only a few years later it was asserted (and denied) in controversy that "many Scottishmen and others made ministers abroad" had been allowed to serve in the Church of England.<sup>(4)</sup> The assertion was made during the discussion of the famous case of Walter

1. Rev. Edward Denny, The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches (Church History Society, 1900), attempts to minimise the significance of some of the well known instances, but without great success.
2. Troubles at Frankfort, ed. Arber, p.14.
3. Strype, Grindal, p. 596; cf. Neal, History of the Puritans, I. 310-11; Scott, Fasti, I. 362, 378, 398.
4. See note 1 to next page.

Travers, who was ordained by a presbytery at Antwerp in 1578. In his defence, Travers, besides citing precedents, pointed out to Whitgift that "the late Archbishop of Canterbury being made privie and acquainted with this my calling to the mynistry abroad, was contented I should preatche in England: The B. of London was likewise contented I should preatche at the Temple which I have done now almost those six yeares: and the present Archbishop of Canterbury hath taken no exception against me....<sup>(1)</sup> untill this tyme". Whitgift, although he was prepared to recognise the validity of non-episcopal orders in cases where episcopal ordination had not been obtainable, rejected Travers's arguments because he had deliberately chosen to leave England, where he could have been ordained by a bishop, in order to receive presbyterian ordination.<sup>(2)</sup> Hooker agreed with Whitgift in admitting that non-episcopal ordination, although irregular, might be valid,<sup>(3)</sup> and it is fairly clear that even Bancroft took the same view, with special reference to the Church of Scotland.<sup>(4)</sup> The famous foreign divine Saravia seems to have been allowed to

1. Lansdowne MSS. 50, f. 178; cf. Fuller, Church History, IX. vii. 51.

2. Lansdowne MSS. 50, f. 178.

3. Ecclesiastical Polity, VII. xiv. 11.

4. There are conflicting accounts of Bancroft's reasons for not insisting on the episcopal ordination of the Scottish bishops sent to England for consecration in 1610. Spottiswoode's account (History, II. 209.) seems preferable. Heylin (Aërius Redivivus, p. 382) declared that Bancroft considered that consecration included ordination. Cf. Makower, Constitutional History of the Church of England, pp. 181-2, note 16.

serve in the Church of England without receiving episcopal ordination, and as late as 1620 there was an instance of the admission to a benefice of a man ordained abroad in a presbyterian church.<sup>(1)</sup>

In a corpus of ideas containing so much that was negative, there were two positive conceptions which, sometimes as mere pious aspirations, but sometimes as practical demands, were current among the reformers. The first was the desire for "discipline" (i.e., provision for the punishment of wrongdoers), which was regarded as essential by men who held the most diverse views on other matters - Bucer, à Lasco, and Calvin among continental reformers, Latimer, Hooper, Scory, Cox, Becon, Jewel and Pilkington in England.<sup>(2)</sup> Bucer's ideas enjoyed great credit in Edwardian England, and they influenced the young king, whose scheme of reforms included the institution of commissions for the exercise of discipline.<sup>(3)</sup> Jewel used language almost identical with that of Calvin,<sup>(4)</sup> and à Lasco's phrase

1. D.N.B., art. "Saravia"; Harold Smith, Ecclesiastical History of Essex, pp. 37-8.
2. Bucer, Scripta Anglicana, pp. 40-45; John à Lasco, Forma ac Ratio, in Opera, II. 45-277; Latimer, Sermons, p. 258; Hooper, Later Writings, p. 51; Strype, Memorials, II. i. 496, II. ii. 481; Original Letters (Parker Society), I. 123; Becon, Catechism, p. 42; Jewel, Works, II. 986; Pilkington, Works, pp. 211, 380-82.
3. Strype, Memorials, II. i. 590; cf. A.E. Harvey, Martin Bucer in England, pp. 80-81.
4. Calvin's letter to Somerset, October 22, 1548, (Gorham, Gleanings, p. 70; Calvin, Opera, XIII. 65): "discipline and the correction of vices are like the nerves ["nerfz" in the original] which maintain the body in its health and vigour"; Jewel (Works, II. 986): "discipline ... is as the sinews of the church to strengthen it and knit the parts thereof together".

"ecclesiastical discipline according to the Word of God"<sup>(1)</sup> was  
 echoed by Becon and by the Scottish reformers.<sup>(2)</sup> The assertion  
 of Becon, Hooper, and the Scots Confession of Faith that  
 discipline is a mark of the church<sup>(3)</sup> was officially countenanced  
 in the articles set forth by the Elizabethan bishops in 1559,  
 which included "the authority of the keys duly used" among the  
 marks of the church,<sup>(4)</sup> and the idea survived among anglicans for a  
 generation.<sup>(5)</sup> The Communion Service, prescribed for Ash  
 Wednesday in the first prayer book of Edward VI., but for  
 "divers times in the year" in Edward's second book and in  
 Elizabeth's, acknowledged that there had been, ought to be, and  
 would again be a "godly discipline", whereby "notorious sinners  
 were put to open penance and punished in this world". In  
 Elizabeth's reign, steps were taken towards the realisation,  
 within the existing system, of this ideal, and there were also  
 significant developments, under puritan auspices, outside the

1. Dalton, Johannes à Lasco, p. 249: "Kirchenzucht gemäss dem worte Gottes".

2. See note 3.

3. Hooper, loc. cit.; Becon, Catechism, p. 42: "The fourth is ecclesiastical discipline according to the prescript or appointment of God's word"; Knox, Works, II. 110: "Lastly, ecclesiasticall discipline uprychtlye ministred, as Godis word prescribed". Becon's words resemble the Scots Confession more than they do the confession of the English congregation at Geneva. (Knox IV. 172).

4. Cardwell, Documentary Annals, I. 264.

5. John Copcot, in a sermon preached in 1584, included among the marks of the church "discipline, whereby wee provide that obedience be yelded both publicly and privatlye unto that which our Saviour hath commaunded". (Lambeth MSS. 374, f. 122).

(1)  
official system.

This insistence on discipline did not imply that consistories of elders were necessary. The demand was simply for "admonition and correction of fautes", by any system which might be effective. It is quite clear, for instance, that the "discipline" which Calvin enjoined in his letter to Somerset in 1548 was not necessarily a consistorial system, and even the section of the Institutes dealing with discipline does not specify any organisation. Elizabethans who denied that the ideal discipline was consistorial were justified, for the current assumption was, as we saw, that in an established church discipline would be secured by the episcopal courts, and that consistories were essential only in a persecuted church. It must be remembered, moreover, that consistorial discipline is compatible with systems of government other than the presbyterian, and that it has actually existed under an episcopal system, as in seventeenth century Scotland. A

1. Strype, Annals II. i. 133-4, Grindal pp. 385-9; Grindal, Remains, pp. 451-7; cf. Frere, The English Church under Elizabeth and James I., p. 100, and Hay Fleming, The Reformation in Scotland, pp. 270-1.
2. Knox, Works, IV. 172.
3. Calvin, Opera XIII. 76; Institutes IV. xi. 3, 4 (Beveridge, III. 231-2).
4. Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, V. lxxii. 14; Pilkington, Works, pp. 380-82.
5. Cf. Henderson, The Scottish Ruling Elder, pp. 106-7. It is noteworthy that the triumph of episcopacy in 1584 involved the abolition of "the new erectit Presbittreis", but not, as Archbishop Adamson insisted, that of the kirk sessions. (Register of the St. Andrews Kirk Session, II. 529.)

thorough understanding of the reformation attitude makes it clear that Bullinger was not inconsistent in combining a favourable view of consistorial discipline with a defence of episcopacy against the presbyterians.<sup>(1)</sup>

The second positive idea which powerfully influenced reformation ideas in ecclesiastical polity was what may be called the conception of the "godly bishop". Although no one believed that episcopal succession or episcopal ordination was essential, or that there was scriptural authority for an order superior to presbyters, yet the expediency of retaining or creating officials with supervisory powers was recognised, and was not believed to be contrary to Scripture. The attitude of the reformers towards episcopacy was in part shaped by their hatred of the existing bishops, who were often notorious as persecutors and enemies of reform, and who were characterized by luxury and neglect of their spiritual functions. Condemnation by the reformers of the wealthy and idle bishops whom they knew so well<sup>(2)</sup> was common, but it was seldom isolated from descriptions of the ideal bishops whom they visualised in a reformed church. In Scotland, Walter Myln asserted that "They whom ye call Byshops, do no Byshops workes, nor vse the offices of bishops ... but lyue after their owne sensuall pleasure and take no care of the flocke, nor regard they the word of God, but desire to be honored and called,

1. Bullinger, Decades, IV. 507-8; Z.L. II. 240-42.

2. E.g., Knox, I. 237, 407, 432, III. 247.

(1)  
 my Lordes". Knox affirmed "that a Bischope that receaves  
 proffit, and feidis not the flock, even be his awin labouris,  
 is boith a theif and a murderare"<sup>(2)</sup>. In England, Latimer used  
 expressions which are well known: "sence lording and loytring  
 have come up, preaching hath come downe, contrarie to the  
 Apostells times. For they preached and lorded not. And now  
 they lorde and preache not"<sup>(3)</sup>. Hooper spoke in similar terms,<sup>(4)</sup>  
 and the Elizabethan bishops Jewel and Aylmer agreed that  
 pastoral work, and not wealth and power, should be  
 characteristic of a bishop.<sup>(5)</sup> Pilkington, like Knox, compared  
 an idle bishop to a thief.<sup>(6)</sup>

"A bishop is a name of office, labour and pains,  
 rather than of dignity, ease, wealth or idleness ....  
 To be a bishop is to be an officer, a ruler, a guide, a  
 teacher of God's flock in God's Church .... Is he an  
 officer that does not his office? Nay, surely, but only  
 in name; for he is a thief in his office, and an usurer,  
 that takes the profit and not the pain".

The principle underlying all this criticism had appeared early  
 in the course of the reformation, for The descryptyon of the  
 images of a verye Chrysten bysshop and of a counterfayte  
 bysshop, attributed to Luther and published about 1536,  
 contained the same points which were made by the English and

1. Knox, I. 553.

2. ib. II. 398, cf. 166.

3. Latimer, Sermons, p. 66.

4. Hooper, Early Writings, p. 396.

5. Jewel, Works, III. 308; Z.L. I. 50-51; Aylmer,  
An Harborowe for faithfull and trewe subjects (1559),  
 Sig. O 4.

6. Pilkington, Works, pp. 494, 604.

(1)

Scottish reformers, while Bullinger's De Episcoporum Institutione et Functione, dedicated to Henry VIII. in 1538, has passages similar to some of those quoted, although it is much less constructive than later works.

The view, implicit in the expressions just quoted, that there is an episcopal function in the church, but that the Roman prelates did not perform it, explains the peculiar phrases sometimes applied to them by the reformers. Knox, for instance, spoke of "that cruel tyrant and unmercefull hypocrite, falselie called Bischope of Sanctandrois"; in describing the parliament of 1560 he uses the sentence: "The Bischoppis (Papisticall, we meane) spack nothing"; and he told the regent that her "proude Prelates" were "none of Christes Bischoppes". In England the Marian bishops were referred to as "pseudo-bishops", while Ridley, after his deprivation, was called "true Bischoppe of London". There is an interesting passage in a sermon of Latimer, where he spoke of Coverdale while the latter was coadjutor to Voysey, bishop of Exeter: "Who is the bishop of Exeter? Forsooth, Master Coverdale. What, do not all men know who is bishop of Exeter? What? He hath been bishop many years. Well, say I, Master Coverdale is bishop of Exeter. Master Coverdale putteth in execution the bishop's office, and he that doth the office of the bishop, he is the bishop indeed".

1. See especially Sig. B vi-vii, B viii verso, D i.

2. Knox, Works, I. 307, II. 121-2, IV. 443.

3. Original Letters (Parker Society), II. 581; Z.L. I. 29, 31; Knox, Works, III. 299.

4. Latimer, Sermons, p. 272.

The criticism of the pre-reformation bishops is supplemented by accounts of the qualities requisite in a "godly bishop" and of the work which he should undertake. The most pointed expression is a very early one, found among German reformers in 1525: "Bishops shall remain; not anointing bishops or ordaining bishops, but such as preach and teach and expound the pure word of God and preside over the Church"<sup>(1)</sup>. Preaching was usually emphasised,<sup>as it</sup> was probably bound to be by men who endeavoured to derive all their ideas from Scripture.<sup>(2)</sup> The descrypcyon of a verye Chrysten byshop compared a "byssshop without mynystacyon of the worde of god" to "a fountayne without water, and a cloude without rayne"<sup>(3)</sup>, and Scottish protestants asserted as early as 1547 that "Thare is no Bischoppes, except thei preach evin by thame selfis, without any substitut"<sup>(4)</sup>. Hooper and Jewel thought that bishops should preach as much as they could, and they were both notable preachers in their own sees.<sup>(5)</sup> Aylmer and Knox thought that the episcopal system should be reorganised to provide in every town of importance a bishop who would be the chief preacher for a comparatively small district.<sup>(6)</sup> Most of the descriptions of the

1. Kidd, p. 190.

2. John Major, a student of Scripture who was not a reformer, wrote in his Expositiones (1529): "Quippe predicare est verum munus prebati, et signanter episcopi. Magistri est docere, ac in museo theosophiam legere. Prelati munus est predicare". (f. CXV. line 96-7)

3. Sig. E v verso.

4. Knox, Works, I. 194; cf. 239.

5. Z.L. I. 50-51. Hooper, Early Writings, pp. 19, 511.

6. Aylmer, An Harborowe, sig. O iv.; Knox, V. 318.

"godly bishop" give some attention to the exact nature of his superiority over priests and to his work in supervision. A passage in The Institution of a Christian Man, although identifying bishops with priests, mentions overseeing as well as preaching. <sup>(1)</sup> The ideal which the English reformers had before them appears in the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum: <sup>(2)</sup>

"Episcopi ... debent inferiores ordines cleri, universumque populum Dei regere ac pascere, non sane ut dominantur eorum fidei, sed ut seipsos vere servos servorum Dei exhibeant; sciantque authoritatem et jurisdictionem ecclesiasticam non alia de causa sibi praecipue creditam esse, nisi ut suo ministerio et assiduitate homines quam plurimi Christo jungantur".

John à Lasco's Forma ac Ratio contains a sermon which asserts that the office of a superintendent or inspector [Greek ἐπίσκοπος] is of divine ordinance in the Church of Christ, and that one minister should be chosen from among the others for order's sake. <sup>(3)</sup> At a later date, when episcopacy had been attacked by the presbyterians, Rudolph Gualter described the principle of reformed episcopacy as the retention of the name of bishop by persons who are placed over a certain number of churches and have the management of such things as appertain to the purity of religion and doctrine. <sup>(4)</sup> The most elaborate description of the "godly bishop" comes from Martin Bucer. Bishops, he said, must lay aside all worldly cares and devote themselves to reading

1. Lloyd, Formularies of Faith, p. 109.

2. ed. Cardwell, pp. 103-4.

3. Johannis à Lasco Opera, ed. Kuyper, II. 57.

4. Z.L. II. 228.

and teaching the holy scriptures, public and private prayer, the administration of discipline, the maintenance of schools and the care of the poor. In order to ensure that the churches under their care have competent pastors, they should visit all parts of their dioceses at least once a year to correct any faults they may find. In their work they should be advised and assisted by priests and deacons, and the synod of each diocese must meet twice yearly.<sup>(1)</sup>

Calvin's views on episcopacy do not differ in any essential from the opinions just examined. It is the "godly bishop" that is described in expressions of Calvin which have seemed to writers both of the sixteenth century and of later times to be unfavourable to episcopacy as generally understood but not to the episcopal principle.<sup>(2)</sup> The passage in his writings which is most frequently quoted as an approval of episcopacy is an exposition of the reformation ideal:<sup>(3)</sup>

"Talem nobis hierarchiam si exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent; ut ab illo tanquam unico capite pendeant, et ad ipsum referantur; in qua sic inter se fraternam societatem colant, ut non alio modo quam ejus veritate sint colligati; tum vero nullo non anathemate dignos fatear siqui erant qui non eam revereantur summaque obedientia observant".

1. Scripta Anglicana, pp. 67-8, 69, 73.
2. E.g., Bancroft, Survay, p. 112, Dangerous Positions, p. 8; Hooker, Works, I. 76 note; Stowe MSS. 155, ff. 9, 10; Whitgift, Works, II. 322-3; Additional MSS. 28, 695, f. 10 verso; Reyburn, "Calvin and Scotland", in Scottish Church History Society I. 214.
3. De necessitate reformandae ecclesiae, quoted by McCrie, Miscellaneous Writings, p. 175 note.

If this pronouncement is discounted as immature (it belongs to 1539), we can read with it a passage from a letter to the king of Poland, written in December 1554:<sup>(1)</sup>

"It is lawful to appoint an archbishop for the famous kingdom of Poland, not that he should exercise lordship or arrogate to himself any authority stolen from his brethren, but that for the sake of order [ordinis causa], he might hold first place in the synods and maintain a holy order [sanctam unitatem]. So also there might be provincial and city bishops, whose duty it would be to keep order as circumstances might require, and one might be chosen from every assembly to whom the principal charge should be entrusted. To endow a man with honour and dignity according to his capacity is a very different thing from gathering the whole world into subjection to a single power".

The distinction between rule over portions of the church and domination over the whole appears also in Calvin's Commentaries on the Philippians:<sup>(2)</sup>

"As the wittes and manners of men are nowe, there can no order stand among the ministers of the worde, except one be sette over the rest. I speake of the severall bodies of the Church, not of whole provinces, much lesse of the whole world".

In the fourth chapter of Book IV. of the Institutes, Calvin describes with evident approval the government of the primitive church, with its bishops appointed for the sake of order and active in preaching and administering the sacraments. This passage contrasts with his sentences on archbishops and patriarchs, and on the word "hierarchy", all of which he

1. Reyburn, John Calvin, pp. 259-60; Opera, pp. 332-3.

A note in the Opera disparages Calvin's approval of episcopacy, but in effect stresses the implication that he was prepared to accept it when it was expedient.

2. Whitgift, Works, II: 324 note 1; English version from the translation of 1584.

(1)  
censured. He was ready to agree to the possession by bishops of a sole power of ordination, and his objection to the exercise of this power by the pre-reformation bishops was directed against the use they made of it, in ordaining sacrificing (2)  
priests instead of preaching pastors.

It is clear that the reformation, so far as it was concerned with polity, was a movement for efficiency. Certain demands are fairly well defined. There must be discipline, provided either by consistories or by some other effective means, and, although there is no need for an order of bishops, there ought to be a rank of clerics superior to presbyters - men of exemplary character, energetic in preaching and administration. The details of the organisation providing these two essentials may vary. It is assumed that an established church has an episcopal system, the bishops being responsible to the crown and, as a rule, assisted by presbyters in

1. Institutes IV. iv, v. (Beveridge III. 74-107).

2. ib. IV. v. 4. (Beveridge III. 93-4).

To the widespread demand for an efficient episcopate should be related two of the reforms introduced by Henry VIII. (a) The statute 26 Hen. VIII. c. 14 provided for the appointment of suffragan bishops. Many suffragans were created, but Latimer urged Edward VI. to make greater use of the statute, which was repealed under Mary and revived under Elizabeth. (Latimer, Sermons, p. 175). (b) The statute 31 Hen. VIII. c. 9 gave the king power to create new sees. Henry contemplated the erection of no less than twenty-one (Cotton MSS. Cleo. E. IV. f. 365, Henry VIII. Letters and Papers XIV. ii. Nos. 428-30, cf. Hill, English Dioceses p. 388), and actually erected six. The great inequalities among the dioceses in respect of area and population would have justified further changes, and explain Knox's remark that each English bishopric should be divided into ten. (Works V. 318).

administration and ordination. In a non-established church, on the other hand, office-bearers are usually elected by the congregation, and assemblies in which the laity are represented govern the church. A complete understanding of the reformers' thought on ecclesiastical polity would undoubtedly require as its basis a more extensive and more detailed examination of their writings than that on which the preceding survey was based. But the attention which has been given has revealed a remarkable degree of unanimity, and enough has been done to indicate the fundamental differences, in this respect, between the atmosphere of the reformation period and that of subsequent generations.

## Chapter 2.

### The Polity of the Scottish Reformed Church, c. 1560-72.

Only when viewed against the background of the current views on church government does the character of the first constitution of the Scottish reformed church become fully intelligible. The tendency of controversialists to read into the work of the reformers the ideas of a later age has been responsible for the tradition that the polity of the Scottish church was from the beginning presbyterian, at least in intention;<sup>(1)</sup> that the superintendents were appointed temporarily because the kirk was not sufficiently well organised to allow the immediate erection of the hierarchy of courts; and that the first protestant episcopate (1572-87) was no part of the constitution of the church. This theory, which has been combated more frequently by the equally unsound statements of episcopalian controversialists than by sound historical study,<sup>(2)</sup> has survived until the present day. If we keep in view the prevalent conceptions on ecclesiastical polity, and relate them to political conditions in Scotland, we must arrive at the conclusion that the polity of the first Book of Discipline was

1. E.g., Wodrow MSS. 8vo. vol. 5, No.4 ("Scotts prelatists vain plea from Scotts superintendents"): "The parity of presbyters and the Government of the Church by presbytereis ... was really the only originall and design".
2. Dr. Gillon, in his John Davidson (1935), asserts that after the introduction of the first episcopate in 1572 "The Church, established by law, remained Presbyterian" (p. 56).

neither presbyterian nor episcopal, but simple "reformed". It will appear, further, that in the years following 1560 the political situation in Scotland was unfavourable to the reformed church, and that the Book of Discipline remained a programme, realised only in part. It is possible to trace, in these years, the adaptation, within the prevalent ideals, of the 1560 system to suit the existing conditions, and in this development a setting can be found for the first protestant episcopate (1572), which was at first acquiesced in, if not actually welcomed, by the kirk.

The organisation existing in the Scottish reformed church immediately after the reformation was not created by a stroke of the pen, but had in part developed without direction by any deliberate policy. For some years, protestant congregations had existed, and, like similar bodies in other countries, they had found it necessary to elect preachers and to appoint elders and deacons. There was no question of basing an organisation on abstract principles - the practice was the usual one, in churches of that kind, for reasons of expediency.

(1)  
This has been pointed out by recent historians, and it is plainly expressed in Knox's own account of the establishment of kirk' sessions.<sup>(2)</sup> The glimpses we have of a state of affairs in

1. MacEwen, History of the Church in Scotland II. 75-6;  
Henderson, The Scottish Ruling Elder, pp. 18-21.
2. Knox, Works II. 151.

which the church was hopelessly disorganised and protestant worship was easily introduced indicate that several protestant congregations may have existed even by the middle of 1559, and from the commencement of the revolution their number must have increased rapidly. Units of church government entirely separate from the established system were thus in existence.

The Book of Discipline, although completed by May (1) 20, 1560, (some weeks before the treaty of Edinburgh and two and a half months before the meeting of the reformation parliament), certainly envisaged establishment for the reformed religion, since it contained directions for the use of the entire revenues of the secular clergy. But, as the Scottish reformed church was not yet, and might never be, established, it was essential that an organisation should be devised which was in no way connected with the existing system. Effective discipline was necessary, and there could be no possible objection to the extension throughout the kingdom of consistories, already in existence in some places. True, consistories were unusual in an established church, but the future was uncertain, and discipline must be provided by

1. Knox, Works, II. 183, 257, between which pages the Book of Discipline is contained. It seemed impossible and unnecessary to give references for all the points in the book which are referred to in the succeeding paragraphs.

It may be mentioned here that, although the Book of Discipline was not recognised by the civil power, and remained in part an unrealised programme, it was regarded by the kirk as its constitution. (Cf. Miss MacGregor, Scottish Presbyterian Polity, p. 65.)

some organisation which would survive whether the reformed church obtained recognition or not. To ordination the Scottish reformers did not attach much importance, for they took the easy view of orders common to all protestants at that time, and they possibly calculated that in the near future the question would be one merely of inducting to charges men who had already been accepted as ministers in England or on the continent, or who believed that they had a special vocation. It was, on the other hand, a matter of the utmost importance that congregations should be provided with ministers, and that there should be some security that the men appointed were and would continue to be exemplary in conduct and energetic in their pastoral work. There was urgent need of an official with supervisory powers.

The term "superintendent" was by no means unfamiliar. Not only had it appeared in Denmark and Germany, but it was in great favour as an equivalent of "bishop" and "rural dean" in England. <sup>(1)</sup> The significance of the term lay in its freedom from the associations which the word "bishop" had at the time - wealth, idleness, inefficiency. The following statement by <sup>(2)</sup> bishop Ponet makes this very clear:

1. A passage in The Institution of a Christian Man equates "bishops or archbishops" with "superattendants or overseers" (Lloyd, op.cit. p. 109). For the use of the term "superintendent" in Edward VI's reign, see Strype, Memorials, II. ii. 141 and Hooper, Later Writings, xvii, xix. For its use under Elizabeth, see Jewel, Works, IV. 906, Strype, Grindal, p. 165, and the document (of 1578) printed in Strype, Annals, II. ii. 695 and in H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. II. 195.
2. Strype, Memorials, II. ii. 141.

"The name of bishop hath been so abused, that when it was spoken, the people understood nothing else but a great lord that went in a white rochet, with a wide shaven crown, and that carried an oilbox with him, wherewith he used once in seven years, riding about, to confirm children, &c. Now, to bring the people from this abuse ... the word superintendent ... should in time have taught the people, by the very etymology and proper signification, what thing was meant, when they heard that name.... Bishops, in time of Popery, were overseers in name, but not in deed.... The evilness of the abuse hath marred the goodness of the word.... And the word superintendent is such a name, that the Papists themselves cannot find fault withal".

In fact, the superintendent was the "godly bishop", and the term, introduced into Scotland by the Book of Discipline, must have implied the entire ideal of a reformed episcopate efficient in preaching and visitation. Its use had a special advantage, if indeed it was not absolutely essential, in view of the circumstances in which the Book of Discipline was written. The compilers could not, had they wished it, have laid down plans for a non-Roman episcopate, for there was no certainty that the existing prelates would conform or that the crown would, in the interests of the kirk, deprive them of their sees and appoint protestants in their places. Superintendents, on the other hand, although they had existed in established churches, had also existed in churches not established, as in the English congregation at Emden and in Lasco's church in London. Thus, whatever the outcome of the revolt, superintendents were possible.

An examination of the superintendents' functions can be used to establish their identity with the "godly bishops"

desired by the reformers. Even the boundaries of the districts assigned to them are significant. It may seem odd that the demand for efficiency did not inspire the Scots to increase rather than to reduce by three the number of dioceses, especially as Knox had urged that each English diocese should be divided into ten. Two facts seem to explain the apparent inconsistency. The average number of parishes in a diocese was about eighty in Scotland and four hundred in England, and there were three English dioceses - Lincoln, Norwich and London - each of which had as many parishes as the whole of Scotland.<sup>(1)</sup> The application of Knox's principle to the large English sees would have created dioceses resembling in size those of the Scottish superintendents. Secondly, provision was made by the Book of Discipline for the distribution of the large and scattered St. Andrews diocese, which probably contained about a third of the population of Scotland, among three superintendents;<sup>(2)</sup> for

1. In Scotland there were thirteen dioceses and about 1000 parishes. In England there were twenty-six bishoprics, five of which were recent creations, and the total number of parishes was probably about 10,000. It was put by contemporaries as high as 13,000 (Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 310); in a report prepared for submission to Beza (Additional MSS. 28,571, f. 67) it appears as 10,000; a report drawn up in 1603, which may not contain the total, gives 9044 (Additional MSS. 38,139, f. 254 verso); the figures in Harleian MSS. 594, 595 seem to justify an estimate of about 9200. The figure of 1200 parishes in the diocese of Lincoln appears in the Lincoln Record Society's volume on The State of the Church (p. 444). Cf. Frere, English Church under Elizabeth and James I., pp. 103-4.
2. Those of Fife, Lothian and Brechin (a district larger than the former diocese of that name).

the separation from the other populous diocese - Glasgow - of portions which helped to form the districts of Jedburgh and Dumfries; and for rationalisation of boundaries, so that enclaves disappeared.

The Book of Discipline, in words which any reformer might have used to describe his ideal bishop, insisted that the superintendents "must not be suffered to live as your idill Bischoppis have done heirtofore", and echoed the words used by (1) Scottish protestants thirteen years earlier in declaring that "they must be precheris thame selfis". They had to preach at least three times a week, either in the chief towns of their dioceses, where they could remain for three or four months at a time, or elsewhere within their "bounds". Their most important administrative duties were in connection with the appointment of ministers, for examination and institution by a superintendent (2) were the only recognised means of obtaining a pastoral charge. Along with his synod, the superintendent could translate (3) ministers, and he was expected, in the course of his

1. Knox, Works, I. 194.

2. B.U.K. I. 27; St. Andrews Kirk Session Register I. 75-6; A.P.S. III. 23 c. 7. Patrons sent letters of presentation to the superintendents, who examined the nominees and, if they found them fit, proceeded to institute them. Warrender Papers (in H.M. Register House) vol. A, fol. 381 is a letter from the regent Moray insisting that the superintendent of Lothian shall no longer delay the examination of the regent's candidate for a benefice in his patronage. Cf. R.P.C. II. 503-4, 565.

3. B.U.K. I. 29.

visitations, to examine ministers and depose them if he thought fit. The superintendents were presidents of courts which had an important place in the constitution of the church. Along with the kirk session of the chief town of the diocese, a superintendent could give judgement on cases in which discipline was concerned, and on appeals against sentences<sup>(1)</sup> passed by the pre-reformation episcopal courts. His greater court, the diocesan synod, which was convened twice yearly and consisted of a minister with an elder or deacon from every parish in the diocese, was, until the appearance of the presbytery, the only court intermediate between the kirk sessions and the general assembly, and acted as a court of appeal from the former.<sup>(2)</sup> The superintendent also had power to act in disciplinary cases without reference to a court, especially (but not solely) in places which had no kirk<sup>(3)</sup> sessions.

It is necessary to examine the assertion that the office of superintendent was not "distinct or permanent".<sup>(4)</sup> Although some of the functions which the superintendents were intended to perform - such as organising congregations and preaching in places which had not ministers - were temporary, yet many others were clearly of a permanent nature, and no

1. Cf. Hay Fleming, St. Andrews Kirk Session Register, I. xxviii note; B.U.K. I. 29, 35, 41.
2. B.U.K. I. 32-3.
3. ib. 43, 74-5; cf. Spottiswoode, History, II. 167. Miss MacGregor (Scottish Presbyterian Polity, pp. 93-4) gives a summary of the duties of superintendents.
4. McCrie, Miscellaneous Writings, p. 179.

provision was made for the ultimate transfer of these functions to other officials or bodies. Certain explicit statements are quite incompatible with the view that the superintendents were meant to be temporary, and it is clear that a succession of holders of the office was envisaged.<sup>(1)</sup> The appointments actually made in 1560 may indicate that the permanent duties were regarded as more important than the temporary, for more care was taken to provide superintendents in districts where protestantism had a firm footing than in parts of the country where the initial task of organisation would be difficult.<sup>(2)</sup>

The case for the temporary character of the office of superintendent has been based entirely upon two phrases which, removed from their context in the Book of Discipline, have been misunderstood. The meaning of the passage in which they occur is this: some office of supervision and inspection is, as a rule, necessary; if, however, we make appointments to<sup>(3)</sup>

1. Knox, Works II. 205-8.

2. The only superintendent placed in the wilder parts of the country was Carswell, and it may have been expected that in his district of Argyll protestantism would make rapid headway, owing to the support of the Argyll family. According to the bounds laid down in the Book of Discipline, the appointments made in 1560 would have made no provision for the whole area north of a line from Aberdeen to Mallaig, including Skye, the Outer Hebrides, and the northern isles. There is, however, evidence that Carswell exercised authority in Skye and even in Harris (J.B.Craven, Records of Argyll and the Isles p. 17).

3. Knox, Works II. 201-2: "we have thocht goode to signifie unto your Honouris, suche reasonis as moved us to mak difference betwix preachearis at this tyme ... we have thocht it a thing most expedient for this tyme".

such an office at present, when the supply of ordinary ministers is inadequate, we may lay ourselves open to such a criticism as was made in England in 1559 - "makinge of lordly byshops before the realm be provided of necessarie ministers"<sup>(1)</sup>; we feel bound, therefore, to set down the reasons for the course we have chosen. The idea that the office of superintendent was regarded as of merely temporary value is sufficiently refuted by two sentences in the Register of the Kirk Session of St. Andrews:<sup>(2)</sup> "wythowt the cayr of superintendent is, neyther can the kyrk be suddenlie erected, neyther can thei be retened in disciplin and unite of doctrin.... Of Christ Jesus and of his apostolis we have command and exempill to appoynt men to sic chergis". The assertion that the office was not "distinct" finds no support in the identity of the order for the admission of superintendents with that for ministers, since we know that John à Lasco's Forma ac Ratio and Bucer's De Ordinatione provided only one form, although these reformers, especially the former, took a lofty view of the office of bishop or superintendent.<sup>(3)</sup>

The identification of the superintendent with the "godly bishop" shows that the occasional use of the name

1. S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. i, No. 122 (Christopher Goodman to William Cecil, October 26, 1559); cf. C.S.P. I. No. 554.
2. St. Andrews Kirk Session Register I. 75.
3. Cf. pp. 23 and 24 supra, and Smyth, Cranmer pp. 229-30.

(1)

"bishop" in place of "superintendent" was not simply due to the impression made on the popular mind by a superficial resemblance, but sprang rather from a thorough understanding of the office. Only an examination of the ideas on episcopacy current in the reformation period, and a comparison of them with the provisions of the Book of Discipline, can explain

(2)

what Erskine of Dun - himself a superintendent - meant when he said that he considered the two offices (of bishop and

(3)

superintendent) to be identical.

The character of the form of government outlined in the Book of Discipline can hardly be understood without reference to continental church politics. The truth about the genesis of the Scottish polity will not be attained until less emphasis is laid on the debt to Geneva and France, for there is not a single feature in the Scottish polity which had parallels only in France and Switzerland. Of course there were

1. Willock was called "Bischof of Glasquo" (Keith, History III. 10), and Winram was described as Episcopus Fifanorum (Hewat, Makers of the Scottish Church, p. 209). The title "lord" was sometimes given to superintendents (Wodrow, Collections (Maitland Club) I. ii. 461).

2. It should, perhaps, be mentioned that there is no possible doubt that Erskine was, in the view of his contemporaries, an ordained minister. (Cf. Calderwood II. 46; McCrie, Life of Andrew Melville, edn. 1824, I. 346 note; Wodrow, Collections (Maitland Club) I. i. 20.) This would never have been questioned but for the quite irrelevant fact that Erskine was a landed gentleman.

3. Calderwood III. 160.

consistories in Scotland - but there were consistories all over western Europe, and the Genevan body had not been the original pattern.<sup>(1)</sup> The "exercise", for which the Book of Discipline made provision,<sup>(2)</sup> certainly had its equivalent in Geneva - but not in Geneva alone, for the Predigerversammlung<sup>(3)</sup> of John à Lasco's churches when he was superintendent of Friesland was a body identical with the Scottish exercise,<sup>(4)</sup> and John Willock, who had spent some time in Friesland, must have been familiar with the organisation of the protestant church there. That the Scots imitated Geneva can, therefore, be doubted; that they imitated France must be denied. The French Book of Discipline of 1559 insisted on the equality of pastors and churches and expressly rejected the office of superintendents or even of visitors with temporary powers,<sup>(5)</sup> while the Scots made the superintendent's office indispensable and gave his church a very real superiority over others.<sup>(6)</sup> Briefly, the French system, with its parity and its complete system of courts, was presbyterian, while the Scottish was not. The argument that the difference is explained by the scarcity of protestant ministers in Scotland

1. Cf. Henderson, The Scottish Ruling Elder, pp. 18-21.

2. Knox, Works, II. 242-5.

3. Choisy, La Théocratie à Geneve au temps de Calvin, p. 227.

4. Dalton, Johannes a Lasco, pp. 250-51; cf. Pascal, Jean de Lasco, pp. 170-71.

5. Chapter I. xvi, xvii, xviii; chapter VI. i. (ed. Campbell, pp. vii, 5, 24.)

6. Knox, Works II. 189.

in 1560 is worthless, because the position of the Scottish reformed church was potentially much stronger than that of the French, and, as we have seen, no provision was made for an alteration of the Scottish organisation after preachers became more plentiful. It is inconceivable that the Scots did not know the details of the French discipline,<sup>(1)</sup> and the fact that there had been in both countries a precisely parallel development, in the same years, of congregations with their pastors, elders and deacons, makes the refusal of the Scots to follow the French precedent all the more striking. It is explained by the fact that the French church was persecuted - its Book of Discipline provided that bishops and priests aspiring to the ministry, or even to church membership, must renounce their benefices<sup>(2)</sup> - and the Scots, looking forward to establishment, did not think of following its example.

To the German churches, on the other hand, there were marked resemblances, as in the appointment of deacons as managers of church property and in the programme of provision for schools and the poor.<sup>(3)</sup> In appointing superintendents, the Scots ignored precedents, in the Hessian constitution of 1526 and in the Genevan Ordonnances of 1542, for temporary visitors,

1. Cf. MacGregor, op.cit. pp. 33-4; Hannay, "The Earl of Arran and Queen Mary", S.H.R. XVIII. 263-4. In 1560 Knox had "great intelligence" with the churches of France. (Works II. 137).
2. Chapter I. iii, XII. iv, XIV. iii. (ed. Campbell, pp. 1, 35, 42.)
3. Kidd, pp. 230-33; Lindsay, op. cit. I. 411.

and created an office almost identical with that existing in many parts of Germany and in Denmark. <sup>(1)</sup> It is to the Danish system that the Scottish has most affinity. In Denmark, as in Scotland, a scheme of reforms was drawn up by an assembly of preachers, and its main points are very like those of the Book of Discipline - evangelical worship, a university with instruction in Greek and Hebrew, schools in every city and town, ministers supported by their parishes, superintendents or visitors elected by the preachers of each district but <sup>(2)</sup> appointed by the state, and the use for the benefit of the sick and poor of all property given to the church for them. In the subsequent settlement, the revenues of the Danish bishoprics were given to the crown, which had to pay, out of them, the salaries of the superintendents and of the professors at the university - the purpose to which the Book of Discipline assigned the temporalities of the Scottish sees. Points in the Danish Ordinatio which are of particular interest are the work assigned to the deacons as managers, in each parish, of the church revenues, and the description of the superattendentes, who, although taking the place of the bishops, "non vocantur ad canonicale otium, sed ad ingentes labores". They were to

1. Miss MacGregor's comparison (op.cit. p. 11) between the Scottish constitution and the Hessian is vitiated by this important difference. The Hessian constitution is to be found in Richter, Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen I.62, and the Genevan Ordonnances at p. 344 of the same volume.
2. This was the procedure envisaged by the Book of Discipline, and used in the cases of Winram and Spottiswoode. Vide p. 45 infra.

preach, not only in their own cities, but throughout their dioceses, to see to it that preachers were efficient, and to examine candidates for ordination.<sup>(1)</sup> Mere similarity, as evidence for a possible debt to Denmark, can be supplemented. The Danish system was certainly known to the English reformers,<sup>(2)</sup> and Cecil suggested Denmark to the Scots as a model for the settlement of the ecclesiastical property, in July 1559.<sup>(3)</sup> That the Scots knew a good deal about events in Denmark is probable on general grounds, for the connection between the two countries was close,<sup>(4)</sup> and we can point in particular to the residence of Machabeus in Copenhagen. Finally, it may be significant that among the Balcarres papers is a copy of the part of the Ordinatio Ecclesiastica which deals with church property.<sup>(5)</sup>

It is impossible to complete this attempt to relate the Scottish organisation to current ideas on ecclesiastical polity without reference to the views of the Scottish reformers on the relations between the church and the civil power. The

1. For some of the information in this paragraph I have to thank Dr. Bredahl Petersen, of Copenhagen, who allowed me to read a chapter of his thesis on Machabeus; Kidd, pp. 325, 328; Ordinatio Ecclesiastica, ff. xxxix-xlvi.
2. Bugenhagen presented a copy of his Ordinatio Ecclesiastica (now in the British Museum) to Henry VIII, and there are reasons for believing that it was known to Cranmer. (J.W. Legg, Cranmer's Liturgical Projects, p. xxxiv). Coverdale's wife was a sister of the wife of Machabeus, and he visited Denmark in Mary's reign. (D.N.B.)
3. Knox VI. 51-5.
4. Cf. Warrender Papers (S.H.S.), I. 11-14, 36-41, II. 105.
5. N.L.S. 29.2.8. (Balcarres Papers vol. VIII.) - "De sustentatione et provisione ministrorum verbi in inclyto Danorum et Norvagorum regno" - is a copy of the Ordinatio from f. xxxix.

point which must be stressed is that the principle of the complete separation of the civil and ecclesiastical spheres, and the denial of the authority of the magistrate in the church, are absent from the thought of the reformers; they came with the Melvillian presbyterians.<sup>(1)</sup> In Scotland, as in all other countries where the movement for reform became strong, there was a claim for the civil power of some kind of divine right which would render it independent of the papacy, and an insistence that the state, responsible to God alone, could reform and govern the church.<sup>(2)</sup> Knox, like John Ponet, conceived the sovereign power, to which he gave the name "the authority", not as a person or a group of persons, but as a power which God required in any state for His purposes. The prince, normally the ruler of the state, should be obedient to God's will, and act as His instrument; when he fails to do so, other parts of the constitution may take his place as the ruling power.<sup>(3)</sup> Thus, when Mary of Guise refused to further the work of reformation, and so failed to do "the duty of every Christian prince and good magistrate", the reformers turned to other parts of the constitution, as they viewed it.<sup>(4)</sup> The nobles,

1. Cf. Hume Brown, Knox, I. 356: "Andrew Melville was driven to the very opposite pole" from Knox, in his politics.

2. Knox IV. 324, 443, 445; Calderwood I. 365, 369.

3. Knox II. 435-6, I. 411. Knox and Ponet use the same language about "the authority" and "God's ordinance".  
(Politick Power, Sig. C. v. verso.)

4. Knox, I. 365-6.

as inferior magistrates, had a duty to carry out God's will if  
 the prince failed to do so,<sup>(1)</sup> and even the community at large  
 might play a part.<sup>(2)</sup> The course actually taken by the Scottish  
 revolt was justified in the theory of the reformers. But was  
 it the case, as has been contended,<sup>(3)</sup> that the Scots meant merely  
 to give the civil power authority to purify the church without  
 giving it any authority over the reformed church? Knox had  
 pronounced the "feeding of Christ's flock" to be a function of  
 magistrates,<sup>(4)</sup> and the Confession of Faith included the  
 "conservatioun and purgatioun" of religion, and the "maintenance  
 of true religion" among the duties of the civil power.<sup>(5)</sup> It must  
 be stressed that there was no essential incompatibility between  
 Calvinist politics and a royal supremacy of the kind prevalent  
 in the Lutheran churches, for Calvin's so-called "theocracy"  
 does not mean the rule of a body of churchmen, but the rule of  
 God's law - "the authority" of Knox and Ponet. The civil power,  
 if it represents the law of God by acting according to it, may  
 therefore have authority over the church. Too much significance  
 has been attached to the arguments deducible from Calvin's

1. Knox, I. 404, 406, 444-9, 272, 298; Calderwood I. 374, 377.

2. Calderwood I. 400.

3. MacEwen, History of the Church in Scotland, II. 156-7.

4. Calderwood I. 365; cf. Knox IV. 443, 445.

5. In the MS. of Knox's History the phrase is "reformatioun  
 and purgatioun": "conservatioun and purgatioun" appears  
 in the Acts of Parliament, in Calderwood, and in the old  
 printed copies of Knox. (A.P.S. II. 534, III. 22; Calder-  
 wood II. 35; Knox II. 118 and note).

principles in cases where the civil power was unwilling to assist reform, simply because in most countries where Calvinism was dominant the protestants happened to be in opposition to the government. A royal supremacy was as impossible for the Scottish protestants between 1560 and 1567<sup>(1)</sup> as it was for their French and Dutch brethren, but there are indications of a disposition to accept a secular authority as supreme over the church. The "Commissioners of Burghs, and some of the nobility and Barons", arranged the appointment of ministers and superintendents in July 1560<sup>(2)</sup>, and the Lords of the Secret Council issued the congés d'élire for the election of Spottiswoode and Winram.<sup>(3)</sup> Further, it is at least arguable that the general assembly was the means by which the inferior magistrates could participate in the government of the church - it may even have originated in an afforced privy council - and that the kirk sessions provided a similar opportunity to the community. After the revolution of 1567 had made possible the acknowledgment of a royal supremacy, the ministers seem to have been prepared to allow the "godly prince" to take his place as governor of the church. When a book which gave the king the title of supreme head of the church was discussed in the general assembly of July 1568, there seems to have been no<sup>(4)</sup> certainty whether such a title was allowable or not. The

1. Cf. Cambridge Modern History, II. 580, 596.

2. Knox II. 87.

3. ib. 144; Register of the Kirk Session of St. Andrews, I. 72-5.

4. B.U.K. I. 125-6; Aldis No.69. The book does not appear to have survived.

oath of supremacy of 1572, acknowledging the king as "the onlie lauchfull and supreme governour of this realme, alsweill in thingis temporall as in the conservatioun and purgatioun of religioun"<sup>(1)</sup>, does not appear to have aroused any opposition or criticism.

While the 1560 system contained some of the elements which appear in the later presbyterian polity, it cannot itself be called "presbyterian". The existence of kirk sessions, which in the sixteenth century were often called "presbyteries", is not an adequate ground for the application of the term "presbyterian" to the entire organisation. Congregational consistories are compatible with almost any type of church government, and, in any case, the character of a national system is to be found not in the organisation of particular churches, but in the method of federation or subordination by which individual congregations are joined together to form a whole. The body characteristic of the presbyterian system with its hierarchy of courts is the presbytery (i.e. the classis), and this did not appear in Scotland until some twenty years after the reformation. Not only were presbyteries entirely absent, but instead of the synod as a council of ministers we find a synodal assembly which was merely assistant to the superintendent, its permanent president. Even if the

1. R.P.C. II. 129-30; Calderwood III. 184; B.U.K. I. 220.

view were tenable that the reformers intended the office of superintendent to be temporary, we should still have to contrast their attitude with that of the Melvillian presbyterians, who would not have allowed the sacred parity of ministers to be infringed even for a time, and who abolished the other non-scriptural (but expedient) offices of exhorter<sup>(1)</sup> and reader at the same time as episcopacy was condemned.

Unlike the reformers, the Melvillians had no regard for expediency, and insisted that in matters of polity the scriptures laid down unalterable laws which could in no circumstances be ignored. These essential distinctions seem to justify the use of the term "presbyterian" to describe the later, and not the earlier, polity. The differences between the two Books of Discipline are accentuated by the modifications introduced into the original system during the fifteen years after 1560.

The provisions of the Book of Discipline, with which the discussion has so far been concerned, must not be regarded as in reality the constitution of the kirk in the decade after 1560, for they were not accepted by the civil power, which alone could have put them into effect, and the resultant position, with the church lacking both establishment and endowment, compelled the churchmen to acquiesce in considerable

1. Cf. Scot, Apologeticall Narration, p. 39.

modifications of the system originally advocated. When the reformation parliament met, it may have been hoped that many churchmen would conform and that the existing ecclesiastical organisation would continue, but it would be plain that parliament could neither coerce the bishops into acceptance of the Confession of Faith nor deprive them if they refused to conform. The strongest Scottish government would not have dared to threaten John Hamilton, half-brother of the duke of Châtelherault, the greatest noble in Scotland and heir to the throne, with the loss of his primatial see. Still less could a party do so whose legal position was dubious and who owed some of their strength to the duke's support. During Mary's active reign, beginning in August 1561, the reformed church seemed at times to be on the verge of overthrow. The legislation of the reformation parliament was of doubtful validity, the precarious position of the kirk was illustrated by the continuance of appointment to benefices by papal provision<sup>(1)</sup>, and the general assembly's right to meet could be questioned<sup>(2)</sup>. For a time, indeed, "the Bischoppis priviledges war nott current"<sup>(3)</sup>, and it was possible to prosecute "mass-mongers"<sup>(4)</sup>, but in 1566 Mary restored his "ancient jurisdictions" to the archbishop of

1. Knox II. 342, 344.

2. ib. 295-6.

3. ib. 380. In January 1562/3 Lethington asked Randolph to obtain a copy of a statute containing all the cases of praemunire - "ment for the wele of the Prelates" (Knox VI. 532, cf. C.S.P. I. 678.

4. Knox II. 379.

(1)  
 St. Andrews, and there were instances of the toleration of  
 (2)  
 "idolatry". The irregularity of the kirk's position, long  
 (3)  
 apparent to lawyers, became a hard fact of which all were  
 (4)  
 conscious. Not until the revolution of 1567 was establishment  
 (5)  
 a reality, as contemporaries fully realised.

It was, therefore, a justifiable argument that the Scottish church was until 1567 a persecuted church, and that the civil war of succeeding years stood in the way of a permanent settlement even after the kirk had been established. Foreigners probably understood the situation sufficiently well to apply to the Scottish church the standards of churches not established; Scotsmen themselves took a more sound, but not essentially different, view. In January 1573/4, the regent  
 (6)  
 Morton wrote:

1. Knox II. 540.
2. B. M. Lansdowne MSS. 8, f. 88, is a copy of a manifesto of the Protestant nobles who had been driven into England.
3. Knox II. 385.
4. Knox II. 485, I. 297, VI. 429-30. In the second of these passages, written probably in 1566, Knox referred to the "Reformation of Religioun, which of Goddis mercy we anes possessed".
5. Z.L. I. 198-201; Gorham, Gleanings, p. 437. Grindal had watched developments in Scotland closely (cf. Z.L. I. 169-70), and may have read the manifesto referred to in note 2, for he follows it in this letter. For the view officially taken in Scotland, cf. A.P.S. III. 71, S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. xxii, No. 58 (C.S.P. IV. 204), and B.U.K. I. 94-5.
6. Wodrow Miscellany I. 289-90; Wodrow MSS. fol. vol. 50, No. 93.

"we have enjoyit the libertie of trew and Christiane religioun, in puritie and unitie of doctrine, ... howbeit, with na setlit Policie [i.e., polity], partlie throw want of the allowance of the auctoritie at the first Reformatioun, and partlie because the benefices of cure wer of lang tyme sufferit to be possest be personis repugnant to the said religioun".

(1)

A statute of March 1574/5 uses similar language, and the letter from Lord Glamis to Beza - the letter which occasioned Beza's De Triplici Episcopatu - makes it clear that as late as 1578 men felt that there had not yet been an opportunity for a real

(2)

settlement:

"In disciplina et politia ... nondum satis inter nos convenit. Nam una cum papistica superstitione disciplina aliquamdiu a maioribus nostris usurpata ante annos aliquot sublata est. In eius autem locum nulla commoda honestaque ecclesiae regendae ratio adhuc subrogari potuit, praesertim cum principes nostri vel a vera religione fuerint alieni, vel cum recte de praecipuis Christianae fidei articulis sentire caeperunt bellis tamen civilibus impediti, eam in rem prout voluerunt, incumbere non potuerint. Nunc autem ab omnibus prioribus illis impedimentis liberi, ... de disciplina aliqua ecclesiastica constituenda laboramus".

Glamis told Beza that one of the questions agitating men's minds was whether the general assembly should continue to meet. The idea was current that its existence depended on custom merely, not on law, and that although it had been indispensable under a sovereign who opposed the reformed faith, it was not necessary under a "godly prince". Clearly, the reasoning usually applied to a persecuted church had been applied to the Church of Scotland, and the recognition by the reformers of the power of

(3)

1. A.P.S. III. 89.

2. Additional MSS. 28,571, ff. 110-111; Appendix C. 2.

3. f. 110 verso.

the civil authority in ecclesiastical matters had led, after the revolution of 1567, to a disposition to accept the supreme civil magistrate, and not inferior magistrates, as the lay element in ecclesiastical government.

The practical importance of the political position of the kirk lay, however, in its influence on the relations between the reformed church and the benefices. <sup>(1)</sup> The comprehensive claim to church property, advanced by the reformers and formulated in the Book of Discipline, was modified by permission being given to benefice holders to retain their revenues, at first on condition that they maintained ministers and later subject to the deduction of a third. The thirds, divided between the crown and the kirk, proved quite inadequate, and the expectation that benefices, as they fell vacant, would go to men professing the reformed religion, was disappointed, owing to the action of the queen and other patrons, who gave benefices to laymen or Romanists. The poverty of many ministers was extreme, and the work of the reformed church was <sup>(2)</sup> seriously hampered by lack of funds. Although the position

1. The best general account of the history of the church property in the period is in Masson's introduction to the Register of the Privy Council (Second Series) I.; cf. R.K. Hannay, "The Foundation of the College of Edinburgh", in the History of Edinburgh University, 1583-1933. An act of the privy council in 1573 (R.P.C. II. 261.) gives a summary of the history of the benefices from 1560.
2. Knox II. 340, 528, 544. David Ferguson, Tracts, p. 11.

(1)  
 improved even before the end of Mary's reign, and the accession of her son entirely changed the prospects of the kirk, yet the period of penury had its effect on the policy of the churchmen. Dissatisfied with the thirds, and realising that acceptance of the Book of Discipline was improbable, the kirk seems to have been driven to see the solution of its difficulties in a closer link between the reformed religion and the benefices, and to have been prompted to make a belated attempt to imitate anglican practice and to take over the framework of the old church. It had always been the intention, even according to the Book of Discipline, that ministers should enjoy the parochial benefices - but only indirectly, for the revenues were to be paid to deacons, who provided for schools and the poor as well as for the ministers. The change which we notice is the adoption of the idea that possession of benefices carried with it a function in the church - instead of ordaining ministers and appointing them to livings when possible, the rectors and vicars in possession are recognised as potential ministers. At the same time, control by the deacons, and distribution of a portion of the fruits of benefices to the poor and to schools, seem to be abandoned. The development is seen most clearly, and had most influence on the constitution of the church, in the bishoprics, which, according to the Book

1. In October 1566 the council decided that benefices worth less than 300 merks annually should go to the reformed church, and in December came Mary's offer of a temporary supplement.

of Discipline, should have ceased to exist as entities, the revenues being divided between the superintendents and the universities.

Only five superintendents, instead of the ten proposed in the Book of Discipline, were appointed<sup>(1)</sup>, and we find that conforming bishops were recognised as capable of performing, in their own dioceses, the functions of superintendents<sup>(2)</sup>. Such a development seems deducible from Knox's principle that "a Bischope that receaves proffit, and feidis not the flock, even be his awin labouris, is boith a theif and a murderar"<sup>(3)</sup>. There was episcopal work to be done in the church; there were no revenues to pay superintendents to do it, but there were men receiving episcopal revenues and professing the reformed faith - why should not they be commissioned to act as superintendents? In 1562 the general assembly refused the request of Alexander Gordon, bishop of Galloway, to be appointed superintendent in his diocese<sup>(4)</sup>, but followed up this refusal by commissioning Gordon to carry out a

1. The term "superintendent" was sometimes applied to the commissioners and visitors who were appointed for short periods, and John Knox is referred to as "superintendent of Edinburgh" in the Records of the Burgh of Peebles (1165-1710) p. 275.
2. Cf. Petrie, A History of the Catholick Church (1662), II. 365: "Whereas of all the bishops three only did embrace or professe the Reformed religion ... none of them had any power in the Church, but by vertue of commission, that was given them by the Assembly, upon account, that they had the Church revenues in the places; and they might have supplid the place of superintendents".
3. Knox II. 398.
4. ib. 374-5; Calderwood II. 184.

(1)  
 superintendent's duties in Galloway. Obviously, the bishop wanted to be paid as a superintendent, while the assembly insisted that he should work without payment, since he was already in possession of the episcopal revenues. In June 1563, Gordon was commissioned to "plant kirks" in his diocese. (2) In the records of successive general assemblies, there are references to him as "superintendent" or "commissioner" of Galloway, and there is evidence that he performed ministerial functions. (3) In 1568 and 1569 he was suspended from his office, firstly for negligence and then because of his support of Mary. (4) The second conforming bishop, Adam Bothwell of Orkney, a man of greater worth than Alexander Gordon, was in his diocese during the critical years 1559-61, and it was reported in March 1560/1 that "the bysshope of Orknaye begynethe to reforme his dioces and preachethe hym self". (5) At first, presumably, his position was irregular, but in June 1563, with the bishops of Galloway and Caithness, he was commissioned to plant kirks. (6) As in the case of Gordon, there is evidence that he was regarded as a (7) (8)

1. B.U.K. I. 28.

2. B.U.K. II. 32.

3. B.U.K. I. 38, 44, 52-3, 65, 112, 114; Robert Gore-Brown, Lord Bothwell, p. 224.

4. B.U.K. I. 131, 150.

5. Perhaps we can judge him by his library (Warrender Papers, S.H.S., II. 396-412).

6. Napier, Memoirs of John Napier of Merchiston, p. 68.

7. S.P.Scot. Eliz. vol. vi. No.25; cf. C.S.P. I. No.967.

8. B.U.K. II. 32.

(1)

superintendent, and that he acted as a minister. In March 1569/70 there was brought against him an elaborate accusation, from which several important points emerge - the assembly maintained that the possession of a see involved a function in the reformed church, and that bishoprics should, therefore, be in the hands of qualified men; Adam Bothwell asserted that he had suppressed "idolatry and superstition" in his diocese, that he had preached and administered the sacraments, and that he had appointed ministers and instituted them to benefices. (2)

The third conforming bishop, Robert Stewart of Caithness, was commissioned, in June, 1563, to plant kirks, and was given an assistant for this task and for preaching. (3) He had less trouble with the general assembly than his fellow-bishops had, and there are several references, between 1564 and 1572, to his work in preaching and visiting. (4)

A disposition to extend the application of the principle which had prompted the use of the conforming bishops seems to lie behind the resolution of the assembly of December

1. B.U.K. I. 52-3. He married queen Mary to the earl of Bothwell (Sir James Melville, Memoirs, pp. 178-9), and took part in the coronation of James VI. (R.P.C. I. 542.) In December 1567 he was accused of negligence and deprived "fra all function of the ministrie", but was restored by the next assembly. (B.U.K. I. 112, 114, 131.)
2. B.U.K. I. 162-3, 165-8.
3. ib. 32, 34.
4. S.P. Scot Eliz. vol ix, No.62 (cf. C.S.P. II. 85); B.U.K. I. 130, 189-90, 222. Robert Stewart's intellect, like Adam Bothwell's, may perhaps be judged from books - those he presented to James VI. (S.H.S.Misc. I. lxvi-lxviii.)

1566 that all bishops, abbots, priors and others receiving teinds should appear at the next assembly "to give ther assistance and counsell ... in sick things as apperteines to Christian religion and preaching of the true word"<sup>(1)</sup> - a resolution deducible from the claim that the teinds were the patrimony of the kirk.<sup>(2)</sup> There could be little doubt as to the manner in which the reformed church would use the victory of 1567. A final attempt seems to have been made to establish a system on the lines laid down in 1560,<sup>(3)</sup> but it must have been plain that the Book of Discipline was less necessary than before, and the extension of the "anglican" principle correspondingly easier, since benefices were no longer bestowed by a Romanist sovereign, and the government no longer prevented the church from controlling the action of patrons. It was now possible to insist that patrons should obtain ecclesiastical approval of their nominees, and that conformers alone should hold benefices, while the policy of compelling parsons to serve could be continued.<sup>(4)</sup> Thirds continued to be exacted from the "auld possessouris, papistis and utheris", who had been presented before James's accession and many of whom did not serve, whereas "the new providit Persoun sen oure Soverane Lordis coronatioun",

1. B.U.K. I. 92.

2. ib. 83-4.

3. ib. 128, 151; cf. Hannay, Foundation of the College of Edinburgh, p. 7.

4. A.P.S.III. 23 c. 7, 37 c. 2, 37 c. 6, 72 c. 3; B.U.K. I. 126, 258.

who was compelled to act as a minister, was allowed to enjoy the entire fruits of his benefice.<sup>(1)</sup> Clearly, the prospects of the ministers were now brighter, but they were still far from enjoying the whole patrimony of the church, especially as men presented in Mary's reign were allowed to draw their revenues,<sup>(2)</sup> and the continuance of comparative poverty caused ecclesiastical property to remain a primary objective in the policy of the kirk.

The account which has been given of the abandonment of the Book of Discipline and of the adoption of "anglican" practice contains the explanation of the kirk's attitude to the protestant episcopacy introduced by the convention of Leith in 1572 - an episcopacy which was potentially and in principle (though not necessarily in practice) in the interests of the reformed church. The appointment of protestant bishops, when the kirk was at last established and its supporters controlled the government, was a logical development from the use already made of conforming bishops and of other benefice holders, and of the attempts to compel patrons to present qualified men. It cannot have seemed as startling to contemporaries as it has to historians. What the kirk hoped to obtain from the new bishops appears in what it gained from the conforming bishops - not only did Bothwell, Stewart and Gordon perform the work of superintendents, but they gave some of their revenues for the

1. R.P.C. II. 495.

2. A.P.S. III. 31 c. 26.

(1)  
 support of ministers. Besides making possible the extension of this practice, the Leith settlement made arrangements for the use of abbots and priors in the reformed church - and their property had been regarded as lost by the compilers of the Book of Discipline. An indication that finance was the main consideration which moved the kirk to accept the new bishops may be found in the fact that David Ferguson's sermon, preached before the convention of Leith, dealt at length with the right of the kirk to its patrimony. (2)

Some evidence must be adduced to show that the church as a whole and the leading ministers individually accepted the concordat. The "convention" of Leith appears to have been so termed simply because it met outside the ordinary course of meetings of assembly, (3) for contemporaries regarded it as a general assembly and it was quite a representative

1. B.U.K. I. 130 (Caithness), and 165 (Orkney). John Carswell, as bishop-superintendent in Argyll and the western isles, paid stipends to ministers (J.B. Craven, Records of Argyll and the Isles, p. 10). Cf. Calderwood, De Regimine ... Epistola, p. 3: "Primum genus fuit Episcopum, qui ejurato papismo sed ad causam reformationis adjungebant. His concessum ut fruerentur redditibus, ea lege, ut pastores in suis dioecesibus, alerent".
2. For details of this sermon, see note 1 on Page 59. The historian Wodrow, although he condemned the concordat, admitted that it was attractive to the kirk because it promised enjoyment of the episcopal property. (Collections, Maitland Club, I. i. 27-8.)
3. It denied that it interrupted this course, (B.U.K. I. 204).

(1)  
gathering. An account of its work by an observer who seems  
to have been able to take a detached standpoint is invaluable: (2)

"Sum doubt standinge betwix the Regent and mynisters of the kirke touching the order of admission of Bishshops and others entringe to spirituall promotion for that no certaine law toward the police of the kirke was established sen the papestrey was abolished, in a quiet conference kepte at Leeth in the later end of January, the mater is agreed. And so far as may be the order of the kirke of England followed. This order is assented unto be certaine comissioners appointed from the Counsell and the assembly of the kirke. The Regent hes allowed it, and promittit to have it enacted by parliament as a law. It is alreddy entered in execution, and one Mr Jhon Douglas, ane agit learned man, rectour of the universitie, nominated in favour of the Erle of Morton to the Archebishopsrik of Sainctandros is admitted by the same order. The same order cometh in practize voluntary, and it is thought ther shall not be grete lett to have it allowed by parliament".

There is no suggestion here that there was opposition to the arrangements, or that they were merely a device to fill the pockets of the nobility. The general assembly of August 1572 expressed no objection to the arrangements made at Leith, and

1. It declared that it had the "strength, force, and effect" of a general assembly (B.U.K. I. 204), the assembly of August 1572 referred to it as a general assembly (ib. 246), and the historian Row reckoned it the twenty-fourth general assembly (History, p. 45). The title of David Ferguson's sermon was Ane Sermon prechit before the Regent and nobilitie, upon a part of the third chapter of Malachi, in the Kirk of Leith, at the time of the Generall Assemblie, on Sondag the 13 of Januarie. Anno Do. 1571. (McCrie, Knox, edn. 1840 p. 292 and note; Aldis No.111; reprint by the Bannatyne Club, 1860.) There were present three superintendents, three commissioners, some thirty ministers, and a number of laymen, making the total over sixty. (B.U.K. I. 203-4.)
2. S.P. Scot Eliz. vol. XXII. No.24; cf. C.S.P. IV. pp. 133-4.

accepted even the titles of archbishop, archdeacon, dean, etc. (although they were obnoxious to many ministers), with a proviso that in agreeing to them they must not be held to sanction popery. It was suggested that the titles should be altered, but only "in these things concerning the function of the kirk", for the ministers seem to have realised the value, from a legal and constitutional point of view, of the retention of the old titles. That the new order was accepted as a temporary measure only is probably due partly to the hope that a constitution more like that proposed in 1560 might yet be obtained, and partly to the consciousness that no final settlement should be attempted during a minority and in a time of civil war.<sup>(1)</sup>

The participation of the superintendents Winram and Spottiswoode in the institution of the new archbishop of St. Andrews is sufficient proof of their acquiescence in the settlement. Of the views of a third superintendent, Erskine of Dun, we are fortunate to have a very full expression, for Erskine was consulted by the government and seems to have been a sort of intermediary between it and the kirk.<sup>(2)</sup> Erskine's fundamental position was the theory which the kirk had long accepted - that benefices have spiritual functions annexed to them. He adduced evidence from Scripture for the episcopal

1. B.U.K. I. 246.

2. Hume of Godscroft, History of the House of Douglas and Angus (1743), II. 217.

power in admitting to cures and in supervising ministers, and identified the offices of bishop and superintendent. His only criticism was that John Douglas, the new archbishop, had been appointed without reference to the church - a justifiable

(1)  
complaint. The approval of David Lindsay, minister of Leith, is indicated by the part he took in the consecration of John Douglas, and by some phrases in a letter he wrote to Henry Killigrew, the English ambassador, on January 16, 1572/3. He referred to "the buik devysit in Lieth, quhairin the order of the election of byschops with mony other gud articles is

(2)  
continuit". Of the favour which John Row, another minister, showed for episcopacy at this time, we have his son's

(3)  
testimony.

Knox's views on the concordat appear, at first sight, to be inconsistent, and it has often been said that he opposed the new episcopate. His opinions on episcopal government have been examined, and his only criticism of anglican episcopacy - that the bishoprics were too large - has been given its proper

(4)  
setting. Of his refusal, in 1552, of the bishopric of

(5)  
Rochester, there are several possible explanations. The most

1. Calderwood III. 156-162; Bannatyne, Memorials, 197 et seq.
2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. XXIV. No.3; cf. C.S.P. IV. No.519.
3. Row, History, p. 415.
4. p. 33 supra.
5. There are good grounds for supposing that Northumberland intended Knox to act as a "tulchan" (Hume Brown, Knox, I. 124; White, Elizabethan Bishops, p. 153; S.P.Dom. Edward VI. vol. xv, Nos. 35, 66, printed in McCrie's, Knox, edn. 1840, p. 354). Knox's own explanation of his refusal was "the foresight of trouble to come" (Lorimer, op. cit. p. 191).

convincing of them seems to be that he refused this promotion for the same reason as he afterwards declined the office of superintendent - namely, that he had, or affected, a preference (1) for energetic pastoral work in a more lowly sphere. (2) His criticism of the concordat of Leith was directed against those aspects of the arrangements which were from every point of view unsatisfactory. John Douglas, the new archbishop, was an unhappy choice, owing to his age and infirmity, and Knox exclaimed: "Alas! for pitie, to lay upone an auld weak man's back that quhilk twentie of the best gifts could nocht bear. It will wrak (3) him and disgrace him". Knox's secretary, looking at Douglas's (4) appointment from the same viewpoint as his master, wrote:

"Heir we may sie what corrutione the kirke is come unto now, that puttis more upoun the bake of ane auld unable man then ten personis ar able to beir; ffor efter he was chosen bischope, the universitie continewed him rector, which is aneuch for ane to discharge. Now also he is continowed in the provestrie of the New College, whilk lykwayis is sufficient for ane manis charge, besydis the bischoprike, quhilk sex guid able men wald do no moir then discharge that cuire".

1. It should, however, be pointed out that Knox's stipend as minister of Edinburgh was almost on a level with that of the superintendents, and was a good deal more secure, while his office did not carry with it the arduous duties of which the superintendents so often complained. (Register of Ministers, etc., Maitland Club. The superintendents had about £600, in money and victual, Knox about £570).
2. He thought "hys state honorable inoughe, if God gyve him strength to persyste in that vocation that he hath placed hym in". (S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. vi, No.25; Knox VI. 122). Cf. McCrie, Knox, edn. 1874, p. 438, and Cotton MSS. Calig. C. III., f. 390 (C.S.P. IV. No.452): Knox said that he preferred to be "not a lord bishop, but a painful preacher of the blessed evangel", and that, although he could have been "a great buschope in England", yet, "the effect growen in Scotland, he being an instrument, doth myche more satisfie hen".
3. J. Melville, Diary, p. 31.
4. Bannatyne, Memorials, p. 228.

Such complaints had their source in a feature of the arrangements which must have been most objectionable - the retention of the old bounds of the dioceses, a severe blow to men who had striven for an efficient episcopate. Knox must have objected also to the simony involved in Douglas's appointment, and to the fact that the appointment had been made without the consent of the <sup>(1)</sup> kirk. General grounds of opposition are expressed in his protest that the "kirke of Scotland suld not be subject to that ordore which then was used, considdering the lordis of Scotland had subscrivit, and also confirmed in parliament, the ordore <sup>(2)</sup> alreadie and long agoe appointed, in the buike of discipline" - i.e., the 1560 system, with its reorganisation of the dioceses and its appropriation to ecclesiastical purposes of the entire episcopal revenues, was preferable. It seems clear, however, that when Knox's strong feeling about the appointment of Douglas had passed away, he came to see <sup>that</sup> the Leith arrangements were the best that could be obtained in the circumstances, and that the kirk was justified in accepting them. In his letter to the assembly of August 1572, he urged that "all Bishopricks vacand may be presented, and qualified persons nominat thereunto, within a year after the vaiking thereof, according to the order taken in Leith be the Commissioners of the Nobility and of the Kirk in the moneth of January last"; that grants of ecclesiastical

1. Cf. Hume Brown, History, II. 154; Knox, VI. 605; Bannatyne, Memorials, p. 228.

2. Bannatyne, Memorials, p. 257.

revenues must have the approval of a superintendent, a commissioner, or one of the new bishops; and that there should be safeguards to secure the efficiency and the sound financial administration of "all Bishops admitted be the order of the kirk now received"<sup>(1)</sup>.

The conviction that the Leith episcopate was merely titular has obscured some of its implications. That an attempt was made to secure "consecration" of a kind resembling the pre-reformation procedure is seen in the institution of John Douglas, when an effort was made to secure the co-operation of all who might be regarded as conforming bishops.<sup>(2)</sup> The sermon was preached by John Winram, who was a sort of de facto bishop;<sup>(3)</sup> Robert Stewart of Caithness, a minister in possession of a see, joined with Spottiswoode, superintendent of Lothian, and David Lindsay, minister of Leith and Chancellor of St. Andrews,<sup>(4)</sup> in laying hands on the new archbishop.<sup>(5)</sup> The ceremony was conducted according to the order for the admission of superintendents, from which Douglas read his responses, but imposition of hands was substituted for mere "taking by the hand".<sup>(6)</sup>

1. B.U.K. I. 247-9.

2. Keith, Bishops, p.216, quotes: "Our sovereign Lord ... ordains an letter to be made under the Great Seal, in due form, direct to the Reverend Father in God, Robert, bishop of Caithness, and the superintendents of Angus, Fife, Lothian, or any utheris lauchful bishops and superintendents, ... commanding them to consecrate the said Mr. John Douglas ...."

3. Winram, as sub-prior of St. Andrews, had been dean of the chapter of the diocese and vicar-general sede vacante. Since 1560 he had also been superintendent of Fife.

4. B.U.K. I. 223.

5. Calderwood III. 206-7.

6. ib.; Scot, Apologeticall Narration, p. 25.

In subsequent consecrations we find the same use of superintendents and conforming bishops, with the addition of (1) "tulchans". Such "consecrations" would be recognised by contemporaries as perfectly valid, and it must be admitted that a real effort was made to comply with traditional forms and to give the new bishops some respectable spiritual lineage.

It is important to note that the "tulchans", far from (2) having "no ecclesiastical standing", took their place in the constitution of the church. They were recognised by parliament, privy council, and general assembly, as having the same functions as superintendents and commissioners, and it was necessary to (3) make some arrangements which would prevent overlapping. The principle adopted was that superintendents should continue, having the same position as before where no bishops had been (4) set up, and acting as suffragans in districts ruled by bishops.

1. Botfield, introduction to Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), I. xiii-xiv; Melville, Diary, p. 32 note 2.
2. Moffat Gillon, John Davidson, p. 19.
3. A.P.S. III. 71 c. 2, 98 c. 7; R.P.C. II. 351-2; B.U.K. I. 294. A curious illustration of the uncertainty which prevailed at first is John Douglas's description of himself as "Archbishop of Sanct Andrewes and Superintendent of Fyf", on April 2, 1572. (H.M.C. Report VI., appendix p. 636.)
4. B.U.K. I. 294. The assembly of August 1572 found "the Diocle of Sanct Andrews, wheresoever it lyeth, to pertain to the Bishop of Sanct Andrews, and to no other Superintendent, to visite and plant kirks", but Douglas's request for assistants, including the superintendents of Fife and Lothian, was granted (ib. 243-4). Winram was thereafter frequently called "superintendent of Stratherne" (a district outside the diocese of St. Andrews)-ib. 264.

They tried to evade the latter duty, and, although they failed, the general assembly felt it necessary to endeavour to delimit their provinces, and also to consider a new arrangement for their stipends.<sup>(1)</sup> That the two offices (of superintendent and bishop)<sup>(2)</sup> were regarded as equivalent is perfectly clear, and references to the work actually done by the bishops are to be found in the Register of the Kirk Session of St. Andrews (where the name of John Douglas takes the place of Winram's, after March 1571/2),<sup>(3)</sup> and in the Register of the Privy Council (where they are recognised to be engaged in ecclesiastical administration).<sup>(4)</sup> The anxiety of the general assembly was not, as some writers have imagined, that the bishops might usurp ecclesiastical functions, but that they might be inefficient in the work they were expected to perform. Two assemblies expressed a wish that bishops should be provided to all vacant benefices;<sup>(5)</sup> the bishop of Dunkeld was censured for bearing the name and not exercising the office of a bishop;<sup>(6)</sup> in one case a chapter was censured for not making proper trial of the

1. B.U.K. I. 296-7, 264, 303, 305.
2. When John Douglas died, Winram received a commission for Fife as well as Strathearn (ib. 318); (St. Andrews Kirk Session Register I. xxxiv); Erskine of Dun instructed the bishop of Brechin in the work of a superintendent-bishop (B.U.K. I. 318); on the restoration of episcopacy in 1584, the superintendent of Angus was once more regarded by the archbishop of St. Andrews as a suffragan (H.M.C. Report V., appendix p. 636).
3. I. xxxiii.
4. R.P.C. II. 351-2, 363-4, 442, 545, 563-4.
5. B.U.K. I. 280, 306.
6. Calderwood, III. 288.

(1)

qualities of the man they elected; again and again bishops were criticised by assemblies, just as superintendents had

(2)

been, for slackness.

There was thus a modification of the Book of Discipline, without any departure from the principles on which it had been based, and the Church of Scotland was given a constitution which might be held to have a superficial resemblance to that of the Church of England, but which was in fact a modified or constitutional episcopacy which offered the reformers all they desired in ecclesiastical polity and which might, in an age inclined to compromise, have satisfied men of almost every opinion. The failure of the system was due in part to the abuse made of it by the nobles and by the bishops, many of whom were unworthy of the office, but mainly to the opportunity this abuse gave to a presbyterian party, which advocated a different system of government and claimed for it divine warrant.

1. B.U.K. I. 288.

2. Calderwood III. 272, 287-8, 303-4, 330, 341-2, 347, 358-9.

### Chapter 3.

#### The relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, c. 1560-1572.

The anglophil tendencies of the Scottish reform movement had been conspicuous, and there were the closest links between the reformers in the two countries. Several of the men who played an important part in the organisation of the reformed church in Scotland had served in the Church of England, and two of them were Englishmen. (1) On the other hand, Scotland had given preachers to England - John Rough, executed in 1557, John Mackbrair, Robert Richardson and William Keith. (2) Association in the work of reformation, and agreement on doctrine, resulted in a consciousness of common aims, and the fact that the achievement of these aims was almost simultaneous in the two countries had some significance for the reformers. Scotsmen thought of England as "of the same religion" as themselves, and (3) as having "enterprised like reformation of religion" with them, while Englishmen were happy to note the success of the

1. Cf. C.M.H. II. 591, and Hewat's Makers of the Scottish Church. Knox, Spottiswoode, John Douglas and William Harlaw had served in England; John Willock and Christopher Goodman were Englishmen who served in Scotland.
2. Knox, I. 187 note 1 (for Rough); the others, who were still alive in Elizabeth's reign, appear in Appendix A.
3. Knox, Works, I. 382, VI. 44.

(1)  
 reformation in Scotland. The ideas on forms of worship and forms of government which had appeared in England under Edward VI., and among English exiles in Mary's reign, were the common heritage of both churches.

The substantial agreement of the English and Scottish reformers on matters of polity has been indicated. We must recall particularly the freedom allowed to each church in the choice of a form of government, and the recognition that differences between an established and a persecuted church were appropriate. English churchmen had no hesitation about admitting the validity of orders conferred in Scotland, and did not insist on the reordination of Scottish ministers who

(2)  
 entered the Church of England, while the Scots on their side, although they possessed consistorial discipline and a system of government more democratic than the anglican, gave full recognition to the administrative and disciplinary system of the Church of England. That this was so is proved by the action of the general assembly in December 1563. A supplication

1. Z.L. I. 88, 109, 113, 116, 124, 140. The only jarring note is Parker's "God kepe us from such visitation as Knocks have attempted in Scotland, the peple to be orderers of thinges". (S.P. Dom. Eliz., VII. No.32; Parker, Correspondence, p. 105.) Dr. Davidson's paper on the influence of the English printers on the Scottish reformation (Scottish Church History Society I.) gives an account of less known contacts.

2. The only indisputable case is, of course, that of John Morrison (p. 14 supra), but it is unlikely that anglican orders were conferred on all, if any, of the Scottish ministers who crossed the border in the 'sixties and 'seventies. It may be significant that many of the Scots who held cures in the diocese of Durham were found in 1578 to have no licences, and one had no letters of orders. (See Appendix A.)

was received from a minister whose wife had deserted him and had fled to England, and it was decided that a letter should be sent to the archbishops of Canterbury and York asking them to cite the woman to appear before the superintendent of Lothian and the session of Edinburgh. On February 10 following, the letter was sent, in the names of Spottiswoode, Knox, and Craig, who enclosed a copy of the act of the assembly and intimated that they had been instructed to address those "whome God of his providence and mercie hath erected as principallies in ecclesiasticall jurisdiction within the realme of England".

(1)

They proceeded:

"We therefore, in the name of the eternall God, of his sonne Jesus Christe, and as ye desyre synne to be punisshed and us your fellow servants in Christe Jesus to serve you or any of you in the like case, moste humblie requyre you to cause your edicts to be published in all suche places as you know them to be expedient, chargeing the said Anne to comper . . . . Forther we moste humblie desyre you to remitte to us . . . your edicts or summondes duellie executed and indorsed in auctentike forme, whiche doing, as we doubt not you shall pleas the eternall God and discharge that part of youre godlie office, so shall you binde us to the like or greater service when soever it shall pleas you or any pastour within that realme to charge any of us".

Parker dutifully consulted Cecil. The archbishop was unwilling to accede to the request of the Scots, and was able to adduce several technical difficulties which justified this attitude, but he offered to act as the Scots wished if the Secretary

1. S.P.Scot. Eliz. VIII. No.78 (act of assembly), IX. No.9 (the letter); cf. C.S.P. II. No.44, 54.; Parker, Correspondence, p. 205 note 2, 205-7, 209.

thought such a step desirable. <sup>(1)</sup> Another proof that the Scots accepted the Church of England as one of the reformed churches is the indignation of the general assembly at the entry of Paul Methuen, a minister excommunicated for adultery, into the <sup>(2)</sup> "Ministrie of England".

Recognition of the Church of England bore fruit in the formulae adopted in 1572 for the first Scottish protestant episcopate, for they were almost identical with those used in England. Although some of the resemblances may be due simply to a common ancestry in pre-reformation formulae, nothing but deliberate imitation can account for the similarity between the two oaths of supremacy, and that there was borrowing from England in 1571 and 1572 is, in any case, proved by a comparison of a Scottish act of parliament (passed in January 1572/3) with the English statute 13 Eliz. cap. xii (April 1571), which imposed subscription to the thirty-nine articles on holders of benefices who had not been ordained by the reformed <sup>(3)</sup> ordinal. In the background to the preparation of the scheme for a Scottish episcopate there were, of course, elements which must have disposed men to borrow from England. The approximation of the government of the Church of Scotland to

1. Parker to Cecil, April 14, 1564. S.P. Dom. Eliz. XXXIII. No.56. Strype prints this letter, rather carelessly and inaccurately, in his Parker, I. 297-8.

2. Knox II. 471 note.

3. See Appendix B. for the two oaths of supremacy and the two statutes, with the identical passages indicated. The documents of the Scottish episcopate (Calderwood III. 163 et seq.) may be compared with Prothero, Documents, pp. 242-5.

that of the Church of England can hardly be viewed apart from the negotiations of the Scots with the English queen, whom they earnestly besought to "tak upoun hir the maintenance and protection of the trew religioun preached and established be law in baith the realmes"<sup>(1)</sup>. Nor can we ignore Elizabeth's ideas about the disposal of the Scottish bishoprics, for she suggested to the Scottish government that St. Andrews should be given to Morton and Glasgow to the Lennoxes.<sup>(2)</sup> There is, moreover, a hint of a direct connection between the genesis of the Leith episcopate and English thought on ecclesiastical polity. On December 14, 1571, Alexander Hay, clerk of the privy council,<sup>(3)</sup> wrote to John Knox from Leith:

"Thair hes bene some conference betwixt some of the Superintendentis and Ministeris, and my Lord Regentis grace, and the Counsell, for agriement in materis twiching the policie of the kirke and dispositioun of benefices. The mater is defferit till the viii of Januar.... Gif ye have with you the buike I sent unto yow when I come from England, intitulat Leges Ecclesiasticae Anglicanae, or Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum which is the worke of Johne Foxe, I will pray yow send the same to me with this beirar".

The Reformatio Legum, which had been published early in 1571,<sup>(4)</sup> contained, as we saw, a description of the "godly bishop", and its manner of dealing with the entire anglican organisation is one calculated to mollify opposition to such a system.

As soon as strong opposition to episcopacy appeared,

1. Warrender Papers (S.H.S.) I. 105 (November 1571).
2. Melville, Memoirs p. 236; H.M.C. MSS. of the Earl of Mar and Kellie, p. 27.
3. Knox VI. 608-12.
4. Strype, Parker II. 62.

the Scottish episcopate was branded as "conformity with England"<sup>(1)</sup>, and the Church of England itself was soon condemned by Scottish presbyterians. But in the few years during which the attempt was being made to stabilise the first protestant episcopate, there was a superficial resemblance between Scottish and English church government which justified the puritan Dering in grouping Scotland with France, Spain and Poland as countries in which the lordship of bishops was "at this day [1573] a swelling wound, full of corruption"<sup>(2)</sup>. Even in 1581, when the episcopate had almost ceased to be anything but a mere form, Robert Browne thought that there was no essential difference between the two countries in respect of church government, because Scotland "framed itself in those matters to please England too much"<sup>(3)</sup>.

It seemed for a time that the association of the English and Scottish reformers with each other, and their agreement on fundamentals, would find expression in a form of worship common to both countries. It has been proved that the introduction to Scotland of the second prayer book of Edward VI. was advocated by the lords of the congregation in 1557 and 1558, and that the book was used in some places in Scotland both

1. J. Melville, Diary, p. 45: "The Regent's meaning was to ... bring in a conformitie with England in governing of the Kirk be Bischopes and injunctiones".
2. Strype, Annals, II. i. 409.
3. Burrage, True Story of Robert Browne, p. 15; Browne, True and Short Declaration, (reprint of 1882), p. 21.

before the reformation was effected and for a short time afterwards. When the Book of Discipline was drawn up, copies of the Genevan service book had already made their way into Scotland, but it is unlikely that they were numerous, as no edition was printed in Scotland until 1562. Decrees of the general assembly, in 1562 and 1564, prescribed the Book of Common Order (i.e., the Scottish edition of the Genevan book), at first for the sacraments, and then for "prayers" as well, but do not appear to have succeeded in altogether displacing the Edwardian liturgy. Over the character of the Book of Common Order, which was in general substituted for the English prayer book, there has been some controversy. It is true that this book does not in every case prescribe forms as definitely as the anglican book, for it contains such directions as "the minister useth this confession or like in effect", and "the

1. The best account of the identification of the Edwardian prayer book with the "common prayers" desired by the Scottish reformers is in Wotherspoon's introduction to the Church Service Society's edition of the second prayer book of Edward VI. (1905). MacMillan's The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church adds little or nothing. On May 27, 1560, the vicar of Lintrathin claimed that "he has been provided in the said vicarage for divers years bygone, and has caused the common prayers and homilies to be read weekly to the parishioners" (H.M.C. Report II., appendix p. 187.)

2. I.e., the book used by the English congregation at Geneva.

3. Knox II. 186; MacMillan, op. cit. pp. 42.

4. B.U.K. I. 30, 54; MacMillan, op. cit. pp. 43-7.

Dr. MacMillan ingeniously argues that the prescription of the Genevan book did not rule out of the use of prayers from the English book, owing to the degree of freedom allowed by the former.

minister prayeth for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit as the same shall move his heart". On the other hand, there was less liberty than some writers have believed, for certain prayers seem to have been intended to be invariable, there was provision for the use of the Lord's prayer and the creed, and ministers were sometimes commanded to adhere to the order set down in the book.

Similarity of practice extended to many points in which the churches have since come to differ most markedly. Following on Calvin's pronouncements, Knox intended Holy Communion to be celebrated once a month, and, although this proved impracticable, there was no intention that celebration oftener than four times a year should be almost unknown, or that in many parishes there should be celebrations only twice yearly. In both intention and practice there was probably little difference from England, where celebrations were comparatively rare, sometimes as few as three in a year. In the Church of Scotland, communicants sat when they received the Sacrament, but there is ample evidence that kneeling was far from being established throughout the whole of England, and that many of those who were persuaded to kneel would have preferred to sit or stand. The use of

1. E.g., McCrie, Knox, edn. 1874 p. 368.

2. MacMillan, op. cit. pp. 64-9.

3. Choisy, La Théocratie à Genève, pp. 13, 236.

4. MacMillan, op. cit. p. 191.

5. V.C.H. London I. 319, 325.

6. Gee, The Elizabethan Prayer Book, p. 179; Hooker, Works, III. 573; McCrie, Knox, edn. 1874 p. 61 note; V.C.H. London I. 319, 325.

unleavened bread, which had been prescribed in England by the injunctions of 1559, and which became one of the grievances of the puritans,<sup>(1)</sup> appears to have survived from pre-reformation times in some parts of Scotland.<sup>(2)</sup> The Church of England did not at that time countenance higher sacerdotal claims than the Church of Scotland did - a form of absolution appeared in the Knoxian communion office, and the forms given by the Book of Common Order for passing sentence of excommunication and for absolving from such a sentence imply that the minister has authority to act in the name of Jesus Christ, so that he seemed to possess "a priestly power greater than that allowed by any contemporary book of the Church of England".<sup>(3)</sup> Although the Book of Discipline and subsequent ordinances condemned the observance of holy days, a calendar of festivals accompanied the editions of the Book of Common Order published in 1564 and subsequent years.<sup>(4)</sup> Lent was observed, and Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays throughout the year were fast days - abstinence from flesh was, as in England, enforced for economic reasons.<sup>(5)</sup>

1. Z.L. II. 121.

2. MacMillan, op. cit. p. 199.

3. MacMillan, op. cit. pp. 39 note 3, 337-8, where the form of absolution from excommunication is printed.

4. ib. 305-6. In a paper published by the Scottish Church History Society (vol. III), MacMillan gives his main conclusions on the observance of the Christian year in Scotland in this period. Cf. Cowan, Bibliography of the Book of Common Order, pp. 61-2.

5. MacMillan, op. cit. pp. 324-5; Knox II. 370 note; Frere, English Church under Elizabeth and James I. p. 101. In the Morton MSS. (N.L.S.), vol. v, fol. 70, there is a licence, dated 1585, allowing Lady Lochleven to eat flesh in Lent and on Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays. Cf. Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1573-89, p. 13, for a proclamation of 1574 forbidding the sale and consumption of flesh on Fridays and Saturdays.

Whatever may have been the legal position with regard to "ornaments", there is no doubt that anglican churches were then extremely bare, with little furniture except a pulpit and a "holy table" which was taken out into the chancel, or even into the nave, for celebrations of Holy Communion. They must have differed only slightly from those of Scotland. A few minor points illustrate the similarity between the two churches in that period - many years elapsed before the use of the surplice<sup>(1)</sup> was established in England, and black gowns were common; organs may have been used in Scotland, and they were used only very seldom in England;<sup>(2)</sup> kneeling had not given way to standing or sitting as the posture during prayer in the Church of Scotland.<sup>(3)</sup>

In liturgical matters, as in polity, the ideas of English and Scottish churchmen minimised the importance of the differences between the churches. It was universally held that each reformed church could, within certain limits, establish<sup>(4)</sup> (or abolish) rites as it chose, and, consequently, no church could censure another for its form of worship. In an established church, the magistrate, acting as head of the church, made the laws on these matters, and opinions of ecclesiastics might carry little weight. This was so in England, where the majority

1. Frere, op. cit. p. 186.

2. MacMillan, op. cit. pp. 95-99. In 1566 it could be said in England that "the use of organs is becoming more general" (Z.L. I. 164).

3. MacMillan, op. cit. p. 151.

4. Troubles at Frankfort, ed. Arber, p. 226 (the opinion of the Frankfort Church in 1559); Cardwell, Documentary Annals, I. 264 (declaration of Parker in 1559); article thirty-four of the XXXIX.; First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. (Parker Society) pp. 157, 199.

of churchmen were in favour of a close approximation to the practices of the continental reformed churches, and "the only obstacle in the way of a completely and consistently reformed church, was Elizabeth herself"<sup>(1)</sup>. It was not only those usually called "puritans" (i.e., men unwilling to conform), who regarded the Elizabethan settlement as a "cloaked papistry" and favoured such demands for the abolition of ceremonies as those which were so nearly passed by the convocation of 1563. There was truth in the puritans' boast that the majority of the bishops would be glad to see further reformation, and endured rather than welcomed the ritual which they used.<sup>(2)</sup> The Frankfort "anglicans",<sup>(3)</sup> a party which included Cox, the typical conformer, as well as Grindal, usually reckoned a puritan, attached so little importance to private baptism, confirmation, festivals, kneeling as the posture for communicants, and the surplice, that they relinquished them because they were regarded as offensive and inconvenient.<sup>(4)</sup> After Elizabeth's accession, some of the new bishops contended for the removal of certain ceremonies, but decided, despite their dissatisfaction, not to desert the church.<sup>(5)</sup> The reasons which the conformers gave for their attitude are never based on a justification of the rites and usages which

1. Pierce, Penry, p. 313; cf. C.M.H. II. 590, and Usher, Reconstruction of the English Church, I. 1.

2. Puritan Manifestoes, p. 65.

3. Cf. McCrie, Knox, edn. 1874, pp. 59, 62-3, 356. Grindal and Horn opposed organs, baptism by women, the interrogation of infants, the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling at Holy Communion. (Z.L. I. 178).

4. Troubles at Frankfort, p. 77.

5. Z.L. I. 169.

they defended. Parkhurst declared that if men had the wheat<sup>(1)</sup> they should not complain of the chaff which accompanied it - hardly the language of an enthusiast. Grindal said to the puritans who were brought before him in 1567: "You see mee weare a coape or a surplesse in Pawles, I had rather minister without these things, but for orders sake and obedience to the Prince"<sup>(2)</sup>. He also repeated an argument which had been used by the anglican party at Frankfort - loyalty to the martyrs<sup>(3)</sup> who, it might be said, had died for the prayer book. It seems to be a justifiable conclusion that the main difference between puritans and conformers in the early years of Elizabeth's reign lay less in opinions on the ceremonies at issue than in the degree of obedience which they were prepared to offer to "the prince".

In Scotland there was no "godly prince" to impose his, (or her) will, and the reformation there took the course which it would, presumably, have taken in England also had there been no state interference. But, although opposition to the<sup>(4)</sup> anglican liturgy was strenuous, there are indications that it was not unanimous, and that some Scots would have welcomed

1. Strype, Annals, II. i. 165.

2. Parte of a Register, p. 32.

3. ib. p. 24; Troubles at Frankfort, p. 38.

4. John Lesley, History (Bannatyne Club), p. 292; C.S.P. I. 603: "the lyttle brute that hathe byne here of late, that thys Quene is advised by the Cardinall to imbrace the religion of Englande, makethe them rounne allmoste wylde; of the which theie bothe saye and preache, that yt is lyttle better then when yt was at the worste" (February, 1561/2).

the adoption of the English prayer book. On August 25, 1560,  
 (1)  
 Randolph wrote to Cecil:

"I have tawlked of late with them all, to serche their opynions howe a uniformitye myght be had in religion in bothe these realmes. Theie seme wyllinge that yt so were, maynie commodyties are alleged that myght insue therof. Howbeyt I fynde them so severe in that theie professe, and so lothe to remytte any thyng of that that theie have receaved, that I se lyttle hope therof. With other I have dealte more liberally, then with them. Theie fynde yt so expedyent that there shall lacke no goodwyll in them therunto".

A few years later, Maitland of Lethington remarked that he did not "prayse the precisenes off soche as do mak everything a mater off conscience (off which nombre ther ar to many in both realmes)" (2). It seems that for the extremists in Scotland even the Book of Common Order was not pure enough, and it is just possible that, parallel with the movement which sought the abolition of episcopacy and the establishment of parity, there was, in Scotland as in England, a movement aimed at the removal from the liturgy of all remnants of catholic practice. The form given by the Book of Common Order for the visitation of the sick fell into disuse - probably it had never been popular; the "rehersing of the beleefe", i.e., the use of the creed, was abandoned; and the term "godfather" was displaced by that of "witness" (3). Clearly, it would be rash to assert that there was a radical divergence between prevalent opinion in Scotland

1. S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. v. No.16; cf. C.S.P. I. No.891, and Foreign Calendar, 1560-1561, No.454.
2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. x, No. 26; cf. C.S.P. II. No.156.
3. Wodrow MSS. fol. vol. XLIV. No. 24. (temp. Charles I.)

and that in England, until the second decade after the reformation, when polity became an issue and the importance of all differences was magnified. The strengthening in Scotland of antagonism to the English liturgy was, of course, contemporaneous with the development in England of a strong attachment to it which had been absent in the early part of Elizabeth's reign.

It is, then, arguable that the state of opinion in Scotland was not contrary to that in England, and that the differences between the two churches were due mainly to political conditions. How far is this view consistent with what we know of the attitude of the chief Scottish reformer, John Knox ? His most serious grievance against the Church of England in 1553, 1555, and 1559, had been the lack of effective discipline.<sup>(1)</sup> In later years, this complaint is not heard, and Knox, as a signatory to the letter sent to the archbishops in February, 1563/4, must have found it possible to take the view that discipline was provided in England by the episcopal courts.<sup>(2)</sup> He had strong objections to the anglican communion office, which he refused to use at Frankfort,<sup>(3)</sup> but that he regarded the rest of the prayer book more favourably is shown by his approval of the Frankfort "liturgy of compromise", compiled mainly from the Edwardian book,<sup>(4)</sup> and

1. Knox III. 85<sup>x</sup> - 86<sup>x</sup>, V. 519-20; Troubles at Frankfort, pp. 55, 65.

2. Cf. p. 70 supra.

3. Troubles at Frankfort, p. 42.

4. MacMillan, op. cit. p. 53 and note 1.

by his use of the anglican arrangement of the psalter until the end of his life.<sup>(1)</sup> In his dislike of the vestments, of kneeling at Holy Communion, and of the sign of the cross in Baptism, Knox was in agreement with many English bishops, and when he "gave the cross and candles a wipe", his opinions, although not his way of expressing them, were identical with those of his old enemy Cox, the typical anglican. In his letters to Anna Locke, which contain his most violent attacks on the Church of England,<sup>(2)</sup> Knox was carried away by his love for forcible expression, and condemned the Elizabethan settlement in the light of the state of affairs he had known under Edward VI.<sup>(3)</sup> His bitterness at this time is partly explained by the English queen's attitude to him, and his more considered opinions are deducible from his relations with the nonconforming party in England.<sup>(4)</sup> He penned the letter of 1566, which was in tone respectful and persuasive, not denunciatory, and which did not suggest that the burdensome ritual should be abandoned. The English puritans who appealed to the Scotsman were answered by a severe censure on their decision to desert the

1. MacMillan, op. cit. p. 43.

2. Knox VI. 12-13, 30.

3. In the letter of April 5, 1559 (Works VI. 12-3), he wrote: "Your sacraments wer ministred, for the most part, without the soul, and be those who to Christ Jesus wer no true ministers; and God grant that so yet they be not. Without the soule, I say, they wer ministred, becaus they wer ministred without the Word trulie and openlie preached". Several months later, Knox admitted that he had not yet seen the Elizabethan prayer book (ib. 83).

4. p. ~~supra~~, p. 86 infra.

(1)

church, and by advice quite inconsistent with the fiery language which Knox had used in a letter to Anna Locke a few years earlier:

(2)

"One jote, I say, of these Diabolicall inventiouns viz. Crossing in Baptisme; Kneeling at the Lord's table; mummelling or singing of the Letanie, a fulgure et tempestate a subitanea et improvisa morte, etc., will I never counsell any man to use".

Knox's attitude to the English puritans in 1566 is, however, in keeping with the most careful exposition he ever gave of his views on the acceptance of the authority of a "godly prince". In a letter written to the congregation of Berwick in 1552, he explained his own opinions on kneeling at Holy Communion, and

(3)

proceeded:

"But because I am but one, having in my contrair magistrates, commone order, and judgements of manye lerned, I am not mynded for maintenance of that one thing to gainstand the magistrates, in all other and cheif poynts of religioun aggreing with Christ and with his true doctrine, nor yet to break nor trouble common order, thoughtmeet to be kept in unitie and peace in the congregatiouns for a time".

He declared that if certain safeguards, to obviate superstition, were introduced, he would bear "that one thing" with patience,

1. The substance of his reply to the first letter of the secessionists must be gathered from the references made to it in their second letter (Lorimer, pp. 298-300): "I cannot allow those that obstinately do refuse to hear the message of salvation at such men's mouths as please not us in all things .... Paul was offended with Peter and 'sharply rebuked him, but for all that he dissuaded none of his auditors from his preaching .... I wish your consciences had a better ground.... God forbid that we should damn all for false prophets and heretics that agree not with us in our apparel and other opinions, that teacheth the substance of doctrine and salvation in Christ Jesus".
2. Knox VI. 12.
3. Lorimer, pp. 251-65; cf. Hume Brown, Knox, I. 133-4.

"daylie thirsting and calling unto God for reformation of that and others". Can we be certain that Knox, in Grindal's place, would not have conformed? Much history might have been different had he found a godly magistrate in Scotland.

The actual contacts between the churches in the period 1560 to 1572 reflect the conditions which have been described. That polity was not yet an issue is proved by the entire absence of any reference to it as a factor differentiating the churches, and proofs have been given of the full recognition which each church accorded to the other. The liturgical differences, slight though they were, prepared the way for a departure from the cordial friendship which as yet marked the official relations between the churches. In other circumstances these differences might have been of no importance, but in the decade after 1560, when there was in England a struggle over vestments and the liturgy, the Scottish reformed church came to be linked with the party in the Church of England which was dissatisfied with Elizabeth's settlement of religion. In the matters at issue, Scotland was a model to the English nonconformists; they regarded the Church of Scotland with affection, and the Scots on their side showed some disposition to assist the English puritans.

When the vestiarian controversy became fierce, Scotland was filled with rumours which inflamed opinion against the English government. "Their flye daylye almoste",

(1)

wrote Randolph to Cecil, "so maynie postes and pacquetts lyke fowles in the Aier, that bringe suche newes and reportes unto thys Countrie owte of your Courte, that theie that willinglye beleeeve anye thyng that of England is evle spoken lack nowe no matter to clatter at their pleasure, to adde to or augmente whatsomever that theie cane invent. The fyrste tale is thys, that the Q. majestie reproved openlye the preacher and willed hym to retorne to his texte or holde his peace. The nexte that her majestie for iii dayes togyther wore a payre of beades with a crucifyx hanginge at them. The thyrd that Bonar in his defence at his arraynement said that ther was never a lawfull Bysshope in England, which so astonysed a greate number of the best lerned that yet theie knowe not what answer to gyve hym, and whear it was determined he sholde have suffered, he is remitted to the place from whens he came, and no more saide unto hym. Yt hathe byne so maynie tymes tolde me that all England was in an uprore upon the controversies of cappes tippes etc. that openlye I am fayne to reprove as maynie as speak of yt". The earl of Moray and Maitland of Lethington, although not men inclined to favour extremists, from whom, indeed, they expressly dissociated themselves, felt impelled to write to Leicester and Cecil. They pointed out that the stigma of "papistrie" was attached to the vestments, and urged that men actively engaged in worthy labours should not be

1. March 30, 1565. S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. X. No.31; cf.  
C.S.P. II. No. 161.

(1)  
bound to them. Randolph agreed with the views of the Scottish politicians; he wrote to Cecil supporting them, and gave additional reasons against the expediency of the English government's attitude. Blame would attach to Leicester and Cecil themselves, he argued, and the prevalence in England of (2)  
apparently Romish tendencies would encourage Mary.

The opinion of the Scottish church was officially formulated in a letter from "The Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of Kirks within the realme of Scotland, to there brethren the Bischops and pastours of Ingland, who hes renounced the Romane Antichryst, and does professe with them the Lord Jesus in sinceritie". While professing to eschew argument, the letter does give an opinion against the vestments, but its central theme is a plea for moderation and for charity towards tender consciences, and there is no suggestion that (3)  
those who wish to use the vestments should lay them aside. Spottiswoode was justified in remarking that this letter shows "in what esteem our reformers did hold the Church of England, and how far they were from accounting the government thereof (4)  
antichristian". It seems that the bearer of the letter was to

1. March 13, 1564/5. S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. X. No. 26; cf. C.S.P. II. No. 156.

2. See note to previous page.

3. The letter is printed by Calderwood (II. 332), Neal (History of the Puritans V. vi), Lorimer (John Knox and the Church of England p. 225), in the Acts of the General Assemblies (B.U.K.) I. 84, and elsewhere. The copy in Lorimer is the best.

4. Spottiswoode II. 44.

be none other than John Knox, who intended to visit England at this time to see his sons, who were at school there. At a session on December 27, 1566, the general assembly acceded to the request of Knox, who was present, for permission to visit England, and provided him with a testimonial which was addressed "to all and sundrie faithfull brethren to whose knowledge thir presents sall come" and which set down Knox's reasons for visiting England as "the naturall love and affectioun he beares to his childrein, now being within the realme of England, and favour to uthers his brethren". In the records of the assembly, this testimonial is followed by the letter to the Church of England, which Knox was commanded to draft, and then by accounts of further business, still in the same session. That Knox was intended to carry the letter seems to be the only possible explanation of the absence from it of his signature, but there is no evidence that he carried out the projected visit to England.<sup>(1)</sup> The records of this same assembly seem to indicate that the moderate attitude officially adopted by the Scottish church was not in accord with the feeling of some individuals, for a committee was appointed to "reconsider and revise the answer made be Mr. William Ramsay, one of the masters of Sanct Salvators Colledge [St. Andrews] to Henrie Bullinger's book anent abulziements [i.e., habiliments] of

1. B.U.K. I. 84-88; cf. Spottiswoode, II. 44, and Lorimer, op. cit. pp. 228-9.

(1)  
 preachers in England". The work of Bullinger referred to was,  
 presumably, The iudgement of H. Bullinger declaring it lawful  
 (2)  
to wear the apparel, and, as Ramsay's work was an "answer" to  
 Bullinger's views, expressed in the title of his book, it  
 probably urged non-compliance with the vestiarian requirements  
 of the English authorities. It would thus be censured by the  
 assembly because its standpoint conflicted with that  
 officially expressed.

A very close connection with Scotland appears in the  
 history of the puritans who, in 1566, decided to secede from  
 the Church of England. (3)  
 There seems to be no valid reason for  
 regarding this group as "congregationalists"; the distinction  
 between "congregationalism" and "presbyterianism" emerged very  
 slowly, and, in any case, a single congregation cannot easily  
 be classified in the light of principles applicable mainly to  
 the organisation of churches throughout a country. The  
 characteristics of those early separatists which are  
 indisputable, and which alone are relevant, were simply a  
 detestation of the established liturgy and ritual, and a  
 desire for consistorial discipline and for democratic  
 government in the church. The Church of Scotland was thus,

1. B.U.K. I. 90. Ramsay's work, if printed, does not  
 appear to have survived.
2. S.T.C. 4063.
3. The best accounts of these separatists are in Burrage,  
The Early English Dissenters, I. 80-82, II. 9-13, and  
 Peel, The First Congregational Churches, pp. 6-19.

(1)

as they asserted, their ideal, partly because, as one of the "best reformed churches", it had "the word truly preached, the sacraments truly ministred, and discipline according to the

(2)

Word of God", and partly because its Book of Common Order was virtually the Genevan service book, which they wished to use.

(3)

When their conventicle was broken up (for the second time),

on March 4th, 1567/8, some of them were thrown into prison,

where they remained for over a year, while others, who remained

(4)

at liberty, went to Scotland. There they met Knox, and

received a measure of encouragement from him, but they were, on

the whole, dissatisfied with conditions in Scotland, for they

found that Romish practices had not been entirely stamped out,

and they soon returned to England, drawing from Grindal the

apt comment: "The Church of Scotland will not be pure enough for

our men. They are a wilful company. God grant them humble

(5)

spirits". Knox had now formulated in a letter his considered

judgment of their attitude, and they found in this a further

disappointment, for he advocated mutual forbearance, and

(6)

condemned secession. The Church of Scotland, it was clear, was

1. They wrote to Knox: "We desire no other order than you hold", in the letter printed by Lorimer, pp. 298-300.

2. Grindal, Remains, p. 214.

3. Burrage and Peel agree in identifying the congregation discovered in the Plumber's Hall in June 1567 with this congregation.

4. Strype (Grindal, p. 179), suggests that the government encouraged them to go to Scotland, and provided letters of introduction to distinguished Scots. Cecil, at any rate, knew a good deal about the visit, as Grindal's letter to him (Grindal, Remains, pp. 295-6) shows.

5. Grindal, Remains, pp. 295-6.

6. Lorimer, pp. 298-300, cf. p. 83 supra. Peel (First Congregational Churches, p. 17) suggests that Knox gave his visitors a sealed letter, which they carried to England.

not yet committed to an alliance with English nonconformists. <sup>(1)</sup>

The main body of puritans who, while unwilling to conform, did not contemplate secession, included men (for instance, Whittingham, Goodman and Humphrey) who had met Knox in England or on the continent and who had taken an interest in the fortunes of the Scottish church after 1560. <sup>(2)</sup> Their admiration for the form of worship established in Scotland was revealed when the English government suggested that Mary should accept the anglican prayer book as a condition of English help towards her restoration. Their spokesman was Sir Francis Knollys, who had himself been at Frankfort, and whose indignation now led him to a violent outburst. He said to Herries, who had presented to Mary the proposal of the English government, "that yff he ment therbye to condempne the forme

1. The identity of Knox's correspondents with the secessionists who had recently visited Scotland is almost certain, and is accepted by Peel, op. cit. A man named Evans was among the visitors to Scotland (Grindal, Remains, loc. cit.), and a man of this name was one of the members of the congregation discovered in March 1567/8 who were not imprisoned, except possibly for a short time. (Burrage, op. cit., I. 82, II. 10.) The writer of the letter to Knox refers to a recent interview with his correspondent, and to "our departure from you". There is no chronological difficulty. The congregation was broken up on March 4; the puritans were in Scotland (at Dunbar) on Good Friday (April 16); they had returned to England before May 8, when Grindal reported their return to Cecil; the letter to Knox, in reply to his letter, was written after news of Mary's escape from Lochleven (May 2) had reached England, but before the writer had heard of the battle of Langside (May 13).
2. Goodman, as we shall see, was in Scotland from 1559 to 1565. Laurence Humphrey wrote to Knox when the regent Moray was assassinated. (Calderwood VIII. 182.)

and order of comon prayer nowe used in Skotland, agreable with  
 divers well reformed churches in Germany, Swyserland, France,  
 and in Savoye, and that withall he wold reject and adnichilate  
 the confession of faythe acknoleged in Skotland by parlament,  
 bycawse there is no sotch confession of faythe acknoleged  
 by parlament in Ynglond, or that yf he ment to expell all  
 the lerned preachers in Skotland yf they wold not return back  
 to receave and wayr cornerd cappes and typpets with surpless  
 and coopes, which they have left by order contynually synce  
 theyr fyrst receuving of the gospell into the realme: then how  
 so ever he ment to further religion hereby ... he myght bryng  
 the substance of religion in peryll<sup>(1)</sup>". Herries replied "that  
 in cities and townes where lerned preachers remained, he  
 allowed very well of that forme and order of comon prayer and  
 preaching now used in Skotland, but in the cuntries where  
 lerned men were lackyng ... the forme of comon prayer in  
 Ynglond was better to be allowed in his judgement", and with  
 this view Knollys agreed.<sup>(2)</sup> Knollys had afterwards to try to  
 explain away his statements as having been prompted merely by  
 the fear that attacks on the practice of the Scottish church  
 would open a way to Romanism:<sup>(3)</sup>

1. Cotton MSS., Caligula C. I., f. 177; cf. C.S.P. vol. II.  
 No. 743. (July 28, 1568.)

2. ib.

3. Knollys to Cecil, August 8th., 1568, S.P. (Mary, Queen  
 of Scots) vol. I. No. 34; cf. C.S.P. II. No. 757.

"As towching the fawte that is fownde with me at the cowrte uppon a gathered exposition owte of my letter, that my commending the Religious usage in Skotland after the forme of Geneva, did so moche disalowe the formularye of Ynglond, as thereby I myght hynder this Queen's disposition to ymbrace this forme of Ynglond, and gyve hyr rather occasion by myslyking of bothe, to rest in hyr owlde, which hyr majestie thinketh very prejudiciall to the purpose which she intendethe: wherunto I answer that it is an easye matter for the cowrte of Ynglond to fynd a fawlte with me beyng a symple poore man, especyally when racked expositions are made of my letters to frame a fawlte therbye, for I commended not the forme of Geneva before the forme of Ynglond: But indede this Queen understode me rightlie and so did my L. Herrys lykewyse, how so ever he makes religion to serve his pollicye, for they understode me, that under sotch a rygorous condemnation of the forme of Geneva myght be browght into Skotland that all the lerned men off Skotland that have conscience therin myght therby be banished or put to sylence, and they beyng so defaced, a hye waye shold be open unto papistraye".

This apologia does not actually account for the admiration of the Scottish church so emphatically expressed by Knollys, or for his bitter remark about "cornerd cappes and typpets", and his point of view remains essentially different from that of Herries, who could say "for the Religioun I wish it in my heart to be in Scotland as it is heir"<sup>(1)</sup>.

That Scotland's position as a model to the English nonconformists was grasped by Elizabeth seems to be shown by her reply to the Spanish ambassador when, in May 1566, he spoke to her about the extent of nonconformity. "She said that those who had disobeyed were certain ministers, not

1. Herries to Cecil, July 28th., 1568, S.P. (Mary, Queen of Scots) vol. I. No. 29; C.S.P. II. No. 740.

natives of the country, but Scotsmen, whom she had ordered to be punished<sup>(1)</sup> - a remark set in its true light by F.W.Maitland's comment: "Literal truth she was not telling, and yet there was a sort of truth in her words"<sup>(2)</sup>. The English queen probably realised that the introduction of the prayer book into Scotland would weaken the English puritan party. The only indication that her distrust of Scotland may have been shared by some English churchmen is a passage in John Lesley's diary which states that in 1571 bishop Cox regarded Goodman and Knox as puritans - but mainly on account of their political opinions.<sup>(3)</sup>

Scotland was a model in its possession of consistorial discipline as well as in liturgical matters. The secessionists of 1566 had noticed that "discipline according to the word of God" was one of the marks of the Scottish reformed church.<sup>(4)</sup> In 1572 the authors of the Admonition to Parliament asked: "Is discipline meete for Scotland ? and is it unprofitable for this Realme ?"<sup>(5)</sup> When Whitgift replied to them : "England is not bound to the example either of France or Scotland", Cartwright's retort was a justification of the tendency, so notable in puritanism, to imitate foreign churches:<sup>(6)</sup>

1. Cal. S.P. Spanish, 1558-67, p. 553.
2. C.M.H. II. 590.
3. Bannatyne Miscellany III. 143.
4. Grindal, Remains, p. 214.
5. Puritan Manifestoes, p. 19.
6. Whitgift, Works, III. 316.

"M. Doctor would bring us into a foolish paradise of ourselves, as though we need not to learn anything at the churches of France and Scotland.... Whereas he would privily pinch at the reformation there, forsomuch as the Lord hath humbled the one, and exerciseth the other by civil wars and troubles, he should have, instead of rocking us asleep in our security, put us in remembrance of God's scourges which hang over us".

(1)

Particulars are given elsewhere of several Scottish preachers who crossed the border in the decade 1560-70, but reference may be made here to two Englishmen who took a prominent part in the work of the Scottish church in the same period. Christopher Goodman, after collaborating with Knox at Geneva, returned from the continent in September 1559 and settled in Scotland, where he became minister first of Ayr and then of St. Andrews. The emphatic puritanism of his opinions is revealed in a letter he wrote to Cecil on October 26, 1559: (2)

"I thoght it my duty to advertise you ... of soche things that offended me and wounded the herts of the godly whiles I abode in England ... As by permittinge and retencinge divers monuments of superstition and som of them abolished in the dais of godly kinge Edward. As for example, crosses and candells wyche (as I am informed) are placed upon the Lord's table, and that in the Quene hir graces chapell. Also the byindinge of ministers to papists aparrell: pluralities of benefices: non residences: makinge of lordly byshops before the realm be provided of necessarie ministers: observation of saints days: chaungeinge of comon bread in the Lord's Supper to a plaine wafer cake: Taking forthe of youre letanie the necessary praier against the Romishe Antichrist: putting unto a new kind of procession for the rogatione weeke: commandinge this only order in all places to be used: And last (wyche stykethe moche in the harts of many) the suffringe of thes bloody byshops and knowne murtherars of gods peeple, and youre deare brethren, to lyve".

1. Appendix A.

2. S.P. Scot, Eliz. vol. i. No. 122; cf. C.S.P. I. No. 554, and Foreign Calendar, 1559-60, p. 62.

The Scottish reformed church was Goodman's spiritual home, as he told Cecil in this same letter:

"Constrened by sondrie injuries done to me in my native contre, where I hoped (especially in thes days) for libertie to serve in my vocation: I now am and have bene in thes parties of Scotland, the space of six weeks and more, where my labors, everywhere at home rejected, ar (praised be God) in sondry places desyred and thankfully receved .... the lyke thyrst and zeale to God's holy word and promotinge of Chryst his kingdom, is not amongst you as were to be wysshed, and as is found in thys peple of latere callinge [i.e., the Scots]".

When Goodman returned to England in 1565, he must have carried with him the conviction that the Scottish church was preferable to the English, and his views, being those of a well known man, may have been influential. Scotsmen did not forget Goodman, for it was to him that John Davidson was advised to (1) apply when he fled from Scotland in 1574; and Goodman did not forget Scotland, for in 1570 he wrote to Knox expressing (2) grief at the death of the regent Moray, and ten years later Randolph informed Leicester that Goodman desired to visit his (3) former home. The other Englishman who laboured in Scotland in the 'sixties was John Willock, who retained his parsonage of Loughborough (Leicestershire) while he was superintendent of (4) Glasgow. Willock paid a visit to England between 1565 and

1. Calderwood VIII. 200; see chapter 6.

2. ib. II. 546.

3. S.P. Dom. Eliz. vol. cxliv. No. 34; cf. Cal. S. P. Dom. 1547-80, p. 688.

4. On May 29, 1562, he wrote to Cecil asking him to use his influence to secure his continued tenure of the benefice. S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. vii, No. 48; cf. C.S.P. I. No. 1108.

1568, and, returning there finally in 1569, lived at  
 Loughborough until his death in 1585. Like Goodman, he wrote  
 to Knox on the occasion of Moray's death.

1. Knox VI. 445-6; B.U.K. I. 123; H.M.C. Hastings MSS.  
 I. 81.

2. Knox VI. 446 and note, 572 note. There is not sufficient  
 evidence to make possible the identification of Willock  
 with the puritan of that name who was accused by John  
 Aylmer in 1576 of refusing to wear the surplice and of  
 administering the Communion with the communicants  
 standing. (Add. MSS. 29,546, f. 56 verso). The Lincoln  
 Record Society's The State of the Church, vol. I. shows  
 two other priests named Willock in the county of  
 Leicester and diocese of Lincoln.

3. Calderwood II. 546.

## SECTION II.

### THE RISE OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

In 1572 it must have seemed unlikely that the amicable relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland would be interrupted. The political position of the Scottish church, and its constitution, were coming into line with those of the Church of England, and would probably make it possible for Morton, with his enthusiasm for "conformity with England" to prevent the incipient Scottish sympathy with English puritanism from causing friction. It was inconceivable that within a few years a Scottish cleric would be censured for giving the English bishops the right hand of fellowship and that a Scottish general assembly would condemn the government of the Church of England as antichristian.<sup>(1)</sup> That such a forecast was in fact illusory is explained by the appearance of new ideas on church government which endangered the new constitution of the Scottish church before it could become stable, and interrupted the tendency of the Church of Scotland to approximate to that of England. These new ideas, in some respects contradictory to those of the reformers, and in every respect more clearly defined, had been first expressed, probably, by Theodore Beza, a man far more intransigent than

1. J. Melville, Diary, p. 141; Calderwood VI. 3.

the earlier Swiss theologians. They were introduced into England and Scotland by men whom the Genevan had inspired, and were received by a considerable number of enthusiasts in both countries, largely, perhaps, because they seemed to offer remedies for the many undeniable abuses which at the time appeared to be inherent in the existing system. In each country a vigorous party demanded that there should be absolute parity among ministers and that the church should be governed by a hierarchical system of courts. Attempts to defend the existing constitution against the onslaughts of the presbyterians necessitated the formulation of arguments antagonistic to theirs and equally dogmatic. When this process was complete, by about 1590, the two parties stood arrayed against each other.<sup>(1)</sup>

1. The association with each party of certain tenets on liturgical matters - an association which, although familiar to us, had no necessary connection with the controversy over polity - came more gradually, for objection to all prescript forms of prayer did not appear until the seventeenth century, and it was not until after 1700 that the Scottish episcopalians finally adopted a liturgy.

#### Chapter 4.

##### The aims and sources of the presbyterian movement.

The principal tenets of presbyterianism were the absolute equality of pastors and the necessity of consistorial discipline. Since superiority could not be conceded even for order's sake, and individuals could not be permitted to perform disciplinary functions, it followed that the church had to be governed by a concentric system of courts or councils - first the congregational consistory or kirk session (not itself necessarily presbyterian, and differing from the other bodies in being usually the court of a single church), secondly the presbytery, classis, or colloquy, then the provincial synod, and finally the national or general assembly. A claim was advanced that this form of government had been ordained for the church by her Founder, and had existed in apostolic and primitive times. The differences between the presbyterian programme and the reformation ideals are obvious. There was no place in the new scheme for the "godly bishop", who, for no other reason than his superiority, was as detestable to the presbyterians as the pre-reformation prelates, with their many faults, had been to the reformers. The assertion that the presbyterian system was prescribed in the scriptures, especially after it was countered by a corresponding claim for episcopacy, rendered impossible the continued recognition of the right of each church to organize itself in its own way, for polity was

elevated to the rank of a dogma, The prominence given to the eldership as the only valid means of discipline put an end to the distinction formerly made between established and persecuted churches. The conflict, in this particular, between the old ideas and the new emerged in the dispute between

(1)  
Withers and Erastus in 1568, and was an important feature in the controversy between puritans and conformers in England. (2)

The adoption of consistorial discipline by churches which were not persecuted would have seemed odd to most of the reformers, but it was the course advocated by the English presbyterians, and they were glad to point to the Scottish church as an example of the existence of consistories under a "godly prince". (3)

It is important to note that the assertion of divine right for the presbyterian system preceded, and at least in part occasioned, the corresponding claim made for episcopacy.

In England the defenders of the establishment were for many

(4)  
years content simply to deny that there was any divinely appointed form of church government, and some of them even admitted that the system advocated by their opponents had the better claim to be considered apostolic. (5) The contention that

1. Cf. Figgis, Divine Right of Kings, p. 300.

2. E.g., Whitgift, Works III. 165-6, and the controversy between Fenner and Copcot (see bibliography).

3. E.g., William Stoughton, An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policie, p. 434.

4. At least down to 1587, when Bridges published his Defence of the Government established in the Church of England.

5. E.g., Whitgift, Works, I. 378, 389; III. 175-6.

episcopacy had a scriptural foundation, usually dated from Bancroft's sermon of February 9, 1588/9,<sup>(1)</sup> was treated by contemporaries as a very singular novelty.<sup>(2)</sup> In spite of this, it made rapid headway. The dictum, dear to the reformers,<sup>(3)</sup> idem est episcopus et presbyter, was condemned as heretical, and Saravia's De Ministrorum Gradibus, which was emphatic on the institution of degrees by God, became influential among churchmen.<sup>(4)</sup> The reformation view of orders and episcopacy passed away, and the antagonistic ideas so familiar in later generations were soon firmly entrenched.

1. R.G. Usher, on "Bancroft and the Divine Right of Bishops", in Theology, vol. I., suggested that Bancroft claimed an apostolic, but not a divine, origin for bishops. But Bancroft's hint that those who denied the superiority of bishops were heretics seems to imply a claim of divine right.
2. Bacon, An Advertisement touching the controversies of the Church of England (Spedding, Letters and Life, I. 86-7): "The other part, which maintaineth the present government of the church, hath not kept one tenor neither.... some of our men (as I have heard) ordained in foreign parts have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers". Letters from Sir Francis Knollys to Walsingham (March 1589 - S.P. Dom. Eliz. ccxxiii No.23) and to Burghley (August 1589 - Strype, Annals IV. 7-8). Letter from Reynolds to Knollys, and Knollys's speech in parliament, contained in Informations.
3. Strype, Whitgift, III. 228.
4. There are many references to it in Bilson's The Perpetual Government of Christes Church (1593), a work which claims apostolic and scriptural sanction for the episcopal system. The effect of the controversy is seen in the differences between the first and second editions of Thomas Rogers's work on the thirty-nine articles. The second (1607) asserts the scriptural origin of episcopacy and the necessity of succession. There had been no equivalent passage in the first edition (1587).

Despite the differences between presbyterian ideas and reformation thought, it could probably be argued that the presbyterian revolt was a necessary consequence of the reformation, and that the continued application of reformation principles was bound to produce presbyterianism. The conception, explicit in England,<sup>(1)</sup> of the reformation as progressive in its deviation from Rome, may or may not have existed elsewhere, but many of the opinions accepted by the reformers could certainly be turned against the position they had adopted.<sup>(2)</sup> Language formerly employed to justify the replacement of wealthy and idle bishops by efficient, preaching bishops, was resorted to in refutation of superiority of any kind, and was turned against protestant bishops who had themselves used it.<sup>(3)</sup> The positive side of the "godly bishop" conception, like the negative, passed into presbyterian thought. From the beginning it had been dangerous to episcopacy, for emphasis on preaching as the chief function of a bishop had encouraged men to think of him as a mere pastor, and so to lose sight of the distinction between the two offices. It was a short step from the reformation position to the definition of a

1. E.g., A Parte of a Register, p. 32; Seconde Parte of a Register I. 96.

2. Cf. Bonnard, La Controverse de Martin Marprelate, pp. 110-111.

3. Sometimes the views of anglican bishops were actually quoted by the puritans, e.g., Harleian MSS. 7581 contains a petition which uses the opinions of Cranmer, Latimer, and Aylmer; Martin Marprelate quoted Aylmer in his Epitome (ed. Petheram, pp. 36-7); cf. Seconde Parte of a Register I. 80.

(1)

bishop as simply a minister of a congregation. The third derivation from reformation thought was the desire for discipline, which came to be a demand for consistories accompanied by a denial of the right of episcopal courts to exercise disciplinary functions. (2) The advance of the new idea must have been facilitated by the existence of doubts about the efficiency of the episcopal courts and about the adequacy of the sentences they inflicted for immorality. (3) Fourthly, opposition to the possession by churchmen of civil office and to their engaging in temporal affairs - an aspect of presbyterian thought with an important bearing on political theory - had appeared early in the reformation period, in both England and Scotland, as part of the attack on Roman bishops. (4) Lastly, the demand for the retention by the church of all property ever dedicated to its use was among those made by the

1. The discrypcyon of ... a verve chrysten bysshop (1536) had proclaimed that "spirituall bysshops ... are all the preachers of the worde of god in cyties, townes, and villages". (sig. M vii. verso, cf. N vi. and vii.)
2. When, in 1566, the English puritans asked Beza's advice on this point, he replied by a condemnation of the anglican system, urging that a consistory, and not an individual or a law-court, must be responsible for discipline. (Strype, Grindal, pp. 513-5.)
3. E.g., Egerton MSS. 1693 f. 129, dated c. 1585; "A true note of such horrible abuses as I can justlie prove to have bene commytted within the Dioces of Exeter by the Bishoppes that have bene of late yeares". One case of incest went without rebuke, and another led only to a "popishe letter of correction" and a fine of £5. Wealthy offenders, particularly, received mild treatment.
4. E.g., Tyndale, Exposition, pp. 247, 273; Cranmer, Remains and Letters, pp. 38, 56 note; Latimer, Sermons, pp. 67, 176; Coverdale, Remains, p. 244.

reformers and was a cardinal point with the presbyterians also.

The importance of continental influence as a source  
 of presbyterianism has always been recognised, <sup>(1)</sup> but some care  
 must be taken to establish the exact relationship between  
 British presbyterianism and the continental churches. In the  
 decade 1560-70 there was among the churches of England,  
 Scotland, Geneva and Zurich a whole-hearted entente, arising  
 from a sense of thankfulness for what had been achieved,  
 a consciousness of common aims, and doctrinal unity. Not until  
 towards the end of the decade was it assailed by differences on  
 ecclesiastical polity, and the Helvetic Confession of 1566,  
 which recognised episcopacy, <sup>(2)</sup> was accepted, officially or  
 unofficially, by all four churches. Bullinger and Gualter, the  
 Zurich divines, were oracles to the Elizabethan churchmen, and  
 were appealed to by both parties in the vestiarian controversy.  
 Attachment to Zurich did not imply estrangement from Geneva,  
 for the two Swiss churches were on friendly terms, and when the  
 English nonconformists appealed to them in 1566, Beza  
 communicated with Bullinger. <sup>(3)</sup> The position of Scotland did not

1. Cf. Bacon's words (Spedding, Letters and Life I. 84):  
 "The fourth and last occasion of these controversies ...  
 is the partial affectation and imitation of foreign  
 churches".

2. Helvetic Confession (London edn., 1566) p. 58: "Bishops are  
 superintendentes, and watchemen of the church, which geue  
 to it sustenance, and prouide for all necessaries. Elders  
 are auncientes, and as it were Senators, and fathers of  
 the Church, gouernyng it with wholesome counsale. Pastours  
 doe bothe keepe the Shepefolde of the Lord, and prouide  
 for thynges necessarie".

3. Z.L. II. No. liii.

differ essentially from that of England, for it was not with Geneva alone that Scottish divines had made contacts, and the Zurich church regarded itself as an ally of the Scottish. <sup>(1)</sup> That a breach appeared in the friendly relations among the churches was due mainly to the opinions of Theodore Beza. They caused Geneva and Zurich to drift apart and Geneva to become the oracle of the English and Scottish presbyterians, while the supporters of the reformation settlement appealed to the older Genevan views, those of Calvin, and to Zurich, which condemned the presbyterian movement.

The differences between Calvin's views and Beza's explain the whole position. Calvin was typical of the reformation, in that his minimum requirements in a church were few and slight and allowed churches to deviate from each other in both ritual and government: <sup>(2)</sup>

"When we affirm the pure ministry of the Word, and pure order in the celebration of the Sacraments, to be a sufficient pledge and earnest that we may safely embrace the society in which both these are found as a true Church, we carry the observation to this point, that such a society should never be rejected as long as it continues in these things, although it may be chargeable in other things with many errors".

The attitude to ritual which was deducible from this general standpoint was, roughly, that ceremonial should be reduced to a

1. Cf. Lorimer, John Knox and the Church of England, pp. 5-6, 44-5; Knox, Works III. 235, 219-26, VI. 550; Z.L. II. 275.
2. Institutes IV. i. 12, cf. IV. i. 9; Beveridge III. 21, 23.

minimum if political and other conditions allowed a church freedom of action, but that no censure attached to the retention of ceremonies where such freedom was absent.<sup>(1)</sup> We<sup>(2)</sup> should remember that Calvin criticised Knox for his severity, and that he had a partiality for some practices which, although prescribed in the English prayer book, were unpopular with the puritans.<sup>(3)</sup> With regard to polity, we may say that although Calvin preferred equality of pastors and ordination by means of a searching examination, a call from a congregation, and induction to a particular charge,<sup>(4)</sup> he had no objection to superiority for order's sake, and made no attempt to insist on a particular system as essential. Beza was much less compromising. In ritual, nothing seemed indifferent to him, and in polity he moved from a grudging acknowledgment of

1. Troubles at Frankfort, ed. Arber, p. 79. The "foolish things" in the prayer book were, after all, "tolerable" (ib. 50-51).
2. Calvini Opera XVIII. 434; Knox VI. 123-4; Reyburn, John Calvin, p. 249.
3. Calvin favoured a form of absolution in the communion service. (Choisy, La Théocratie, p. 235). He considered it indifferent whether the words of distribution were spoken to individual communicants or not (Strype, Annals, I. i. 385-7, quoting Epistle 361), whether communicants received the elements into their own hands, whether they divided them among themselves or received individually, and whether the bread was leavened or unleavened. (Institutes IV. xvii. 43, quoted by Whitgift, Works, III. 83.) There were godfathers and godmothers at Geneva. (Choisy, op. cit. p. 236.)
4. Institutes IV. iii. 10, 15; v. 4 (Beveridge III. 66, 70, 93-4). Cf. Choisy, La Théocratie, pp. 49, 223-4; Lindsay, History of the Reformation II. 132; Cambridge Modern History II. 370-1.

(1)  
 episcopacy to a condemnation of the Church of England on account  
 of its system of ordination and its lack of consistorial  
 (2)  
 discipline. He took a leading part in the introduction of the  
 idea that consistories alone could provide efficient discipline,  
 siding with Withers against Erastus. The addition of  
 "discipline" as a mark of the church to Calvin's two marks -  
 preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments -  
 (3)  
 was no novelty, but in the mouths of Beza and his disciples  
 "discipline" meant the presbyterian system of government, which  
 (4)  
 they regarded as essential to the being of a true church.

The development of Beza's ideas led to a breach  
 between Geneva and Zurich which was first evident in 1568, when  
 Bullinger and Gualter sent letters of sympathy to Erastus,  
 (5)  
 while Beza wrote a treatise condemning him. In the next decade,  
 Gualter dissociated himself from the party in England that  
 sought the introduction of presbyterian government, condemned  
 their violence and defended episcopacy. He opposed the notion

1. E.g., in his confession of faith (1560); Engl. edn. (1565),  
 f. 108 verso.
2. Z.L. II. No. liii; cf. p. 116 infra.
3. Cf. p. 17 supra.
4. Cf. Bancroft, Survay, p. 127 et seq., D.P., p. 42; Heylin,  
Aerius Redivivus, pp. 10, 32. The old definition of  
 discipline - "admonition and correction of faults" -  
 appeared as late as 1572 (in the First Admonition,  
Puritan Manifestoes p. 9). Two years later Travers  
 defined discipline as "the polity of the Church of Christ  
 ordained and appointed of God". (Full and Plaine  
Declaration, p. 6.) The term had been used in the sense  
 of "polity" in Calvin's Institutes (IV. x. 32, Beveridge  
 III. 225), and in the French and Scottish "books of  
 discipline".
5. Figgid, Divine Right of Kings, pp. 294-6, 304-5.

that there was a form of government applicable in all circumstances, and continued to favour the right of princes to prescribe polity to their churches.<sup>(1)</sup> He illustrated his growing dislike of Geneva by the remark: "The Genevians do still endeavour to thrust their discipline upon all churches", and by a wish that Beza would bear himself modestius et humilior.<sup>(2)</sup> Bullinger adopted the same attitude,<sup>(3)</sup> accusing the presbyterians of thirst for power and of greed.

Although presbyterian theory, at least in its most intransigent form, was manufactured by Beza and imported into England and Scotland from Geneva, the reasons for the acceptance of Beza's opinions are to be found in the condition of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland in the second half of the sixteenth century. Abuses connected with ecclesiastical revenues were prevalent for many years after the reformation. Some account must be given of the situation, and of the ways in which the remedy of abuses was connected with presbyterian theory.

The dilapidation of benefices, particularly the bishoprics, was notorious. That the first protestant episcopate of Scotland was widely regarded as merely a device

1. Z.L. II. 225-35, 249-54; H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. II. No.192 (W. Murdin, State Papers, p. 276).
2. Z.L. II. 237-9; Strype, Annals, II. i. 470.
3. Z.L. II. 240-43; 244-8.

for securing the bulk of the episcopal revenues to the nobility is well known, and evidence of the alienation of property to the patrons of sees, and of dilapidation by bishops in the interests of their own families, is abundant.<sup>(1)</sup> But the "tulchan" principle, although it received its quaint name in Scotland, was conspicuous in the England of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, and it is a curious fact that in November 1571, two months before the convention of Leith recognised the forms by which the Scottish "tulchans" were appointed, the English queen expressed to the Scottish regent a hope that the bishopric of Glasgow would be used to recoup the Lennox family for the expenses incurred in the national interest by the late regent, who, she said, had intended to take this step.<sup>(2)</sup> Under Edward VI. it had become almost the rule for an appointment to a see to be accompanied by a reduction in endowment,<sup>(3)</sup> and in Elizabeth's reign, although alienation to private persons was prohibited,<sup>(4)</sup> spoliation by the crown was flagrant. On his appointment, a bishop had often to hand over or lease property to the queen, who sometimes passed it on to her favourites, or even to promise

1. A.P.S. III. 211, 355; B.U.K. I. 373, II. 413-4, 417, 450, 479, 600-603, 737; Calderwood, III. 302; Bannatyne Miscellany I. 102; Masson, op. cit. pp. cxxviii-ix; cf. Reyburn, "Calvin and Scotland", in Scottish Church History Society I. 215. The lesser clergy followed the example set by the prelates.
2. H.M.C. MSS. of the Earl of Mar and Kellie, p. 27.
3. C.M.H. II. 502; Smyth, Cranmer, pp. 274 et seq.
4. The statute I Eliz. cap. xix forbade alienation (including leases for more than twenty-one years or three lives), except to the crown. The law was strengthened by 13 Eliz. cap. x, but not until the next reign was alienation to the crown forbidden (1 Jac. I. cap. iii).

an annual cash payment. Pilkington, for instance, was obliged to pay to the crown £1020 annually.<sup>(1)</sup> Some of the bishops, either because they were naturally careless of their trust, or because they were discouraged by the royal action, took no interest in maintaining the value of the episcopal property, and, although they could not alienate, gained infamy by extensive dilapidation. The evil example set by the queen and her bishops was followed by the patrons of lesser benefices and the men they nominated to livings.<sup>(2)</sup> Both loyal churchmen and puritans were incensed at the spoliation of the church - Whitgift used very plain language on the subject to the queen herself and to Burghley;<sup>(3)</sup> puritans, although they wished to see the bishops despoiled, were quite as convinced as Whitgift that the diversion of ecclesiastical revenues to laymen was

1. Pilkington, Works, p. v. Much of the evidence of alienation is collected by F.O. White (Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops, especially pp. 16, 135, 166, 282-3, 301-2, 351). Cf. Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, I. cl. The scandalous vacancies, a further method of diverting episcopal revenues to the crown, are shown by Kennedy (op. cit., I. xii-xiii). The cases of Oxford and Ely, vacant for forty-one and twenty-one years respectively, are the best known; but nine sees were vacant for from five to nine years, and only five for less than three years.
2. Cf. Frere, English Church under Elizabeth and James I. pp. 191, 303; Pierce, Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts, pp. 99-104; Fuller, Church History, IX. i. 21, ii. 32, iv. 4.
3. Whitgift, Works, III. xiii-xv; H.M.C. Salisbury MSS., III. 153; cf. Bancroft, Survey, pp. 234-5; Jewel, Works, II. 1011.

sacrilege, and they had no wish to see the distribution among courtiers of property which they planned to use for other purposes.

The second major evil was the possession of benefices by men who could not or would not perform spiritual functions in the church - priests who refused to renounce the Roman allegiance, laymen, youths, and men of little or no education. The action of patrons was often unchecked by moral considerations, and added to the heritage of abuses from the period when the medieval system was breaking down. Indications have already been given of the position in Scotland under Mary, and of the reiterated desire of the general assembly that "qualified men" and no others should be presented to livings. The evil done before 1567 could not be undone at a stroke, and even after 1567 patrons were not always guided by the highest motives. The struggle over the presentation of non-qualified (1) men continued. Conditions in England must have been similar, for there is ample evidence of the possession of benefices by laymen, the buying and selling of livings, pluralism and absenteeism, ignorance and inability to preach. When the (2) puritans compiled their great survey of the ministry, about 1586, they could find only 472 preachers in 2537 parishes; ecclesiastical officials, although perhaps applying a lower

1. A.P.S. III. 212 c. 4; B.U.K. II. 632, 659; J. Melville, Diary, pp. 347-8.

2. Seconde Parte of a Register, II. 88 et seq.

standard, reported in 1603 that there were less than 5000  
 preachers in the 9000 or 10,000 parishes of England; the<sup>(1)</sup>  
 puritan ministers of Sussex, in the same year, declared that of  
 300 ministers one hundred did not preach and sixty were  
 negligent in preaching.<sup>(2)</sup> Returns (for 1575) of persons holding  
 more than one benefice show that 655 livings were held by 239  
 incumbents.<sup>(3)</sup> Of 335 parsons in Essex, 225 were either  
 uneducated, pluralist or non-resident, or of scandalous life.<sup>(4)</sup>  
 These evils, like the dilapidation of bishoprics, were  
 condemned by conformers as well as by puritans. Parker wrote  
 in 1567/8 that in the diocese of Norwich the buying and selling  
 of benefices and the fleecing of parsonages and vicarages had  
 gone so far that everything was for sale, and went on:<sup>(5)</sup>

"The best of the country, not under the degree of  
 knights, were infected with this sore, so far that some one  
 knight had four or five, some other seven or eight benefices  
 clouted together, fleecing them all, defrauding the crown's  
 subjects of their duty of prayers, somewhere setting boys or  
 their serving-men to bear the names of such livings".

<sup>(6)</sup>  
 Other bishops were perturbed, and the laymen who supported the  
 puritan cause in the House of Commons found in these abuses  
 their strongest argument. In 1571 Strickland "spake at large  
 of the abuses of the Church of England, and of the Churchmen;

1. Additional MSS. 38,139, f. 254 verso. The total number of  
 parishes is given as 9044.
2. H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. XV. 390.
3. ib. XIII. 134.
4. T.W.Davids, Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity in Essex,  
 p. 88.
5. Parker, Correspondence, p. 311.
6. Additional MSS. 29,546, f. 41; Seconde Parte of a Register,  
 I. 260-7; Bancroft, Survey, pp. 234-5.

as first, that known Papists are admitted to have Ecclesiastical Government, and great livings; that Godly, honest and learned Protestants, have little or nothing; that Boyes are dispensed with to have spiritual Promotions; That ... unable men are qualified, or some one man allowed too many spiritual livings".<sup>(1)</sup>

Thirdly must be reckoned impropriations, which were a more serious evil in Scotland than in England, because in the former country a larger proportion of parish churches had been annexed to monastic establishments. The problem of providing for appropriate churches when the monastic body was replaced by a layman or a lay corporation had exercised the minds of Scottish churchmen from an early date.<sup>(2)</sup> One of the statutes of 1581, when the presbyterian party was triumphant, provided that all annexed churches should have ministers whose stipends would in future be reserved on the appointment of a new holder of a "prelacy".<sup>(3)</sup> In England too the protests were vehement,<sup>(4)</sup> and Grindal, in 1576, took a very gloomy view of the situation:

"This Church of England hath been by appropriations, and that not without sacrilege, spoiled of the livings, which at the first were appointed to the office of preaching and teaching. Which appropriations were first annexed to abbeys; and after came to the Crown; and now are dispersed to private men's possessions, without hope to reduce the same to the original institution".

The evil may have been most serious in Wales,<sup>(5)</sup> but at the end of

1. D'Ewes, Journals, p. 157; cf. pp. 165, 302, 357-9.

2. B.U.K. I. 59.

3. A.P.S. III. 211 cap. 2.

4. Grindal, Remains, p. 382.

5. Additional MSS. 29,546, f. 54 recto (a remark of the bishop of St. David's in 1576): "all good benefices for the most part be impropriate".

Elizabeth's reign seventy-five parishes out of 120 in  
 Staffordshire were inappropriate, and 108 out of 300 in Sussex. (1)  
 Throughout the whole country, almost 4000 of the 9000 or  
 10,000 parish churches were inappropriate. (2)

There were three ways in which the remedy of abuses was directly connected with presbyterian theory. The first was the material point that the abolition of episcopacy would set free great revenues which could be devoted to the purposes of the church generally, and especially to the maintenance of an efficient ministry and the relief of the poor. This idea was seldom absent from the minds of the English and Scottish presbyterians. Cartwright admitted that there was a very close connection between the agitation against episcopacy and the desire that the property of the bishoprics should be devoted to what puritans considered the general good of the church: (3)

"If the fat morsels of our bishoprics and archbishoprics were taken and employed to their uses of maintenance of the poor, and of the ministers, and of the universities, which are the seeds of the ministry, I think the heat of the disputation and contention for archbishops and bishops would be well cooled".

Some puritans argued that in the primitive church the bishops had merely held their property in trust for the benefit of the

1. E.H.R. XXVI. 431-52; H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. XV. 390.
2. Additional MSS. 38,139, f. 254 verso.
3. Whitgift, Works, II. 321.

(1)

poor and of clerks in lower orders, while others inveighed

(2)

against episcopal wealth as inexpedient. The most suggestive

discussions combine references to episcopal wealth with

contrasts between it and the prevailing poverty among the

(3)

lower clergy - "out of one of their livings may half a dozen

(4)

learned preachers be sufficiently provided for" - or urge the

(5)

use of episcopal revenues to redeem impropriations. That an

attack on episcopal property was part of the presbyterian

(6)

programme was at once realised by the bishops. In Scotland,

where the evil of episcopal wealth was aggravated by the

fact that some bishops never, and the rest only occasionally,

performed spiritual functions, the same line was taken by

the presbyterians, who argued that the prelates had taken

up "for the maintenance of their ambition and ryotousness,

the emoluments of the kirk quhilk may sustain many pastors,

(7)

the scholes, and the poor". The testimony of the writer of

the Historie and Life of King James the Sext, although he

wrote of the period when the restored episcopate of the

(8)

"Black Acts" had become ineffective, is invaluable:

1. Cartwright, Second Reply, pp. 649-50; Seconde Parte of a Register, II. 10.

2. ib. II. 75-6.

3. E.g., Travers, Full and Plaine Declaration, pp. 113-4, 123-4.

4. Seconde Parte of a Register, I. 258.

5. Puritan Manifestoes, p. 95; cf. An Humble Motion, Sig. E iv.

6. Z.L. I. 296, 299.

7. B.U.K. II. 425.

8. p. 231. The words have a special significance if they were written by John Colville, to whom the authorship of this work is ascribed, since Colville, as we shall see, showed a thorough understanding of another aspect of the relationship between abuses and presbyterian theory.

"Becauss the Prelats had great rents that appertenuit to the kirk be gude rycht, and that they did na service or function thairin, bot levit at thair pleasure; And the saidis Bishopries and Prelaceis had certayne temporall lands annexit unto thayme, whereby ather of thayme are callit Lords. For thir two cawsis, the ministers estemit thair estait sa odious, that thay preachit mikle aganis thayme; and besydis all this, they estemit thair awin ordinar stependis to litle, and evill payit, and therefore devysit to put in the heid of the Prence, that thais temporall lands could not, or sould not, justlie appertayne to the Prelates, bot rather to the Crown".

The Act of Annexation (1587) was thus in part a victory for presbyterian principles, and was so regarded by James, who called it "that vile act of Annexation".<sup>(1)</sup>

The second link was the method of conferring orders. It is obvious enough that ordination by a presbytery did not leave as wide a door open to abuses as ordination by an individual, while choice by a congregation made an inefficient ministry almost impossible, since it obviated the danger from abuse of patronage. These facts were brought out, significantly, in what is almost the first attack on the episcopal system -  
<sup>(2)</sup>  
 Beza's letter to Bullinger of September 3, 1566:

"What can be more abominable, what more extravagant, than that assumed power of the bishops, by which they admit at their pleasure parties not so called [i.e., by a congregation] ... and at length, on the vacancy of any preferment, after the delivery of a written form for a certain sum of money, ... they appoint this or that individual to whatever churches they please?"

1. Works of James VI., ed. McIlwain, p. 24
2. Z.L. II. No. liii; Strype, Annals, I. ii. App. xxix.

The works of English presbyterians frequently touch on this subject, and argue from the existing abuses to a condemnation of episcopal ordination:<sup>(1)</sup>

"The Bysshoppes callynge is not agreeable to the holye worde of God, in callynge their ministers, in givinge them orders in their owne houses, and some that are neyther sounde in the faythe, nor honest in livynge, and some which were presented to the Byshop by a gentlemans letter or Ryng, some suche I knowe, which gentleman hath a parsonage, etc., then his man must bee his minister and have 20 nobles a yeare and his master the whole profitt of the benefyce, is not this the miserable case of our bysshoppes to maynteyne this cursed act, to make suche ministers for mens pleasures".

The stress laid by presbyterians (and also by independents) on the close association between a minister and a particular charge, to which he should be elected by a congregation, led to attacks, in both England and Scotland, on the entire system of presentation to parsonages and vicarages, which were too often regarded as property rather than as offices. Men who wanted popular election of "godly" ministers were not inclined to tolerate either the rights of patrons or the principle that there was continuity from the pre-reformation priesthood.<sup>(2)</sup>

The evils resulting from the bishops' misuse of their powers should have been less prevalent in Scotland than in England, for there had been checks on the action of both superintendents and "tulchan" bishops in instituting the nominees of patrons.<sup>(3)</sup>

1. Seconde Parte of a Register, I. 150; cf. I. 170, II. 76.
2. Barrowe, Briefe Discovery of the False Church, pp. 10-11 and 53-4; Puritan Manifestoes, p. 32; Seconde Parte of a Register, I. 71; J. Melville, Diary, p. 112.
3. B.U.K. I. 294.

In practice, however, it may have proved fairly easy for patrons to have their own way, for there is evidence that men unfit for spiritual office did hold benefices, and that it fell to presbyteries, after their erection, to remedy the evil.<sup>(1)</sup>

The third connection which may be traced between the prevalent abuses and presbyterian theory is through the diaconate. The potential value of lay finance officers, elected by and representing the congregations, for the prevention of dilapidation and the direction of expenditure, is obvious. The presbyterians, turning to the primitive church for their arguments, asserted that in ancient times, when the bishops held their property in trust, they committed it to the deacons, who made use of it for the benefit of the poor, inferior clerks, and strangers.<sup>(2)</sup> Travers, in his influential work A Full and Plaine Declaration, argues from the principle that "the neede off a great nombre may be relieued by the abundance and excess off a fewe", and suggests that the deacons must "enter an action" against the bishops for the recovery of revenues to which the poor have a right.<sup>(3)</sup> When John Colville wrote to Beza in 1584 to set before the Genevan the point of view of the Scottish ministers who had been exiled for their adherence to presbyterianism, he justified part of their policy as follows:<sup>(4)</sup>

1. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 347-8; McCrie, Andrew Melville, edn. 1824, I. 341 and note HH; A.P.S. III. 542-3.
2. E.g., Seconde Parte of a Register, II. 10.
3. pp. 124, 154, 155.
4. Additional MSS. 32,092, f. 43 verso.

"Quidam sunt in Scotia ecclesiastici ordinis homines beneficiorum decoctores, praecipue Episcopi, inter quos iste noster [i.e. Archbishop Adamson] primus est: patrimonium enim Episcopale quamvis valde opimum iam post quadriennium ad nihilum redegit: ut decoctoribus istis provideatur cupiunt ministri annuam saltem rationem diaconis fieri ne effraena epicureorum licentia ecclesiae bona profundat; quae partim pauperibus, partim ministris, partim scholis impendenda sunt".

It is, therefore, a justifiable argument that presbyterianism owed some of its strength to a detestation of abuses and a demand for efficiency. Was this practical aspect of puritanism prominent before episcopal government was condemned and presbyterian government advocated? Contemporaries thought that in England it was. Walsingham (1) described the development of puritanism as follows:

"When they inveighed against such abuses in the Church as pluralities, non-residence and the like, their zeal was not condemned, only their violence was sometimes censured. When they refused the use of some ceremonies and rites as superstitious, they were tolerated with much connivance and gentleness. Yes, when they called in question the superiority of bishops, and pretended to bring a democracy into the Church, yet their propositions were heard".

Bacon analysed the "growth and progression" of puritanism in a similar fashion: (2)

"It may be remembered that on that part, which calls for reformation, was first propounded some dislike of certain ceremonies supposed to be superstitious; some complaints of dumb ministers who possess rich benefices; and some invectives against the idle and monastical continuance within the universities, by those who had livings to be resident upon; and such like abuses. Thence they went on to condemn the government of bishops".

1. Spedding, Letters and Life of Bacon, I. 100.
2. ib. 86, Bacon's Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England.

It appears that the question of the maintenance of the clergy had been discussed at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, for Thomas Sampson expressed the view that the poorer priests should be saved from destitution by the generosity of the bishops, and Peter Martyr agreed with him.<sup>(1)</sup> Christopher Goodman complained (in 1559) of the evils arising from non-residence and pluralism,<sup>(2)</sup> and a supplication presented to the queen in the third year of her reign dealt with the appointment to benefices of ignorant men, papists, pluralists, non-residents, and men learned in the law but not in the Word.<sup>(3)</sup> When the vestiarian controversy was at its height, the malcontents gave some attention to the prevalent abuses. One of Percival Wiburn's criticisms of the Church of England was directed against the evils resulting from the system of patronage,<sup>(4)</sup> and the letters of Beza which contained the first attacks on episcopacy included similar matter.<sup>(5)</sup> For a time there seems to have been a reluctance to condemn the bishops, who, although they were blinded by wealth, honour and dignity, and set on "hills and mountains" in their pomp, might conceivably be instruments of reform, if they would use their

1. Z.L. I. 1, II. 32, 39.

2. Vide p. 94 supra.

3. Seconde Parte of a Register, I. 50; the editor thought this petition more in line with those of twenty years later, but there seems no reason to question the date.

4. Z.L. II. 360 (undated, probably 1566; cf. D.N.B.)

5. Vide p. 125 infra.

(1)  
position to influence the government. This attitude changed,  
(2)  
and the bishops came to be viewed as obstacles to reform:

"You will neither reforme Gods church yourselves for feare of losing your pomp and honor, neither will you suffer those which would, even with the loss of liberty, living, and life, that the beautiful face and purity of the Apostolicke Church might once shine in Englande, which God for his crucified Christe Jesus sake bring to passe".

This position had been reached by 1572, the year of the Admonitions to Parliament, the first of which was concerned very largely with the evils which have been described, while the second, altogether more constructive, was the complement of the first, and described the entire presbyterian system of government. (3) There are traces of the persistence of what may be termed the "inductive" argument for presbyterianism, (4) and the extent to which English puritan literature is occupied with the discussion of abuses and their remedies is very striking. It is clear from the survey of the ministry which appears in A Seconde Parte of a Register, (5) from the bills prepared for presentation to parliament, from An Abstract of (6) Certain Acts of Parliament, (7) and from other puritan works or

1. The first item in A Parte of a Register, dated c. 1570; Seconde Parte of a Register, I. 82-3 (1571 or 1572).
2. ib. I. 80 (probably 1571); the same line had been taken by an Englishman who wrote from Geneva c. 1568-9 and condemned the bishops as obstacles to reform. (ib. I 62-3.)
3. Even the second Admonition attached great initial importance to the provision of a sufficient maintenance for the ministry. (Puritan Manifestoes, p. 95.) Field and Wilcox, in their confession, maintained their argument that each church should give its pastor an adequate income, and attacked the wealth of the bishops. (Seconde Parte of a Register, I. 87.)
4. ib. I. 75, II. 76.
5. ib. II. 38 et seq.
6. ib. I. 304 et seq.

manifestoes from the First Admonition to the Millenary Petition, that there was a practical and businesslike aspect of the English puritan movement, and that the men who led it dealt with facts as well as ideals. More than half of Walter Travers's A Full and Plaine Declaration is taken up with criticism of abuses or the exposition of remedies for them. Stress is laid on the necessity of a vocation in ministers, on the calling of ministers by congregations, on appointment to a particular charge, and on the education of candidates for the ministry. The evils Travers condemns are simoniacal bargains between the patrons of livings and their nominees, the pomp and superfluity of a few, contrasted with the poverty of many, the spoliation of the church by laymen, and, finally, impropriations. He repudiates the idea that he wishes to give a superfluity to the ministry, or to spoil the bishops in order to enrich unworthy men, but he insists that the position must be amended, and he is guided to his remedies by his belief that the abuse of property once given to the church is sacrilege. His main points are that the bishops must be deprived of their wealth and that all church property must be administered by the deacons.

1. Over 100 pages out of 193.
2. pp. 66, 113-4, 115-6, 126-7.
3. pp. 118-9, 124, 117-8, 126-7.
4. pp. 120-3, 124, 154-5.

The development from criticism of abuses to the advocacy of presbyterian principles cannot be worked out as fully for Scotland, owing, mainly, to the paucity of the literature in that country. It can, however, be shown that there is nothing improbable in the idea of a similar development there. The influence of material considerations on the policy of the kirk between 1560 and 1572 has been indicated, particularly innits bearing on the acceptance of the first protestant episcopate. When it became clear that the 1572 settlement, owing to the abuse of it by the nobles and the bishops, had not produced the results anticipated, men must have looked for a new system which would ensure the abolition of the many existing evils. John Davidson's Dialog betwix a clerk and ane courteour (1574) reveals the tenacity with which the kirk held to its comprehensive claim to church property, and shows that a struggle was inevitable. The uneasiness felt by the ministers in August 1574 (that is, after Andrew Melville's arrival in Scotland, but before he can have exerted much influence), is perhaps shown in the decision of the general assembly that persons buying or selling benefices or using any kind of bargaining with regard to them, directly or indirectly, should be deprived of all function in the kirk.<sup>(1)</sup> The significance for "tulchan" bishops, who were the worst offenders in this respect, must

have been obvious. The assembly of October 1576 showed its anxiety at the prevalence of dilapidation by legislating against beneficed men, including bishops, who set "feus and tacks", defrauding their successors.<sup>(1)</sup> The interest taken by the church in the problems connected with benefices appears in the records of one general assembly after another, and Melville's own concern with the fate of the ecclesiastical property is manifest from his reference to the "restoration of church revenues to their legitimate uses" in the report on the progress of the Scottish presbyterian movement which he sent to Beza in November 1579.<sup>(2)</sup> The second Book of Discipline condemned sacrilege, and was emphatic on the value of the diaconate.

1. B.U.K. I. 373.

2. Calderwood, Vindiciae, p. 41; cf. p. 131 infra.

## Chapter 5.

### The introduction of presbyterianism to England and Scotland.

The system which promised to cure all the ills of the church had been described, as we saw, by Theodore Beza. On at least five occasions before 1580 he formulated his opinions with special reference to the situation in England or Scotland, and these expressions of his views became well known and influential. He first condemned episcopacy, it seems, in a letter to Grindal written in June 1566. The acquaintance of English puritans with this letter is shown by its publication along with the first Admonition to Parliament in 1572, and its appearance both in that book and in the collections of Beza's letters published in 1573 and 1575 must have made it familiar to a large number of Englishmen.<sup>(1)</sup> A more violent attack on the anglican system was contained in a letter to Bullinger written on September 3, 1566, but there is no evidence that it was known to contemporaries.<sup>(2)</sup> More effective was the letter from Beza and his colleagues at Geneva to "certain brethren of the Church of England". Dated October 24, 1567, it denounces a system of ordination which makes no provision for the vote of

1. Puritan Manifestoes, pp. 43-55; Beza, Epistolae (1573 and 1575), No. VIII.; Strype, Grindal, pp. 167-8.
2. Zurich Letters, II. No. liii; Strype, Annals, I. ii, Appendix xxix.

presbyters, for assignation to a parish, or for examination of morals, and it inveighs against the pronouncement of excommunication by episcopal courts. This letter, besides appearing in the 1573 and 1575 editions of Beza's Epistolae, was published in Whittingham's Brieffe Discours off the troubles at Franckford (1574)<sup>(1)</sup>. In 1572 Beza wrote to Knox and warned him not to be persuaded to subject the Scottish church to bishops - "sicut Episcopi Papatum pepererunt, ita pseudoepiscopos (Papatus reliquias) Epicureismum terris invecturos. Hanc pestem caveant qui salvam Ecclesiam cupiunt"<sup>(2)</sup>. This letter, after being published in the 1573 and 1575 collections of Beza's letters, became famous as Beza's seventy-ninth epistle, and was long remembered by presbyterians<sup>(3)</sup>. More important still is the De Triplici Episcopatu<sup>(4)</sup>. About the end of 1577 or the beginning of 1578,

1. Beza, Epistolae, No. XII.; Troubles at Frankfort (ed. Arber), p. 239; Strype, Grindal, p. 507.
2. Knox VI. 613-5; Row, History, p. 52; Beza, Epistolae, No. 79.
3. Strype, Whitgift, II. 164; Calderwood VI. 12.
4. The facts about the De Triplici Episcopatu have never before been set down completely and accurately. The letter of Glamis is in the Appendix (C. 2). The questions, as well as Beza's answers, are printed in Fields's translation. Field's book included a letter from Beza to James Lawson (Additional MSS. 32,092, f. 72, cf. p. 133 infra), and this led men to regard Beza's work as a reply to Lawson and not to Glamis. Cf. Strype, Whitgift II. 166, Annals II. ii. 336; Hooker, Works I. 75-6 notes; Spottiswoode, History II. 221; Calderwood III. 397.

(1)

Claude Colladon, a member of a well known Genevan family and an associate of Beza, visited Scotland and conferred with several Scots, among them Lord Chancellor Glamis. When Colladon returned home, he carried to Beza a letter, dated April 20, 1578, in which Glamis explained that there were controversies in Scotland on ecclesiastical polity, mainly because no complete and efficient substitute for the pre-reformation form of government had as yet been found - the rule of the Romanist Mary had been succeeded by civil wars, and only very recently had an opportunity for a final settlement appeared. Glamis referred to discussions in the Scottish parliament - he himself had been a member of more

(2)

than one commission on ecclesiastical polity - and asked for advice. He had long been eager to write to Beza, because he was familiar with some of Beza's writings and realised that Geneva was a model in ecclesiastical matters, but he had been unable to send a letter until the opportune visit of Colladon. He asked six questions, each of them aimed at discovering Beza's ideas on some aspect of ecclesiastical organisation. Beza sent Glamis a written reply which contained, of course, a condemnation of episcopacy and a recommendation of

1. "Claudius Colladonius" in the letter of Glamis. The name of Claude does not appear in the Biographie Universelle, but those of Germain, Nicholas and David, all related to each other and all prominent in the Geneva of Calvin and Beza, do.
2. A.P.S. III. 89; B.U.K. I. 365.

presbyterian government, with particular stress on the necessity of erecting classes to take over the chief episcopal functions. This reply was known subsequently as the treatise De Triplici Episcopatu (from Beza's classification of bishops in three categories - divine, human and devilish), and was translated into English by the puritan John Field under the title The iudgment of a most reuerend and learned<sup>(1)</sup>  
man concerning a threefold order of bishops. The importance of the work may be estimated, not only from Bancroft's reference to it and from the replies made to it by Bridges<sup>(2)</sup> and Saravia, but from the considered judgment of Whitgift,<sup>(3)</sup> given in a letter to Beza himself:

"While we hope all things were a little more pacified, your book, my friend Beza, of a threefold episcopacy, anno 1590 [an error for 1580] sent to this island; and not much after translated into the English tongue ... flying through the hands of many, set a new torch to the flame that was before almost quenched".

That the work was influential in Scotland as well as in England appears from James Melville's remark that it "did<sup>(4)</sup> mikle guid". Two years after Field had translated Beza's

1. Cf. p. 154 infra.

2. Bridges, Defence of the government established in the Church of England (1587), pp. 328-416; Bancroft, Survey p. 50; Saravia, De Ministrorum Gradibus (edn. 1840) pp. xi-xxv. Saravia wrote as follows: "I cannot wonder enough at the Scotchmen, who could be persuaded to abolish and reject the state of bishops, by reasons so ill grounded, partly false, partly of no moment at all, and altogether unworthy of a man of such fame" (Hooker, Works I. 75 note).

3. Strype, Whitgift, II. 166.

4. James Melville, Diary, p. 55.

reply to Glamis, his friend Thomas Wilcox published a translation of Beza's Discourse of the true and visible markes of the catholique church, another work which condemned episcopacy and recommended presbyterian government.

Whatever influence may have been exerted in Britain by Beza's writings, it is undeniable that the work of some of his disciples in bringing the Genevan doctrines to this country had far-reaching results. Thomas Cartwright, whose condemnation of episcopacy had led to his expulsion from Cambridge, lectured at the Academy at Geneva for some months from June 1571, and in January 1571/2 Beza obtained permission for him to attend some meetings of the Geneva consistory in order to study its working, so that he would be able to report on it in England and defend consistorial discipline against its critics.<sup>(1)</sup> It is possible that the Englishman accompanied Beza when he went to La Rochelle to act as moderator of a synod which revised the French discipline, and so had an opportunity of seeing French presbyterianism at work.<sup>(2)</sup> On his return to England, Cartwright's influence was at once revealed in the second Admonition to Parliament, which

1. A.H.R. V. 284, XXI. 484; Pearson, Cartwright, p. 50.
2. Mrs. W.W.D. Campbell, French Book of Discipline, p. x, and "Early English Presbyterianism and the Reformed Church of France", in Journal of the Presbyterian History Society of England, II. Cartwright's Directory resembles the French Book of Discipline more than it does any other work. The Seconde Parte of a Register contains a copy of the French discipline (I. 77).

(1)  
 differed from the first Admonition in being more constructive.  
 It outlined the complete system of consistories, conferences,  
 and synods provincial and national, and lays down that  
 "ministers must be equall, and the order must be that some  
 must be governed by all, and not all by some in the church  
 government". (2) Two years later, the presbyterian principles  
 were fully formulated by Walter Travers in his Ecclesiasticae  
Disciplinae Explicatio, which was at once translated into  
 English by Cartwright. The author and the translator were  
 associated in Beza's mind as advocates of the new doctrines. (3)  
 Bishop Sandys was justified in remarking in 1574: "The author  
 of these novelties, and after Beza their first inventor, is  
 a young Englishman, by name Thomas Cartwright". (4)

The work done in England by Cartwright and Travers,  
 was done in Scotland by Andrew Melville. After being absent  
 from his native country for ten years, the last five of which  
 he spent at Geneva, and so completely losing touch with his  
 friends at home that they thought him dead, Melville came  
 back about the middle of 1574. (5) It seems possible that Beza  
 and he had agreed on the line of action necessary in Scotland,  
 for the Genevan had already, in Epistola LXXIX., expressed his

1. "The other bokes are shorte ... and therefore they have  
 not so muche tolde you how to Reforme, as what to  
 Reforme" - Puritan Manifestoes, p. 90.
2. ib. pp. 97, 107, 126.
3. Fuller, Church History, IX. iv. 19.
4. Z.L. I. 312.
5. James Melville, Diary, pp. 38-47.

distrust of the pseudoepiscopi, and he declared that his permission to Melville to leave Geneva was a sign of his goodwill to Scotland.<sup>(1)</sup> Soon after his arrival in his native country, Melville had letters from Beza, and he in turn reported to his master on the progress of the anti-episcopal and presbyterian movement.<sup>(2)</sup> Melville's fame had preceded him,<sup>(3)</sup> there was competition to obtain his services, and when he was appointed principal of Glasgow university "The schollars frequented to the colledge in suche numbers that the rowmes were skarse able to receave them".<sup>(4)</sup> Melville had, therefore, every opportunity to make his influence felt, and there is ample evidence of the extent and direction of that influence. James Melville admitted that before his uncle's arrival "monie knew nocht yit the corruption and unlawfulness of that invention of men" [i.e. episcopacy], and declared that several ministers, including archbishop Boyd of Glasgow, were "informed mair throwlie be Mr Andrew of the unlawfulness of bishchops, and the right manner of governing of the kirk be presbyteries".<sup>(5)</sup> A careful study of the organisation of the

1. James Melville, Diary, p. 42.
2. ib. p. 51; two drafts of letters, dated October 1, 1578, and November 13, 1579, in Wodrow MSS. (N.L.S.), fol. vol. 42, No. 3; the second is printed in Calderwood's Vindiciae, p. 41. Cf. McCrie, Andrew Melville, (2nd. ed.) I. 153-5.
3. J. Melville, Diary, p. 47.
4. Calderwood III. 339.
5. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 32, 47, 52.

Scottish Church between 1560 and 1575, and of the attitude of the kirk to the first protestant episcopate, leads one to believe that the regent Morton was justified in accusing Melville and his followers of disturbing the peace of the church "be thair conceats and oversie [oversea] dreams, imitation of Genev discipline and lawes"<sup>(1)</sup>, and to accept the description of Melville's work given by Spottiswoode (whose account, after all, does not differ in essentials from that of James Melville)<sup>(2)</sup>:

"In the Church this year [1575] began the innovations to break forth which to this day have kept it in a continual unquietness. Mr. Andrew Melvill, who was lately come from Geneva, a man learned (chiefly in the tongues), but hot and eager upon anything he went about, labouring with a burning desire to bring into this Church the presbyterial discipline of Geneva".

A curious tribute to the work of Melville comes from presbyterian historians who, somewhat inconsistently with their view of the polity of the church as originally presbyterian and their denial of the reality of the first protestant episcopate, have acknowledged that he effected a revolution in the opinions of his fellow-countrymen.<sup>(3)</sup> It is Spottiswoode alone who attributes to Melville the instigation

1. J. Melville, Diary, p. 68.

2. Spottiswoode, II. 200; this historian, it should be noted, was lavish in his praise of Knox, and gave an account of his father's views which, although its accuracy has been questioned, is in accord with what we know of the old superintendent and of the early organisation of the church. (Spottiswoode, II. 179-80, 336-7).

3. McCrie, Melville, (2nd. edn.) I. 137-8; Gillon, John Davidson, pp. 21-2, Cf. S.H.R. XXII. 19.

of the first discussion, in a general assembly, of the  
 lawfulness of episcopacy,<sup>(1)</sup> but it can at least be said that the  
 story is not incompatible with the rest of our knowledge, for  
 a connection between Melville's return to Scotland and the  
 appearance soon afterwards of a movement against episcopacy  
 is unquestionable. Only one of Andrew Melville's fellow-  
 workers seems to have had a direct connection with Beza -  
 James Lawson, sub-principal of Aberdeen university and  
 successor to Knox at Edinburgh. There is no evidence that  
 Lawson was ever in Geneva, although he may have visited that  
 city when he was on the continent before 1567, but Beza  
 commended him highly in the notice of Knox in his Icones (1580),  
 and in March 1580/81 the Genevan replied to a letter in which  
 Lawson had given him an account of the struggle against the  
pseudoepiscopi.<sup>(2)</sup> In July 1584 Lawson again sent Beza a report  
 on recent events in Scotland.<sup>(3)</sup>

The progress of the anti-episcopal movement in the  
 four years following Andrew Melville's arrival in Scotland was  
 very rapid. The assembly of August 1575, which heard the  
 first protest against "the name and office of bishop", appointed  
 a commission to discuss whether bishops, "as they are now in

1. Spottiswoode, II. 200.

2. Additional MSS. 32,092, ff. 72-3; cf. Strype, Annals,  
 II. ii. 336.

3. Wodrow MSS. (N.L.S.), fol. vol. 42, No.8. Unfortunately,  
 this letter is almost entirely indecipherable.

the Kirk of Scotland, have their function grounded upon the Word of God or not". The resultant report on "the office of a Bishop or Superintendent" insisted that the term "bishop" was applicable to every pastor, but allowed that overseers could be chosen who would visit "reasonable bounds besides their ownne flocke"<sup>(1)</sup>. The next general assembly (April 1576) commanded the bishops to accept "particular flocks", and some of them agreed to do so, but there ensued a struggle with the archbishops of Glasgow and St. Andrews, who were unwilling to abdicate any part of their episcopal function.<sup>(2)</sup> By October 1577 agreement had been reached on the main provisions of the second Book of Discipline,<sup>(3)</sup> which was thoroughly presbyterian, and the general assembly of April 1578 forbade, provisionally, the election of bishops - a decree made definitive in June.<sup>(4)</sup> In July 1580 came the final condemnation of episcopacy.<sup>(5)</sup>

This attempt to show the importance of Genevan influence in the development of English and Scottish presbyterianism must not be taken to imply that no significance should be attached to the organisation of the reformed churches in France and Holland as models or examples.

1. Calderwood III. 355-6.
2. ib. 367-8, 370-1, 378.
3. ib. 387-8.
4. ib. 403-4, 411.
5. ib. 469-70.

It was in 1571, the year before the Admonition to Parliament, that the Netherland churches held an assembly which made orders about the holding of consistories, classes and synods, and which decided that "No Church shall have or exercise dominion over another; no Minister, Elder, or Deacon, shall bear rule over others of the same degree: but everyone shall beware of attempting or giving the least cause of suspicion of his aiming at such dominion"<sup>(1)</sup>. Ten years later, a national synod at Middelburg arranged "the Churches in every District under Classes, and the Classes under particular Synods"<sup>(2)</sup>. The connection of the English puritans with the Low Countries was very close, and the organisation of the Dutch church must have been known to them from about 1577 at least.<sup>(3)</sup> The possibility of a debt to Holland cannot be ignored, but it does not appear to have any bearing on the present subject.

What actually took place, in both England and Scotland, as a result of the work of Cartwright and Melville, seems to have been less a change in the views of the older men than the assumption of leadership by young men who imbibed presbyterian ideas while they were students at universities,

1. Brandt, History of the Reformation in the Low Countries, I. 294.
2. ib. 381.
3. We shall see that Travers was in Antwerp in 1577 (chapter 6). Barrowe, in his Briefe Discoverie, wrote of the "new duch Classes" (p. 191).

and who were characterized by inexperience of pastoral work<sup>(1)</sup> and by a doctrinaire disregard of expediency. Very few of the older churchmen, even of those who had thought the reformation settlement imperfect, appear to have become presbyterians; none became prominent in the movement. The older men of both parties had too much in common to become bitter enemies of each other. Together they had been driven into exile by Mary Tudor, or had engaged in a life and death struggle against Mary of Guise and Mary Stewart; together they had rejoiced in the accession of Elizabeth or James. They were largely men who had collaborated in forming congregations in time of persecution or exile, and in organising churches within a protestant establishment; as colleagues, they respected each other.<sup>(2)</sup> - The men who were regarded as leading puritans in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign - Whittingham, Foxe, Humphrey, Lever, Sampson, Gilby, and Goodman - took no part in the presbyterian movement.<sup>(3)</sup> Gilby and Sampson are most nearly exceptions, but the contrast between Gilby's works and the typically<sup>(4)</sup> presbyterian books written by Cartwright, Travers, and Udall is more marked than the superficial resemblances. John Foxe

1. Cf. Frere, English Church, p. 155; Kennedy, Parker, p. 250.

2. Cf. Z.L. I. 162, and Strype, Parker, I. 371-4.

3. They are said to have collaborated with Field and Wilcox in 1572 (Strype, Whitgift, I. 55), and Sampson asserted in 1573 that the divinely appointed polity was absent in England (Strype, Annals, II. i. 392-3).

4. View of Antichrist (1578) and Dialogue betweene a Souldiour of Barwicke and an English Chaplaine (1581).

expressly dissociated himself from the presbyterians, and wrote of the turbulentus Genius which inspired their <sup>(1)</sup> factiosa capita. Neither Whittingham, Humphrey, nor Goodman seems to have shared the presbyterian hatred of the established form of ecclesiastical government, and all three held office <sup>(2)</sup> in the church. That the presbyterian party was a party of young men is easily proved - of the older puritans, who accepted episcopacy, none was born later than 1527, while the presbyterians were all born after 1534; Travers and Wilcox were still in their early twenties when they began to play leading parts in the revolt.

This view finds some support in the remarks of contemporaries. Grindal told Bullinger in 1573: "They are young men who disseminate these opinions.... Humphrey, and Sampson, and some others, who heretofore moved the question <sup>(3)</sup> about ceremonies, are entirely opposed to this party". In 1565 Burghley had spoken of the "rash young heads that are <sup>(4)</sup> so soon ripe to climb into pulpits", and in 1573 he said that there had entered into pulpits "a number of persons young in years, but over-young in soundness of learning and discretion, which ... have enticed ... their auditories ... to conceive

1. Fuller, Church-History, IX. iii. 14.

2. Whittingham was dean of Durham, Humphrey was dean successively of Gloucester and Winchester, Goodman was archdeacon of Richmond (Le Neve, Fasti, III. 267) and possibly dean of Chester (S.P.Dom. Eliz. vol. clii.No.33).

3. Z.L. I. 292.

4. Strype, Annals, I. ii. 158.

erroneous opinions, in condemning the whole government of the Church and order ecclesiastical<sup>(1)</sup>".

In Scotland, too, we see the appearance of a party of young men. Of the men who had been active in organising the reformed church in its earliest years, only one - Robert Pont - can be regarded as a presbyterian. Continued support for the episcopacy which they had accepted in 1572 appears in John Craig and in John Erskine of Dun, both of whom accepted the restored episcopacy of 1584, and in David Lindsay, who lived until the seventeenth century and became a bishop. Most of the reformers were born before 1520 (but Pont in 1524 and Lindsay c. 1531), and the Melvillians were separated from them by almost two decades - James Lawson and Alexander Arbuthnot were born in 1538, while Andrew and James Melville, Walter Balcanquhal, and John Davidson were born after 1544.

It seems arguable that there is some significance in the close association of the presbyterians with the universities, and in their comparative inexperience of parochial work. Their leading men in England, Cartwright and Travers, might be regarded, in their own terminology, rather as "doctors" than as "pastors". Danger from the universities had been foreseen by Burghley in 1565<sup>(2)</sup> and by Hutton in 1573,<sup>(3)</sup>

1. Strype, Parker, II. 350.

2. Strype, Annals, I. ii. 158.

3. H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. II. p. 60; Mordin, pp. 261-66.

and Francis Bacon, an observer and critic of presbyterianism, explained the doctrinaire outlook of the presbyterians as  
 (1)  
 follows:

"The Universities are the seat or the continent of this disease; whence it hath been and is derived into the rest of the realm. There, men will no longer be e numero, of the number. There, do others side themselves before they know their right hand from their left.... They skip from ignorance to prejudicate opinions".

In Scotland, the presbyterians were, to an even greater extent,  
 (2)  
 men of academic outlook. Andrew Melville was a university man all his life, and for a time he had his nephew, James, as a colleague; James Lawson was sub-principal of Aberdeen, 1569-73, and John Davidson, who was a regent at St. Andrews from 1572 to 1574, spent so much of the subsequent fifteen years in exile that he can have done little parochial work  
 (3)  
 before about 1589.

Most of the presbyterian programme could easily be  
 (4)  
 visualised in terms of the existing system - the consistory, as the discipline-enforcing organisation in each congregation, was already established in most parts of Scotland, and in

1. Spedding, Letters and Life of Bacon, I. 82-3.
2. Cf. this estimate of Andrew Melville: "Melvinus vir fuit eruditus; at Scholis quam Ecclesiae aut Reipub. muneri obeundo magis idoneus" - Volusenus, Vita Adamsoni, p. 4.
3. See chapters 6, 7 and 8.
4. A consciousness of the ease with which a transition could be effected appears in the plan for the use of churchwardens and collectors for the poor as elders and deacons. (Neal, I. 278).

England the desire for effective discipline was so strong that something very like a consistorial system existed in some parishes;<sup>(1)</sup> the provincial synod was simply the council of a diocese, but with no permanent president occupying the place of bishop or superintendent; the general assembly had been the governing body of the Scottish church since 1560, it had continued - irregularly, some thought - after the revolution of 1567, and, with the decline in importance of the baronial element in its composition, it could be viewed as merely a gathering of ministers and elders. The body intermediate between individual churches and the provincial synod - the presbytery or classis - had been foreshadowed, in both England and Scotland, by the "propheying" or "exercise",<sup>(2)</sup> and it is possible to trace the emergence of presbyterian practice as a development which proceeded along parallel lines in the two countries.

The Book of Discipline had prescribed that the ministers and readers of churches within six miles of every important town should join the ministers of that town in a weekly meeting for "prophecie" and "interpretatioun". There

1. Strype, Annals, II. i. 134; cf. Cartwright's remark in his reply to Whitgift (Whitgift, Works, I. 84): "There be places in England, where the ministers be called by their parishes, in such sort as the examples of the scriptures do shew to have been done, before the eldership and government of the Church be established".
2. "Propheying" was in the main the English, "exercise" the Scottish, term. Cf. Petrie, History of the Catholick Church II. 333: "propheying (which in Scotland is called The Exercise)".

is no foundation for the idea that the "exercise" was originally intended to develop into the presbytery,<sup>(1)</sup> nor any indication that the "exercises" were at first regarded as, even potentially, administrative units, but in the second decade after the reformation, possibly because of the appearance of presbyterian theory, their possible value as links between particular congregations and the synods, which met only twice yearly, was recognised. In 1572/3 the general assembly approved a suggestion that "sick matters as falls out betuixt the Synodall Conventiouns and General Assemblies salbe headed and notit at every Exercise, twenty days befor the General Assembleis, that the brethren may be ripely advised with the samine"<sup>(2)</sup>. In March 1574, indeed, and in October 1576 it was noted that the exercises were declining, and on the second of these occasions ministers and readers within eight miles of towns (instead of six)<sup>(3)</sup> were commanded to attend. But some exercises must have continued to flourish, and even to increase in importance, for there is evidence that in August 1578 the exercise of Edinburgh regarded itself as a body possessed of certain executive powers.<sup>(4)</sup> The erection of

1. This notion was fostered by presbyterian controversialists, e.g. Scot, Apologetical Narration, p. 10.

2. B.U.K. I. 265.

3. ib. 321, 366.

4. N.L.S. MSS. 29.2.6 (Balcarres Papers vol. VI), No.88:

"The xii day of August 1578.

"The qlk. day the brethren of the exercyiss of Edinburgh beand convenit with the commissioner of Lowthiane, hering the ernist suitt of the lordis laitlie departit out of this toun to haif ane Minister, hes appointit thair brethren Johne Brand and Mr. Thomas M'Gye or ony of thame to pass unto the saidis Lordis according to their desyir, willing thame to travell nocht onlie in preitching of the Word but also in persuading alsweill thame as the parttie in Striviling to concord and unitie ...."

presbyteries had now commenced, and there was at first some doubt as to the relations between the new body and the exercise which it so closely resembled, but the uncertainty was ended by a decision of the general assembly of July 1579 that in places where an exercise was in existence "the exercise may be judgit a presbyterie"<sup>(1)</sup>. The position of the exercises can hardly be made clear without reference to the "city units" which in some cases preceded both kirk sessions and presbyteries.<sup>(2)</sup> The several congregations of a large town seem to have been regarded as in a sense a single church, and they were served by a single consistory. This consistory was, of course, the kernel of the exercise of the district round the town; there was possibly no attempt to differentiate between its functions as a consistory and the functions of the exercise, and, consequently, the assumption by the exercise of executive powers was easy. There is probably need of the caveat that whereas the historian is inclined to think in terms of institutions, contemporaries may have thought simply of personnel.<sup>(3)</sup>

In England, the "exercise" or "prophesying" was a

1. B.U.K. II. 439.

2. Cf. D. B. Smith in S.H.R. IX. pp. 20-22.

3. The best known city unit was the "general kirk of Edinburgh". The churches of the city were represented in a consistorial assembly by their ministers, elders, and deacons. Cf. Maitland Club Miscellany, I. i. p. 97.

(1)  
 well recognised institution shortly after 1570, and it is evident that by February 1572/3, when bishop Parkhurst acceded to the request of the men of Bury St. Edmunds to have an exercise established there, exercises had been tried and had proved successful. It must be assumed that precedents in Geneva and elsewhere had suggested the institution to English reformers. A good deal of evidence can be adduced to support the view that the exercises, continuing unofficially and even secretly after official recognition was withdrawn in 1577,<sup>(2)</sup> were gradually turned into the classes of the next decade.<sup>(3)</sup> It has been asserted, with complete justification, that the "orders" of the Dedham classis are in effect those of an exercise,<sup>(4)</sup> and the similarity between the two bodies extended to terminology. The chairman of both "prophesying" and classis<sup>(5)</sup> was called a "moderator" - a term which has come to be associated almost exclusively with the assemblies of presbyterian churches. Propheesyings were often called "conferences", and the second Admonition to Parliament, which contained a description (the first printed in England) of the complete presbyterian platform, not only used this term for

1. The earliest "orders" given by Strype are dated June 1571. (Annals II. i. 133-40; Grindal pp. 260-2.)

3. As late as 1584 there were meetings of what could be regarded as propheesyings. (Seconde Parte of a Register I. 176-7.)

4. Usher, Presbyterian Movement, p. 25.

5. ib. pp. 25-7; Strype, Annals II. ii. 546, 695, III. i. 477.

6. Durham Manifesto, pp. 107-2.

the classes, but gave an account of these assemblies which must have compelled men to compare, if not to identify them .  
 (1)  
 with the prophesyings:

"A conference I call the meeting of some certaine ministers, and other brethren, ... to conferre and exercise themselves in prophesying, or interpreting the scriptures, after the which interpretation, they must conferre uppon that whiche was done, and judge of it, the whole to judge of those that spake .... At which conferences, any one ... of the brethren, are at the order of the whole, to be employed upon some affaires of the church .... The demeanors also of the ministers may be examined and rebuked, ... some causes within that circuit ... may be decided".

The probability that prophesyings developed into classes is strengthened by the association of the earlier assemblies with nonconformity. When five puritan ministers were deprived in January 1573/4, it was found that three of them had been "moderators" and that all of them had taken part in  
 (2)  
 prophesyings. The danger from the exercises as gatherings which provided the nonconforming party with an organisation was fully realised in 1576 by John Aylmer, then archdeacon  
 (3)  
 of Lincoln:

"I have found great boldnesse in the meaner sort which will ere it be long, bring great confusion in the Church if it be not speedily prevented. There is of late a rank of Rangers and posting Apostles, that go from Shire to Shire, from Exercise to Exercise, namely Patchet, Standon, etc. accompanied, countenanced and back'd with Sir R. Knightly,

1. Puritan Manifestoes, pp. 107-8.
2. Seconde Parte of a Register I. 121.
3. Additional MSS. 29,546, f. 56 verso.

Mr. Carlell and others out of Warwickshire, Northamptonshire and other shires to Ashby where Gilby is Bishop, to Leicestershire where Johnson is Superintendent, to another place where the Monk Anderson reigneth, to Coventry, etc. and there are Bishops rayled at, Metropolitans wonder'd at for their visitations, for their officers, their pompe, their not visiting and what not".

A classis, according to the definition of the second Admonition, was merely an exercise with disciplinary, and possibly executive functions, and the ease with which exercises could become bodies laying down rules which bound their members is obvious enough. There was no reason why they should not even provide opportunities for ordination after the presbyterian  
(1) fashion. In 1576 the bishop of Hereford, who understood the character of the polity advocated by the presbyterians, was  
(2) suspicious of the exercises, and wrote to Grindal:

"I fear'd that might happen in my diocese, which I hear to have happen'd in some others: where some platform of Cartwright's Church, under colour of such Exercises, hath been laid. And if it be not well and wisely look'd unto will creep ut Gangrenae morbus".

The case for continuity from exercise to classis is, clearly, very strong, and a parallel development in England and Scotland is probable.

Led by men of an energetic and courageous type, and possessed of the opportunity given by the existence of undeniable abuses for which its programme offered a remedy, the presbyterian movement in both England and Scotland inevitably

1. Cf. Seconde Parte of a Register I. 71.

2. Additional MSS. 29,546, f. 52 verso.

implied a serious threat to the established order. The success of the movement in Scotland and its failure in England are accounted for by political circumstances. It was the strength of the English queen and her undoubted protestantism which saved episcopacy and the prayer book in England at a time when the majority of thoughtful Englishmen were favourable to puritanism, while a king whose effective power was slight and whose attachment to the reformed religion could at times be questioned found it impossible to avert the temporary triumph of presbyterianism in Scotland. The progress of the revolt was in each case assisted by the precision of its demands, for, whereas the presbyterians could deduce from the scriptures a logical exposition of their entire programme, their opponents, accustomed to be content with less dogmatic ideas, could merely protest that the scriptures did not prescribe a polity and allege reasons of expediency against the jus divinum claimed for the new system. The decline in the strength of English puritanism and the growth of stronger convictions among the English conformers date from the adoption by the episcopalian party of a counter claim of divine right. Whatever the bitterness of some of the reformers in matters of doctrine and ritual, a spirit of "sweet reasonableness" had characterized their views on polity. This disappeared, and in its place came violent dissensions which produced in the first generation parties within the church, in the second rebellion and civil war, and in the third the formation of rival communions.

SECTION III.THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIAN  
PARTIES DOWN TO 1604.Chapter 6.Early contacts and the beginnings of co-operation, 1570-1584.

It is unlikely that the brief period during which the Scottish church approached "conformitie with England" had succeeded in effacing the memory of the relations between Scotland and the English puritans in the 'sixties. The tradition of reference to Scotland probably survived among the English nonconformists, while many Scots continued to take a friendly interest in their efforts. It cannot be disputed that a considerable number of ecclesiastics in each country knew a great deal about current events in the other, for the English church continued to receive Scottish preachers into its service, while many Scots obtained part of their education in England, or taught in schools there, before becoming ministers at home.<sup>(1)</sup> This underlying probability should be kept in view, like a background which, although essential, does not obtrude itself on the observer even when there is little action in the foreground. It may be this background, rather than any notable, or even perceptible, incidents, which explains the appearance, about 1580, of an almost complete consciousness among the

1.) See Appendix A.

English and Scottish presbyterians that their aims were identical.

Presbyterianism was first advocated in Britain in 1572 (in the second Admonition to Parliament), but it is probable that the men who were to lead the English and Scottish presbyterian parties had already met in the Geneva of Theodore Beza.<sup>(1)</sup> Andrew Melville was in Geneva, as "regent" or master of the second class in the college, from November 10, 1569, until April 6, 1574,<sup>(2)</sup> and, so far as we know, was absent from the city for only one short period during these years - from July to September 1570 he was at Lausanne. Thomas Cartwright arrived at Geneva before July 3, 1571,<sup>(3)</sup> and remained there until at least January 31, 1572. It is open to doubt whether Melville was, as has been maintained,<sup>(4)</sup> one of the compagnons anglais of Cartwright mentioned in the Geneva records - the context of the phrase seems to imply that the other Englishmen were visitors like Cartwright and not residents like Melville - but it is most probable that the two met. Cartwright returned to England in 1572, but left again at

1. This passage is based on Borgeaud, L'Academie de Calvin 1559-1798, pp. 107-10, 113, 119, 316, and "Cartwright and Melville at the University of Geneva, 1569-74", in A.H.R. V. 284-90.

2. J. Melville, Diary, p. 41.

3. Camden Soc. Misc. VI., Walsingham's journal p. 9; cf. Pearson, Cartwright, p. 48.

4. Pearson, Cartwright, p. 53. Scots were, of course, often regarded as "English" on the continent. In universities where there was no Scottish "nation" they were enrolled in the English "nation", and Scotsmen and Englishmen spoke the same language.

(1)

the end of 1573 or early in 1574 and went to Heidelberg, so that he was no longer in England when Melville passed through that country on his way home to Scotland in June 1574. After spending at least three weeks in Paris, Melville left that city on May 30, and in London, where he would arrive a few

(2)

days later, he remained "a space". If he gave any attention to ecclesiastical affairs, he must have learned of the importance of "exercises", and of their danger to the

established church government, for these subjects were under

(3)

discussion at the time. It may be that as Melville proceeded northward the vision of a British presbyterian church was already taking shape in his mind - if indeed it had not been implanted there by Beza.

The Scots, and Melville in particular, learned more about the development of English presbyterianism during the next few years. In 1574 Travers published his Explicatio Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae; Melville knew of the work fairly soon after its publication, and recognised its importance, for in December 1575 he presented a copy to his friend Arbuthnot, principal of King's College, Aberdeen. News of English affairs at this period must have been brought to Melville by

(4)

1. Pearson, Cartwright, p. 131.

2. H.M.C. Report II. p. 187, J. Melville, Diary, p. 44.

3. Strype, Annals II. i. 477-80.

4. Pearson, op. cit. p. 142.

another friend, Thomas Smeton, who had been befriended by Walsingham in Paris in 1572 and, returning to England in the ambassador's train, had become a schoolmaster at Colchester.<sup>(1)</sup> Smeton visited Scotland in 1576, but did not receive the welcome which he thought he merited, and he went back to England to persuade Walsingham to prepare the way for a more successful appearance in his native country.<sup>(2)</sup> Returning to Scotland in 1577, Smeton soon became a professor at Glasgow university, where Melville was principal. He did not forget his English friends, for in 1583 he saw Walsingham during the latter's mission to Edinburgh, and in a letter which he wrote<sup>(3)</sup> to the English secretary shortly afterwards he suggested that, as Scottish universities were training more men than could be absorbed at home, and many students were compelled to go to France, some of his scholars might find places in England - a suggestion which may account for the presence in England of some of the Scottish divines who are to be found there in this period. In the same letter, Smeton mentioned the receipt of a book written by William Whitaker, the puritan controversialist.

1. Calderwood III. 406-7; Spottiswoode II. 320; McCrie, Andrew Melville, edn. 1824, II. 379-82.

2. C.S.P. V. 222-3.

3. C.S.P. VI. 635-6.

In the 'seventies we note the first appearance in England of the "Scottish preacher called Davidson", who was for about fifteen years a frequent associate of English presbyterians, and whose identity with John Davidson, minister first of Liberton and then of Prestonpans, can sometimes be proved and is always possible. At the beginning of 1574,<sup>(1)</sup> John Davidson, then a "regent" at St. Andrews university, wrote a book attacking the assignment by the regent Morton of several parishes to a single minister. In January 1573/4, he was cited to appear before the regent, and on March 26 he was called before the council.<sup>(2)</sup> Bail was granted to him, but the danger of a severe penalty was so great that those who were guarantors agreed that he should take refuge abroad, and in April one of his friends advised him to flee to England and address himself to "Mr. Gudman", who would find him a convoy to La Rochelle. In June, Davidson disappeared, but he did not at once go to England, for he was in Argyll in November 1574 and his departure by sea from Leith may not have taken place until early in 1575.<sup>(3)</sup> He was absent from Scotland for several years. His original intention had been to go to France, and he certainly spent part of his exile on the continent,<sup>(4)</sup> but it

1. Aldis, No. 124 (dated 1573/4).

2. Wodrow, MS. biography of Davidson (Glasgow University Library); R.P.C. II. 716.

3. Hume of Godscroft, History of the House of Angus and Douglas II. 242; Calderwood V. 339 and VIII. 200-201. In July 1594 Davidson dated his departure from Leith as nineteen years, or a little more, before.

4. Pearson, op.cit. p. 171.

is equally clear that he was for some time in England and that he became known to English presbyterians. His attack on Morton had brought him to the notice of Henry Killigrew, English ambassador in Scotland at the time, who reported the incident to Walsingham, and this may explain Davidson's appearance as an associate of the circle of public officials with puritan sympathies which included, besides Walsingham and Killigrew, William Davison. Towards the end of 1577, William Davison, then English agent at Antwerp, informed Laurence Tomson, Walsingham's puritan secretary, of the proposal that the English Merchant Adventurers at Antwerp should have a chaplain. Tomson replied on December 15 that he would try to secure William Charke, the noted puritan, and added: "I know of an other honest Scotishe man of your owne name, who I thinke wil be very fitt for yow, if yow like so to be accomodat". The man actually appointed, however, was Walter Travers, whom Davison had met at Antwerp in the previous August, and who was now in London. His appointment was arranged by Killigrew (who referred the matter to Walsingham), and it seems that Davison had carried on negotiations with Killigrew and Tomson simultaneously, for Tomson persisted in his endeavours to obtain the services of Charke after Killigrew had practically completed his

1. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. IV. ff. 262 recto, 264 verso;  
cf. C.S.P. IV. Nos. 783, 788.

(1)  
 arrangements with Travers. While John Davidson was in England, he made the acquaintance of other puritans besides those of the Walsingham-Davison group, and his friendship with John Field, who acted as a sort of secretary to the English presbyterian party, is particularly significant. The two had many conversations, in which they agreed on the general principle that "it is no small comfort to brethren of one natione to understand the state of the brethren in other nationes".

(2)  
 Other associates of Davidson were John Stubbs (the brother-in-law of Cartwright), Charke, who had been, like Davidson himself, a candidate for the Antwerp chaplaincy, and "manie gude brethrein and sisters of his acquaintance", who were all eager, a few years later, to renew their friendship with the Scotsman.

(4)  
 The general assembly of April 1577 petitioned for permission to Davidson to return to Scotland, but he does not appear to have returned for some time.

(5) (6)

1. S.P. Dom. Addenda 1547-1625 vol. xxiii. No. 3, and vol. xxv. Nos. 68 and 74 (Cal.S.P.Dom. Addenda 1566-79, pp. 442, 528-9, 532); S.P.~~Dom.~~ Holland and Flanders vol. iv, No. 38 (Foreign Calendar, 1577-8, No. 516).
2. N.L.S. MSS. 6.1.13 f. 42 (Appendix D).
3. ib. Stubbs is identified from subsequent mention of him as a friend of Davidson by James Carmichael (Wodrow Misc. I. 414) and from the association of "John Stubbs, scaeva" with James Carmichael (vide infra, p. 205 ). Charke, the "Cherk" of the letter, was, as we have seen, known to Tomson and Davison, and subsequently appears as an associate of Scottish ministers (infra p. 188 ).
4. Wodrow Misc. I. 414.
5. B.U.K. I. 388.
6. Wodrow (MS. biography of Davidson) gave no evidence to support his view that Davidson returned in 1577 or 1578. Dr. Moffat Gillon, in his John Davidson, states his opinion (pp. 51-2) that the return took place soon after the appeal by the assembly, but at the same time considers it possible that Davidson was in England in 1579 (p. 83). There is no evidence that he was in Scotland before 1579, when he was minister of Liberton (Scott, Fasti I 170).

Just as he had previously raised a storm which compelled him to flee from Scotland, so now he seems to have achieved notoriety in England which resulted in his expulsion from that country in turn. In October 1579 the English government was "geven to understande that one Davison, a Scottishman, in his common preachinges and lectures hath uttered certen lewde and disordered speeches to her Majesties discontentacion", and decided to investigate the matter. <sup>(1)</sup> With England too hot for him, Davidson was forced to return to Scotland, where the power of his old enemy, Morton, who had ceased to be regent in 1578, was declining.

The interest in Scottish presbyterianism which had been stimulated in John Field, presumably by Davidson, led to the publication, in 1580, of The iudgement of a most reuerend and learned man from beyond the seas concerning a threefold order of bishops - a translation by Field of Beza's reply to the questions sent to him by Lord Glamis in 1578. As this work does not seem to have been previously printed, the assumption must be that Field obtained a copy of Beza's letter from Davidson or some other Scotsman. <sup>(2)</sup> The publication, in the

1. A.P.C. XI. 289.

2. There is no evidence of the existence in print of a Latin version of the De Triplici Episcopatu. The British Museum catalogue classifies Field's translation as a translation of an unidentified work by Beza. Bancroft's account in his Survey seems to support the view taken here (p.50): "The same yeare [1580] also he writte the discourse of his three kinds of Bishops ... and sent it unto a man of great state in that countrey [Scotland]. It hath since been translated into English by Field".

interests of English presbyterianism, of a work written with reference to the situation in Scotland shows that the two parties were already aware that their aims were identical. Further evidence of Field's interest in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs appeared in 1583, when he published a sermon of Knox, the manuscript of which he had obtained from the widow of the puritan Edward Dering. In an epistle dedicatory to Dering's widow, Field urged her to obtain other writings of Knox if she could, and explained that his admiration for the Scottish reformer was due to a perusal of the account of Knox's life and death published at Edinburgh in 1579, along with Thomas Smeton's Ad virulentem Archibaldi Hamiltonii apostatae dialogum ... responsio.<sup>(1)</sup> Readers of this volume would learn a certain amount about James Lawson, Knox's successor at Edinburgh and a leading presbyterian, and would be reminded of the association between the English and Scottish churches in the previous decade.<sup>(2)</sup> Field's interest in Scotland probably led him to read the Scottish confession of 1581, three editions of which were published in London,<sup>(3)</sup> and to admire the solemn oath which it contained to defend the doctrine and discipline of the Scottish church.

1. Knox, Works IV. 87, 88, 91, 92.

2. Smeton's Responsio, pp. 95, 118.

3. S.T.C. 22020-2.

In the period before 1584 there were two occasions on which the English and Scottish presbyterian bodies came into contact with each other in a way which we can regard as formal and official. The first was the invitation of Cartwright and Travers to chairs at St. Andrews university. The reorganisation of that university, undertaken in 1579, was aimed at the erection of "a colledge of Divinitie for the profession of learned toonges and Theologie against the Seminaries of Rems and Rome"<sup>(1)</sup> - that is, the effort was one in which not Scots only, but protestants generally, should be interested. The scheme was ratified by parliament in November 1579,<sup>(2)</sup> and Andrew Melville, who had been principal of Glasgow university, was chosen as principal of St. Andrews, where he took up his duties towards the end of 1580.<sup>(3)</sup> Two of the chairs in the new college were not filled immediately, for reasons connected with administrative detail,<sup>(4)</sup> and it may have been to these that the English puritan leaders were subsequently invited. The letter of invitation was printed by Fuller,<sup>(5)</sup> who attributed to

1. Church of Scotland Library, Wodrow MSS., vol. 28, No. 6. Andrew Melville, writing in 1610: "I was transported thirtie yeers ago by the advise and authoritie of generall Assembly and three estats at his Majesty's command from Glasco ... unto St.Androis for reforming of the Universitie, and erecting a Colledge, etc."
2. A.P.S. III. 178 c. 2.
3. J. Melville's Diary, pp. 82-3.
4. A.P.S. III. 181.
5. Church-History, IX. vii. 52.

Andrew Melville the idea of inviting Cartwright and Travers -  
 a suggestion which is supported by the existence of this draft  
 of a letter from Melville to the two Englishmen: (1)

Th. Cartwright et Gualtero Traverso,  
 4 non. mart. 1580.

Caeterum haec rerum divinarum in Academia Andreana  
 professio, ad quam vos nostri regis, et ecclesiae invitant  
 literae, eiusmodi est ut ea nihil aptius ad dei gloriam inter  
 nos propagandam, nihil opportunius, ad ea scribenda quae  
 vestros populares, omnemque posteritatem erudiant dici aut  
 frugi posset.

This draft supplies the exact date of the invitation - March  
 1580/81 - which is not given in the letter of invitation  
 printed by Fuller. That letter states that the Scots had  
 rejoiced at the boldness and constancy with which Cartwright  
 and Travers had fought for presbyterian government in England,  
 and suggested that their great gifts, which could not be used  
 to the full in their own country, might be more fruitful if the  
 two Englishmen took refuge in Scotland. It goes on to explain  
 the objects of the reorganisation of the university of  
 St. Andrews and to express the high esteem in which Cartwright  
 and Travers were held both in Scotland and in England.

The second contact of a formal nature was on the  
 occasion of the second attempt which the Scottish church made  
 to assist English nonconformists. Circumstances differed from  
 those in which the first attempt had been made in 1566, for

1. Wodrow MSS (N.L.S.), fol. vol. 42, No.3 - "drafts of  
 letters by Andrew Melville".

then the Scottish church had regarded itself as a sister church to the Church of England, and not as the ally of the English puritans. Presbyterianism had now triumphed in Scotland, after a struggle lasting more than five years. The establishment of presbyteries had commenced immediately after the acceptance of the second Book of Discipline in 1581, and under the government of the "Ruthven Raid liberals or  
(1)  
presbyterians", who had, in April 1582, overthrown the Lennox government (which had supported episcopacy and seemed to endanger protestantism), the kirk was in the ascendant. The general assembly expressed its approval of the new government, the king proclaimed the freedom of the church, and the erection of presbyteries continued. Almost at once the Scottish presbyterians decided to use for the benefit of their English brethren the influence which they had now obtained with the government. Before the end of the year, some ministers contemplated making a motion at the next general assembly that the government should be petitioned to join the kirk in an appeal to Elizabeth "towching the reformatioun of some abuses" in the Church of England "and especiallie that sincere men may have libertie to preache withowt deposing be the tyrannie of the bishoppes". On January 1st., 1582/3,

1. Masson's introduction to the Register of the Privy Council, second series I. cxviii.

John Davidson wrote to Field asking him to consult the English brethren and report to Davidson whether they thought the proposed step expedient. Field referred Davidson's proposal to members of the English presbyterian party, with many of whom he was constantly in touch, and they decided that they would be obliged to the Scots if they would be so mindful of the interests of English presbyterianism.<sup>(1)</sup> When the next general assembly met, in April 1583, Davidson and his friends must have fulfilled their promise, for three ministers were appointed to convey to the king the assembly's wish that he would make it part of the mission of his ambassador to England to ask Elizabeth to form a protestant league with Scotland and other states, and to "disburdein their brether of England, of the yocke of ceremonies imposed upon them against the libertie of the Word". James replied that he would "give command to his Ambassador, to treat for the same, as opportunitie served best for the advancement of the cause",<sup>(2)</sup> but nothing seems to have been done.<sup>(3)</sup>

At this point an attempt must be made to arrive at an understanding of the attitude of Walsingham and William Davison

1. Davidson to Field, 1st January, 1582/3. (Appendix D.)
2. Colonel Stewart was about to set out for England.  
(C.S.P. VI. Nos. 411 et seq.)
3. B.U.K. II. 613-4.

towards presbyterianism. "There is plenty of evidence to prove that Walsingham's personal sympathies lay with the reformers"<sup>(1)</sup>, for instance his friendship with Cartwright, who wrote to him from Geneva in 1571<sup>(2)</sup> and whom he encouraged, with a gift of £100, to undertake the refutation of the Rhemish Testament,<sup>(3)</sup> his choice of Rainolds for the lectureship he founded at Oxford,<sup>(4)</sup> and his knowledge of the negotiations for the appointment of Travers to the Antwerp chaplaincy.<sup>(5)</sup> When it was proposed that the anglican prayer book should be abandoned by the Antwerp church, Walsingham confided his views to Travers, and, while telling Davison that he thought him too rash in his support of the Genevan forms of prayer, he took care to point out that his reason for doing so was not that he disliked the forms themselves,<sup>(6)</sup> William Davison, it has been said, was "as near to being a Puritan as a public official safely could be"<sup>(7)</sup>, but there seems no need to qualify his adherence to puritanism. It was on his initiative that an "honest, learned and godly man" was sought for the Antwerp

1. Read, Walsingham, II. 260-1; cf. E.H.R. XXVIII. 34 et seq.;

2. Walsingham's journal, p. 9 (Camden Soc. Misc. VI), cf. Pearson, Thomas Cartwright, p. 48.

3. Fuller, IX. vi. 16.

4. Fowler, History of C.C.C., p. 160. (Oxford Hist.Soc. vol. XXV.)

5. p.152 supra.

6. S.P. Holland and Flanders VI. No. 54 (Walsingham to Davison, May 8, 1578); cf. For. Cal. 1577-8, No. 852; Read, Walsingham, II. 264-5, and E.H.R. XXVIII. 35 note 7.

7. Read, Walsingham, II. 261.

(1)  
 chaplaincy, and it is clear from the names proposed - Charke,  
 John Davidson, and Travers - that only puritans would be  
 deemed to have these qualifications. Of the proposal that  
 the prayer book should give way to Genevan services at Antwerp  
 Davison was a "pryncypall fortherar"<sup>(2)</sup>. He was, moreover, on  
 intimate terms with Travers. In a letter to Davison,  
 Killigrew asks to be remembered to Travers, "whose labours the  
 Lord blesse with incresse of frute"<sup>(3)</sup>; Randolph, sending a letter  
 to Davison by Travers, writes: "I cannot sufficiently commend  
 to you the bearer, my friend Mr. Travers, nor a little praise  
 your godly purpose to have him there so near yourself"<sup>(4)</sup>; and in  
 1585 we find Davison asking Travers to return a book he has  
 lent him - a book which Davison insists that no one must see  
 as it is on its way back to him.<sup>(5)</sup>

There is little evidence for the years before 1584 of  
 links between Walsingham and Davison and the Scottish  
 presbyterians, but the Antwerp appointment reveals John

Davidson in contact with a group composed of Walsingham,

1. S.P. Holland and Flanders IV. No. 38; cf. For. Cal.  
 1577-8, No. 516.
2. S.P. Holland and Flanders VI. No. 54; cf. For. Cal.  
 1577-8, No. 852.
3. For. Cal. 1577-8 No. 132.
4. ib. No. 810.
5. S.P. Dom. Eliz. CLXXXI. No. 34; cf. Dom. Cal.  
 1581-90, p. 259.

Davison, Tomson, Killigrew, Charke, and Travers. Walsingham may have heard of Andrew Melville, through his correspondence (1) with Geneva and through his association with Smeton, who, after taking refuge with Walsingham during the St. Bartholemew (2) massacre, and returning to England in his company, maintained friendship with the secretary. When he was in Scotland in 1583, Walsingham was visited by Smeton, and met Lawson, the (3) minister of Edinburgh and a leading presbyterian. William Davison was in Scotland in 1566, and may have remained there for some time, as nothing is known of him for some years after (4) that date. A Scotsman by descent, if not by birth - nothing seems to be known about his pedigree - he professed to take (5) a keen interest in Scottish affairs. He went to Scotland a second time in January 1582/3, and during his visit, which lasted only two or three months, he formed a friendship with (6) James Lawson.

A political motive explains in part the support given by Walsingham and Davison to the Scottish presbyterian party, for its members seemed to be, and at times were, ~~the~~

1. In July 1571 he had a letter from Portus, who was very intimate with Melville (Camden Soc. Misc. VI., Walsingham's journal, p. 9; J. Melville, Diary, P. 42.
2. Calderwood III. 407.
3. C.S.P. VI. 635-6, VII. 54.
4. D.N.B.; Nicholas, Davison.
5. Sir J. Melville, Memoirs pp. 327-8.
6. On April 9, 1583, Lawson preferred to send a complaint to Davison rather than to his former colleague, Bowes, who had remained in Edinburgh (S.P.Scot. Eliz. vol. xxxi. No. 93; cf. C.S.P. VI. 371-2).

the truest friends England had in Scotland. John Davidson, for instance, showed his enthusiasm for the "amity" in his praise of Bowes: "Goode Mr. Bowes doeth good service heir for the wellfare of the Church of God boyth thare and heir, in that he travaletth faythfullie and most diligentlie to keip<sup>(1)</sup> those two countries knit in amitie and treu freindship".

When Lennox was in power in Scotland in 1580 and 1581, and it was feared that Roman machinations were about to succeed in Scotland, Burghley agreed with Walsingham that the ministers should be supported: "We think that the Ministers of the Church of Scotland which have Credite and are wise may do much to abase the Credite of D'Obignye, who surely in th'end if he prosper, shall be the Instrument to overthrow the Religion there, and for that purpose was directed thither by the House of Guise"<sup>(2)</sup>. Spanish observers attributed the inspiration of the movement against Lennox to Elizabeth and her advisers, and said that when James checked the attacks on his favourite, Elizabeth encouraged the ministers to excommunicate the duke.<sup>(3)</sup> Perhaps we may say that Walsingham's leanings towards presbyterianism and the enthusiasm for a definite Anglo-Scottish understanding which he from first to

1. Letter to Field, Appendix D.

2. N.L.S., Wodrow MSS. folio vol. 50, No. 47. (Burghley and Walsingham to Bowes, April 17 or 19, 1580); cf. C.S.P. V. No. 475.

3. Span. Cal. 1580-86, No. 276, p. 387.

last displayed combined to lead him to the conviction that it was in a presbyterian Scotland alone that the English interest could be secure. An Englishman who did not sympathise with the aims of the presbyterians would soon have been alienated from them by their violence, as Sir John Foster was : "I was credible informed by some of myne acquaintance of the best, that there is like to be great alterations in Scotland, and that speedily, in Religion and God's Word through the dealings and beheaviour of the Ministers who have thereby procured many that before were zealous towards God's Word to be in the Contrar: for they take so much upon them, that they deny that the King shall have any thing to do with the spiritualitiis, or is Supream Head of the Church, nor will not permytt him to make any Bishop; and that the Mess is like to be sett up again.<sup>(1)</sup>" Walsingham and Davison had no misgivings of this kind. The idea that, if the Scottish Church had bishops, there might one day be a British church on the anglican model, did not appeal to them, and they steadily refused to believe that Scottish episcopalians could be well-disposed to the English alliance.

The Scottish presbyterians did not long enjoy the triumph which the Ruthven Raid had brought them, for James escaped from the raiders at the end of June, 1583, and the

1. N.L.S., Wodrow MSS. folio vol. 50, No. 51, Foster to Walsingham, May 13, 1582 (copy).

government, under the "anti-presbyterian dictatorship" of Captain James Stuart (Arran), soon resolved to treat the ministers as its enemies. The general assembly of October was alarmed at the crown's interference with the jurisdiction of the kirk, and attacked Patrick Adamson, who was already on good terms with the king, and was soon to be revealed as the government's instrument in the overthrow of presbytery.

Adamson's character suffered so severely at the hands of his presbyterian opponents in his own day, and so few attempts have been made in subsequent generations to ascertain the truth about him, that it would be difficult to depict the man as he was. His ability, however, and his literary and rhetorical skill, stand out, for even his enemies paid tribute to them, and his portrait is that of a strong and capable man, with, perhaps, more of the lawyer, or even of the man of action, than of the cleric in his nature. A search for weapons against the presbyterians, who claimed a divine right for their system, led Adamson to assert the scriptural and apostolic origin of episcopacy, and, from the moment of his

1. B.U.K. II. 634.

2. Calderwood III. 716.

3. The article in the D.N.B. is fair.

4. J. Melville, Diary, p. 53 - "man of notable ingyne, letters, and eloquence"; p. 293 - "this man had manie grait gifts, bot specialle excellit in the tounge and the pen". Historie and Life of James the Sext (p. 205) mentions Adamson's "rare learning" and "excellent doctrine". Andrew Melville described him as "vario et versatili ingenio", in his letter to Castel (Appendix F).

5. In the Scottish National Portrait Gallery.

6. Calderwood IV. 500.

appointment as archbishop, he made it clear that he would not be subordinate to the assembly, or hold his office on  
 (1)  
 conditions. With this conception of his order went the idea, present in the minds of many moderate men among his contemporaries, that episcopal government in the Scottish church would smooth the way to union with England. On the birth of James in 1566, Adamson had hailed the infant as prince of  
 (2)  
 Scotland, England and Ireland, and in 1573 he published a poem expressing gratitude to Elizabeth for her assistance to the  
 (3)  
 Scottish protestants against the Marians - assistance which had brought the civil war to an end. It was not only in government, but in the liturgy also, that he sought conformity, for in 1584 it was asserted that he had celebrated a marriage  
 (4)  
 according to "the English ceremonies", and one of the accusations brought against him by Andrew Melville in a letter to the churches of Geneva and Zurich was that under his rule the "state of public prayer, with the simplicitie of rites in ministration of the sacraments, and celebrating of mariage, is filthilie adulterated".  
 (5)

While the fall of the Ruthven Raiders had endangered

1. Calderwood III. 371-2.
2. C.S.P. II. no. 439, 456.
3. S.T.C. no. 147.
4. MacMillan, Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, p. 47, citing Wodrow Misc. I. 417.
5. Calderwood IV. 163.

presbyterianism in Scotland, and had opened the way for the re-establishment of episcopacy, in England the struggle between the presbyterians and the bishops had become more violent. Even in 1582 there were three events which indicate the growing strength of presbyterian organisation and the development of the habit of co-operation - the meeting of three score ministers at Cockfield in May, the first general conference at Cambridge in June, and the commencement, in October, of the regular meetings of the Dedham classis.<sup>(1)</sup> The appointment of Whitgift to the primacy in August 1583 initiated a policy of repression, of which the new archbishop's "articles" and the revised high commission are indicative.<sup>(2)</sup> The immediate result was increased activity among the puritans, and the further strengthening of their organisation. From March 1583/4 onwards, the classes appear as centres of organised opposition; co-operation is insisted on, and individuals ready to conform are discouraged from doing so.<sup>(3)</sup> An incident in June 1584 reveals the system at work. Field, who held in his hands the threads of the puritan organisation, wrote to the ministers of Lincoln encouraging them to stand fast in their refusal to subscribe to Whitgift's articles; numerous copies of the letter were made, and these were passed

1. Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, pp. 68-9; Usher, Presbyterian Movement, pp. 25-7.

2. Prothero, Documents, pp. 211-14. 472a-k; Camden, Annales II. 403-4.

3. Usher, op. cit. pp. 34, 35, 37, 38 and note.

round among the members of the party in the district, so that  
 all might know Field's counsel.<sup>(1)</sup> The grand puritan retort to  
 the archbishop, the triumph of the puritan organisation -  
 the survey of the state of the ministry - was commenced in the  
 summer of 1584.<sup>(2)</sup>

Not only was there coincidence in time between the  
 commencement of Whitgift's archiepiscopate and the opportunity  
 presented to Adamson. On the initiative of the latter, there  
 was co-operation between the primates.<sup>(3)</sup>

Adamson had numerous motives for making a journey  
 to England. There seems no reason to doubt that he wished to  
 leave Scotland and go to the continent for the sake of his  
 health; at any rate, Bowes accepted this without question,  
 James's letter of credit is explicit about it, and even after  
 the excuse, if excuse it had been, was no longer necessary,  
 Adamson persisted in it.<sup>(4)</sup> It was suggested that he was glad  
 to escape from impending excommunication, and that by his  
 departure he prevented the completion of the process against  
 him.<sup>(5)</sup> There was, of course, a diplomatic mission of importance,

1. H.M.C. MSS. of Marquis of Bath at Longleat, II. 24-5.
2. Usher, op. cit. pp. 36 (July 1, 1584), 38.
3. There are accounts of Adamson's mission to England in  
 J. Melville's Diary (p.141), Calderwood's History (III.  
 763, IV. 49) and his Vindiciae (p.54). Later historians  
 have made no attempt to reconstruct the narrative from  
 contemporary documents.
4. S.P.Scot Eliz. XXXIII. Nos. 71, 74 (C.S.P. VI. Nos. 681,  
 684); Adamson's second letter to Whitgift (Appendix E iii).
5. S.P.Scot Eliz, XXXIII. Nos. 80, 84 (C.S.P. VI. Nos. 691,  
 696).

and from the first it was intended that Adamson should have  
 audience of the queen of England.<sup>(1)</sup> But that the journey had  
 significance for ecclesiastical affairs was realised from the  
 beginning, for it was thought that the archbishop would go to  
 Geneva and other places on the continent to obtain  
 condemnation of the ministers.<sup>(2)</sup>

Adamson was at Berwick on November 20th. and 21st.,<sup>(3)</sup>  
 and arrived in London on November 30th.<sup>(4)</sup> He proceeded with  
 his diplomatic work,<sup>(5)</sup> but also communicated with Whitgift,  
 sending him a document containing a statement of the views of  
 the Scottish presbyterians and a refutation of them, and  
 asking for an interview.<sup>(6)</sup> Whitgift, although personally  
 willing to accede to this request, decided not to act without  
 reference to the government, so he sent a copy of Adamson's  
 articles to Burghley, and asked for advice. Perhaps acting  
 on this advice, he sent his chaplain to Adamson to inform him  
 that the queen's permission must be obtained before the two  
 archbishops could meet. Meantime, Adamson had learned, to  
 his great distress, that Walsingham had obtained a copy of his

1. C.S.P. VI. No. 706; Calendar of Border Papers I. No. 188;  
cf. Read, Walsingham II. 225.
2. C.S.P. VI. No. 703.
3. C.S.P. VI. No. 696; Calendar of Border Papers I. No. 188.
4. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXIII. No. 89 (C.S.P. VI. No. 702).
5. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXIII. No. 92 (C.S.P. VI. No. 705).
6. The account given is based on the correspondence of  
 Whitgift and Adamson (Appendix E). Adamson's "Articles",  
 which appear in their original form in Additional MSS.  
 32,092, ff. 73-75, are printed in J. Melville's Diary,  
 pp. 148-53, and in Calderwood's History, IV. 50-55.

(1)  
 articles, and visualised their use by the secretary and by his friends in Scotland to discredit the Scottish government and Adamson himself. In spite of this blow, Adamson continued to aim at consultation with the English bishops. It was to Mr Secretary Walsingham, ironically enough, that he had to apply for permission to live for a time at Oxford or Cambridge, and to confer with Whitgift or any other learned men whom Elizabeth might think it fit that he should consult. He explained that his health had improved since he came to  
 (2)  
 England.

Adamson succeeded in part of his mission, for he had a conversation with Whitgift at Lambeth, receiving a copy of one of Whitgift's books against Cartwright, and promising him in return copies of books which he had in the press. Moreover, he was entertained by the archbishop of York at his house, and met the bishop of London.  
 (3)  
 The difficulties which he encountered were, however, more notable than his successes. Copies of his "articles" found their way not only to Scotland but also into the hands of the English presbyterians, who thought that they contained matter suitable for discussion at

1. Adamson's first letter to Whitgift, and Whitgift's reply, which considers the leakage unaccountable, as Whitgift has retained the original and Burghley, he believes, has retained the copy he sent to him. Walsingham, it is clear, had set Archibald Douglas to spy on Adamson; Douglas reported his arrival in London (note 4 on previous page), and wrote "he keipis his selff quiett as zit" - as if Walsingham had told him to expect some unofficial activities.
2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. xxxiii, no. 94; cf. C.S.P.VI. no. 707.
3. Adamson's second and third letters to Whitgift, in Appendix E.

(1)

their conferences, and the enemies of the archbishops spread a rumour that they were conspiring for the restoration of Romanism, with the result that Adamson had to expound his protestant faith in four or five public sermons. His son-in-law and biographer, Florence Wilson, tells us that in these sermons Adamson gave such high praise to king James that Elizabeth commanded him to desist, and that he continued in private to advocate the right of the Scottish king to the

(2)

English crown. A number of English "nobles" who desired the overthrow of episcopacy approached Adamson with a suggestion that he should engineer the abolition of bishops in Scotland,

(3)

in order to set an example to England, but it was more to the archbishop's mind to defend episcopacy and to warn

(4)

England against presbytery, and this he did.

The English presbyterians showed their interest in Adamson's mission and their consciousness of the danger from it, not only by accusing the archbishops of Romish tendencies and by urging Adamson to change his policy, but also by

1. H.M.C. Report XII. ix. 149-50. The MS. collection which includes the Dedham classis minute book contains a copy of the "Propositiones Ministrorum Scotiae serenissimo Regi oblatae" among writings which were "inserted ... because they were conferred of in our meetings". Usher did not print this in his Presbyterian Movement, but admits that his edition is incomplete (p. 75).
2. Adamson, Poemata Sacra (1619), sig. A 3 verso.
3. Adamson's second letter to Whitgift (Appendix E iii).
4. In his unfinished work Psillus, which he described in the dedicatory epistle to his version of the Apocalypse (Works, edn. 1619, sig. T2 verso).

criticising Whitgift for negotiating with the Scottish primate. Their spokesman was Robert Beale, a man who belonged to the Walsingham-Davison group, and whose interest in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs is proved by the existence of collections made by him, of MSS. relating to the Scottish church.<sup>(1)</sup> He pointed out "that it is vehemently suspected that the Archbishopp of St. Andrewes is lately departed hence, with suche an approbation of our rites here, as carieth with it a condemnation of the forme used there. Whereon it is not unlike, but at the first some hold will be taken, to the great disadvantage of the Church."<sup>(2)</sup> Whitgift explained and apologised in a letter to Burghley: "Yt may be also that I have spoken in the mislike of the churches in Scotland, but not of late nor uppon anie conferrens with the Bishop of St. Androse, for what so ever my opinion ys of that platforme, yet I have learned not to be curious in aliena republica. All the conferrens that ever I had with the Bishop of St. Andrews I mayd knowne to your Lordship, sethens which tyme I have not sene hym nether hath he my hand to anie thing".<sup>(3)</sup> Whitgift,

1. H.M.C. Report II. 45, volume CXXXII. of the Calthorpe MSS. contains an answer by the Scottish ministers in England to a letter subscribed by certain of the flock in Scotland (1584), a copy of the [? second] Book of Discipline, "the quarto book of the progress and continuance of true religion", letters of John Knox and others; Bernard, Catalogi, Yelverton MSS. vol. LIV - this volume is clearly related to Beale, and contains several Scottish items.
2. Strype, Whitgift, I. 295, III. 97.
3. H.M.C. Bath MSS. at Longleat, II. 23.

although clear in his own mind as to the character of Scottish presbyterianism, had been discreet - more discreet than Bancroft, who had to apologise in a similar way some six years later, was to be.

Adamson remained in England for several months. His return to Scotland was followed, <sup>(1)</sup> in May 1584, by the "Black Acts", which overthrew the presbyterian system and established episcopacy, under the King as head of the church. There is ample material to show the effect which the failure of the Scottish presbyterian experiment produced in the minds of Walsingham and William Davison. It is true that the fall of the Ruthven Raiders had seemed to endanger English interests in Scotland, and of this Walsingham and Davison were well aware, particularly as the former had been sent to Scotland in August 1583 simply because of the gravity of the political situation. Further, Davison believed, or professed to believe, that the government of Arran, especially after the failure of the revolt of the protestant lords in April, 1584, aimed at <sup>(2)</sup> the restoration of Mary. Events proved that these fears were not justified, for the government of Arran was protestant and

1. Calderwood says that Adamson returned soon after the execution of Gowrie (May 2, 1584), or possibly about April 27 (History IV. 49). In his Vindiciae (p. 54) he says that the parliament was held immediately on the archbishop's return. Its first meeting was on May 19, when Adamson was present (A.P.S. III. 290).
2. Cotton MSS., Calig. C. VIII. f. 71; cf. C.S.P. VII. 182.

anglophil, but Davison could not trust a government which had overthrown presbytery. Even before he had learned details of  
(1)  
the "Black Acts", the prospect seemed gloomy:

"Some doubteth there is (confirmed by dyvers speaches and vaunts of the Bishop of St. Androwes since his retorne) that in this parliament thei will attempt the suppressinge of the Presbiteryes of the ministrie and restraine the power of the generall assemblies, because thei see not how ther corruptions maie easelie creepe into that churche so long as that discipline and government standeth wherein the xxv yeris past there hath not ben found so much as one detected heretique eyther amongst them selves or the laitye nor till of late anie one man amongst their greatest who durst openlie avowe papistrie".

When Davison received more definite information, he passed it on to Walsingham, colouring it with jeremiads for the presbyterian system and attacks on the Scottish bishops. On  
(2)  
the 27th. of May he wrote:

"Since my last I have receaved some particularities of the actis concluded in Session of parliament which tended cheeflie as it apperes to the confounding and supplanting of the present state and government of that church. Wherein the Kinge hath assumed to him self an absolute jurisdiction. Discharginge all assemblies generall provincially and presbiteries to convene or meddle in anie sorte with the discipline of the church. And devolved the whole spirituall jurisdiction thereof into the handes of the Busschoppes, men eyther in lief learning or both justlie to be chalenged. restored Montgomery to the Archbisshoprick of Glasgowe and freed him by parliament from the sentence of excommunication".  
(3)

Next day, Davison continued his lament for the "discipline", and on the 10th. of June he returned to the attack on the  
(4)  
bishops:

1. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. f. 53; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 138.
2. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. f. 62; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 146.
3. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. f. 149; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 149.
4. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. f. 167; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 167.

"The open invasion of the Church and ministrie first by the utter overthrow of the whole discipline and government thereof, next by apprehendinge wardinge or banishinge of the best and most godlie learned ministers, restoringe Mongomerie to the Archebisshoprick of Glascow and freinge him by parliament of the sentence of excommunication, comittinge the whole ecclesiasticall discipline to some few Busshopps, of which some are infamed in lief, suspectt in doctrine, and others utterlie incapable of anie ecclesiasticall charge, beinge onlie Civill men enjoyinge ecclesiasticall titles, etc.".

It is possible that Davison received news of the events he described in the first and second of these letters from Lawson and Balcanquhal, the presbyterian ministers of Edinburgh. The first of the letters (that of May 27th.) is that in which he reports their arrival at Berwick (he wrote from that town) and we know from a letter which Lawson and Balcanquhal wrote to Davison that they had met him in Berwick, that they were grateful for his conduct towards them when they met, and that they regarded his mission as being in the interests of their party.

Davison's regret at the change in the government of the Scottish church is all the more striking because it can be contrasted with the attitude of another Englishman, Widdrington, who was content to present facts without colouring them with praise of presbyterianism or attacks on the bishops:

1. p. 183 infra.

2. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. f. 60; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 148.

"It is concluded that all assemblies bothe generall and Sinodall, publique and pryvate, shalbe discharged, except at such tyme as it shall please the king that they convene.

"Certen Bushops are appointed judges to the ministerye having powir to controlle ther doctrine and depryve from there function such as they think good. The Archbushop of St. Androis being one of there censours.

"The B. of Glasco, Montgomery, is relaxed, and made free from the sentence of excommunicatioun pronounced against him, and that, by act of parliament, having found after their maner the proffe to have bene wrongusly laid against him. He is thought to be an other of the Judges of the ministerye ....

"The king is institute supreame head of the churche".

Walsingham condoled with Davison, but, in the absence of news to cheer him, he had to be content with censuring the policy of the English government not only towards the Scots exiles, but towards the English presbyterians, in a letter of June 3rd.:

"The porre gentlemen that are retyred into this realme are lyke to receyve but cowlde comforte, having fewer favorers then I looked for and sooche become ther ennemyes as neyther the awthorytye of their place nor the care they owght to have of her majesty's savetye dothe make allowable in them. But yt agreeethe with the coorse thei nowe howld here in dysplacyng and depryving the best affected ministers. I looke for no better frutes from them that use relygyon for pollecye and many tymes abuse yt for factyon".

In two other letters, Walsingham expressed his distress at the treatment of the exiled Scots, and we shall see later the practical way in which he showed his sympathy with them.

1. S.P.Scot. Eliz. vol. xxxv, no. 3; cf. C.S.P. VII. no. 161.
2. S.P.Scot. Eliz. vol. xxxv, no. 14; vol. xxxvi, no. 15; cf. C.S.P. VII. no. 175, 241.

Burghley and the queen knew that sympathy with the exiles was not called for, since, as even Walsingham realised, the presbyterian party in Scotland "in respect of the common (a) cause can be no ennemyes to the amytye", and could not be dangerous to England. But Walsingham was incapable of viewing presbyterians and their misfortunes from a purely political standpoint, while Davison, still less discreet, made his admiration of presbytery so evident that he fell into disfavour with the Scottish government. In August 1584 the secretary warned the ambassador that he was believed to have been "a dealer underhand" in an attempt to overthrow Arran, and wrote: "you are heard for a man suspected, whatsoever outward show they doe make to the contrary, in respect of the favour they know you to beare to the poore distressed (1) ministers, who doe receave very small confort here". No Englishman, however strong his support of presbyterianism, can have been more emphatic in his sympathy with the Scottish disciplinarians than William Davison was.

a. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. IX. f. 357 (C.S.P. VIII. No. 446).

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. xxxvi, no. 15; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 241.

## Chapter 7.

### Scottish Presbyterians in England, 1584-1587.

The despair of the Scottish presbyterians at the "horrible bondage and slavery" into which the "Black Acts" had brought the church was expressed by a writer of the next generation: "To speake it in a few words, our whole forme of spirituall government, grounded upon the Word of God, (wherunto the cursed bishops subscribed themselves, as their hand-writt will testifie) which was growing and increassing in God's mercie among us, and did grow and increase, until it came to a reasonable perfection; at this point is altogether cast down"<sup>(1)</sup>. The irreconcilables among the ministers, some of whom had been involved in the attempt made in April 1584 to overthrow the government of Arran, fled to England to escape persecution. In May, Patrick Galloway, minister of Perth, and James Carmichael, minister of Haddington, crossed the border, and on the 27th. of that month the ministers of Edinburgh, James Lawson and Walter Balcanquhal, arrived at Berwick.<sup>(2)</sup> Altogether,<sup>(3)</sup> almost a score of presbyterian pastors went into exile.

1. Calderwood IV. 75, cf. 219.

2. Spottiswoode, History II. 314; C.S.P. VII. no. 146.

3. The names of eighteen are in Appendix A.

Their leader had preceded them. Charged with uttering seditious speeches in the pulpit, Andrew Melville was ordered to enter into ward in Blackness castle on February 17, 1583/4, and he fled the same day to Berwick. As he was in Berwick in June, and there is no evidence that he had as yet been further south, the assumption must be that he had remained in the border town. Since it was by a letter from Andrew Melville, after he had left Scotland, that James Melville learned of Adamson's proceedings in England, Andrew himself must have received news of the archbishop's activities during the period which he spent in Berwick. One of his informants was Jean Castel, minister of the French church in London, but it is very likely that another was William Davison, who was in Berwick for some weeks in May 1584. We may be sure that Walsingham would equip Davison with any information which could be used to discredit Adamson, and we know that Davison associated with the Scottish exiles at this time - Lawson and Balcanquhal were befriended by him as they passed through Berwick, and Andrew Melville himself is soon to be found acting as a tutor to Davison's son. It may even have been from

1. Warrender Papers, vol. B, fol. 62 - the "charge to Mr. Andro Melvill to enter in ward in the Blakness", dated "xvii february 1583"; Spottiswoode, History II. 309; Calderwood, Vindiciae, p. 52; R.P.C. III. 631-2.
2. J. Melville, Diary, p. 170.
3. ib. p. 148.
4. See Appendix F.
5. pp. 183, 199 infra.

William Davison that Melville obtained a copy of the "articles" which Adamson had sent to Whitgift and which had been abstracted from Burghley's office. He proceeded to write refutations of the archbishop to the French church in London and to the Genevan and Zurich churches.<sup>(1)</sup>

The apparent absurdity of choosing England as a place of refuge was pointed out in a letter written to the exiles by Patrick Adamson, who told them that the English queen "albeit her Majestie loveth and maintaineth the Gospell, is a rare auditrix of preaching, and, except in Lent, and few solemne dayes, heares no sermons". Further, the English church was "burthened with sindrie ceremonies and injunctions, whereunto their clergie is astricted".<sup>(2)</sup> To the Scottish presbyterians, however, the England of Elizabeth seemed more attractive than the Scotland of the "Black Acts", because, in the first place, it was indubitably protestant - they hesitated to say as much of Scotland - and the English queen, in spite of her "injunctions", was a "notable instrument of God for the advancement of religion".<sup>(3)</sup> At the worst, they reflected, it would be possible to live quietly in England, spending the time in study and in the preparation of some

1. N.L.S., Wodrow MSS., quarto vol. xx, "Melvinus Pastoribus Genev. et Tigur.", printed in part in Calderwood's Vindiciae (p. 54), and translated and printed in full in James Melville's Diary (pp. 154-164); see Appendix F, and cf. McCrie, Andrew Melville I. 220.
2. Calderwood IV. 90.
3. Warrender Papers, vol. B., fol. 29 recto.

kind of apologia for their attitude towards their own government - "Ingland wes and is ane receptacle for the trublit and persecuted sanctes of God quhair we may quyetlie and in peace awayt upon our books, digest things in ordour wrytin befor to ws"<sup>(1)</sup>. It might, moreover, be possible to "trawell in our vocatione as it should please the Lord to grant occasione", and from this point of view there was a linguistic advantage in the choice of England as a place of exile.<sup>(2)</sup> A letter written to the refugees reminded them of the opportunities which they might have in England: "And be profiting thair as ye may the kingdome of Christ, quhes home, howss and kingdome is thair alls weill as heir. Thair is a kynd ther of exercéis of sic as ar compted prelectours or lessone makers, quhairintill it may be ye mycht profitablie exerceis yourselfs in the Lord's work and saiff and free from the impuritie and pollutione of the Romesh and superstitious ceremonies"<sup>(3)</sup>. Contact with the English puritans, in fact, might give the Scots a chance to preach and teach without being compelled to wear the surplice or use the prayer book. They knew that they could, in any case, look forward to "consultatione with lernit men, zealous bretheren and quho ewer<sup>(4)</sup> hes defendit the Lord's caus", and they were well aware that

1. Warrender Papers, vol. B., fol. 29 recto.

2. ib.; Harleian MSS. vol. 291, fol. 124.

3. ~~ib. fol. 44 recto~~. Warrender Papers, vol. B., fol. 44 recto.

4. ib. fol. 29 recto.

their aims were identical with those of the English presbyterians. As a result of the co-operation between Adamson and Whitgift, Andrew Melville said, "the maist lernit and fathfull Pastores in bathe the kingdomes ar forced ather haillelie to keipe sylence and leave the ministerie, or then by flight and exyll to saiff thair lyves, or els to essay the filthie weirines of stinking pressones; or then of necessitie to do that quhilk only remeanes agains thair dewtie and conscience, to subscriue to the ambitius tyrannie of the fals Bischopes", and he requested the prayers of the Swiss churches on behalf of "the Kirks in bathe the countries, for the graitest part is destitut of thair Pastors"<sup>(1)</sup>. Church government, he hinted, was not the only issue - in both England and Scotland the bishops represented "the impietie of manie corrupt rytes and ceremonies"<sup>(2)</sup>. Just as, a few years before, Beza's reply to Glamis, written for the Scots, had been translated for the use of English presbyterians, so now a letter written by Beza to the English puritans was used in discussions among the Scots on the question of subscription to the bishops' articles<sup>(3)</sup>. It was, of course, realised that

1. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 157, 164.

2. ib. p. 157, cf. p. 160.

3. Warrender MSS. vol. B. f. 44 recto: "Mr. Bezais answering epistle to the bretheren of Ingland, I suppose anent the ceremonies, wes alleggid, bot quhen the difference wes schawen betuixt ws quhom Christ had possessit of long in a libertie, and that with the allowing of all, and now wer violentlie to be disturbit from the same, and thame quho wer bot suppliant for that quhair of thei were nevir yit in possessione....".

there was this difference between the English and the Scottish nonconformists, that the former sought liberty which they had never possessed, while the latter felt that they had been deprived of freedom which had been theirs for years.

A study of the movements of the Scottish ministers shows that they lost no time in establishing contact with the English presbyterians. James Melville said that his journey from Fife to Berwick took place about the summer solstice, that is, about June 11 or 12. Some days had elapsed between his arrival in Fife from Angus, when he learned of the flight of Lawson and Balcanquhal (which took place on May 26-7), and his own flight, and these days included a Sunday, the 7th. of June.<sup>(1)</sup> From James Melville's arrival in Berwick, about June 12, we can date Andrew Melville's departure for the south as about June 10, and the departure of Lawson and Balcanquhal about June 15 or 16.<sup>(2)</sup> Lawson and Balcanquhal arrived in London about June 21.<sup>(3)</sup> Andrew Melville was in London on that date,<sup>(4)</sup> and had presumably arrived a few days earlier. Before Lawson and Balcanquhal had been in London a fortnight, they had "talket with the godlie and zealous brethren", and, quite early in<sup>(5)</sup>

1. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 167, 168, 170.

2. ib. p. 170.

3. Calderwood (VIII. 261) says the 23rd., but the ministers themselves, in their letter to Davison on July 4th., say that they have been in London fourteen days. (See note 5).

4. Wodrow Misc. I. 413.

5. Letter to Davison, July 4th., 1584, S.P.Scot, Eliz. XXXV., cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 195.

July, a party of Scottish ministers, including Andrew Melville and Lawson, were intimate enough with the puritans to be welcomed at a general conference at Oxford.

James Melville tells us that in July 1584 Andrew Melville, Lawson, and some other ministers visited Oxford and Cambridge.<sup>(1)</sup> Balcanquhal, who seems to have been inseparable from Lawson, was probably a member of the party, but it is unlikely that Carmichael was with the others, for he wrote on July 6 that he intended to be in London for some time,<sup>(2)</sup> and it will appear that he had important business there, while John Davidson can scarcely have left Newcastle before the middle of July.<sup>(3)</sup> The Scots who went to Oxford and Cambridge "conferrit with the most godly and lernit" in the university towns.<sup>(4)</sup> At Oxford they took part in a conference which was attended by Edward Gellibrand (the leading puritan in Oxford), Thomas Wilcox (one of the authors of the Admonition to Parliament), and many other English presbyterians. One of the points discussed was a critical one - "the proceeding of the minister in his duety, without the assistance or tarrying for the Magistrate".<sup>(5)</sup> The crisis

1. J. Melville, Diary, p. 219.

2. Wodrow Misc. I. 414.

3. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 171, 172.

4. ib. p. 219.

5. Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, pp. 73-4.

which had developed since Whitgift's appointment as archbishop had led naturally to the discussion of this question, and one aspect of it had been raised at a meeting of the Dedham classis on June 1, 1584 - "whether a minister might cease <sup>(1)</sup> preaching being forbidden by the magistrate".

After their visit to the universities, the Scots returned to London, where nearly all the exiled ministers were present at the funeral of James Lawson, who died on October 7. <sup>(2)</sup> A little is known of their environment in the capital. Some of them lodged in Honey Lane, Cheapside, with one Anthony <sup>(3)</sup> Martin - possibly the Anthony Martin who signed a petition on behalf of the presbyterian minister Thomas Barber, who was the preacher at St. Mary le Bow, on the other side of Cheapside <sup>(4)</sup> from Honey Lane, and was, as we shall see, associated with the Scottish exiles. It was at the church of Allhallows in Honey Lane that Thomas Wilcox had been lecturer before his <sup>(5)</sup> imprisonment in 1572, and it may be that the acquaintance of the Scots with Wilcox (whom they met at Oxford) explains the ease with which they made friends, including Anthony Martin and Thomas Barber, in the district round Honey Lane.

1. Usher, Presbyterian Movement, p. 36.
2. J. Melville, Diary, p. 219; Wodrow Misc. I. 451
3. Wodrow Misc. I. 437, 451.
4. Seconde Parte of a Register, II. 220, 262.
5. D.N.B. on Wilcox.

About the end of 1584 and the beginning of 1585, during the session of parliament, there was considerable activity among the puritans, including two general conferences in London, one in November and one in February.<sup>(1)</sup> The November conference was particularly important, for a special effort seems to have been made to secure representation.<sup>(2)</sup> That the Scottish ministers took part in this activity may be deduced from their continued association with Field. Gellibrand had urged that Field should have further discussion with the Scots about "tarrying for the magistrate",<sup>(3)</sup> and it appears that there were at Field's house frequent meetings of ministers, including Barber and the Scots. It was on account of these meetings that Field was suspended, and when he was examined at Fulham on March 4, 1584/5, he admitted that "there is some meetinge of his fellow ministers at his house, as Mr. Barber with others, touchinge conference in learneinge, three or foure, and saith that he hath resorted to the Scottishe ministers, beinge three of them, and sometimes they come to his house".<sup>(4)</sup> The three Scots were presumably Andrew Melville, Balcanquhal, and John Davidson.

1. Bancroft, D.P. pp. 74-5; Usher, Presbyterian Movement, pp. 40, 42.
2. Usher, op. cit. p. 40.
3. Bancroft, D.P. p. 74.
4. Seconde Parte of a Register I. 283-4.

One of the general conferences at which the Scottish ministers were present was the occasion of a number of resolutions which were, in Fuller's words, "the embryo of the presbyterian discipline, lying as yet, as it were, in the womb of episcopacy"<sup>(1)</sup>. It was decided that no one should accept ordination until he had been "called" by a particular congregation and his "call" had been approved by the classis. Provision was made for the election of elders and deacons, and for the convocation of classical, provincial and national assemblies. The sympathy of the English presbyterians with the Scottish exiles took practical shape in the resolution that the "comitial assemblies" [i.e., assemblies meeting in Oxford and Cambridge at the commencements] should make collections for the relief of Scottish ministers. Our knowledge of this general conference depends on Bancroft, who dated it as "about the yeere 1583", but only because he thought that date appropriate in view of the presence of the Scots. He was uncertain, too, about the place - "I thinke at London, or at Cambridge". This conference should probably be identified with one of those in London in the winter of 1584/5, when, as we have seen, several Scottish ministers were in close touch with the English presbyterian party.<sup>(2)</sup> There was, of course, a

1. Fuller, Church History IX. v. 1.

2. ib.; Bancroft, D.P. pp. "45-48" (correctly 69-72, the pagination being incorrect in the British Museum copy); cf. Dale, History of English Congregationalism p. 152, and Wood, History of the University of Oxford II. 224-5, who attribute this meeting to Oxford, presumably identifying it with the general conference of July 1584.

(1)

general conference at Cambridge in July 1585, but there is no evidence that any Scots were present, and the nature of the resolutions themselves is in favour of the earlier date. Whatever the date and place of the meeting, Bancroft's account does imply a connection between the Scottish exiles and a very important stage in the evolution of a "discipline in a discipline, presbytery in episcopacy" - a stage marked by what is possibly an early draft of part of the English Book of Discipline.

How widely the Scottish ministers were known in London is to be seen in Calderwood's account of the funeral of James Lawson, which was the occasion of the most impressive gathering of English and Scottish presbyterians recorded in the period. It was attended by at least eight Scottish ministers, among them Andrew Melville, James Carmichael, John Davidson and Walter Balcanquhal; by a large body of English puritans, including Travers, Field, Stephen Egerton, Barber, Charke and other preachers; by the three ministers of the French church, the high master of St. Paul's school (John Harrison) and "secretar Walsingham's gentleman". Altogether there were present over 500 persons, some of them London Scots, but many of them natives of the city. John Davidson,

(2)

1. Usher, Presbyterian Movement, p. 50.

2. The account of the funeral (in the larger MS. history of Calderwood), is printed in Wodrow Miscellany I. (p. 452), and in Wodrow's Biographical Collections (New Spalding Club, p. 231). Neither printed copy is satisfactory, and the above is based on the British Museum MS. (Additional MSS. 4736, f. 166 verso).

during his second exile, renewed the friendship with John Stubbs which he had formed in the previous decade, and possibly collaborated with him in preparing a refutation of Cardinal Allen.<sup>(1)</sup> Stubbs appears as an associate of James Carmichael also, for in November 1585, when writing to Lord Willoughby about Scottish affairs, Stubbs said that "Mr. Carmighel"<sup>(2)</sup> would communicate with his lordship.<sup>(3)</sup> It is possible that some of the Scots met Cartwright, after his return from the continent in April 1585. His imprisonment, immediately on his arrival in England, attracted considerable notice, and when he was released, in July, he must have associated with his old friends, to whom the Scots were known.

In the relations between the Scots and their English brethren the English puritan habit of secrecy had in the main prevailed over the aggressive recklessness characteristic of Scottish presbyterianism. The latter quality did, however, show itself. Accustomed at home, in 1582 and 1583, to

1. D.N.B. article on Stubbs; Calderwood IV. 38 - "the answers which the ministers who fled to England made to Alane's booke, penned by Mr. Davidstone"; Wodrow, MS. biography of Davidson, said that Allen had "in a printed book reflected severely on Protestants, Through the sides of the Scots ministers, who he alledges oppose their prince"; Allen, Defence of the English Catholiques (1584), attacks the Scottish ministers as seditious (pp. 79, 83, 122, 137), and makes special mention by name of those who had fled to England (p. 137).
2. H.M.C. Ancaster MSS. p. 16.
3. Pearson, Cartwright, pp. 228-30.

unrestrained freedom of speech, the Scots hoped that, once out of the reach of the Arran government, they could resume with impunity their attacks on the Scottish crown.<sup>(1)</sup>

The English authorities had been forewarned. They had learned the official version of the events before the "Black Acts" from Adamson while he was in England. He did not return to Scotland until the beginning of May, and on June 16<sup>(2)</sup> he wrote to Whitgift explaining the policy of the government. Presbytery had been overthrown, he said, not only because it was repugnant to the scriptures and to the practice of antiquity, but because the democratic assemblies had shown themselves instruments of sedition. The ministers who had gone to England had not been banished, but had fled before violence had even been threatened, and they ought not to be allowed to remain in England, or, if they did remain, to preach. Whitgift, with his usual consideration for the civil power, notified to the queen the receipt of this letter, and presumably informed her of its contents.<sup>(3)</sup> The primate had other correspondents in Scotland, and in January 1584/5 he received from one of them

1. Cf. Camden, Annals, II. 409 and 420; Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p. 268.

2. J. Melville, Diary, p. 166. The lateness of Adamson's return explains the error of some writers in placing his mission after the flight of the ministers.

3. Adamson's third letter to Whitgift, Appendix Eiv; S.P. Scot.Eliz. XXXVI. No. 15; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 241.

(a Scotsman) a letter which indicates that he kept a careful  
 watch on developments north of the border.<sup>(1)</sup>

Attempts were made to persuade the ministers to return. James sent two envoys to promise the ministers preferment if they would come back to Scotland, and entertained hopes of securing the return from England of other Scots preachers besides those who had fled recently.<sup>(2)</sup> At its face value the negotiation was a praiseworthy effort to establish the new ecclesiastical régime in Scotland by obtaining the co-operation of as many capable Scots ecclesiastics as possible, but nothing that came from the Arran government could be accepted at its face value by the presbyterians, linked as they were to that government's political antagonists. With the failure of these attempts, the Scots government proceeded to urge the English government to treat the ministers harshly. First the master of Gray, who was sent to London in October, 1584,<sup>(3)</sup> and then Sir Lewis Bellenden, who went to England in February 1585,<sup>(4)</sup> were commissioned to influence the English government against the banished Scots. Gray tried to play on Elizabeth's dislike of

1. Appendix Ev.

2. Calderwood IV. 124-5; Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII., f. 66. (cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 165); Harleian MSS, 291 f. 123, a letter from James at Falkland, June 10, 1584, mentioning Herbertson, and addressed to a preacher in London.

3. C.S.P. VII. No. 339.

4. ib. No. 542.

rebellion: "I beseitche your majestie for the veil of your awin  
 estet ether to remufe furthe of England the fugitive ministres  
 or than do ordein sume limites to them for avoyding practising  
 vithein your Countrie, for, as I scheu your majestie at my  
 parting, thair democriticall dissingis be ennemie to all  
 princes. But I vil not insist heirin, ne Videar Curiosus in  
 aliena Republica"<sup>(1)</sup>. Bellenden took with him a copy of the  
Declaration of the King's Majesty's Intention and Meaning  
concerning the late Acts of Parliament, a document drawn up  
 by Adamson to give the official explanation of the "Black Acts"<sup>(2)</sup>.

Possibly because Adamson's work had been effective,  
 the Scottish ministers did not at first expect that they would  
 have opportunities for preaching<sup>(3)</sup>. It was suggested that the  
 Scots in London should have their own church, on the analogy  
 of the French, Italian, and Dutch churches, and Lawson tried  
 to enlist Walsingham's support for the project<sup>(4)</sup>. The council,  
 however, decided that it would be dangerous to countenance a  
 form of service in the English language differing from that of  
 the Church of England, and refused the Scots a "peculiar church".  
 In the autumn of 1584, possibly because their English  
 presbyterian friends allowed them to preach in their churches<sup>(5)</sup>,

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXVII. No. 5; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 508.
2. Calderwood IV. 352.
3. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXV. No. 35; XXXVI. No. 15; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 195, 241.
4. Hume of Godscroft, II. 361.; Wodrow Misc. I. 418.
- 5.- Cf. Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p. 268.

the Scots began to deliver sermons in London pulpits. Balcanquhal preached once or twice before Lawson's death on October 7th., and continued to preach regularly until January 1584/5. John Davidson preached twelve or thirteen sermons in St. Olaf's, Old Jewry, on Sundays and holy days, beginning on November 8th.<sup>(1)</sup> He "so rayled against the King of Scots in the pulpit", that he was known at court, and amongst the bishops, as a "Thunderer", and the master of Gray, who felt that this was exactly the sort of thing he had come to warn Elizabeth against, complained. On January 5, 1584/5, both Balcanquhal and Davidson were summoned before the bishop of London. Davidson may not have obeyed the summons, but Balcanquhal did, and the bishop explained to him that it was on the council's initiative that the command to cease preaching had been issued. Balcanquhal's congregation there-<sup>(2)</sup> upon petitioned the council in his favour, but without effect. The Scots were not easily silenced. The lieutenant of the Tower, who was friendly to the ministers, allowed some of them, including Andrew Melville, to preach and to form a congregation in his church, which was exempt from episcopal<sup>(3)</sup> jurisdiction.

1. Wodrow Misc. I. 428-9; Calderwood, IV. 247.
2. Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, p. 26; Heylin, loc. cit.;  
Wodrow Misc. and Calderwood, loc. cit.
3. Hume of Godscroft, op. cit. II. 361

Among the Scottish ministers exiled in England in 1584 and 1585, one who played a minor but significant part was John Cowper. He had a connection with England before he went to that country, for his brother William, after graduating at St. Andrews in 1583, had become a schoolmaster at Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire, in a school conducted by a Scotsman named Guthrie, who was related to James Lawson. John came to London with some of his fellow ministers in June 1584, and was present at Lawson's funeral in October, but shortly afterwards he went to Cornwall, where he acted as chaplain to Anthony Rouse, a justice of the peace, and took part in the work of the exercise of Saltash. He remained there for about a year, but at the end of 1585, when most of the ministers returned home, he left Saltash, after receiving a testimonial from the exercise, and went back to Scotland, where he soon became a minister in Edinburgh. His brother (1) William joined him there, and became a minister also.

It was not only ministers who were exiled in England in 1584. About the end of April the earls of Angus and Mar, and the master of Glamis, after their failure to (2) overthrow Arran, fled from Scotland. After living in the

1. Wodrow's Biographical Collections (New Spalding Club), p. 231; Scott, Fasti, I. 53, III. 460, VII. 345; Warrender Papers (S.H.S.) I. 171, 203-6; J. Melville, Diary, p. xxxvii (where there is a reference to Guthrie's school at Hoddesdon); Calderwood, VIII. 261; see Appendix A.
2. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 165-6.

north of England until February 1584/5, the noblemen went south, and, after a month in Norwich, settled in London, where they remained until the return of nearly all the exiles in October.<sup>(1)</sup> The cause of the nobles was identical with that of the ministers, and the two bodies of exiles associated closely with each other. The agent of the lords while they were in the north was John Colville, who connects the political and ecclesiastical interests of the exiles. He had been a minister himself, and, although it may be doubted whether he ever devoted much attention to things spiritual, it must be remembered that, along with Andrew Melville, he was commissioned to write to Beza condemning Patrick Adamson and explaining the position of the Scottish church, and that Andrew Melville sent a message by Colville to Jean Castel.<sup>(2)</sup> James Carmichael, who was the most politically minded of the ministers, had frequent communication with the noblemen.<sup>(3)</sup> While they were at Newcastle, the lords had as their chaplain first John Davidson (in June and July 1584), and then James Melville (from July 1584 until the noblemen left the north in February 1585), and in London the two Melvilles acted together as chaplains.<sup>(4)</sup> At Newcastle there was formed a congregation on the strictest

1. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 171-2, 221, 222.
2. John Colville to Beza, March 23, 1583/4 (Add. MSS. 32,092, f. 42); Melville to Castel, Appendix F.
3. Wodrow Misc. I. 424, 429-32.
4. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 171-2, 221-2.

(1)  
 Genevan model, which must have interested all the English puritans who knew of it. We have evidence that Miles Moss, who ministered to the nobles while they were at Norwich, was filled with admiration for their piety, and there is a reference to direct communication between Angus and the "brethren of the Church of England".<sup>(2)</sup><sup>(3)</sup> However, contact between the Scots lords and English clerics is less important than the position of the lords as strengthening the link between the ministers and Walsingham.

Walsingham's attitude to both noblemen and ministers was, as we should expect, a very friendly one, and he confided to William Davison his great distress at the "very small comfort" which both bodies of exiles received in England - although they had shown themselves "good instruments for the interteyning of the amytie", yet they were "not lykely to be used with that kindeness that eyther Christyanytye or pollecyte requirethe".<sup>(4)</sup> On June 20, 1584 (almost immediately after the arrival of the ministers in London), Walsingham sent for Carmichael, Galloway and Andrew Melville, and gave them the news of Scottish affairs which he had just acquired

1. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 181-4.

2. Miles Moss, Scotland's Welcome, published in 1603. The dedication is to John, Earl of Mar, and recalls the association of Moss with the Scots nobles in 1585. Cf. pp. 64-5 of the work.

3. Hume of Godscroft, II. 377.

4. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. xxxv, no. 14, xxxvi, no. 15 (C.S.P. VII. no. 175, 241); cf. Camden, Annals, II. 409, and Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p. 268.

from William Davison's letter of June 15. After they had discussed the situation, the secretary promised further conference with Carmichael, who was commissioned, or felt prompted, to prepare a statement of the case of the ministers and the lords, a task in which he was assisted by English politicians like Randolph and Bowes, puritan officials like Killigrew and Davison, the ministers of the French church, John Colville, John Davidson, and English presbyterians.<sup>(1)</sup> The policy of this group, which received the countenance of the secretary, was made quite clear in a conversation during which Carmichael and Bowes criticised the English government for refusing to follow William Davison's advice.<sup>(2)</sup> In a second interview with Walsingham, on July 2, Carmichael talked with him about "the state of the cuntre, the tyrannie of the bischops, the barons, the stur of the common peple at this common confusioun, the King's religioun and lyf, the number of ministers fled; and so on. Walsingham made it clear that he was interested in religion, and not merely in politics.<sup>(3)</sup> On July 19, the secretary sent for Lawson, Andrew Melville, Balcanquhal and Carmichael, and once more gave them news of

1. Wodrow Misc. I. 413; Calderwood VIII. 260-261. The date of the interview is given variously as June 19 and June 21, but it was on a Saturday, and the Saturday was June 20. The letter of Davison described by Calderwood is easily identifiable with that of June 15. (C.S.P. VII. no. 171).
2. Calderwood VIII. 261-2.
3. Wodrow Misc. I. 414.

(1)  
 Scottish affairs. William Davison, who was still in  
 Edinburgh, was regarded by the ministers as virtually a  
 representative of them and their interests, (2)  
 and by Carmichael  
 as an agent for the collection of materials for the apologia  
 he had undertaken to prepare, including the acts of the  
 parliament of May 1584, the second Book of Discipline, the  
 acts of the general assemblies, "David Hume's Book", Knox's  
 history of the reformation, and the bishops' injunctions. (3)  
 On August 24th. Carmichael wrote that he owed Davison "hartie  
 thanks" for his "greit fidelitie and lawful diligence in the  
 common cause", and asked for news of certain books which he  
 had asked him to send to London. (4)  
 On the same occasion he  
 expressed a hope that Davison would secure his introduction  
 to Burghley, "quho hes neid of scharp spurres". (5)  
 Walsingham,  
 although secretly encouraging the ministers, had urged that

1. Calderwood VIII. 267-8.

2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXV. No.35; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 195.

3. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXV. No.50; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 208.

In volume XXIX. of the Scottish State Papers of Elizabeth's reign (in the P.R.O.) are two copies of the second Book of Discipline, accompanied by copies of some acts of general assemblies. Each is endorsed "Mr. James Carmichel's book", and addressed "To my Lord Ambassitour". Presumably they were sent to Davison by Craig, to whom Carmichael refers in his letters to Davison as an assistant in the collection of materials, or some other Scot, and passed on to Carmichael, who gave them to Walsingham.

The various documents Carmichael wanted are mentioned in the authorities cited on this page. Laing, who edited the Wodrow Miscellany, suggested that "David Hume's Book" was the first part of Hume of Godscroft's History.

4. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXVI. No. 45; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 267.

5. ib.

they should not make any defence publicly, but by October 21, when the master of Gray was on his way south, Carmichael thought the time had come to speak out, and asked Walsingham to obtain permission for the Scots to publish their apologia.<sup>(1)</sup> A connection may perhaps be presumed between Carmichael's attitude at this point and the activity of the Scottish ministers in London pulpits in November and December. It must not be assumed because James Carmichael was the usual correspondent of Walsingham and Davison that he acted in isolation from the other ministers or that his interests were closer to those of the banished noblemen than to those of the kirk. Walsingham had originally consulted Andrew Melville and Patrick Galloway as well as Carmichael, and in his letters Carmichael usually makes it clear that "the brethren"<sup>(2)</sup> are concerned. Both Melville and Carmichael, it seems, were acquainted with Davison's family in London, for Carmichael reported to the ambassador on July 6 that "Your worship's sone, Francis, hes gevin guid pruif of his proffit in the Greek to Mr. Melvil upon the first chapter of Mark".<sup>(3)</sup>

The Arran government was overthrown on the return of the exiled lords at the beginning of November, 1585.

1. Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. f. 164 verso; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 349.
2. He sent "the commendations of my selve and of my brethrein" to Davison, and "the humble commendations of the rest of the brethreins service" to Walsingham; he thanked Davison for his good offices "in name of the hail faithful". (Letters of July 6th., October 21st., and August 24th.)
3. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXV. No. 50; cf. C.S.P. VII. No. 208.

Andrew Melville and Walter Balcanquhal had returned to Scotland with the lords, and on November 6, they wrote from Stirling to the ministers still in London - Carmichael, Davidson, James Melville and "the rest of the Scottish Preachours" - asking them to return.<sup>(1)</sup> The letter was received on November 19,<sup>(2)</sup> and James Melville left London shortly afterwards.<sup>(3)</sup> He was in Linlithgow on December 27. The assumption that Carmichael and Davidson went back to Scotland at this time is, however, unwarranted. On January 2 and January 16, 1586, letters were addressed to Carmichael at London, and he was still in England on March 4.<sup>(4)</sup> There seems no reason to doubt that he continued to live in the south for about two years, during which another minister was in charge of his parish of Haddington, and we know that the epistle dedicatory of his Grammaticae Latinae, de Etymologia, Liber Secundus is dated from Cambridge in September 1587. The book, published at Cambridge, is dedicated to king James, and may have been designed to pave the way for the author's return to Scotland.<sup>(5)</sup> In the same way, there is no proof of

1. Wodrow Misc. I. 437.

2. ib.

3. On that date he wrote to Walsingham. (Harleian MSS., vol. 291, ff. 188, 189.)

4. Wodrow Misc. I. 438, 440 and note; Additional MSS. 32,092, f. 80 verso, Andrew Hunter to Carmichael, January 16, 1585/6. (Appendix G.)

5. Scott, Fasti, I. 369; Wodrow Misc. I. 440 note; the book itself (S.T.C. 4660).

John Davidson's presence in Scotland before November 1588,<sup>(1)</sup> when he refused to resume his former charge at Liberton.

Our knowledge that Carmichael remained in England, and a reference to others besides him being in London in January 1585/6<sup>(2)</sup> make it possible that Davidson remained in England, and there are references in 1587 to a Scots preacher of his name who was notorious for his activities as a puritan.

Whether Davidson had ever ceased preaching may be doubted, for it is not even certain that he obeyed the summons to Fulham in January 1584/5, and he probably had opportunities of preaching in the Tower in 1585.<sup>(3)</sup> In August 1587, the activities in London pulpits of Davidson, Barber, who has already appeared as an associate of the Scots, Wiggington, whom we shall see linked with Davidson on another occasion, and some other preachers, led to an order from the Court of High Commission that no one in charge of a church in the City should allow any of the ministers named to preach or read lectures, unless a licence from the queen, a university, the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of London, could be produced. Besides the written order, an

1. Scott, Fasti, I. 170; both Wodrow (MS. biography of Davidson) and Dr. Moffat Gillon (John Davidson, p. 85) assume the return of Davidson at the end of 1585; the John Davidson referred to in 1586 (B.U.K. II. 667) is the minister of Hamilton.

2. In Andrew Hunter's letter (Appendix G); Calderwood has a story of a visit paid by Davidson and Carmichael to Randolph when they were in England in exile. He dates it December 1582, probably an error due to his having just recounted the death of Buchanan in September 1582. The incident may belong to this period. (Calderwood I.131-2).

3. Cf. p. 193 supra.

oral message was sent that Davidson, Wiggington, and another  
 should not preach again in any case. <sup>(1)</sup> It is conceivable that  
 this prohibition did not bring John Davidson's preaching to  
 an end, for he may have been the "Daverson, a Scot", who  
 delivered a sermon in London on June 29, 1588: <sup>(2)</sup>

"Touching [blank] Daverson a Skott, who preached  
 at Aldermanbury church on St. Peters day in the forenoone,  
 29<sup>o</sup> Junii 1588.

"The Manne. he preached with a kerchief on his head,  
 a welvett nightcap upon that, and a felt hat on that: and  
 praied a long praier with all on: in the end, putt off his  
 hatt, and laid it by, saieing: Lett us sing a psalme to the  
 praise of god.

"The Matter. he said: There was now a great plague  
 at hande, becawse there is nb Love at all in yow toward the  
 gosple. It is a fowle falt that there is no generall fast  
 proclaimed, for the reformation of things. It is no  
 mervail things be amys, for the gosple rules not the Queene,  
 rules not the Counsaill, rules not the clergy, rules not the  
 citizens. The doctors of the universities dare not speak  
 the truth, becawse the spiritt of God is not in them. He  
 said, he was infourmed, that divers of that parishe, were  
 hinderers of the gosple".

It was not only by preaching that Davidson attained notoriety.

In 1588 Waldegrave published A Short Christian Institution

made first for the use of a private family, and now communicate

by the Author to other flocks and families, written by "J.D." <sup>(3)</sup>

Some delay in the licensing of the book was known to the  
 author of Martin Marprelate's Epistle, and in the course of an  
 attack on the bishops, he wrote: <sup>(4)</sup>

1. Seconde Parte of a Register, II. 231-2.

2. Additional MSS. 32,092, f. 100. Endorsement - "Tuching  
 Daverson a Skott. Buttolfs by Cripelgate".

3. S.T.C. 6173.

4. Epistle, edn. 1588, p. 34. (Petheram's edition, p. 43).

"they are afraid that anything should be published abroad/ whereby the common people should learne that the onely way to saluation/ is by the word preached. There was the last sommer a little catechisme/ made by M. Dauison and printed by Walde-graue: but before he could print it/ it must be authorized by the Bb. either Cante. or London/ he went to Cant. to haue it licensed/ his grace committed it to doctor Neuerbegood (Wood) he read it ouer in halfe a yeare/ the booke is a great one of two sheets of paper. In one place of the booke the meanes of saluation was attributed to the worde preached: and what did he thinke you: he blotted out the word (preached) and would not haue that word printed/ so ascribing the way to work mens saluation to the worde read".

Cooper noticed this accusation when he replied to Martin in his Admonition to the People of England, and gave, in passing, his opinion of Davidson: "How Dauisons Catechisme was allowed, or how long in perusing, I know not: some paultry pamphlet it is, like to that busie and vnlearned Scot, now termed to be the author thereof. D. Wood is better able to iudge of such matters, than either Dauison, or any Martinist, that dare be knowven"<sup>(1)</sup>. In Hay any Worke for Cooper, Martin retorted that although Cooper abused Davidson and Wiggington, their "good names can take no stain from a bishops chopps"<sup>(2)</sup>.

Davidson's name appears with those of Wiggington and other puritans elsewhere in the same work: "I see heere that they haue quarrelled with thee Walter Trauerse, Iohn Penri, Thomas Sparke, Giles Wiggington, Master Dauison, &c."<sup>(3)</sup>

1. Admonition, p. 49.

2. Hay any Worke for Cooper (ed. Petheram) p. 69.

3. ib. p. 61.

On the downfall of Arran, in November 1585, the episcopacy which the "Black Acts" had established was endangered, and both parties in England - the episcopalians who had encouraged Adamson and the presbyterians who had been so intimate with the exiled Scottish ministers - were keenly interested in its fate. It seemed likely that the enthusiasm of the restored lords for presbytery would secure its triumph, and the majority of the ministers, who came back from England within a few weeks of the return of the lords, expected a revolution in the church. In fact, however, the episcopacy which Arran had supported was not at once overthrown, and the fate of the kirk was for some time uncertain. The anxiety of the English presbyterians about the situation in Scotland is shown by a remark in a letter which Knewstubbs wrote to Field about the time of Arran's fall: "I would be glad to heare somewhat of the estate of Scotland: it doth more trouble me than our owne: For I am conceiuing some hope upon the change of their former proceeding"<sup>(1)</sup>. Field was probably well informed about Scottish affairs, and able to give Knewstubbs the information he wanted, for he had correspondents in Scotland and was in touch with James Carmichael, who had remained in London after most of the ministers returned home. This is made clear by a

1. Bancroft, D.P. pp. 5-6.

letter in which Andrew Hunter, a Scottish minister, writing from Leith in January 1585/6,<sup>(1)</sup> asked Carmichael to give his "hartie commendations to Mr. Feild", and referred to letters which Field had sent him to deliver to some other Scottish ministers. From the same letter it appears that the Scots were conscious that the eyes of their English brethren were on them, and that the failure to secure the immediate success of presbytery would cause disappointment in England, for Hunter told Carmichael: "Comfort the Brethren of England. Desire them not to be discouraged for our tryell, and their disapoynted expectatioun". The indication which this letter gives that Carmichael assisted English puritans to follow developments in Scotland is confirmed by a letter written by John Stubbs to Lord Willoughby on November 15, 1585, a date soon after the news of Arran's fall reached England: "The successes of Scotland do hitherto answer the begynnyngs and so are lyke to continue by God's mercy. The noble men theare have a nyce part to play; on the one side to give ther King all kingly honor, and on th'other syde to provide for ther own saufty. God graunt them wisdom. Mr Carmighel sendeth your Lordship an other letter of such things as are doen since his last"<sup>(2)</sup>. Two months later, Lord Willoughby received a

1. Add. MSS. 32,092, f. 80 verso (Appendix G); for Hunter, see Appendix A.

2. H.M.C. Ancaster MSS. p. 16. "Jhohn Stubbs, scaeva, to Lord Willoughby in Denmark", November 15, 1585.

report on events in Scotland from Sir Drue Drury, who was Sir Amias Paulet's assistant in the guardianship of Mary, and who later showed his sympathy with puritanism by helping to secure the restoration of Udall after his suspension.<sup>(1)</sup> After describing two incidents in the struggle between James and the ministers, Drury went on to remark: "It is greatly to be lamented the messere [misery] that both theyr and here the preachers bryng apon the church and themselves chefly, for omytting to use the counsell of the Holi Gost, as in being innosent as doves and wise as serpentes".<sup>(2)</sup>

In February 1586 a conference of politicians and ministers agreed on a working compromise between presbytery and episcopacy, and there is evidence that some Englishmen were interested in the proceedings.<sup>(3)</sup> At the critical general assembly of May 1586, when the full presbyterian programme was once more accepted, Dr. Giles Fletcher, who was at the time attached to Randolph's embassy in Edinburgh, was an observer. He sent an account of the proceedings to Walsingham, introducing it by a letter in which he wrote: "knowing your good care for the Church of God/I thought you could bee  
at home

1. D.N.B., articles on Udall and Drury.
2. H.M.C. Ancaster MSS. p. 18. January 24, 1585/6.
3. There are two copies of the "conclusions" of this conference in Cotton MSS. Calig. C. IX. (ff. 162-3, 222-3), and one in S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXIX. No. 17. (C.S.P. VIII. No. 276.)

(1)  
 content to hear how thinges stand with it hear". Dr. Fletcher communicated details of this assembly's proceedings to his brother, Richard, the dean of Peterborough, who retailed them to Whitgift, allowing himself the liberty of making some unfavourable, although obscure, comments on them: "I have sent your grace these first proceedings of the ecclesiasticall generall assemblye in Scotland latelie begun there: but not lykeliie to end in hast for their manifold matters so saltlye accordinge to their fyrie humour controverted".  
 (2)

From May 1586, when the general assembly ordered the re-erection of presbyteries, it became increasingly clear that episcopacy was for the time doomed in Scotland, and the parliament of July 1587 may be regarded as marking the end of the episcopal period which the "Black Acts" had initiated. The English presbyterians were jubilant, and hoped that the success of their cause in Scotland would be the signal for the overthrow of episcopal government in England also. Udall's Diotrephes, published in April 1588, contained the idea that the struggle in Scotland was identical with that in England, and it was particularly insistent that the bishops of both countries were conscious of identity of interest and were

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XXXIX. No. 84; cf. C.S.P. VIII. No. 407. The enclosure is not among the state papers, but there is a copy of the conclusions of the assembly in Harleian MSS. 7004 (f.10).
2. N.L.S. MSS. 6.1.13, ff. 33-4; copy in B.M.Add. MSS. 32,092, f. 88 verso.

co-operating. The writer had a fairly sound knowledge of developments in Scotland - not only the bare facts of the temporary success of presbyterianism in 1582-3, and the rise and fall of the subsequent episcopacy, but also of such factors as the support given to presbyterianism by some of nobles and the boldness of the ministers on their return from England. Some of the sentences Udall puts into the mouth of Diotrephes, the bishop, may be quoted: <sup>(1)</sup>

"The puritanes in Scotland had got up their discipline, and utterly overthrowen all the soveraigntie of bysshops, by which they prevailed so mightilie, that wee feared our fall in England shortly to ensue, whereupon I was sent ... to goe and seeke the subversion of their generall assemblies, and the rest of their iurisdiction, wherein I prevailed a while, but now it is worse, than ever it was.... The whole land cried for Discipline againe, and the noble men so stiffely did stand to it; and lastly, the Ministers that came home from England, dealte so boldly with the king that I was utterly cast out wythout all hope, ever to do any good there again, and nowe I make homeward in haste, least I loose all there also".

Such a passage as this seems to strengthen the possibility that Udall had visited Scotland in 1587, and had attended the general assembly in June of that year - a possibility not incompatible with what we know of Udall's movements or with the visit which he paid to Scotland in 1589. <sup>(2)</sup>

1. Udall, Diotrephes (ed. Arber), p. 7.
2. Wodrow, in his MS. life of Robert Bruce (Church of Scotland Library, Wodrow Lives vol. I) produces an autobiographical account of part of Bruce's life. This relates that Andrew Melville took Bruce to the assembly of June 1587, when "Mr. Udal the Englishman was there, and sundry other Strangers". The date must be 1587, the year in which Bruce became minister of Edinburgh. There was an assembly in June of that year, and Andrew Melville was moderator. Cf. R.P.C. IV. 518 note, where this visit is accepted.

## Chapter 8.

### Bancroft and the Scottish church: English presbyterians in Scotland, 1587-1591.

The events of the four years dealt with in this chapter centre round the critical year 1590, when the relations between the English and Scottish presbyterians had repercussions which necessitated diplomatic action by the English government.

The first important factor in the situation was the interest taken in the Scottish church by Richard Bancroft, at this time chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. His motive in attempting to discredit the Scottish presbyterians in the famous sermon that he preached at Paul's Cross on (1) February 9, 1588/9, he afterwards explained as follows:

"The generall drifte of my sermon in that point was, that forasmuch as the malecontents of this state, for the erectinge of a new kingdome, doe presse us so earnestly with the examples of other reformed churches, and namely of Scotland; to lett the people understand what I had read and receaved concerninge the inconveniencies and practises, both there and els where, that, findinge the like busy and turbulent humorists amongst us (who labor continually by all meanes possible to infect this land with those corrupt opinions, which, if in time they be not looked into, will hazard the estats of all Christian kingdomes) they might through that experience be warned and made more cautious of them".

With this object in view, he drew on two unfavourable accounts of Scottish presbyterianism. One was the Declaration of the

King's Majesty's Intention and Meaning concerning the late Acts of Parliament, a manifesto drawn up by archbishop Adamson in defence of the "Black Acts". After being printed by Vautrollier in Edinburgh in 1585, it was published in London in the same year, with the significant title: Treason pretended against the King of Scots, by certaine Lordes and Gentlemen, whose names hereafter followe. With a declaration of the Kinge's Majestie's intention to his last Acts of Parliament, which openeth fully in effect all the saide (1) conspiracy; and it subsequently appeared in Holinshed.

Bancroft was particularly determined to show that the establishment of the puritan "discipline" did not mean the disappearance of vice and crime, and to support this part of his argument he turned to another source - a letter of Robert Browne, the separatist, who had seen presbyterianism in action (2) in Scotland and had criticised it severely. Bancroft (3) explained his motive in using Browne's letter as follows:

"Our consistorians doe tell us with very great vehemencye and boldnes, that the cawse why we have so many disorders in the Realme, murder, theft, roges, idlenesse, etc. is for want of theyr presbiteriall government, affirminge that if we had the same, we shold have a very paradise upon this earth. In which respects I confesse I have been

1. Wodrow Misc. I. 473-5.

2. Browne, A New Year's Guift, ed. Burrage, pp. 8, 25-6. The MS. of this work (B.M. Additional MSS. 29,546, ff. 67-72.) is endorsed by Bancroft, and the passages he used are underlined.

3. Appendix H iii.

carefull from time to time to understande what fruits appered of this new government where it was erected. So as beinge appointed to preach at Poules Crosse ... I did by meanes procure some instructions from Mr. Browne, who had travayled, as he sayd, through the chiefest parts of Scotland".

By mentioning, in addition, Buchanan's De Jure Regni apud  
 (1)  
Scotos, Bancroft showed that he was already disposed to emphasise the politics of presbyterianism as the most discreditable and dangerous part of that programme. Had Bancroft confined himself to repeating the allegations of the Declaration and of Browne's letter, criticism of his sermon would have come only from those who wished to defend the government of the Scottish church; but he took it on himself to say that James had not altered his views since his condemnation of presbyterianism in 1584, and implied that he was merely waiting for an opportunity to re-establish  
 (2)  
 episcopacy. This suggestion, it will appear, had serious consequences.

Bancroft seems to have thought that in his sermon he had only indicated the lines on which the Scottish church could be attacked, and to have decided that he would obtain more exact information about conditions there, in order to defend and emphasise his views. The necessary instruments

1. Bancroft, Sermon, p. 76. Buchanan's book had been printed in England in 1580 (S.T.C. 3976.)

2. ib. p. 75.

were ready to his hand. John Copcot, Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, had found it necessary to study Scottish ecclesiastical affairs when engaged in a controversy with Dudley Fenner over the necessity of consistorial discipline, and in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1584, he had quoted from John Craig's Catechisme (which had been published in London in 1583 and 1584), a passage expounding the power of the eldership.<sup>(1)</sup> This sermon was circulated in MS.,<sup>(2)</sup> and was answered by Dudley Fenner's Defence of the Counterpoyson, to which Copcot wrote a reply in which he used the Declaration of the King's Majesty's Intention and Meaning to show "what stay to civill government" the eldership had been in Scotland, and how it had been "injuriouse to their soveraygne his estate, and the cause of great troubles both in the church and common weale".<sup>(3)</sup> He went on:<sup>(4)</sup>

"the experience that the Kings Majestie of Scotland hath had may learn others to beware in tyme unlesse they minde to be dealt with as his majestie was: who verye wisely did foresee that some went aboute to establish an ecclesiasticall tyranny within his country under pretext of new invented presbiteryes, whiche neyther shoulde answere to the king, nor bishop under his Majestie, but should have an infinite jurisdiction, as neyther the law of God nor man can tolerate".

1. Lambeth Palace MSS., vol. 374, f. 135 verso. The sentence is quoted by Fenner in his Defence (Sig. A 3). The passage quoted is from Craig's Catechisme, edn. 1583, f. 41, edn. 1584, f. 44.
2. Fenner, in his preface to the Defence, makes this clear.
3. Lambeth Palace MSS., vol. 374, f. 228 recto, 229 recto.
4. ib. f. 229 verso.

Copcot, therefore, was ready to co-operate with Bancroft, and it happened that he was friendly with Robert Naunton, who was at this time attached to the English embassy in Edinburgh. Naunton was not sympathetic to the presbyterians, whose form of government he called an "anarchy", and in a letter to Copcot he wrote of the violent way in which they attacked Bancroft's sermon.<sup>(1)</sup> Copcot showed this letter to Bancroft, who decided that he could make use of Naunton to arm himself for the controversy which, the letter clearly showed, must ensue. When Copcot wrote again to his friend, he enclosed a letter in which Bancroft asked Naunton to endeavour to obtain copies of correspondence between the Scottish ministers and Beza or other continental divines, and to send him answers to certain questions. These questions were aimed at discovering the details of the presbyterian organisation in Scotland, particulars of the treatment given to James by the ministers, and the political ideas of the kirk. From the way in which they are framed, it appears that Bancroft wished to compare the Scottish organisation with the English presbyterian platform, to condemn it as inefficient, to denounce the Scots as rebellious and seditious, and so, by implication, to discredit the English puritans.<sup>(2)</sup>

1. Additional MSS. 32,092, f. 106. November 12, 1589.

2. Egerton MSS. 2598, ff. 240-245; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 337.

The questions are printed in Calderwood V. 78 et seq.  
See Appendix H.

Naunton was urged by Bancroft to take precautions that would ensure the secrecy of their correspondence, but evidently there was some kind of exposure. The only account (1) of this, although clearly incorrect in many particulars, is too circumstantial to be dismissed altogether. It relates that a letter to Bancroft from John Norton, an English bookseller resident in Edinburgh, was intercepted, and that when Norton was examined (on February 12, 1589/90) he admitted that he had received certain questions from Bancroft - the questions which we know Bancroft sent to Naunton. It seems possible that Naunton had employed Norton in some way, for there is no mention of any trouble befalling Naunton, who had in any case returned to England by February 10, 1589/90, (2) and confusion of the names Norton and Naunton does not adequately explain the appearance of the story about Norton.

Bancroft had another instrument in his quest for information. To John Gibson, a Scottish minister, he signified his "earnest desyre throughly to knowe the order and accustomed fashions concerninge the elderships ase they are now erected in Scotlande", and Gibson sent him detailed information about "the orders and custome of thame generallie... 1<sup>o</sup> concerninge there proceedings, 2<sup>o</sup> the agreement of everye

1. Calderwood V. 77.
2. C.S.P. X. No. 353.

severallie presbyterie aparte, 3<sup>o</sup> the successe of that government generallie in all men concerninge reformation in godlyness and maners"<sup>(1)</sup>. This letter from Gibson exists today in the same volume of MSS. which contains a series of answers to the questions Bancroft sent to Naunton.<sup>(2)</sup> Bancroft seems to have made use, at a later date, of the information which was sent to him by Gibson, and it is therefore probable that the answers to his questions also came into his hands.<sup>(3)</sup>

Bancroft seems to have attempted to revive the co-operation between the English bishops and Adamson which the latter had initiated in 1583, for, about January 1590/1, letters from Bancroft to Adamson were intercepted. They were directed to Bowes, the English ambassador, and aimed at encouraging Adamson by promising him English support in any attempt at the restoration of episcopacy.<sup>(4)</sup> Adamson, it must

1. N.L.S. MSS. 6.1.13, ff. 39-41. The letter is addressed to "Mr. Doctor Bancroft", and signed "Johne Gibson, Minister of Godes worde". As Gibson implies at the beginning of the letter that he is no longer "acquainted with there effares", he may have been in England at this time, and may possibly be the "Johne Gibsoun, Scottisman, precher", who was wrongfully imprisoned for robbery at Leicester in April 1590. See Appendix A.
2. The answers are ff. 37-38, Gibson's letter ff. 39-41, of N.L.S. MSS. 6.1.13. See Appendix Hii.
3. In his apology (see Appendix Hiii), Bancroft refers to "the advertisements I have receaved since owt of Scotland towching these matters", and to the "jarres there are amongst the ministers themselves, every one seeking to deface another, so as in theyr meetings, as I am enformed, there is litle but bablinge, pratlinge, and quarrelinge" - a state of affairs on which Gibson's letter contains considerable information,
4. Calderwood V. 118.

be remembered, had not become completely insignificant, for the presbyterians still thought him dangerous in August 1590, when James Melville attacked him in his sermon to the general assembly, and, although there is little evidence that English episcopalians intrigued with him at this period, the ministers were certainly suspicious.

The attitude adopted by Bancroft in his sermon, and his subsequent actions, were by themselves capable of raising a storm. The situation was aggravated by the presence in Scotland, at different periods throughout these months, of Udall, Penry, and Waldegrave, who, sufficiently notorious puritans individually, were particularly dangerous at this time, owing to the association of all three, but particularly Penry and Waldegrave, in the production of the Martin Marprelate tracts. Udall's Demonstration of Discipline, published in June 1588, must have been welcome to all presbyterians who read it, and, as there is evidence that it was known in Scotland, it may have prepared the way for his reception in that country. The possibility that Udall had paid a visit to Scotland in 1587 has been mentioned, and it may be that he renewed, or established, contacts with some Scots while

1. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 281-2.

2. Wodrow MSS. (N.L.S.), fol. vol. 44, No. 8, is a summary of this work, written by a Scotsman, who has altered "prescribed" in the title to "prescryvit".

he was in Newcastle, where he spent some time after his deprivation in July 1588. At any rate, he was welcomed in Scotland, for he was present at the general assembly of June 1589, and he preached before the king on the 20th. of that

(1) month. After his return to Newcastle, Udall was visited, early in October, by Penry, to whom he may have given some information about conditions in Scotland, where Penry intended to take refuge, and where he arrived later in the month. (2)

Waldegrave, after severing his connection with the Marprelate press, seems to have paid two visits to La Rochelle, and he did not settle in Scotland until the spring of 1590. (3) He was appointed printer to the king, taking the place formerly occupied by Dekprevik and Vautrollier, and was for some years responsible for the majority of the books published in (4) Scotland.

Waldegrave had long been associated with the English presbyterians, for he had published such works as Field's translation of Beza's letter to lord Glamis (1580), and Wilcox's translation of Beza's Treatise of the True and Visible Marks of the Catholique Church (1582). More recently, he had published Udall's Diotrephes (1588). His work had included the

1. Calderwood V. 58.

2. Pierce, Penry, p. 251.

3. ib. pp. 232, 259.

4. Aldis, pp. 7,8; Dickson and Edmond, Annals of Scottish Printing, pp. 394-474.

publication of some distinctively Scottish books - editions of  
 the Confession of Faith and of the Book of Common Order.<sup>(1)</sup> As  
 a result of his activities, he had been regarded with  
 suspicion even before the Marprelate tracts appeared, and, at  
 some date previous to his exile, had endured an imprisonment  
 of twenty weeks.<sup>(2)</sup> When the Scottish king made Waldegrave his  
 printer, he insisted on an undertaking that his press would  
 not produce books likely to offend the English government,<sup>(3)</sup>  
 but Waldegrave paid no heed to this provision. Before he had  
 been long in Edinburgh, he published three books for his  
 companion, Penry - A Briefe Discovery, Reformation No Enemy,  
and Propositions and Principles of diuinitie, propounded and  
disputed in the universitie of Geneva - besides the work  
 called An Humble Motion, which, although not by Penry, may  
 have been corrected by him.<sup>(4)</sup> In 1592 Waldegrave published two  
 works by the puritan Dudley Fenner,<sup>(5)</sup> and in 1593 there appeared,  
 probably from his press, A Parte of a Register.<sup>(6)</sup> Copies of  
 those books, and of Scottish works of similar character, were

1. S.T.C. 22020, 22022; cf. Bonnard, La Controverse de Martin Marprelate, p. 7.
2. Harleian MSS. 5910, part iv. ff. 150, 156; Pierce, Penry, p. 179; D.N.B.
3. C.S.P. X. Nos. 499, 508.
4. Aldis, Nos. 209, 215, 221, 226.
5. ib. Nos. 230, 231.
6. Recent research has suggested that this book was printed by Richard Schilders at Antwerp (J. Dover Wilson, in Transactions of the Bibliographical Society XI. 65-89).

exported to England, where some of them were seized on their  
 arrival by the authorities. <sup>(1)</sup> The situation was aptly  
<sup>(2)</sup>  
 described by Bancroft:

"And now, upon better care being taken by her Majesty that no such Libels should be hereafter Printed in England ... they have found such favour, as to procure their chief instrument and old Servaunt Walgrave to be the King of Scot's Printer; from whence their wants in that behalf shall be fully supplied. For having obtained that place, (as hee pretendeth in print) they haue published by hundreths certaine spitefull and malicious books against her Maiesties most honorable privy Councell. Also their humble motion to their LLs. with three or foure other very slanderous Treatises. And now it seemeth, for feare that any of all their said Libels and rayling Pamphlets ... should perish ... they haue taken upon them to make a Register: and to Print them altogether in Scotland, in two or three volumes: as it appeareth by a parte of the sayde Register, all ready come from thence, and finished: which containeth in it three or foure and forty of the sayd Libels".

Penry's activities in Scotland, where he remained  
<sup>(3)</sup>  
 until August 1592, were not confined to the composition or correction of books for Waldegrave's press. In the first

1. In June 1591, copies of the following books were seized on their arrival in England: Robert Bruce's Sermons, Penry's Propositions and Principles of diuinitie, John Davidson's Bancroft's Rashness, and An Humble Motion. All had been printed by Waldegrave, and all, as we shall see, were known to Bancroft. (Arber, Transcripts II. 38; cf. Ferguson, "Relations between London and Edinburgh Printers and Stationers", in The Library, 4th. series, vol. VIII. (1928), pp. 154-5.) A list belonging to the year 1595 proves that the two works by Dudley Fenner which Waldegrave had printed; as well as Penry's Propositions and Principles of diuinitie and Bruce's Sermons, were in circulation in England (ib. p. 193).
2. Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, p. 46.
3. Pierce, Penry, p. 306. He paid some visits to England during the period.

few months, before the English government requested that he should be expelled, he appeared at "publick assemblies",<sup>(1)</sup> and even acted as a preacher, "being thereunto earnestly desired, and called by the order of that church".<sup>(2)</sup> Later, when the Scottish privy council had decreed his banishment, he had to lie low, but there is no reason to think that he lost touch with some of the ministers with whom he had become friendly. We know something of the subject-matter of the conversations and discussions which he had with Scots. He asserted afterwards that he had endeavoured to overcome his friends' prejudices against the Church of England, by giving them a more exact account of conditions in it "than they were generally certified by their Merchantes, or such other as travelled thither", but it seems more likely that he had been in substantial agreement with them in condemning "the Prelacy heere maynteyned" and "the multitude of dumb Ministers that are tollerated & dayly made in this Land", and in lamenting the fate of the preachers who were "suspended, silenced, emprisoned, deprived, &c". If he merely intended to argue that, in spite of these abuses, it was not the case that "litle or no truth is permitted to bee taught in England",

1. Note 1 to p. 228.

2. Brook, Lives of the Puritans, II. 55.

then his attitude was merely the orthodox puritan position,  
 and not a defence of the Church of England.<sup>(1)</sup> There are  
 indications, however, that his approach to the separatist  
 standpoint led to serious differences of opinion between him  
 and some of the Scots, particularly John Davidson.<sup>(2)</sup>

The Scottish church and the Scottish king had  
 grounds for complaint in Bancroft's sermon, and the English  
 authorities, both ecclesiastical and civil, could hardly  
 regard with equanimity the reception into Scotland of Udall,  
 Penry, and Waldegrave. The action taken by the kirk made the  
 situation still more critical.

On April 29, 1589, the presbytery of Edinburgh  
 discussed Bancroft's sermon, appointing Robert Bruce, Robert  
 Pont, and John Davidson to frame a reply, and on June 10 the  
 three ministers were ordered to submit their work to the next  
 general assembly for its approval. There is no record of any  
 action by the assembly, but on December 9 the Edinburgh  
 presbytery decided to direct a petition to Elizabeth "desyring  
 hir Majestie to tak order with Mr. D. Bancroft", and ordered  
 four ministers to draw it up.<sup>(3)</sup> Two versions of a letter to

1. Burrage, John Penry, pp. 37-8 (Lansdowne MSS. 109,  
 ff. 35-6); cf. Strype, Whitgift, II. 175.
2. Calderwood V. 698.
3. Wodrow Misc. I. 470.

Elizabeth were actually written, but there is no evidence that  
 (1)  
 either was sent to the English queen. In these drafts, the  
 ministers boldly pointed out that they had rendered service  
 to England by supporting the English interest in Scotland, and  
 declared that danger to the "amity" came from English clerics,  
 who were inspired by "Satan that old Serpent" to calumniate  
 the kirk. This process had commenced with the publication in  
 England of the Declaration of the King's Majesty's Intention  
 and Meaning, which was "receaved, diligentlie red, and that  
 in the eares of diverse cheif personages of the realme ...  
 printed againe at London, and with an odious new preface  
 prefixed thereunto reprinted againe ... also insert and  
 imprinted word for word as we heir in the Chronicles of your  
 countrie compiled by Holinshed for the perpetuall memorie  
 thereof". The petitioners proceeded with their main  
 complaint: "Secondlie, one Bancroft, chaipplane (as he boldlie  
 affirmeth) to the lord Chancellor, emboldened by these ther  
 proceedings to say no worse, with most impudent mowth tooke  
 upon him to traduce ws, our Ministrie, and whole Church  
 openlie at Paules Crosse on Sondag the 9 of Februarie last in  
 time of parlament ... where beside many unworthie parts

1. One is printed by Calderwood (V. 72-77), and exists  
 in MS. in Wodrow MSS. fol. vol. 43, No. 42; a much  
 longer version from which extracts are given here,  
 is in Wodrow MSS. fol. vol. 42, No. 5. The two  
 versions are similar in character, and have identical  
 passages.

uttered by him against the goode brethren of your owne realme, he entred upon ws, not sparing our verie dead, but railing against that famous father Mr. Knox". Thirdly, they complained that "we, our discipline and whole ministrie ar most ridiculouslie flooted, as we heir, in thar stage playes, pamphlets, and pasqwills imprinted day by day,<sup>(1)</sup> so that ther appereth no end of ther malice against ws", and they concluded this part of the letter with a hint to the queen that by her treatment of the English puritans she was "hielie provoking our patience", and with a threat of "a fearfull curse within your owen bowells". They went on to request that the Declaration, being a forgery by Patrick Adamson, should be deleted from Holinshed; that Bancroft should apologise publicly; that some action should be taken with the authors of the "pasquiles, print bookes and stage playes" already mentioned; and finally - most astonishing request of all - that "it may please yow after the example of goode Josaphat to proclaime a publict fast universalie owtthrough your realme with preaching and supplication". This extraordinary document makes it impossible to question the bitterness of what Robert Naunton described in November 1589 as "the ould inveterate

1. The reference is to the anti-Martinist literature, which included plays by Lyly, Green and Nash. (Cf. Pierce, Historical Introduction, pp. 221-3; Dexter, Congregationalism, pp. 165-6; Bonnard, La Controverse de Martin Marprelate, chapters viii and ix.) None of these has survived.

grudge conceived by this clergie against Mr. Doctor Bancroft<sup>(1)</sup> for intermedling with their anarchie here established", and the unbridled audacity of the ministers at a time when they were, in effect, the rulers of Scotland.

It was perhaps the consciousness that it was impossible to approach Elizabeth with such immoderate demands that led to a more reasonable course - the composition by John Davidson, who had been associated in the preparation of the abortive petition,<sup>(2)</sup> of Bancroft's Rashnes in rayling against the Church of Scotland (1590). On the other hand, Davidson's impatience with the indecision of presbyteries may have impelled him to go forward on his own account. The little book brings out not only the strength of feeling against Bancroft for his attack on the Scottish kirk and king, but the sympathy which Davidson continued to feel for "the godlie brethren of Englande, who urge Reformation of that Church, and chiefly, the remooving of that heavie bondage of Antichristian government by loftie Lordes, wrongfully called Bishops ... and restoring in the place thereof the joynt administration of Christian Discipline by the Ministers and Elders of the Church"<sup>(3)</sup>. The circumstances in which this book was written, the fact that it was printed by Waldegrave, and

1. Add. MSS. 32,092, f. 106. Naunton to Copcote, November 12, 1589.
2. Calderwood (V. 72) describes the shorter version as a letter from Davidson to Elizabeth.
3. Wodrow Misc. I. 505, where the work is reprinted.

the author's close association with English presbyterians, make it possible to view Bancroft's Rashnes as a Scottish contribution to English puritan literature.

The kirk developed its policy along lines hardly less distasteful to the English government than the presentation of one of the petitions would have been. There is evidence that the ministers did not choose their line of action without reference to the English presbyterians. As on a previous occasion when the Scots sought to assist their English brethren, the approval of the latter was asked - this time by the despatch of a Scottish minister to England in the summer of 1590.<sup>(1)</sup> In the spring, it had been decided that ministers should include in their public prayers a petition for "the afflicted brethrein in England",<sup>(2)</sup> and the practice, forbidden at the request of the English ambassador,<sup>(3)</sup> was resumed when the kirk's nuncio returned from England. Just as Udall's Diotrephes had shown that the English presbyterians were aware of the identity of their cause with that of the Scottish church, so it was now revealed that the Scots were conscious of the common interest against the same enemies. In the general assembly of August 1590, James

1. Bancroft, D.P., p. 6.

2. Calderwood V. 88.

3. Bowes reported on August 1 that "one of them, latelie commed out of England, renewed the praier against the myndes of the rest". (see p. 230 ).

Melville preached a sermon on discipline, making the most extreme claims for the necessity of the presbyterian courts and for their powers over kings and nobles as well as common men, and he said that his subject was specially apt because "zealous brethrein" in England were suffering for the truth, and "those Amaziahs, the bellie god bishops in England, by all moyen and money were seeking conformitie" between the two  
(1)  
churches. This declaration of war was made in the presence  
(2)  
of the English ambassador.

The kirk, in the policy which it adopted, had the partial support of the king. James had, indeed, been in Denmark from October 22, 1589, until May 1, 1590, and it was in his absence that the kirk resolved on the petition to Elizabeth and on the prayers for the English puritans - probably their most extreme measures. Moreover, he expressed displeasure with Davidson for writing Bancroft's Rashnes, and  
(3)  
with Waldegrave for printing it. But his annoyance at the English preacher's aspersions on his sincerity was genuine enough, and it may have been this which prompted him, in the general assembly which heard Melville's remarks on the sufferings of English puritans and the intrigues of English bishops, to make his well-known outburst against the English

1. J. Melville, Diary, p. 281; Calderwood V. 100-101.

2. See p. 231.

3. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 48; cf. C.S.P. X., No. 482; Calderwood V. 112.

church - "As for our neighbour kirk in England, it is an evill masse said in English, wanting nothing but the liftings"<sup>(1)</sup>. James was, undoubtedly, in alliance with the kirk at the time, and he may have been sincere both in his words at this assembly and in the appeal which he subsequently agreed to make for Udall and Cartwright.

The English government had to try to secure the eviction of Penry from Scotland, and the cessation of the prayers for the English puritans. The attitude which it would take to the complaints made by the Scots against Bancroft was less certain, but, fortunately for the cause of moderation, England's demands with regard to Penry and the prayers had been satisfied before the other question became acute, so that Elizabeth's government was able to appreciate the justice of the Scottish king's grievance against the English priest, and to compel the latter to make an apology.

In April 1590, Bowes, the English ambassador at Edinburgh, was instructed to demand the banishment of Penry from Scotland. The Welshman was now less intimate with the main body of the ministers than he had been at first, for the ardent interest in presbyterianism which he had shown on his arrival had diminished, and the consequence had been his virtual repudiation by the kirk. He continued, however, to

1. Calderwood V. 106.

enjoy the support of some Scots, and it may be to them that the government's delay in acceding to the ambassador's demand was due. (1) James returned from Denmark on May 1, and on May 12 Bowes had an audience. He informed the king that Penry had "falne within the case of treason", and begged that he should be banished. James replied that he was "willing and readie to satisfie her Majestie herein, purposing to inquire further of Penries being here and doinges, and thereon to give order for her Majestie's contentment", (2) but he moved slowly, and Elizabeth decided to strengthen her ambassador's hand by writing directly to the Scottish king. On July 6 she despatched the famous letter in which she enlarged on the political danger of presbyterianism and raised the question of the prayers: (3)

"And lest fayre semblance, that easely may begile, do not brede your ignorance of suche persons as ether pretend religion or dissemble devotion, let me warne yow that ther is risen, bothe in your realme and myne, a secte of perilous consequence, suche as wold have no kings but a presbiterye, and take our place while they injoy our privilege, with a shade of Godes word, wiche non is judged to folow right without by ther censure the be so demed. Yea, looke we wel unto them. Whan the have made in our peoples hartz a doubt of our religion, and that we erre if the say so, what perilous issue this may make I rather thinke than mynde to write. Sapienti pauca. I pray you stap the mouthes, or make shortar the toungez, of suche ministers as

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLV. No.33, XLVI. No.18; cf. C.S.P. X. Nos. 391, 454.
2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLV. No. 44; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 403.
3. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 5; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 441, and Letters of Elizabeth and James VI. (Camden Society), pp. 63-4.

dare presume to make oraison in ther pulpitz for the persecuted in Inghland for the gospel. Suppose you, my deare brother, that I can tollerat suche scandalz of my sincere government? No. I hope, howsoever you be pleased to beare with ther audacitie towards your selfe, yet yow wil not suffar a strange king receave that indignitie at suche caterpilars hand, that, instead of fruit, I am affraid wil stuf your realme with venom. Of this I have particularised more to the bearer, togither with other answers to his charge, besiching you to heare them, and not to give more harbor-rome to vacabond traitors and seditious inventors, but to returne them to me, or banische them your land".

However favourable to the presbyterians James's opinions may have been at the time, his interests demanded that Elizabeth  
(1)  
should be satisfied. Bowes proceeded in his negotiations, now with a double request, since the question of the prayers had been added to that of Penry. On July 22 he had an interview with the Scottish king, and requested that, according to his former motion, Penry might either be delivered to him to be sent into England to be dealt with according to law, or else be publicly banished. The king "bothe soone called to mynd his former promis and also readelie agreed that he should be spedelie banished agreable to his former intent and promise, saing that great labour had bein made to him in the favour of Penrie; yet nevertheles he found that sondrie of the learned Ministers here thought that Penrie wold do no good here". Bowes next "informed the king

1. It is arguable that James's remarks at the August general assembly (see p. 227) may have been designed to exculpate him from a charge that he was playing the game of the English bishops by satisfying the queen.

that sondrie ministers in this realme (appearing to condempne the government of her Majestie and the Church in England established by lawe), used in their sermons to move their auditories to praie for suche as they said were prosecuted in England for the word of God, meaning suche as Penrie and others, seeking th'alteracion of the ecclesiasticall order of the Church of England". James received this statement favourably, for, "seking to understand th'effect of their praiers, and misliking some part thereof", he "agreed to give order to the Chancelour for redresse herein". Bowes thought that all would go well, for he expected that the order for Penry's banishment would soon be issued, and he learned from others present at religious services (for he purposely absented himself) that the objectionable prayer was omitted.<sup>(1)</sup> He was not disappointed, for the banishment of Penry was decreed on August 6.<sup>(2)</sup> As for the prayers, which had been renewed by "one of them, latelye commed out of England", the king gave "order to them all to use that praier no more, whereunto they have agreed to obaie, using now to praie generallie for their afflicted brethern in France, Geneva,<sup>(3)</sup> and all other places wheresoever". The ambassador reported

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 18; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 454.

2. R.P.C. IV. 518.

3. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 22; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 458.

the final settlement of both matters in a letter to Burghley  
 (1)  
 dated August 14:

"Fivethlie it is ordered by act of Counsell that John Penrie shalbe banished, and that your Lordship maie se th'effect of th'act sett downe, I send the copie of the same inclosed to your Lordship, trusting that by the sight thereof and my deligence used therein, it shall appeare I have shewed litle favour to him, as some without cause wold have it to be thought.

"Sixthlie, the king hathe taken order to staie the praier used by the ministers in their sermons for suche as they note to be persecuted in England.... They use nowe to praie for the Churches in France, this Isle, Geneva and elsewhere. And therewith to praie also generallie for all suche as are afflicted for rightuousnes in France, this Isle, Geneva and elsewhere, which praier being left to the deliverie of the preacher, as his utterance and spirit serve, is hitherto well tempered, especiallie by the grave sort that seke to preserve the amitie and concord betwixt these two realmes".

Bowes may have thought that his task was accomplished, but he can hardly have felt completely at ease, for it was at the general assembly of this same month that the king criticised the Church of England and James Melville preached on the necessity of discipline. At Melville's words "without the right and perfyt discipline, na right and perfyt Kirk", Bowes, who was present, showed his displeasure, and he discussed the  
 (2)  
 matter with Melville afterwards.

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No.31; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 464.  
 This letter has two enclosures, the first being the act of council decreeing Penry's banishment (R.P.C. IV. 517-8), and the second a list of articles submitted by Bowes to the Chancellor on August 6, one of them being concerned with Penry. On the MS. of the letter there are marginal notes by Burghley, including one relevant to the extract given above - "no persecution in th'ile".
2. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 280-81.

By the beginning of October John Davidson's book against Bancroft had appeared, and Bowes learned that James, although he wanted to suppress the book, was unwilling to condemn its sentiments. <sup>(1)</sup> On October 24, Bowes was able to explain the situation which the publication of Davidson's <sup>(2)</sup> book had produced:

"By my former letters I advertised your Lordship of the booke written by Mr John Davison against some part of Mr. Docter Bancroft's sermon preached at Pawles Crosse and imprinted. This booke given me by the king I send inclosed to your Lordship. And albeit that the king hathe earnestlie travailed to staie and suppresse the rest of the Bookes, yet it is said that some fewe have escaped the hands of the Printer, whom the king hathe muche blamed for the same, and bound him with sufficient suerties in this Towne, to print nothing hereafter without the king's allowance and warrant, agreable to th' order nowe appointed in that behalf. This matter hathe had sondrye consultations, and bein diverslie tossed, wherein the king, and after the Lord Chancelour, had intended to have written to your Lordship. For it is stomaked here, that Mr. Bancroft should in his booke charge the king bothe with manyfest dissimulacion, and also to have given out the declaracion, which was not authorised by the king, but sett furth by th' archebisshop of St. Androes. And it is much noted that this declaracion should be annexed to the Chronicle of Mr. Hollingshead. Nevertheles, the king and Chancelour have thought it convenient to stay their letters, upon sundrie respects moving them thereunto, chefelie that they will not give any offence in the cause, nor desier effects doubtfull to be graunted. And they hope that some thinge shalbe done for the king's honour and contentment in this behalf, wherein they had rather by ther letters give thanks for suche courtesies to be shewed, then to adventure to kindle any fiere. Wherein it may be that ether something hathe bein

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No.48 ; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 482.
2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 58; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 492.

shewed to your Lordship by others, or els shortlie shalbe. In this I have so farre travailed to suppressse these bookes, as I have lost by the good countenance and companie of the chief Authors thereof. And some labour is made to bring me to further mislike of the rest of the Ministerie, then is convenient for the service in my chardge. Wherein I knowe and must of duetie record, that the good wills of the godly and discrete ministers have and still may proffit greatlie her majesty's services. Therefore I shall carefullie do myne endeavour to preserve their good and accustomed devotions, and myne owne humble and loyall duetie to her majestie".

On receiving this letter, and the copy of Davidson's book which Bowes enclosed, Burghley sent for Bancroft and for "one Mr. Thynn", the publisher of the Declaration. Bancroft, who had read Davidson's newly published attack on his sermon, guessed why Burghley had sent for him, but, although he was thus prepared, the interview was unpleasant. Burghley pointed to the passages in Davidson's work dealing with Bancroft's remarks about James, <sup>(1)</sup> told him that the pulpit was not a place to deal in much with princes, and appeared to be "greatly moved". Bancroft was "in sorte dismayed", and, as time was short and Burghley had many other people to interview, he thought it best to frame an explanation or apology in a letter to the Treasurer. In this letter, he began by explaining his motive in making a reference to Scotland, and went on to examine the character of the Declaration. He gave

1. Burghley's marginal notes to Bowes's letter of October 24 (see previous note). This paragraph is, of course, based on Bancroft's apology, in Appendix H iii.

illustrations of the violence of the presbyterians and of their seditious attitude towards the king, and praised the "Black Acts" for the check which they had imposed on the ministers. He then explained how calumnies about James were circulated, and how the Declaration was set forth to refute them, and reminded Burghley that neither had the Declaration, originally published cum privilegio regali, been disavowed, nor Adamson condemned for publishing it. Bancroft next dealt with the central point in the criticism of James, protesting that there was a difference between the words which he had spoken in the pulpit and the printed copies of the sermon, and urging that no man in his senses would have wittingly offended the Scottish king, since he was Elizabeth's ally. But at the worst, he continued, his words could not bear the construction put on them. He proceeded to carry the war into the enemy's country by referring to the violent language used by Knox, and, more recently, other Scottish ministers, about the English crown and the English church. "The consistorian humor is of a strange mixture. They will censure and gall every man but they must not be touched". Before leaving this part of his subject, Bancroft made his favourite point about presbyterian politics. He went on to justify his use of Robert Browne's letter, and concluded by asserting that information which he had received from Scotland since he

preached his sermon had tended to confirm him in his critical attitude towards the Scottish ministers.

On November 23, Burghley sent a copy of this letter to Bowes, who showed it to the king and the Lord Chancellor. It gave only partial satisfaction to James, who regretted that Bancroft had not abandoned Browne as a source of information, and would have preferred that the Englishman should, either at Paul's Cross or some other public place, correct his mistakes and declare his true meaning.<sup>(1)</sup> Burghley, on learning James's attitude, wrote to the Chancellor of Scotland on December 22, and this letter was used by Bowes to mollify the Scottish king, who was contented to express a wish that the differences between Bancroft and the ministers might be debated without any aspersion on his honour. Chancellor Maitland thought Burghley's attitude to Bancroft a very wise one, and the king agreed with him that, although they were not fully satisfied, they would be content to pass the matter over in silence, as a renewal of negotiation might bring contention rather than profit.<sup>(2)</sup>

Before Bancroft's apology had been secured, Bowes was once more concerned with Penry and Waldegrave. On

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 69, 71; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 505 and enclosure.

2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVII. No. 4; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 517.

November 19 he "shewed the king that it was merveiled in England, that ether Penry should be suffered to remaine in Scotland, notwithstanding his former order taken for his banishment, or that Walgrave the printer might be permitted freelie to print seditiouse bookes against his native contrie of England", and he requested "that Penry might be sought out and banished with the punishment of suche as had receit him, And that Walgrave might be prohibited to exercise his science here, so appearentlie against the state of England". James and Chancellor Maitland replied that they thought that Penry had left Scotland, but that search would be made for him and that, if he were found, he and his "receittours" would be punished. They explained that Waldegrave had "entred into great bonde with sufficient suertie in this Towne, that he shall not hereafter imprint anything without th'allowance and warrant of the king first obtayned for the same, wherein the king and suche as shalbe appointed to see and examyn all thinges to be imprinted by him, wilbe watchefull and provident to staie and barre all bookes and works offensive to her Majestie or England; and that this Realme standeth in nede of a Printer, therfore the king passed over his said fault, and upon the bonds mencioned, received and allowed him to use his science here". Nevertheless, the king assured Bowes that if the printer were "taken hereafter with any like

offence against her Majestie or Realme of England", he and  
 his sureties would be punished.<sup>(1)</sup> Bowes had been of the  
 opinion that it was unnecessary to make further trouble  
 about Penry, for he believed that the Englishman had left  
 Scotland immediately after his banishment was ordered.<sup>(2)</sup>

Investigation by the Scottish government confirmed his view,  
 as he reported to Burghley on December 18, 1590:<sup>(3)</sup>

"The king told me that he had made enquire for  
 Penry (whom I said her majestie thought to be secretlie  
 kept in Scotland) and that he was informed by persons  
 very honest that he was departed, and the king could not  
 learne any thing of his being in this Contrie. His wife  
 contineweth in this Towne, supported by benevolence of  
 his frânds here, whereon some of them have assured me,  
 that he departed in dede from her a good while past, and  
 hathe no repaire to her, nether is it knowne where he is.  
 Lykewise the king saithe that he hathe received and  
 planted Walgrave to be his printer upon caution given  
 that he shall not heirafter offend her majestie or estate,  
 and that he hathe suche hold of him, as he trusteth that  
 he will beware to fall into any errour heirafter,  
 whereupon the king is desierous to reteine him with her  
 Majesties favour and to make triall of him".

The troubles of the ambassador were at last over, and his  
 government had succeeded in its policy.

To this period belongs a group of attempts by the  
 Scottish presbyterians to assist their English brethren -  
 attempts by more concrete means than the prayers which had  
 added to the anxieties of Bowes. Udall, who had been

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVI. No. 64; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 499.

2. See previous note.

3. S.P.Scot. Eliz. XLVI. No. 73; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 508.

summoned to London for examination in December, 1589, and  
 had been confined since, <sup>(1)</sup> wrote in March, 1590, to Robert  
 Bruce, one of the Edinburgh ministers, explaining his unhappy  
 situation. It happened that James was still in Denmark, and  
 Bruce was in an influential position. He wrote on April 3  
 to the Scottish ambassador in London, asking him to  
 intercede with Elizabeth and her councillors for liberty to  
 Udall to go to Scotland, which he had in the previous year  
 agreed to do if suspended from preaching in England. <sup>(2)</sup>  
 Although Udall's imprisonment continued, Bruce did not forget  
 him, and in June 1591 he joined with Lord Lindsay <sup>(3)</sup> to procure  
 from James a letter to Elizabeth on behalf of Udall,  
 Cartwright, and other puritans, asking that they should be  
 set at liberty. The letter was sent to Archibald Johnson, a

1. In June 1590 he is said to have been in prison for 26 weeks. (A.P.C. XIX. 224).
2. H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. IV. pp. 25-6. In the calendar, the name of the preacher for whom Bruce urged the ambassador to intercede appears as "Weall" and "Veall"; the facts, however, fit Udall - (a) He was at this time in prison; (b) he had, as Bruce's letter states of "Weall", preached at the last assembly at which the king had been present - that of June, 1589; (c) Robert Bruce was one of those who procured James's letter on behalf of Udall in the following year; (d) there are references to an earlier appeal by James than that of June 1591, in A new discovery of old pontificall practises, (p.42), and in Petrie, History of the Catholick Church, II. 484-5, and these may be related to this effort by Bruce.
3. Calderwood V. 131-2. It was to Lord Lindsay, significantly enough, that Waldegrave dedicated his edition of Dudley Fenner's Godly and Learned Treatises, in December 1591.

Scottish merchant in London, and by him forwarded to

(1)  
Burghley. With regard to the efficacy of the letter, there is probably some truth in Fuller's observation: "This letter prevailed little with the Queen, nor do I finde that the king of Scotland was discontented thereat. Princes politickly understanding their mutual secret language (not to say silent signs) whose desires to forraigne Princes for private persons carry this tacite reservation, if it may stand with the conveniency and pleasure of him to whom it is written. Besides, they know by their own experience, that often there is the least of themselves in their own letters, as granted meerly for quietness sake to satisfie the importunity of others". (2)  
Heylin says that "the Queen looked upon it as extorted rather by importunity of some which were then about him, than as proceeding from himself". (3)  
With James's intercession for Udall and Cartwright may be grouped his appeal for Waldegrave. On June 20, 1592, he wrote to Burghley, asking him to use his influence with Elizabeth that Waldegrave might "have hir pardoun confirmed to him be write for the former offencis imputed to him, cancelling the memory thairof", so that he might be able to visit England when he

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVII. Nos. 63, 76; cf. C.S.P. X. Nos. 574, 587; Fuller, IX. vii. 30; Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p. 316; Pearson, Thomas Cartwright, Appendix xxvi.
2. Fuller, loc. cit.
3. Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p. 317.

had occasion to do so. The king reminded Burghley that Waldegrave had given an undertaking to work only under licence  
(1)  
from the Scottish government.

While the Scottish presbyterians tried to make their sympathy for their persecuted English brethren effective, by their reception of Udall, Penry, and Waldegrave, by their prayers, and by obtaining the appeal on behalf of Udall and Cartwright, the English puritans showed their sympathy for the Scots by defending them against Bancroft's attacks. Penry's A Briefe Discouery of the vnthuthess and slanders contained in a sermon preached the 8 of Februarie 1588 by D. Bancroft (1590) has a section which deals with  
(2)  
Bancroft's remarks about Scotland. Penry replied to Bancroft's general standpoint by explaining that the puritans sought the establishment of presbyterian government not because it existed in Scotland or Geneva, but because it was divinely appointed, and asserted that impurities in the Scottish or Genevan systems, if any were discovered, would not be imitated. He said that Bancroft's insinuation that the Scottish king "is a deadly enemy vnto the present governement established in his kingdome, and watcheth but his

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. XLVIII. No. 53; cf. C.S.P. X. No. 699.
2. Penry, Briefe Discovery, pp. 42-44, replying to Bancroft's Sermon, pp. 72-78.

time to ouerthrow it", and his allegation that the Scottish ministers were seditious, would be answered by the Scots themselves, but he argued that, in any case, rebellious conduct on the part of the ministers did not prove their form of government false. He also censured Bancroft for using a letter of Robert Browne, "a knowne scismatic" and a "proud vngodly man", as evidence. At a later date, after John Davidson had stated the case for James and the kirk, a puritan petition to the queen, possibly by Barrowe, was able to present a more elaborate criticism of Bancroft.<sup>(1)</sup> The author of this work said that Bancroft turned to Scotland for illustrations of the rebellious tendencies in presbyterianism because he could find no evidence in England, and that he had implied, as a result of his use of the Declaration, that James was a "flat hypocrite". The writer urged that the Declaration was "counterfait by the gracelesse Archbushop of St. Andrewes", and that the king was a sincere supporter of the established polity. He emphasised the most vulnerable point in Bancroft's sermon, the attack on James, by quoting from Davidson's Bancroft's Rashnes.

1. Harleian MSS. 7581, "A petition directed to her most excellent majestie". It was published, probably in 1591, and is attributed to Henry Barrowe. (S.T.C. 1521). The section on Scotland is f. 28, p. 51, of the MS., and p. 46 of the printed copy.

## Chapter 9.

Later events, down to the Hampton Court conference, 1591-1604.

In the three or four years following 1590, the most important feature in the relations of the English puritans with Scotland is the use which was made by them, and by their detractors, of the edition of Knox's History published by Vautrollier in 1587 - certainly the Scottish work which was most influential in England in the whole period under review.

(1)

Vautrollier, who had come to England early in Elizabeth's reign, went to Scotland about 1580, and spent there some six years (broken by a visit to England in 1583), first as a bookseller and later, in 1584 and 1585, as a publisher. Some facts about his life indicate that his appearance in 1586 and 1587 as a publisher of Scottish presbyterian literature was not purely fortuitous. He was fairly friendly with Thomas

(2)

Randolph, a man who, throughout his career, took an interest in Scottish affairs, both political and ecclesiastical, and who seems to have sympathised with the presbyterian party.

On his arrival in Scotland, Vautrollier brought from an

1. The account in the D.N.B. is used throughout this paragraph; the account in Harleian MSS. 5910 part iv, f. 146, is inaccurate in many particulars; cf. Worman, Alien members of the book-trade during the Tudor period, Dickson and Edmond, op. cit. pp. 377-385, Huguenot Society's Returns of Aliens, part ii, p. 355.
2. Harleian MSS. 5910, part iv, f. 146 verso.

Englishman a letter of introduction to George Buchanan, with whom Randolph was intimate. The general assembly of July 1580 recommended that Vautrollier, who had probably just arrived in Scotland, should be licensed as a publisher,<sup>(1)</sup> and there are illustrations of the printer's association with the more extreme presbyterian ministers - in April 1583, when Vautrollier lost a load of books through an attack by pirates, it was James Lawson, minister of Edinburgh, who wrote to William Davison on his behalf;<sup>(2)</sup> and Vautrollier's wife, who carried on the publishing business in London during her husband's absence in Scotland, was present at Lawson's funeral in October 1584.<sup>(3)</sup> It is hardly surprising that when Vautrollier returned to England in 1586 he brought with him the MS. of Knox's history of the reformation, a work which had lessons, religious and political, for the English puritans, and which had been commended by the Scottish presbyterian exiles in 1584.<sup>(4)</sup> The book was printed, but in February 1586/7 the copies were seized at the orders of the primate, and the publication of the work was forbidden, although Vautrollier and his friends hoped that a book so damaging to queen Mary

1. B.U.K. II. 462.

2. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. xxxi. No. 93; cf. C.S.P. VI. 371-2.

3. Wodrow Misc. I. 452.

4. James Carmichael to William Davison, August 24, 1584, S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. xxxvi, No. 45 (C.S.P. VII. 294):  
 "Bot we [i.e., the exiled ministers, engaged in producing an apologia] ar all more desyrous of Mr. Knoxis historie if it could be procurit by anie meanes... quhilk wald do us all singular pleisour and profit to the cause".

(1)  
 would be allowed. A further service rendered by Vautrollier to the presbyterians was the publication of an edition of the Book of Common Order (1587), a task which he undertook, at least ostensibly, because there was at the time no qualified printer in Scotland. In requesting permission to proceed with this work, he explained to the government that the book was intended for distribution in Scotland only, and offered surety (2) that it would not be distributed in England. The seizure of the edition of Knox's History did not prevent the circulation among English puritans of mutilated copies of that book, and it is not unlikely that some copies of the Book of Common Order were available for those who wanted them.

The writer (possibly Henry Barrowe) of the petition to the queen which has already been mentioned as containing a defence of the Scottish ministers against Bancroft knew Knox's History sufficiently well to be able to cite a passage in it (3) which had no bearing on any important issue. More significant is the use made of Knox's work by Copinger, Arthington and their fellow conspirators in the wildest of all puritan schemes - the plot of 1592. They thought that Knox supported their theory of "extraordinarie reuelations", and they found in his writings

1. Knox I. xxxii, xxxix-xl.
2. S.T.C. 16582, 16583; H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. XIII. 361.
3. A petition to her Maiestie (?1590), p. 18 (MS. in Harleian MSS. 7581, f. 11), citing "Histo. of the Church of Scot. pag. 44".

some authority for plans to effect reformation by force. <sup>(1)</sup> It is clear that, apart from the instances which have been given of frank sympathy and co-operation between the English and Scottish presbyterians in 1590 and 1591, there was some <sup>(2)</sup> correspondence of a more sinister nature. The contacts of Copinger and Arthington with Scotland may have originated through Penry, for Arthington confessed that Penry had sent him word from Scotland that "reformation must shortly be <sup>(3)</sup> erected in England"; another link may have been through Wiggington, who has been shown to have been an associate of John Davidson, and who was involved in the conspiracy. The Scot with whom Copinger corresponded was James Gibson, a minister who outshone his fellows in the violence with which he expressed his opinions, and particularly his criticism of the king - violence for which he was censured by the general assembly, suspended from the ministry, and finally proclaimed <sup>(4)</sup> a rebel. On December 31, 1590, Copinger wrote to Gibson: "Thee state of our Church groweth worse and worse: our zealous Ministerie and Magistracie are daylye disgraced and displaced: the meanes of helpe is taken away, except, that God would either move her Maiestie inwardly ... or else stirre up, some

1. Defence of Job Throkmorton, sig. B i verso. Copinger used arguments from Knox to persuade Throkmorton of the value of "extraordinarie reuelations". Cf. Sutcliffe, Answer to Job Throkmorton, f. 15.
2. Cosin, Conspiracy for pretended reformation, almost passim, points out links between the conspirators and Scotland.
3. Sutcliffe, Answer to Job Throkmorton, f. 47.
4. C Calderwood, IV. 484-8, 630, 672-5, V. 99; J Melville, Diary p, 253.

faithfull Zorobabell or Nehemiah .... Myselfe am acquainted with some, who, to do seruice herein, would aduenture the losse of their liues.... And therefore, I, though most vnworthy, haue aduentured to write vnto yow, to beseech yow in the bowels of Christ Iesus, to haue conference with such, as are most able to aduise you on our behalfe, and to returne answere, how a man may examine himselfe in this matter, and what be the extraordinary thinges, which must bee in him, that is so called: what course he is to take, to haue his extraordinary calling knowne: first to himselfe, and then  
 (1) to the Church". Gibson replied "that he had conferred with the best of the ministry where he was, and that there was a letter ready to be sent to Iunius, and finally that the French King should be moued, and all good offices done for the  
 (2) behoofe of Copinger and his brethren". Gibson was also able to assure his correspondent that "the best of our Ministerie are most carefull of your estate, and had sent to that effect, a Preacher of our Church this last summer (1590) of purpose to conferre with the best affected Ministers of your Church, to laye downe a plot, how our Church might best trauell for your reliefe.... The Lord knows what care we haue of your  
 (3) Church, both in publike and priuate praiers, &c."

1. Bancroft, D.P., pp. 145-6.

2. Sutcliffe, Answer to Job Throckmorton, f. 48 verso.

3. Bancroft, D.P., p. 6; cf. Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p.316.

The critical events of the years 1589-91 were followed in 1592 by the establishment of presbyterian church government in Scotland and the almost simultaneous suppression of English presbyterianism. Every historian must echo Heylin's remark: "Thus have we brought the Presbyterians to their highest pitch in the Kirk of Scotland, when they were almost at their lowest fall in the Church of England"<sup>(1)</sup>. Bancroft, who had so much to do with the exposure of English presbyterianism, did not fail to castigate the Scots in the works which gave to the world the fruits of his investigations - Dangerous Positions and Proceedings and A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, both published in 1593. The line which he took - indicated in the famous phrase "Scottizing for discipline" - was that a great deal of English puritan thought could be traced to Scottish sources, and he paid particular attention to the subversive politics of the Scottish reformation and of the Melvillian party. He was now equipped with a much more adequate knowledge of Scotland than he had displayed in 1589, when, in compiling his sermon, he had drawn on Adamson's Declaration and Robert Browne's A New Year's Gift. Of printed books, he had now read the first Book of Discipline,<sup>(2)</sup> if not the second, the 1584 edition

1. Heylin, Aërius Redivivus, p. 303.

2. In discussing presbyterian views on ordination, Bancroft refers to the provisions of the first Book of Discipline only (Survey p. 186) - one of many indications that his knowledge of Scottish ecclesiastical affairs was not complete (cf. Survey, pp. 49-50).

of The Book of Common Order,<sup>(1)</sup> John Davidson's attack on his  
 sermon (Bancroft's Rashness),<sup>(2)</sup> Penry's A Briefe Discovery,<sup>(3)</sup>  
 the volume of Robert Bruce's Sermons which Waldegrave had  
 published in 1591,<sup>(4)</sup> and the 1587 edition of Holinshed's  
Chronicles,<sup>(5)</sup> from which he extracted some information about  
 recent Scottish history. Most important among printed  
 sources, however, was Vautrollier's edition of Knox's History,  
 which Bancroft studied carefully and used to illustrate his  
 conception of the politics of the Scottish reformers and of  
 the presbyterians.<sup>(6)</sup> In manuscript, Bancroft had, presumably,  
 the answers to the questions which he had sent to Robert  
 Nauntoun,<sup>(7)</sup> the information sent him by John Gibson, and at  
 least one of the letters from archbishop Adamson to Whitgift,  
 a document which the primate may have allowed Bancroft to use.<sup>(8)</sup>  
 He refers also to "James Gibson's conference with the king:  
 penned by himselfe, and deliuered abroad in many Copies", i.e.,<sup>(9)</sup>

1. Survey pp. 147, 174.
2. Dangerous Positions, p. 6.
3. This is the work cited in the Survey, pp. 75, 78.
4. Survey, pp. 458-60. Bancroft quotes without giving a reference, but his quotations make identification possible.
5. Survey pp. 48-9 - "the English Chronicles of Scotland (as they stand corrected)". The references are to the 1587 edition of Holinshed.
6. Survey pp. 48-9 (almost a score of references); p. 228; D.P. p. 10 et seq. (numerous quotations).
7. Vide p. 214 supra.
8. The passage quoted in D.P., p. 5, comes from a letter in the Appendix (E iii).
9. D.P., p. 27.

an account of an interview during which Gibson had called the king a persecutor, because he maintained "the tyrannie of bishops, and absolute power"<sup>(1)</sup>.

Another English controversialist of the same period, Matthew Sutcliffe, took a line similar to Bancroft's. His attention may have been first drawn to Scotland by An Humble Motion, for in his Treatise of Ecclesiasticall Discipline (1591), he noticed that the author of An Humble Motion, writing from Scotland, had urged the sale of episcopal property to redeem impropriations, and he expressed surprise that this suggestion could come from Scotland, "seeing the ministerie of that Church is vtterly ruined and impouerished"<sup>(2)</sup>. Before he wrote his Answer to a certaine libel supplicatorie (1592), Sutcliffe had studied Vautrollier's Knox, the Declaration of the Ruthven raiders (published in 1582), and the information which Holinshed gave about events in Scotland in 1584 and 1585.<sup>(3)</sup> From these sources he cited passages which he thought illustrated the seditious tendencies of presbyterianism, and he asked whether the English disciplinarians agreed that reformation could be effected in defiance of the government. In his Answer to Job Throkmorton

1. Calderwood IV. 484-8.

2. Sutcliffe, Treatise of Ecclesiasticall Discipline, p. 103.

3. Sutcliffe, Answer to a certaine libel, pp. 192, 193, 194, citing "History of the Ch. of Scotland", "Declaration, Anno 1582", and "Chronicle".

(1595), Sutcliffe dealt with the Copinger-Arthington  
 conspirators and their use of Knoxian politics,<sup>(1)</sup> and accused  
 them of desiring to "bring the queen to repentance" by the  
 method applied to Cardinal Betoun in 1546:<sup>(2)</sup>

"How this repentance should be wrought, it  
 appeareth by the discourse of the murder of the Archbishop  
 of S. Andrewes Anno. 1546. there it is said, that Peter  
 Carmichael, and Norman Lesly stroke him first, but Iames  
 Meluin presenting to him the point of his sword said, repent  
 thee of thy former wicked life, and so after some short  
 speach dispatched him, which is a very compendious kinde of  
 bringing men to repentance".

The Scots were not ignorant of Sutcliffe's attacks on them,  
 and John Davidson wrote a reply to some of his "calumnies".<sup>(3)</sup>

The persecution of English puritans in 1592 and  
 1593, and particularly the sufferings of men, like Udall and  
 Penry, who were well known in Scotland, alarmed the Scottish  
 presbyterians. Bancroft's works probably found their way to  
 Scotland - there is evidence that Andrew Melville read  
Dangerous Positions, and esteemed its author "the capital  
 enemy of all reformed churches in Europe"<sup>(4)</sup> - and served to  
 sustain the hatred of the English bishops which had flourished  
 since 1584. In September 1593 a synod at which John Davidson  
 and James Melville were present agreed that one of the perils

1. Sutcliffe, Answer vnto ... Iob Throkmorton, ff. 13,15.

2. ib. f. 47.

3. Calderwood IV. 45.

4. J. Melville, Diary, p. 679.

of the time was "the hote persecution of discipline by the tyrannie of Bishops in our neighbour land"<sup>(1)</sup>. Two years later, one of the reasons for a fast was described as "the barbarous crueltie and great boundage exercised and brought upon our deere and worthie brethrein", not only by "the confederats of the Councell of Trent", but also by "suche as it becometh not"<sup>(2)</sup>, in England and other countries. At atmosphere of suspicion and tension survived from the critical year 1590, and in 1596 there occurred a situation closely resembling that with which Bowes had previously had to cope. This time the denunciatory sermon came from a Scottish presbyterian, and was directed against the English queen and the English church. David Black, minister of St. Andrews, had spent seventeen years as a school-master in England before being appointed to a charge in the Scottish university town, at the instance of Andrew Melville, in 1590.<sup>(3)</sup> In October 1596 he preached some sermons in which "he said that her Majestie was an Athist, That the religion professed ther (meaning in England) was but a show of religioun, guyded and derved by the bishops injunctiouns. And they would not be content with this at home. But would persuade the king to bringe in the

1. Calderwood V. 265.

2. *ib.* 376.

3. Scott, *Fasti*, V. 420; S.P.Scot. Eliz. LIX. No. 63:

"Mr. David Black, sometymes a scholmaster in Ingland and beinge made denison lyved ther about xvii yeares".

same here. And thereby to be debarred of the liberty of the  
 word".<sup>(1)</sup> As soon as Bowes heard of this, he informed Burghley,  
 and asked for instructions. He had decided to "call for  
 tymely tryall and dewe punishment",<sup>(2)</sup> and with this end in view  
 he "set downe in wrytyng and delivered to the king th'effectes  
 of th'informacion given" against Black.<sup>(3)</sup> When accused, the  
 preacher denied the charges made against him, and tried to  
 take refuge in the fact that he had been naturalised as an  
 Englishman. "He wisheth and prayeth to be tryed in Ingland,  
 and by immediate meanes for her Majestie, that therby he may  
 be cleared, or otherwyse punished with the uttermost paynes  
 of the law, which as an Englishman he will (as is offred by  
 his friends) willingly suffer".<sup>(4)</sup> Bowes kept his government  
 fully informed of the proceedings.<sup>(5)</sup> The case was complicated  
 by Black's action in "declining" the jurisdiction of the  
 council, as Andrew Melville had done in 1584, but the  
 Scottish government, perhaps moved by pressure from the  
 English ambassador, brought forward a charge of the

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. LIX. No. 66, enclosure iii.

2. ib. No. 63.

3. ib. No. 66.

4. ib. No. 66.

5. ib. Nos. 71, 74, 75, 83. There are copies of Black's  
 "declinatour" to the council, of a proclamation against  
 him, of the two citations of Black, of depositions  
 against him, and of the sentence. Cf. Calderwood,  
 V. 457, 465, 476, R.P.C. V. 326, 334-6, 340-2, 345-8, and  
 S.R.Gardiner, History of England, I. 56 et seq.

publication of traiterous and slanderous calumnies against the king's mother and estate. The accused had widespread support, but the "well affected" agreed with Balcanquhal, minister of Edinburgh, in "highe prayse and commendacion of her Majestie, her religion and vertues, approving her Majestie to have ben a most loving mother of trew religion, and of Chrysts church throughe all Christendome, and especially in this realme, and to the king and estate thereof"<sup>(1)</sup>. On December 2, Black was ordered to "enter in ward be north the north water"<sup>(2)</sup> within six days.

Black's trial had proved a sort of test case between the crown and the kirk, and it is not surprising to find that some of the opponents of James's claims to headship of the church turned to England in the course of their arguments:<sup>(3)</sup>

"Your Majestie knowes verie weill, there is not a Popish prince in Europe darre claime the like stile [i.e., headship of the church], and a Protestant prince there is none but her Majestie of our nighbour countrie. And yee know, Sir, how King Henrie the Eight gott that stile, and how she has bruiked it sensyne; and the most learned, not of Britaine onlie, but of all Europ, and the most godlie, have opponed, and yitt doe oppone themselves thereunto. And had not her Majestie beene letted by the corrupt bishops, with some particular politick counsellors, that reformation had beene there long er now, which they say your Majestie mindeth to chasses away".

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. LIX. No. 75.

2. ib. No. 83; R.P.C. V. 340-42; not December 9, as in Calderwood (V. 498).

3. Calderwood V. 545-6 (January 1596/7).

The author of this document, keeping the parallel with England before him, reminded James that he had written "a verie favourable letter to her Majestie of our nighbour countrie, desiring her that the consciences of good and learned men, namelie, of Cairtwright, sould not be straited with the yoke and boundage which now your Majestie urgeth.... For, as your Majestie's letter boore, the conscience is a verie tender thing, and hard to be controlled in maters of religioun"<sup>(1)</sup>.

There was no doubt in the minds of the Scots that the English bishops still sought conformity between the two countries.<sup>(2)</sup>

The suspicion that they were co-operating with the Scottish king, and the consciousness that the presbyterian parties in the two countries had a common cause, are commentaries on the flight of two Edinburgh ministers to England in December 1596. They were Robert Bruce, who appeared earlier as a friend of Udall, and Walter Balcanquhal, who had been an exile in England in 1584 and 1585, and whose admiration for Elizabeth, recently expressed in a sermon,<sup>(3)</sup> did not extend to the

ecclesiastical system which she maintained. Threatened with imprisonment for their opposition to the king's policy, they crossed the border about December 27, and, after five or six days in Tweedmouth, went to Yorkshire.<sup>(4)</sup> Where they spent the

1. Calderwood V. 550.

2. J. Melville, Diary, pp. 390-91 (February 1596-7).

3. See previous page.

4. Calderwood V. 521.

next three months, before they returned to Scotland, <sup>(1)</sup> is not clear, but there is at least a possibility that they appealed for help to the earl of Essex, the patron of the English <sup>(2)</sup> puritans.

The connection between Essex and the puritans is the background against which the next visit of Robert Bruce to England must be viewed. The more extreme puritans, <sup>(3)</sup> including, it was alledged, Stephen Egerton, whom the Scots had met in 1584, had supported the rebellion of Essex by preaching the politics of resistance. After the failure of the Essex rebellion, all preachers in England were urged to condemn the treason of the earl, and this the puritans were unwilling to do. The parallel between their position and that of the Scottish ministers, who were compelled about this time to publish the official version of the Gowrie conspiracy, came readily to the mind of any Scot. Robert Bruce was banished in September 1600, for his refusal to accept the king's story of the Gowrie plot, and was forbidden to repair <sup>(4)</sup> to England. He went to France, but in February 1600/1 the earl of Mar, who had been sent to London to negotiate with Essex, but had arrived only after the execution of the earl,

1. They returned before April 21, 1597. (Calderswood V. 626).
2. H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. VII. 10 - a reply from Essex (dated January 8, 1596/7) to Scottish ministers who had asked him to persuade the government to receive them into England.
3. H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. XI. 157-8.
4. R.P.C. VI. 162.

asked Bruce to come to London "to conferre with the Earl of Mar and the ministers there". It is very likely that Mar, in the course of his negotiations with the partisans of Essex, had renewed contacts with English puritans whom he had met when he was in exile, along with the other leaders of the Scottish presbyterian party, in 1585. Bruce came over to England and some of the puritan ministers showed him "that they were urged tuiching Essex, as I was urged tuiching Gowrie; and as they were content to reverence the law, to trust and rest satisfied tuiching the tryell of that great assise that past against Essex, so I am content, to content me for the present with that tryell that past against Gowrie"<sup>(1)</sup>. Bruce said afterwards that he had "advised with the learnedest of the ministrie in England", especially Anthony Wotton, lecturer at Allhallows by the Tower and a noted puritan, and had discussed the reasons for their refusal to condemn the treason of Essex.<sup>(2)</sup> Bruce returned to ~~Scotland~~ <sup>Berwick</sup> in June, 1601.<sup>(3)</sup>

In the last years of the century, the suspicion of the Scottish presbyterians that the English bishops were conspiring with James increased rather than diminished, for there could be little doubt of the king's intention to restore episcopacy. James's observance of Christmas in 1598,

1. Calderwood VI. 102, 130-131.

2. Calderwood VI. 194; D.N.B. on Wotton

3. Calderwood VI. 135-7.

an event intrinsically insignificant, was the occasion of excited speculation that the king intended to govern the church by "injunctions" - an idea which had been hateful to some of the ministers ever since the time of the regent Morton. The English agent at Edinburgh reported that "the extraordinary keeping of this day is judged by many to proceed from some advise and policy of our bisshops in England, betwene some of whom and the king some do thinck there is an intelligence"<sup>(1)</sup>. Almost as a matter of course, episcopacy was condemned in the light of conditions in England, which were used to prove that "Antichristian and Anglican episcopall digniteis, offices, places, titles, and all ecclesiasticall prelacieis, are flatt repugnant to the Word of God"<sup>(2)</sup>.

Along with the fears of the Scots we should probably consider the hopes of their English brethren, who thought of James as a presbyterian, or at least a puritan, monarch. Hugh Broughton, a "doctrinel puritan" (although not a presbyterian), already in 1599 looked on the Scottish king as the "next defendour of the faith by the title and right of England", and regarded him as a possible champion of what Broughton considered orthodox Calvinist theology, against the views of some of the bishops.<sup>(3)</sup> It is perhaps significant of the puritan

1. S.P. Scot.Eliz. LXIII. No. 85 (George Nicolson to Robert Cecil, Dec. 25, 1598).
2. Calderwood VI. 3.
3. S.P. Scot.Eliz. vol. lxiv, No. 2.

hopes from James that Waldegrave had, in 1598, printed at Edinburgh Peter Wentworth's Pithie Exhortation, a work which supported James's claim to the English crown, and that the king was greatly enraged because the English representative  
(1)  
at his court obtained a copy.

Hopes and fears alike became more intense when Elizabeth died and James was recognised as her successor. The English bishops, it was rumoured, feared the ruin of their  
(2)  
estate, and Bancroft, now bishop of London, who knew more about the Scottish king than any of his fellows did, thought  
(3)  
that the new monarch might wish to introduce the "discipline". The prelate could hardly view with equanimity the accession of a sovereign whom he had insulted a few years before. On the other hand, "the sincerer sort of professors ... looked for reformation of all the abuses and corruptions of that Church. The king interteanned intelligence with some of them". Among the intermediaries between James and the puritans was one Wilcox, who visited the king in Scotland and subsequently  
(4)  
assisted in preparing the way for his accession. There is no evidence to identify this Wilcox with the famous puritan who had collaborated with Field in composing the Admonition to Parliament and who had conferred with the Scottish presbyterian

1. S.P.Scot.Eliz. vol. lxvi. no. 9.

2. Calderwood VI. 220.

3. Strype, Whitgift, II. 469.

4. Calderwood VI. 220-221.

exiles in 1584, but the latter was still alive and active, and<sup>(1)</sup> was, further, intimate with Peter Wentworth, whose Pithie Exhortation seems to be connected with the negotiations between James and the puritans. No other Wilcox is mentioned in any of the main sources for the history of English puritanism. The Scottish ministers thought that they now had an opportunity to give effective help to the English presbyterians, and the synod of Lothian, addressing James before he left for England, petitioned "for releefe of good brethrein of the ministrie of England". The king replied "that he was not minded at the first to urge any alteratioun. As for Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Travers, and some others, he understood they were at freedome.<sup>(2)</sup> He would show favour to honest men, but not to Anabaptists". James was probably sincere in distinguishing between moderate men and extremists. In the latter category he put Robert Browne, who had visited Scotland in 1584, and Penry, whom he<sup>(3)</sup> suspected of having influenced the Scottish ministers. The distinction appears in the preface to the edition of the<sup>(4)</sup> Basilikon Doron published at London in 1603:

"First then, as to the name of Puritanes, I am not ignorant that the stile thereof doth properly belong onely to that vile sect among the Anabaptists, called the Familie of loue... Of this speciall sect I principally meane, when I speake of Puritanes; divers of them, as Browne, Penrie, and others, hauing at sundrie times come in Scotland, to sowe their popple amongst vs (and from my heart I wish, that they

1. D.N.B. on Wilcox.
2. Calderwood VI. 222.
3. ib. V. 698.
4. Sig. A 5-6.

had left no schollers behinde them, who by their fruites will in the owne time be manifested) and partly, indeede, I giue this stile to such brainsick and headie preachers their disciples and followers, as refusing to be called of that sect, yet participate too much with their humours ... in the contempt of the ciuill Magistrate ... in making for euerie particular question of the policie of the Church, as great commotion, as if the article of the Trinitie were called in controuersie.... But on the other hand, I protest vpon mine honour, I meane it not generally of all Preachers, or others, that likes better of the single forme of policie in our Church, then of the many ceremonies in the Church of England; that are persuaded, that their Bishops smels of a Papall supremacie, that the Surplise, the cornerd cap, and such like, are the outward badges of Popish errors. No, I am so farre from being contentious in these things, (which for my owne part I euer esteemed as indifferent) as I doe aequally loue and honour the learned and graue men of either of these opinions".

The English puritans were convinced that they had grounds for hope. Miles Moss, who recollected the piety of the Scottish nobles to whom he had ministered in 1585, dedicated to one of them (the earl of Mar) a work with the title Scotland's Welcome, in which he wrote: "We are to conceiue of the King, Nobles and People together, as of a beautiful Church, and holy Spouse of Jesus Christ"<sup>(1)</sup>. Few had had Moss's opportunity of discovering the devotion of Scottish nobles to religion, but it was easy for all to recall James's action in appealing on behalf of Udall and Cartwright. Cartwright himself reminded the new king of that instance of "rare and incomparable humanity", when he dedicated to him his In Librum

1. Scotland's Welcome, (1603), pp. 65-6.

(1)

Salomonis, qui inscribitur Ecclesiastes ... Homiliae, and William Stoughton, in his Assertion for True and Christian Church-Policie, wrote of Udall that he was "arayned, and convicted, and so died in prison, notwithstanding our Soverayne Lord, King JAMES, then King of Scotland, had gratuslie written for his deliverance"<sup>(2)</sup>. It seemed a good omen that the new monarch was accompanied by Mr. Patrick Galloway, who had made friends in England in 1584 and 1585, and evidently established a reputation as a preacher within a few months of his arrival in James's train.<sup>(3)</sup> Before the end of 1603, he was known to be one of the friends at court to the petition of the ministers of Sussex, and it was rumoured that his association with "sectaries" and his "forwardness in matters of religion"<sup>(4)</sup> had led to his imprisonment in the Tower. In October, an English presbyterian thought that it might be arranged through Galloway, whom he knew to be "constant in the cause", that there should be "petitions from all the presbytereis to the king, in the behalfe of the ministers of England, a letter to the Lords of the Councell, to the Erle of Marr, and Sir George Hume, and to the Lord of Kinlosse to

1. In Librum Salomonis, qui inscribitur Ecclesiastes ... Homiliae (1604), epistle dedicatory.
2. Stoughton, Assertion, (1604), p. 332.
3. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS. XV. 220. Lord Cobham, in the Tower, wished to see a preacher, and mentioned "Mr. Galloway of some of his [? the king's] preachers". July 1603 or later.
4. H.M.C. Salisbury MSS. XV. 262, 283.

interest them in the cause of reformatioun". The substance of the petition, he thought, ought to be that the English bishops should be like those of Scotland in authority, although they kept their livings. He believed that the king was resolved "to have a preaching ministrie, to mitigat subscriptioun, and to restore the censures of the kirk (1) ad integram". Andrew Melville's sympathy with the efforts of his English brethren at this time appears in his verses replying to the resolutions in which the English universities (2) condemned the millenary petition.

The stage was now set for the Hampton Court conference, of which there were high hopes not in England only, but in Scotland, where the presbyterians had "gryt expectatioune that all the great and grosse corruptiounes (3) of the Kirk of England should be reformed". Actually, the deliberations merely revealed the antipathy of the king to presbyterianism, and some of James's words may have brought

1. Calderwood VI. 234-5.

2. Oxford's reply to the petition was published in 1603 as An Answer of the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, and other the Heads of Houses in the University of Oxford. The Cambridge letter of congratulation to Oxford is in Strype's Annals, IV. 522-3. Melville's verses were called Anti-tami-cami-categoria. (McCrie, Melville, 2nd. edn., I. 232.) There is a copy at Lambeth, in a volume of puritan material (No. 113).

3. J. Melville, Diary, p. 554.

home to the English puritans that their connection with Scotland had been, after all, unprofitable, for it was unlikely to bring them favour from a king who had suffered too much at the hands of their allies.<sup>(1)</sup> In Scotland, as in England, there was despondency - the conference had been a "gryt disapoyntment, discouragement, and disgrace of all that craiffed and luikit for reformatioun"<sup>(2)</sup>. An account of the proceedings was sent to Scotland by Patrick Galloway, who had been present at Hampton Court,<sup>(3)</sup> and when this was read before a meeting of the presbytery of Edinburgh at the end of February (1603/4), James Melville "craved two things: First, that they would, as Christian and brotherlie compassioun craved, be greeved and tuiched with sorrow, with manie godlie and learned brethrein in our nighbour countrie, who, having expected a reformatioun, are disappointed and heavilie greeved; and if no other way could be found for helpe, that they would at least helpe by their prayers to God, for their comfort and releefe. Nixt, that seeing the presbyterie of Edinburgh had ever beene as the Sion and watche-towre of our kirk, and the ministers thereof the cheefe watchemen, that they would watche and take heed that

1. Barlow, Summe and Substance of the Conference ... at Hampton Court (1604), pp. 39, 44, 71, 79-82.
2. J. Melville, Diary, p. 554.
3. Barlow, op. cit. p. 21; Calderwood VI. 241.

no perrell or contagioun come from our nighbour kirk; and  
 givewairning, in cace there be occasioun, to the presbyterais  
 throughout the countrie; and namelie, that they take heed at  
 this parliament, which is indicated by proclamatioun, and  
 intended for unioun of the two realms"<sup>(1)</sup>. Sympathy with the  
 English puritans and suspicion of anglican influence in  
 Scotland were still dominant, and the possibility of a union  
 of the two realms intensified them.<sup>(2)</sup>

1. Calderwood VI. 246-7.

2. ib. 257-64; J. Melville, Diary, p. 569.

## Chapter 10.

Conclusions - the influence of each party on the other,  
and the results of the contacts between them.

The years 1560 to 1604 are a formative period in the history of the relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, for they reveal a transition from complete cordiality to violent hostility. In an age when ecclesiastical affairs counted for so much, a change of this kind was bound to have significant effects on the relations between the two peoples, and it was supremely important because in these same years political conditions were bringing the two states ever closer together until they were finally joined by a personal union. Men in both countries were aware of the necessity for an alliance between England and Scotland, and as the century drew towards its close they became increasingly conscious of the probability that the two countries would be united. Both in the calculations of politicians and in the ideals of visionaries the relations between the two churches were an essential feature of any conception of either "amity" or union.

Viewed against this background, the relations between the English and Scottish presbyterian parties had important results. They accentuated the differences between

the two churches, and probably accelerated the divergence of one from the other, for it is quite conceivable that, if the presbyterian parties had not been so closely linked together, men would have been less conscious of the different forms of worship and government, and the atmosphere of suspicion and hatred which caused the Scots to use "anglican" as a synonym for "antichristian" would have been absent. The Scottish distrust of the English bishops was partly due to a knowledge of the sufferings which they inflicted on "the brethren of England", men who were regarded by many Scots not merely as sound theologians and disciplinarians, but as personal friends. On the other hand, the English government's hostility to presbyterianism arose in part from the association of the English puritans with Scottish ministers who took a pride in defying their king and his council and in countenancing rebellion.

Secondly, the alliance of the two presbyterian parties and the readiness of the English puritans to regard the Church of Scotland, particularly in its presbyterian periods, as a model, greatly complicated the task of the statesmen, especially as politicians who shared enthusiasm for the "amity" were at variance with each other on ecclesiastical matters. The official attitude of the English government, represented by Burghley and the queen, was aimed

at an understanding which need not be rooted in conformity and which might be facilitated by the continuance in Scotland of a struggle which weakened that country. This was quite inconsistent with the ideas of Walsingham and William Davison, who thought that the English government should support presbytery, and had no hesitation in giving to the Scottish ministers all the help which their official position enabled them to give. The situation in Scotland, as Burghley realised, was such that neither party should be regarded as deserving either the steady confidence or the persistent suspicion of the English government, for there had been in the background ever since the 'sixties a body of opinion which visualised a British church on the anglican model, while the Scottish presbyterians might be viewed as potential conspirators with England's own ecclesiastical rebels in schemes to overthrow Elizabeth's established church.

Thirdly, the relations of the English puritans with Scotland made a valuable contribution to the ease with which the political union of the two countries was effected. To the English puritans James appeared as a potential friend - a fact which can be explained only by a study of the history of the Scottish reformed church down to 1603 and by a knowledge of the extent of the information about James which the English puritans possessed. Not only had the Scottish king described the

English liturgy in language which any puritan might have used; not only had he consented to the establishment of presbyterian government - and his sincerity in doing so, questioned by Bancroft, had been defended by John Davidson, Penry and Henry Barrowe; he had also tried to give assistance of one kind or another to Udall, Cartwright and Waldegrave. It may be that the English puritans' knowledge of James and his policy was the half-knowledge that is dangerous, but it is plain that even James's Scottish subjects did not yet, in 1603, regard him as hostile to all the essentials of the puritan-presbyterian programme. He had as yet shown no taste for ritual nor a preference for forms of worship other than those of the Book of Common Order; the polity which he seemed to favour can hardly be called episcopalian, and was really a compromise between the claims of the presbyterians and the needs of the constitution. James's enthusiastic adherence to anglicanism after 1603 is not adequate ground for arguing that he had persistently aimed at the establishment of anglicanism in Scotland before that date, or that he was insincere in the views which he had expounded in the Basilikon Doron:<sup>(1)</sup>

1. Vide p. 259 supra.

"I meane it not generally of all Preachers, or others, that likes better of the single forme of policie in our Church, then of the many ceremonies in the Church of England; that are persuaded, that their Bishops smells of a Papall supremacie, that the Surplise, the cornerd cap, and such like, are the outward badges of Popish errors. No, I am so farre from being contentious in these things, (which for my owne part I euer esteemed as indifferent) as I doe aequally loue and honour the learned and graue men of either of these opinions".

There were reasonable grounds for the puritan hope - a hope not dashed until the subject of polity was discussed at the Hampton Court conference - that James would favour a simple form of worship and a modified or constitutional episcopacy. The English puritan view of the king may, therefore, have been justified; it was unquestionably of the greatest importance in helping to shape the English attitude towards the Scottish succession. In the last years of Elizabeth's life there were some significant incidents which give us a hint that James and the English puritans had an understanding, and that the English and Scottish presbyterian parties were working together to ensure the peaceful accession of the Scottish king to the English throne.

Is there any evidence that developments in one country influenced the course of events in the other? The presbyterian programme in its entirety appeared first in England, and for a few years after 1572 English presbyterianism led the way. There is no evidence that the Scots, after they began to imbibe presbyterian ideas in 1574, were encouraged

by the progress of the movement in England, but we know that they became increasingly conscious of the similarity of their position to that of the English presbyterians, and the probability is strong. There does not appear to have been any notable importation of English presbyterian literature (1) into Scotland - although Andrew Melville, as we saw, knew Travers's De Disciplina Ecclesiastica - but the only possible explanation of the invitation of Cartwright and Travers to St. Andrews is admiration for their writings.

It is easier to analyse the influence of Scotland on England. Reference by the English puritans to the Scottish church commenced in the 'sixties, and was probably continuous. The importance of this connection from the point of view of the liturgical requirements of puritanism cannot be overestimated, and even if Scotland had done no more for the English puritans than provide them with copies of a reformed service book in the English tongue its action would have been of the utmost value. Only one edition of the Book of Common Order was printed in London, and even it was not intended for circulation in England, but there are indications that many

1. No English puritan works appear in the inventories of books left by Thomas Bassandyne (died October 1577) or Robert Gurlaw (died September 1585), although the number of English books in these inventories is considerable. (Bannatyne Miscellany II. 191-2, 209-215; cf. Ferguson, "Relations between London and Edinburgh Printers and Stationers", in The Library, 4th. series vol. VIII., pp. 157-178.)

copies of Scottish editions found their way into England and were used by the puritans there.<sup>(1)</sup> The influence of Scotland on the development of the English presbyterian movement is less clear. It is plain enough that there was no imitation of the Scottish church, and that Penry's repudiation of a debt to foreign churches was completely justified so far as it related to Scotland:<sup>(2)</sup>

"We desire not the Eldership to be planted in the Church of England, because Scotland or Geneua enjoyeth the same, but inasmuch as Christ Iesus the head and king of his church hath commaunded it to bee therein. And therefore we admit the gouernment of no church vnder heauen to be the paterne of that which we desire, but only that regiment which is set downe in the Word of God, the perfection whereof if any Church hath attained vnto, wee reioice with them, and desire to be partakers of so great a blessing, in the Lods [sic] good time. But as for any thing that is amisse (if there be ought) either in Geneua or Scotlande, wee labour no more to haue that established in England".

Other critics of English presbyterianism besides Bancroft noted differences between the Scottish programme and the English;<sup>(3)</sup> and all the evidence shows that the English

1. A copy of the edition published at Edinburgh by Lekprevik in 1565 was acquired by Francis Russell, earl of Bedford, who was stationed at Berwick in the 'sixties and was noted for his puritan convictions. (M.St.Clare Byrne and Gladys Scott Thomson, "My Lord's books", in The Review of English Studies VII. 385-405.) Bancroft used the 1584 edition (Survay, pp. 147, 174). In 1584 the minister of Boughton Mountchensey in Kent was deprived, partly because he had celebrated marriage according to the "book of Scotland" (Strype, Annals III. i. 355).
2. Penry, A Briefe Discovery, pp. 42-3.
3. Travers, Defence, pp. 69, 113 (replying to Dr. Bridges); A Remonstrance (the anglican reply to Udall's Demonstration), pp. 42, 142.

presbyterians, if they borrowed at all, were debtors to the Swiss, French and Dutch churches rather than to the Scottish. There is, of course, no doubt that Scotland served as an inspiration and a model, especially in discussions on the necessity of consistorial discipline under Christian  
(1)  
princes, but Scottish influence was in the main of a different, although not less important, nature.

The greater success of the Scots - owing, mainly, to the ability of the ministers to link themselves to politicians who were ready to engineer revolutions - gave an impetus to the efforts of their English brethren, and contact with the Scottish presbyterians, whose political ideas were in keeping with the situation in Scotland and with their own subversive activities, sometimes encouraged the English presbyterians to depart from their passive policy of "tarrying for the magistrate". A real change in the character of the English presbyterian movement took place about 1583 or 1584. The erection of classes had commenced at least as early as 1582, but there was subsequently a rapid development in organisation, culminating in the approval of the Book of Discipline in 1587. There are grounds for believing that the presence of Scottish ministers

1. E.g., William Stoughton, An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policie, pp. 433-4.

in England in 1584 and 1585 was connected with this development. We know that the Scottish exiles expounded to the English brethren their views on "the proceeding of the minister in his duty, without the assistance or tarrying for the magistrate", that Scottish ministers were closely connected with English presbyterians at the general conference which approved an embryo Book of Discipline on its first recorded appearance, and that the English puritans eagerly watched the efforts of the Scots in 1586 and 1587. The Scots probably told the English presbyterians how the Scottish general assembly, without waiting for the approval of the government, had drawn up the second Book of Discipline and had put it into practice by beginning to erect presbyteries; it was possible to argue that the technical or legal position of a general assembly did not differ from that of a puritan general conference, and that imitation would be perfectly legitimate. Bancroft knew that the puritan activity in the last few months of 1584 and the beginning of 1585 marked a change in their attitude towards the  
 (1)  
 government:

1. Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, p. 74.

"What was resolved amongst the brethren of London, about this matter at that time, I know not. Marry this I finde, that presently thereupon, they grewe more violent, and prepared themselves to proceede more resolutely, in the challenging of their Discipline, as it is plaine by the dealing both of them, and of their fauourers, that yeare in November and December after, at the Parliament, 27 of her Maiesty".

Bancroft believed that Scottish influence was responsible for the tendency to abandon the policy of "tarrying for the magistrate"<sup>(1)</sup>, and the same view was taken by Heylin, with<sup>(2)</sup> reference to the events of 1586 and 1587:

"In these exorbitancies [the actions of the Scottish presbyterians in 1586] they are followed by the English Puritans, who had been bad enough before, but henceforth shewed themselves to have more of the Scot in them, than in former times. For presently upon the news of the good success which their Scottish Brethren had at Sterling, a scandalous Libel, in the nature of a Diologue, is published, and dispersed in most parts of England: in which the state of this Church is presented to beclaid open in a Conference between Diotrephes...."

It is important to remember that our entire knowledge of the English presbyterian movement is very scanty, and the relative importance of the evidence of Scottish influence is greater than its absolute value appears to be. If our knowledge of the contacts between the English presbyterians and the Scots could be compared quantitatively with our knowledge of the contacts of the English presbyterians with

1. Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, pp. 94-5.
2. Heylin, op. cit. p. 273.

each other, the importance of the intercourse with the Scots would be discovered to be greater than it appears to be when viewed in isolation.

The influence actually exerted by Scotland is not, however, identical with the influence ascribed to the Scots by those critics of English presbyterianism, Bancroft, Sutcliffe and Heylin, and it is of some significance that whereas the violent polemics of these writers give a great deal of space to Scottish influence, the measured and reasoned Ecclesiastical Polity of Richard Hooker is silent on the subject. It is probable that one of the most important results of the connection of the English puritans with Scotland lay in the opportunities which that connection gave to the critics of English presbyterianism. Association with the politics of Knox - politics which had been formulated for a struggle against a Romanist crown but which were capable of application in the very different struggle in which the presbyterians engaged - attached a certain stigma to English presbyterian thought, a stigma which was undeserved, because only a few extremists ever contemplated emulating the Scots in carrying through a reformation against the wishes of the government. Reference has already been made to the importance attached by Bancroft to Knox's History. He used that book mainly to illustrate the politics of the Scottish

reformation, and professed to be convinced that the English puritans were imbued with the idea that inferior magistrates have rights in the state against the sovereign, and that even the people may execute vengeance on their princes if they are idolatrous or wicked. Useful party capital could be made out of these charges, and they could be pointed with illustrations from Knox - the English presbyterians, it was alleged, were prepared to applaud a plot like that of Copinger and Arthington, just as Knox had applauded the murder of Cardinal Betoun.<sup>(1)</sup> Sutcliffe makes references to Knox and Buchanan, but gives more space to the "roads" or raids made by the Scottish presbyterian nobles in 1582 and 1584 and to the approval given to these coups by the Scottish ministers:<sup>(2)</sup>

"The proceedings of the Consistorials, both in Scotland and England declare the same [i.e., seditious tendencies]. In Scotland the roades first of Ruthven, then of Sterling, where forcing the king, for safegarde of his honour and life, to take himselfe to the Castle; they deposed Bishops, and erected Consistories".

Such a warning of the fruits to be expected from English presbyterianism, however unwarranted, must have been effective in discrediting the English puritan party.

1. Dangerous Positions, book I., chapters iii. and iv., book IV. chapters iv. and v., p. 177.
2. Sutcliffe, An Answer (1592), pp. 71, 75, 80, 95.

Much history has been made. Two churches have drifted apart, and each has chosen a different form of government, so that episcopacy is "English" and presbytery is "Scottish". The minority in each country looks for assistance to the majority in the other, and the fact that the struggle is one common to the two peoples greatly intensifies the bitterness involved. Many of the elements which shaped the course of events throughout the seventeenth century can already be discerned.

## APPENDIX A.

## Scottish Preachers in England, 1560-1604.

As explained in the preface, and at the beginning of section III., this appendix is designed merely as a contribution to a study which would provide a valuable background to the subject of the thesis. There is, of course, no suggestion that every Scottish ecclesiastic in England was a centre of presbyterian, or any other, influence, and the men whose names appear in the list, numbering 63 in all, fall roughly into three categories: (1) Thirty Scotsmen who served in the Church of England - 12 of these were in the diocese of Durham, but the remainder have come to light in the other dioceses about which information could be easily obtained. (2) Twelve Scotsmen who obtained part of their education in England, or taught in schools there, some of them afterwards becoming ministers at home. (3) Eighteen Scottish presbyterian ministers who took refuge in England, mainly in 1584-5 - most of them associated with English puritans. In about fifteen cases altogether the bulk of the information has already been given in the body of the thesis. Many of the identifications are only conjectural.

Aird, William. (c. 1555-1606) Fasti I. 100, J. Melville, Diary, p. 218. Called to the ministry in 1584; in England in 1584 and 1585; minister of St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, September 1586.

Anderson, Duncan. (c. 1560- ) Matriculated at St. Andrews in 1575 and graduated in 1577. (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 177, 282) In England in October 1584, and invited by James to return (C.S.P. VII. 376). "Duncan Andersoun minister at Aldersgait" on Feb. 10, 1586/7 (ib. IX. 280). "Anderson, Scotsman, late preacher in London" returned to Scotland in April 1594, and was suspected of being a spy (ib. XI. 325, 338).

Balcanquhal, Walter (c. 1548-1617). D.N.B., Fasti I. 52, 125. See chapters 7 and 9. Minister in Edinburgh in 1574. In England from May 1584 to October 1585 and from December 1596 to April 1597.

Black, David (c. 1550-1603). Fasti V. 420. Chapter 9. A schoolmaster in England from about 1573 until 1590, and naturalised as an Englishman. Minister of St. Andrews in 1590.

Bruce, Robert (1554-1631). D.N.B.; Fasti I. 52, 54; chap. 9. Graduated at St. Andrews; studied law in Paris; minister of Edinburgh, 1587; in England, December 1596 to April 1597 and February 1600/01 to June 1601.

Caldcleuche, John (c. 1560-1612). Fasti V. 123. Graduated at St. Andrews in 1574 (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 172, 281). Joined James Melville at Berwick in 1584, and went on with him to London (J. Melville, Diary p. 218). Became a regent at St. Andrews, and minister of Abdie in 1594.

Caldwell, James. Came to England about 1564, and was described in November 1571 as a "minister, born in Scotland" (Hug. Soc. Publicns. X. ii. 50). Acted as an agent for John Lesley, bishop of Ross, who lodged in Caldwell's house in London (C.S.P. III. 541, IV. 38; Hatfield Calendar I. 437). A man of this name was rector of Loughton, Bucks., from 1573 until his death in 1592 (Alumni Cantab. I. 366).

Colville, John. (1543-1605). D.N.B.; Fasti III. 266; see chapter 7. Colville hardly counts as a preacher, but was an important link between England and the Scottish church. Graduated at St. Andrews in 1561; minister of East Kilbride in 1567; precentor of Glasgow in 1569; master of requests in 1578; in England three times between 1578 and 1586, and on his third visit was an associate of the exiled ministers.

Cowper, John (c. 1560-1603), brother of William Cowper, q.v. A graduate of St. Andrews (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 177, 286). In England 1584-5, connected with the exercise of Saltash (see chapter 7). Minister of Edinburgh in November 1586, and of Glasgow in 1587 (Fasti I. 53, III. 460).

Cowper, William (1566-1619), brother of the above. D.N.B., Fasti VII. 345. A graduate of St. Andrews. Taught in a school at Hoddesdon, Herts., between 1583 and 1586. Returned to Edinburgh in 1586; minister of Bothkennar in the same year. Consecrated bishop of Galloway, 1612, and died Feb. 15, 1619 (Keith, Catalogue of Bishops p. 280).

Daverson, . A Scot who preached in London in 1588, possibly identical with John Davidson, q.v. See chapter 7.

- Davidson, John (c. 1549-1604). D.N.B.; Fasti I. 27, 53, 170, 387; see chapters 6, 7, 8. Matriculated at St. Andrews in 1567, and was a regent there from 1572 to 1574. In England between 1574 and 1579 and from 1584 to 1588. Minister of Liberton (1579-1584) and of Prestonpans.
- Davison, John (1496-1578). Lincoln Rec. Soc. Publicns. II. 21, 203. Ordained by the bishop of Dunblane, 1526. In 1576 rector of Saperton. Successor admitted, after his death, April 10, 1578.
- Deas, James. Fasti II. 148, V. 182. Sent to England by James VI. in October 1584, to persuade the exiled ministers to return (Cotton MSS. Calig. C. VIII. folio 164 verso). Minister of Anstruther Wester in 1585, and of Earlstoun from March 1586.
- Douglas, John. Curate in the diocese of Durham, January 1577/8 (Surtees Soc., Proceedings of Richard Barnes p. 31).
- Douglas, John. Rector of Stambridge from September 7, 1560, and of North-weld Basset from December 31, 1568. Died before May 26, 1570. (Newcourt, Repertorium II. 542, 644).
- Fenche, Patrick. Curate in the diocese of Durham, July 1578 (Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 76-7).
- Forsyth, Alexander. Fasti II. 264, V. 177. At James Lawson's funeral in October 1584 (in London) - see p. 188 above. Minister of Dumfries (1585), of Craigie (1586) and of St. Monans (1593). Went back to England in 1605.
- Fowler, William (c. 1560-1612). How far he was a genuine cleric is doubtful - cf. John Colville. D.N.B.; Fasti II. 112. Graduated B.A. and M.A. at St. Andrews (St. A. Early Records pp. 175, 179, 285) in 1576 and 1578. In England in 1583-1584. Parson of Hawick, and "minister", in 1585. In England 1603-1612.
- Frowed (Frude, Fuirde), George. Graduated at St. Andrews in 1570 (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 164, 275). Ordained by the bishop of Peterborough in 1574 (Lincoln Rec. Soc. Publicns. II. 212) and naturalised (Hug. Soc. Denizations and Naturalisations p. 98). In 1576 rector of Braceborough (Lincoln Rec. Soc., loc. cit.). Was he connected with the John, or George, Frude who was minister of Dalmeny until suspended in December 1566 (Fasti I. 200)?

- Fullerton, Hew (c. 1560-1608). Fasti III. 104.  
 Graduated B.A. at Glasgow in 1578 (Recs. of Glasgow Univ., Maitland Club, III. 3). Sent to England by Thomas Smeton in October 1583, with a recommendation to Walsingham (C.S.P. VI. 636). Minister of Dumfries in 1586 and of Kilmarnock in 1601. Was he the "religious Maister Fullerton, the Scott" who was known to English puritans (Wm. Stoughton, An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policie pp. 335-6)?
- Galloway, Patrick (1551-1626). D.N.B.; Fasti I. 53-4; chapter 7. Minister of Fowlis Easter in 1576 and of Perth in 1581. In England May 1584 to October 1585. Minister of the king's household, February 1589/90. In England 1603-4. Minister of St. Giles, Edinburgh, 1607.
- Gibson, James. Fasti I. 384, 391, 396, 418; chapter 9. Minister of Spott (1576), of Saltoun (1577), of Pencaitland (1580). In England 1584-1585 (Historie and Life of James the Sext, p. 205). Minister of Tranent in 1597.
- Gibson, John. Matriculated sizar from St. John's, Cambridge, Easter 1583, and graduated B.A. in 1585/6 (Venn's Alumni Cantab. II. 211). Ordained in England, and possibly vicar of Kilham, Yorks, 1592- (?) 1602 (ib.). Minister of Athelstaneford, 1601-5 (Fasti I. 353).
- Gibson, John. Graduated at Glasgow in 1589 (Recs. of Glasgow Univ. III. 5). Was he the Scots preacher accused of robbery at Leicester in April 1590? (C.S.P. X. 279, cf. chapter 8).
- Guthrie, Related to James Lawson. Had an academy at Hoddesdon, Herts., at least from 1584, and died in 1609 (J. Melville, Diary p. xxxvii). Present in London at James Lawson's funeral in October 1584 (p. 188 supra).
- Hastings, Andrew. Curate in the diocese of Durham, January 1577/8 (Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 36). Had no licence.
- Hume, David (?1560-?1530). D.N.B. At St. Andrews university in 1578. Visited Geneva and returned in 1581. In England in 1584 and 1585, associated with the exiled lords, and present at James Lawson's funeral (p. 188 supra).

Hunter, Andrew. Matriculated at St. Andrews in 1576  
(St. A. Early Recs. p. 288). A minister  
until May 1594, when he was deposed (Calderwood V. 236).  
Went to England, and left London for Holland in  
June 1595 (C.S.P. XI. 617). Minister of the Scots  
brigade in Holland, 1597 (Scots Brigade in Holland,  
S.H.S., I. 57). In September 1598 he said he was  
willing to come to England (Hatfield Cal. VIII. 342,  
371), and in November he was in touch with the bishops  
of London and Durham (S.P. Scot. Eliz. vol. lxxiii, no.  
56, 86). Landed at Yarmouth in August 1599 (Hatfield  
Cal. IX. 319). Again in Holland in 1601 (Scots Brigade,  
I. 63).

Keith or Kethe, William. (? - 1608). D.N.B.; Strype,  
Annals II. i. 150-1. At Frankfort in  
1554 (a "puritan"), and at Geneva 1556-61. Rector of  
Okeford Superior, Dorset, 1561. Chaplain in Havre,  
1563, and in the north, 1569.

Knox, Eleazar (1558-91). McCrie, Knox, edn. 1874, p. 416;  
Venn's Alumni. A son of John Knox.  
Matriculated at Cambridge, December 1572, and graduated  
B.A., M.A., B.D. Ordained deacon and priest, Sept.  
1586. Vicar of Clacton, Essex, 1587-91.

Knox, Nathaniel (1557-80). Brother of the preceding;  
same sources. Matriculated at Cambridge,  
Dec. 1572; graduated B.A. and M.A.

Lawson, David. A curate in the diocese of Durham, Jan.-  
Feb. 1577/8. Had no licence. (Surtees  
Soc., as cited, p. 29).

Lawson, James (1538-84). D.N.B.; Fasti I. 51; chap. 7.  
At St. Andrews 1559-69; sub-principal of  
Aberdeen, 1569-72. Minister of Edinburgh, 1572.  
In England May 1584; died in London, October 1584.

Livingstone, George. A curate in the diocese of Durham,  
Jan.-Feb. 1577/8. Had no licence, and  
was reported in July 1578 to be "sick or infirm"  
(Surtees Soc., as cited, pp. 38, 77).

Lynne, William (c. 1565-?). Graduated at Glasgow in  
1583 (Glasgow Recs. III. 4). Sent to  
England by Thomas Smeton (C.S.P. VI. 635). At  
James Lawson's funeral, in London, October 1584 (p.  
188 supra). A man of this name was admitted to  
Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge, in October 1590 (Venn's  
Alumni III. 122).

- Mackbrair, John (c. 1515-1584). Knox, Works I. 529-30. Matriculated at St. Andrews (St. A. Early Recs. p. 228). Became a priest. Went to England in 1551, and was vicar of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, from 1552 to 1553 (Newcourt, Repertorium I. 687). In Frankfort 1553-4, and elsewhere in Germany 1554-9. Preached at Paul's Cross, Sept. 3, 1559 (Strype, Annals I. i. 199). Vicar of Billingham, 1565, and of Newcastle, 1568. Died about November 17, 1584. (Surtees Soc., as cited, pp. 42, 55, 57, 75, 85 note 2).
- Manwell, John. Curate in the diocese of Durham, Jan.-Feb. 1577/8. (Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 55).
- Maxwell, Thomas (1534-c.1593). Lincoln Rec. Soc., Publications II. 6, 196, 229, and State of the Church pp. 79, 150, 385. Ordained by bishop Reid of Orkney, 1557. Admitted rector of Scrafield, Mar. 22, 1571/2, and remained there until his death.
- Maxwell, Thomas (1540-?). Venn, Alumni Cantab. III. 166. Born in Scotland. At Trinity College, Cambridge. Ordained priest at London, Mar. 25, 1578. Possibly curate of Colbrooke, Middlesex.
- Maxwell, Thomas (c. 1560-1605). Fasti I. 256. Graduated M.A. at Glasgow in 1583. Probably sent to England, like other Glasgow graduates, by Thomas Smeton, and naturalized there in December 1584 (Hug. Soc., Denizations and Naturalizations p. 167). Minister of Carnwath in 1588 and of Quothquan in 1597.
- Melville, Andrew (1545-1622). D.N.B.; chapters 6, 7. In England in June 1574 and from February 1583/4 until October 1585.
- Melville, James (1556-1614). D.N.B.; Fasti V. 212; chap. 7. In England from June 1584 until Dec. 1585.
- Menzies, John (1536-16?). Lincoln Rec. Soc., Publicns. II. 210, State of the Church p. 416. Graduated M.A. at Cambridge, 1560. Ordained by the bishop of Peterborough, 1573. Rector of Swayfield in 1576, and was still serving the cure in 1603. Probably two sons were at Cambridge - James, B.A. 1594/5, and Thomas, matriculated c. 1594; one was ordained at Peterborough, the other at Lincoln. (Venn, Alumni III. 175).

Methuen, Paul (c. 1535- ?). D.N.B.; Fasti II. 124.

He was "brought up under Mr. Coverdall", and "married an Engleshe woman" (C.S.P. I. 680). Minister of Jedburgh, 1560. Deposed in 1562, and took refuge in England, acting as a minister there. In 1566 the general assembly ordered him to do penance, and he fled to England again. Presented to Brendon rectory on Feb. 5, 1570/71 (Register of Matthew Parker I. 320), and naturalised on Mar. 27, 1571 (Hug. Soc. Naturalizations and Denizations, p. 169). Possessed three benefices in Devon in 1582 (Hatfield Cal. II. 514). In 1584 was in contact with Leicester and the Scottish exiles (Wodrow Misc. I. 425).

Moncrieff, Archibald (c. 1562-1634). Fasti IV. 196.

Educated in England and at St. Andrews, where he matriculated in 1577 (St. A. Early Recs. p. 290) and graduated M.A. in 1580. At James Lawson's funeral in London, 1584 (p. 188 supra). Minister of Abernethy, 1586.

Morrison, John. Fasti I. 362, 378, 398; chapters 2, 3.

A minister in Scotland, 1574-6. Licensed by Grindal, April 6, 1582. Curate of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate from 1582/3 until 1592 (Hug. Soc., Publications X. ii. 284, Seconde Parte of a Register II. 181; Newcourt, Repertorium I. 916).

Pattenson, Cuthbert. A curate in the diocese of Durham, Jan.-Feb. 1577/8. Had neither letters of orders nor licence. (Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 31).

Pont, Robert (1524-1606). D.N.B.; Fasti I. 93, 99.

Educated at St. Andrews. Preacher in Scotland from 1562; minister of St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, 1574. In England, 1584-5 (C.S.P. VII. 512).

Richardson, Robert (c. 1500-1573). D.N.B.; Knox I. 530.

Graduated at St. Andrews, 1519 (St. A. Early Recs. p. 109); remained at the university for some years, and wrote a commentary on the rule of St. Augustine. Naturalised in England in 1540; mentioned by Sadler in 1543; possibly rector of Chelsey, deprived 1554. In 1555, preached a recantation sermon, but only pro forma (Strype, Memorials III. i. 356). Presented to St. Matthew's, Friday Street, June 15, 1559 (Sede Vacante Institutions p. 76). Referred to as a Scot in 1571 (Hug. Soc., Publicns. X. ii. 11).

- Richardson, Thomas. Hatfield Cal. V. 207; Alumni Oxon.; Brasenose Coll. Reg.  
Born at Leith. At Oxford during the lifetime of John Hawarden, who resigned the principalship of Brasenose in Jan. 1564/5. Graduated B.A. in Feb. 1574/5. Stayed long in Gloucestershire; possibly held a living; for sixteen years sang in the college at Gloucester, until displaced by Rudd, who became dean in Jan. 1584/5.
- Robertson, James (1555-1623). Fasti V. 319.  
Graduated at St. Andrews in 1574 (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 172, 281), and taught in the university. In 1584, joined James Melville at Berwick, and went on to London with him (Diary, p. 218). Minister of Dundee in 1588.
- Robinson, Patrick. Complained to the Scottish ambassador in May 1594 that he would lose his living in England unless he obtained naturalisation (Hatfield Cal. V. 204-5).
- Scott, John. A curate in the diocese of Durham, January 1577/8. (Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 35).
- Simson, Patrick (1556-1616). Fasti IV. 318.  
Born at Perth, graduated M.A. at St. Andrews, completed his education in England. Minister of Spott (1577), of Cramond (1582), and of Stirling East (1590).
- Smeton, Thomas (1536-83). D.N.B.; Fasti III. 410; chap. 6.  
Graduated at St. Andrews in 1556 (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 154, 259). Spent some years on the continent. A schoolmaster at Colchester, 1573-7. Visited Scotland in 1575 or 1576 (C.S.P. V. 222-3). Minister of Paisley, 1577/8; principal of Glasgow, 1580.
- Story, Thomas (c.1550-c.1625). Fasti II. 33, 47, 51, 151, 165.  
Minister of Foulden (1576) and of Chirnaide (1578). On May 27, 1584, he arrived in Berwick with Lawson and Balcanquhal (C.S.P. VII. 163) and presumably went further south. Minister of Hutton (1596) and of other parishes in Scotland until 1625.
- Strachan, Alexander (? -1607). Fasti V. 136, 146.  
At James Lawson's funeral in London in 1584 (p. 188 supra). A member of the exercise of St. Andrews, 1593; minister of Cupar, 1599; banished in 1606.

Strother, William. A curate in the diocese of Durham,  
Jan.-Feb., 1577/8. Had no licence.  
(Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 31).

Wood, David (c.1540- ?). A graduate of St. Andrews in  
1556, and remained at the university  
until at least 1558 (St. A. Early Recs. pp. 154, 157,  
259). Minister of Kinghorn, and on January 13,  
1562/3, he was deprived because he had defamed a  
reader. There is no further reference to him in  
Scotland (St. A. Kirk Session Reg. I. 175-6; Fasti V. 93X).  
"Wood the Scotchman is a factious fellow" - Grindal to  
Parker on January 13, 1566/7 (Grindal, Remains p. 291).  
On Sept. 8, 1570, he was presented to the rectory of  
Allington, but in 1576 was non-resident, and resigned;  
he was also deprived of Sutterton before Nov. 19,  
1575 (Lincoln Rec. Soc., Publicns. II. 15, 20, 140,  
203, 293, 314 note). In London in November 1571 - "Davie  
Woode, Scotte, dennyzein, and preacher, hath byn in  
England tenne yeares" (Hug. Soc., Publicns. X. ii. 65).  
In June, 1581 "David Woodd, a Scottishman, pretending  
himself a minister in the Church, but yet by some  
vehementlie suspected to have no calling in that  
function, is to be charged with sundry articles of  
notorious offences" (A.P.C. III. 71). "Mr. Wood,  
deprived", was at James Lawson's funeral. (p. 188 supra.)

Wright, Andrew. A curate in the diocese of Durham,  
Jan. 1577/8. (Surtees Soc., as cited, p. 37.)

Note. The accounts in the D.N.B. and in the Fasti,  
where they exist, are, as a rule, inadequate,  
and are considerably supplemented by the  
information given above.

The following books, not noted in the general  
bibliography, are used:

Canterbury and York Society.	<u>Registrum Matthei</u> Parker, vol. I. 1907.
Huguenot Society of London.	<u>Letters of denization and</u> <u>acts of naturalization,</u> 1509-1800. vol. I. 1893.
Huguenot Society of London.	<u>Returns of Aliens dwelling</u> <u>in London.</u> 4 vols. 1900-8.

- Kent Records. Calendar of institutions by the chapter of Canterbury sede vacante. 1923.
- Lincoln Record Society. Lincoln Episcopal Records in the time of Thomas Cooper, 1571-84. 1913.  
(Vol. II. of the society's publications.)
- Maitland Club. Records of the University of Glasgow.  
4 vols. 1854.
- Newcourt, R. Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense. 2 vols. 1708-10.
- Scottish History Society. Early Records of the University of St. Andrews. 1926.
- Scottish History Society. History of the Scots Brigade in the United Netherlands. vol. I. 1899.
- Surtees Society. Injunctions and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Richard Barnes, 1575-87.  
1850.
- Venn, J.A. Alumni Cantabrigienses. 1922 etc.

## APPENDIX B.

## "Conformity with England".

## (a) The oaths of supremacy.

## English.

I, A.B., now elect bishop of C., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other her Highness' dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority ecclesiastical~~l~~ or spiritual, within this realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and lawfull successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges and authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, or united or annexed to the imperial crown of this realm. And further, I acknowledge and confesse, to have and to

## Scottish.

I, A.B., now elected bishop of C., utterlie testifie and declare in my conscience that your Majestie is the onlie lawfull and supreme governour of this realme, als weill in things temporall as in the conservatioun and purgatioun of religioun;

and

that no forraine prince, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have anie jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminencie, or authoritie ecclesiasticall or spiritual, within this realme. And therefore I utterlie renounce and forsake all forraine jurisdictiones, powers, superioriteis, and authoriteis, and promise, that from this furth I sall and will bear faith and true allegiance to your Majestie, your heyres and lawfull successours; and to my power sall assist and defend all jurisdictiones, priviledges, pre-eminencies, and authoriteis granted and belonging to your Highness, your heyres and lawfull successours, or united and annexed to your royall crowne. And further, I acknowledge and confesse to have and

hold the said bishopric of  
C. and the possessions of  
the same entirely, as well  
the spiritualities as the  
temporalities, only of your  
Majesty and crown royal of  
this your realm;  
and for the said posses-  
sions I do mine homage  
presently unto your Highness,  
and to the same, your heirs  
and lawful successors,  
shall be faithful and true;  
so helpe me God and the  
contents of this booke.

hold the said bishoprick  
and possessions of the  
same, under God,

onlie of your Majestie,  
and crowne royall of  
this your realme;  
and for the saids posses-  
sions I doe my homage  
presentlie unto your Majestie,  
and unto the same your heyres  
and lawfull successours  
sall be faithfull and true.  
So helpe me God.

(b) The statute 13 Eliz. cap. xii and the Scottish statute of January 1572 (cap. 3).

English.

That the Churches of the  
Queenes Majesty's Domynions  
may be served with Pastors  
of sounde Religion,

be it enacted by the  
authoritie of thys present  
Parlyament, That every  
person under the degree  
of a Bysshop which doth or  
shall pretend to be a Priest  
or Minister of Godes holy  
Word and Sacraments, by  
reason of any other fourme  
of Institution ...  
shal in the presence of the  
Byshop or Gardian of the  
Spyritualties  
of some one Diocesse where  
he hath or shall have  
Ecclesiastical Lyving  
declare his Assent and

Scottish.

... that the kirk within  
this Realme  
be servit be Godly persounis  
of sound Religioun obedient to  
the authoritie of the Kingis  
Maiestie our Soverane Lord. It  
is thairfoir concludit statute  
and ordanit be his Maiestie  
with aulse of his said Regent  
thre Estatis and haill body  
of this present  
Parliament That euery  
persoun

quha sall  
pretend to be ane  
Minister of Goddis  
word and Sacramentis, Or quha  
presently dois or sall pretend

... sall in the presence of the  
Archebishop, Bishop  
Superintendent or Commissioner  
of the Diocie or Province  
quhair he hes or sall haue  
the Ecclesiasticall leuing  
gif his assent and

subscribe to all the  
Articles of Religion which  
onely concerne the Con-  
fession of the true  
Christian Faith ...

And shall bring from such  
Bysshop or Gardyan in  
Wryting under his Seale  
autentike, a testimonial of  
such Assent and Subscription,  
and openly on some Sunday in  
tyrne of the publique servyce  
afore noone in every Church  
where by reason of any  
Ecclesiastical Lyving ~~he~~  
he ought to attende

reade both the  
said Testimonial and the  
said Artycles; ...

And that yf any person  
Ecclesiastical or which  
shall have Ecclesiastical  
Lyving shall advysedly  
maynteyne or affyrme any  
Doctrine directly contrarie  
or repugnant to any of the  
said Articles, and being  
convented before the Bysshop  
... shall persist  
therein or not revoke his  
Errour, or after such Revoc-  
ation ~~he~~ neftsoones affyrme  
such untrue Doctryne, such  
maynteyning or affyrming  
and persisting or such  
eftsones affyrming, shalbe  
just cause to depryve such  
person of his Ecclesiasticall  
promotions; And it shalbe  
lefull to the Bisshop of the  
Diocesse or Thordynarie, or  
the said Commissioners, to  
deprive suche person so  
persisting ....

subscribe the  
articklis of Religioun  
contenit, in the actis of our  
Soverane Lordis Parliament ...

and sall bring ane  
testimoniall in wryting  
thairupon.

And oppinly on sum Sondag in  
tyrne of Sermone or publict  
prayeris in the Kirk  
quhair be ressoun of his  
ecclesiasticall leving ~~he~~  
he aucht to attend or of the  
frutes quhairof he ressauis  
commoditie reid baith the  
Testimoniall and Confessioun

...  
and gif ony persoun  
Ecclesiasticall or quhilk  
sall haue Ecclesiasticall  
lewing sall wilfully  
mantene ony  
doctrine directly contrair  
or repugnant to ony of the  
saidis articklis and being  
conuenit and callit as  
followis ... sall persist  
thairin and not reuoke his  
errour, or efter his reuoc-  
atioun sall of new affirme  
sic vntrew doctrine sic  
mantening affirming  
and persisting

salbe  
Just caus to depriue him  
of his ecclesiasticall  
lewing. And it salbe  
lauchfull to thame befoir  
quhome he is callit and  
conuenit to  
deprive him ....

(It should be noted that the Scottish statute, although not passed by parliament until January 1572/3, formed part of the arrangements made at Leith in January 1571/2 - B.U.K. I. 212.)

## APPENDIX C.

Glamis to Beza, April 19th. 1578.

Additional MSS. 28,571, fol. 110. (Copy.)

Clarissimo viro D. Theodoro Bezae.

Cupieram iam pridem ad te vir clarissime scribere, teque variis de rebus quae apud nos in quaestionem vocantur consulere partim ecclesiae vestrae Genevensis in religione et doctrina consensione motus, praecipue autem nominis ac eruditionis tuae quam opera tua pie et erudite summa cum ecclesiae utilitate in lucem edita abunde testantur fama et celebritate impulsus verum quod maxime volui hactenus propter locorum intervalla et turbulentum nostrae regionis et ecclesiae statum facere non potui; et nunc illud exequent<sup>ur</sup> occasionem eamque commodissimam mihi iam tandem oblatam esse plurimum gaudeo. Venit enim ad nos et optimus et eruditus meo iudicio Claudius Colladonius Genevensis tibi (ut ex Johanne Stringero satis intellexi) bene notus et familiaris, quem de statu vestrarum ecclesiarum diligenter consului, quantum quidem per temporis brevitatem quo apud nos vixit et occupationes meas quibus interea distinebar, licuit. Ecclesias autem vestras tam bene pieque constitutas esse in ipsis persecutionum fluctibus et evangelium Christi libere et sine pharisaico fermento praedicari vobiscum ex animo laetamur, simulque hanc felicitatem ut solida et constans sit Deum optimum maximum ecclesiae suae custodem et vindicem oramus. Doctrinam quidem de filio dei vobiscum eandem retinemus et profiteamur, adeo ut tametsi caeterae regiones et ecclesiae in hac extrema mundi senecta opinionum quasi monstris turbentur, nos tamen singulari dei optimi maximi beneficio in doctrina adeo consentimus ut nulli inveniantur qui eam oppugnare vel velint vel audeant. At in disciplina et politia in qua viri alioqui pii et de universis religionis capitibus recte sentientes nonnunquam dissentire deprehenduntur, nondum satis inter nos convenit. Nam una cum papistica superstitione disciplina aliquandiu a maioribus nostris usurpata ante annos aliquot sublata est. In eius autem locum nulla commoda honestaque ecclesiae regendae ratio adhuc subrogari potuit, praesertim cum principes nostri vel a vera religione fuerint alieni, vel cum recte de praecipuis Christianae fidei articulis sentire caeperunt bellis tamen civilibus impediti, eam in rem prout voluerunt, incumbere non potuerint. Nunc autem ab omnibus prioribus illis impedimentis liberi, et pacem et talem regem nacti (cuius egregia indoles et in vera religione

f. 110  
verso

educatio tantum nobis promittunt, quantum a quopiam in ea aetate expectari possit) de disciplina aliqua ecclesiastica constituenda laboramus. Maxime vero cum illius Tutor et Dominus prorox universaque nobilitas et regni (ut vocant) ordines eam in partem diligenter incumbant verum quum de singulis disciplinae capitibus paulo diligentius inquirimus, evenit ut multa nobis obiiciantur de quibus nonnihil dubitamus, etsi bene sperem mihiq; ipse persuadeam nos in ea re non minus quam in religione consensuros. Sed quum intelligam ex librorum tuorum quos summa cum voluptate lego et admiror, et eruditorum ac piorum literis et sermone singularem tuam pietatem summa cum eruditione et humanitate coniunctam praetermittere non potui, quin hoc praesertim tempore hisce de rebus ad te scriberem. Quamvis autem multa sint de quibus tuam mentem et sententiam requirerem, quaedam tamen eaque praecipua tibi referam, ne nimia longitudine aut orationis prolixitate tibi variis ecclesiae negotiis occupatissimo esse videar molestus.

1. Quum in singulis ecclesiis singuli pastores ac ministri constituti fuerint, quumque par et aequalis omnium in ecclesia Christi ministrorum potestas videatur: quaeritur sitne Episcoporum munus in ecclesia necessarium, qui ministros quum res postulabit ad comitia vocari, ad ministerium admitti et iustis de causis ab officio removeri curabunt. An potius omnes ministri aequali potestate fungentes nulliusque superioris Episcopi imperio obnoxii viros idoneos in doctrina cum consensu patroni ius patronatus habentis et ipsius populi eligere, corrigere, et ab officio removeere debeant. Ut autem retineantur eiusmodi Episcopi, movere nos, duo possunt. Unum populi ipsius mores et contumacia qui vix ac ne vix quidem in officio contineri potest, nisi eiusmodi Episcoporum qui universas ecclesias procurrant et invisant, autoritate coerceatur. Alterum leges regni longe usu et inveterata consuetudine receptae, ut quoties de rebus ad Reipublicae salutem pertinentibus ex publicis regni comitiis agitur, nihil sine Episcopis constitui potest quum ipsi tertium ordinem et regni statum efficiant, quem aut mutare aut prorsus tollere Reipublicae admodum esset periculosum.

2. Post reformatam religionem consuetudine receptum est, ut Episcopi et ex ministris pastoribus senioribus tot quot iidem Episcopi iusserint unum in locum conveniant cum praecipuis Baronibus et nobilibus religionem veram profitentibus, et de doctrina et de moribus inquisituri. Nunc vero quum princeps verae religionis studiosus sit: quaeritur an eiusmodi conventus cogi possint sine iussu vel consensu principis. An solis ministris convenire

f. 111 recto liceat quoties voluerint. An denique nobilibus aliisque pietatis studiosis et senioribus qui apud nos quotannis ex populo atque ex ipsa nobilitate eliguntur sine mandato regis ad eiusmodi comitia venire liceat et expediat. Quandoquidem nobilium et laicorum conventus aliis videtur sub principe pio non necessarius, quum sola consuetudine nulla vero certa lege sub principe religionem impugnante paucos ante annos receptus fuerit, quo plus authoritatis eiusmodi comitia haberent: quum praeterea periculosum videatur, ne si nobiles tam frequentes et frequenter sine consensu regis conveniant, aliis de rebus quam ad religionem pertinentibus aliquando deliberent. Alii vero nullo modo reiiciendos arbitrantur, quin potius valde necessarius videtur hic conventus, ut nimirum nobiles religionem omni studio et conatu promoventes in comitiis tanquam *παράκλητοι* [sic] et adiutores ministris adsint, ac de ipsorum vita, moribus populi et id genus aliis testimonium perhibeant. Alioquin futurum si princeps parum pius postea regnaverit ut neque ministri tuto convenire, neque decreta sua executioni mandare sine nobilium consensu et auxilio possint.

3. A quo, hoc est a Rege, an ab Episcopis eiusmodi comitia ecclesiastica ~~cogi~~ et quum ~~coguntur~~ quibus de rebus leges ferre possunt.

4. Debeantne excommunicari papistae eodem modo quo Apostatae, an vero leviori paena puniendi sint.

5. Quibus de causis aliquem excommunicare liceat: verbi gratia: Si quis homicidium patravit asserens se id vel necessitate vel vim vi repellendo fecisse: (eaque de re paratus est iudicium subire, neque adhuc a Rege aut occisi proximo quovis accusatur) licetne ecclesiae de homicidio inquirere, sitne dolo malo, an casu vel necessitate factum, et homicidam cogere ut secundum delicti qualitatem publicam in ecclesia paenitentiam in sacco et cinere agat aut recusantem excommunicatione feriat eique aqua et igni interdicat.

6. Quum superiori saeculo magnae facultates eleemosinae nomine a principibus aliisque multis concessae sive Episcopis monasteriis et huiusmodi quumque tantae opes videantur potius obesse quam prodesse Episcopis, et monasteria in Republica et Ecclesia sint inutilia: quaeritur quid de eiusmodi bonis, quae semae ecclesiae consecratae fuerunt, fieri debeat. Nam quum Episcopi et ministri ex decimis satis habeant unde commode et honeste vivere possint, an princeps potest cum consensu statuum regni reliquam partem inferre, ut vel in suos vel in publicos usus convertere illi liberum sit,

praesertim cum eiusmodi bona non tam in decimis quam in praediis rusticis aut urbanis consistent. Quae quidem quaestio quum potius civilis quam ecclesiastica esse videatur constitueram tibi hac in re non esse molestus. Sed quia complures pii ac eruditi apud nos existimant has res quae semel piis usibus destinatae fuerunt, non posse in profanos usus etiam publicos conferri: non potui hoc quoque argumentum silentio apud te praeterire.

f. 111  
verso.

Haec sunt, vir clarissime, quae hoc tempore mihi in mentem venerunt, et de quibus te in huiusmodi disputationibus optime exercitatum consulere volui. Etsi autem sum tibi vel ipso fortassis nomine ignotus, tamen quum eiusdem corporis sumus membra, nosque eadem religio in Christo coniungat, me rem neque ab hominis Christiani officio alienam, neque tibi viro humanissimo ingratam facturam existimavi, si de ecclesiarum nostrarum statu constituendo et de nonnullis capitibus quae apud vos controvertuntur paucis ad te scriberem. Quod si audacius apud te virum alioquin maxime occupatum fecisse videar, id totum humanitati tuae et purae religionis propagandae studio utrique nostrum divinitus concesso acceptum feries. Si autem hasce meas primitias lubenter susceperis, mihi quum per occupationes licet responderis, te rem ecclesiis nostris summe necessariam et longe mihi gratissimam facturum intelliges. Caetera ex Colladonio, cuius ingenium et mores, quum nobis omnibus valde placuerint tibi commendarem nisi vobis quam optime notum esse intelligerem. Dominus Jesus te <sup>suo</sup> spiritu fortitudinis et constantiae adversus omnium hostium insultus et impiorum malitiam muniat, et nobis ac ecclesiis quam diutissime incolumem conservat. 13 Calend. Maii. 1578.

Tuo obsequio paratissimus.

Glamius.

## APPENDIX D.

Davidson to Field, January 1, 1582/3.

National Library of Scotland MSS. 6.1.13. f. 42.

Grace, mercie, and peace.

I thank yow beloved brother for your gentill remembrance of me with your letter dated the 22 of Juli last which as it wes moist acceptance unto me so wes it comfortable to the brethren of the ministrie in those quarters who at that tyme wer heavelie trubled be those adversaries whome the myghtie hand of our God hath now myghtelie beaten down/ God grant that we never forget so myghtie and mervalus deliverances. On the morrow eftar I resaved your letter I resaved an other frome the Rochell tending to the same end, to wit lamenting our trublous state and therewithall conforting ws in our God/ It is no small confort, brothir (as ye and I have diverss tymes spoken in conference) to brethren of one natione to understand the state of the brethren in other nationes and therefore let ws practise it as occasione will serve. For my part I sall not be unmyndfull when I may have meit berars/ Thair is a motion, brother, in the heads of some brethren heir wherein your advyce wold do goode as we think, to wit that a generall sute be made be our generall assembleie nixt (which wilbe the 24 of Aprile nixt be gods grace) to the king's grace and hole state that a reqwest frome thame and the hole generall assembleie be directed to the Quenes majestie with hir state and your churche towching the reformatioun of some abuses in your churche and especiallie that sincere men may have libertie to preache without deposing be the tyrannie of the bishoppes. This I thought goode/ onelie to move unto yow rudelie for the present, to the end with advyse of the brethren there your fordar informatioun in this case may direct ws fordir, if it shall be thoght expedient/ God grant ws the spirit of faythfulnes and wisdome for the using of all lawfull meanes for the advanceing of God's glorie and proffeit of his churche. Goode Mr. Bowes doeth goode service heir for the wellfare of the churche of God boyth thare and heir, in that he travalet faythfullie and most diligentlie to keip those two countreis knit in amitie and trew freindship/ For no goode man can be ignorant how muche our concorde and unitie helpeth the goode caus of Christ, which is not a lytill invyed be Satan and his

instruments. The spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ remane with you allwayes, brother, to the end, and in the end. Amen. Now my hartie commendationes remembred to the brethren thare, and especiallie to goode Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Cherk and to him whose commendationes caried be me to you made our fyrst acquaintance, together with Mr. Browne half brother Mr. Catfield; not forgetting my wyves commendationes to yow and your bedfellow. I tak my leve of yow, from Edinburgh the fyrst of Januar, 1582.

Your assured freind to my powar,

Mr. Johne Davidson.

I pray yow also Salute my cousine Davidsons in Great Wood Streit and his wyf in my name.

addr. To his loving brother in Christ, Mr. Feild, preachour of the Word of God deliver this in London.

end. Davison to Feild, whether the synode might take order for the K. moving her majestie for reformation. It was liked by the brethren here.

Concerning this, to answer in generall that the brethren shall think themselves beholdinge to them, if the shalbe so careful.

## APPENDIX E.

## Whitgift and the Scottish Church.

(i) Adamson to Whitgift, December 1583.

British Museum Additional MSS. 32,092,  
folio 75 verso (copy).

To my Lords Grace of Canterburie

Reverendissime D. Archiepiscopo, et frater in Christo multum colende; Accessit ad me Capellanus tuus, mihique significavit, non esse tibi integrum de iis articulis, quos ad te misi, mecum conferre sine serenissimae Reginae venia a me obtenta. De ea re cum mecum consulerem, perlatum est eosdem versari in manibus D. Secretarii Walsinghamii. Quae res mihi non parvum attulit molestiam. Neque enim mihi satis perspectum est quonam pacto D. Secretarius affectus sit erga hanc causam; et me petere a Serenissima Regina veniam (causa iam eventui lata et publicata) nescio quomodo visum est praeter officium et dignitatem. Mihi testis est Deus optimus maximus me nihil aliud spectasse aut spectare, quam ut confusioni huic, quam nonnulli in ecclesiam praetextu evangelicae puritatis invehere volunt, obviaretur doctissimorum virorum iudiciis et principum auctoritate; praesertim ne ad eos scopulos impingeremus, ad quos alii naufragium fecerunt. Itaque in Domino a te peto, ut intelligam quonam pacto haec prodierunt in publicum; ut tuo consilio quae desunt, restitui possint. Multum vale.

Frater et Symmistes

Ad. Sancti-andreae Archiepiscopus.

(ii) Whitgift to Adamson, January 4, 1583/4.

B.M. Add. MSS. 32,092, folio 76 (copy).

To the Archbishop of St. Androes.

Salutem in Christo, etc. De articulis quod scribis, fateor me tradidisse eorum exemplar Domino Thesaurario. Significaveram enim illi, quid a me petieras, et quid tibi denuo responderam; ut ab ea intelligerem, num mihi liceret tuae voluntati satisfacere. Credo illum apud se retinere idem exemplar, neque id cuiquam tradidisse.

Quod ad me attinet, id in hac causa feci, quod officium meum postulaverat, et desiderio tuo maxime expedire videbatur. Articuli ipsi, quos a te accepi, apud me manent. Si quoquam modo veniam a Serenissima Regina mihi de eisdem tractandi impetrare poteris (hoc enim a te ipso proficisci debet) quid de singulis sentiam, summam et plane demonstrabo. Vale in Christo, Reverende Frater. Lambethae, 4o. Januarii, 1583.

Tuus in Christo frater

Jo. Cantuar.

(iii) Adamson to Whitgift, April 1584.

B.M. Add. MSS. 32092, folio 76 verso (copy).

To my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury his Grace.

Quod nunc ad Dominationem tuam scribam, facit domum profectio, quam ante duos aut tres dies institui. Quod autem minus doctissimo tuo colloquio frui licuit, scio per eos stetisse, qui utrique nostrum invidiam creare conati sunt. Articulorum enim exemplar, quos tibi tradidi, miserunt in Scotiam, ut factionem illam magis inflammarent. Sed cum viderem plerosque ex Nobilitate vestra conspirasse in eas partes, et ad ecclesiasticum ordinem evertendum consilia sua conferre; abstinui ab eo argumento in Anglia. Scripsi tamen ad Bezan prolixè et Pastores Genevenses, et hortatus sum ad pacem ecclesiarum conservandam; neve studerent regna revocare et ad oppiduli Genevensis exemplar redigere; quod sine eorum internectione fieri non posset. Ostendi etiam prolixè quot incommoda peperit in regno nostro eiusmodi anarchia democratica et quam propinquam ruinam minitetur toti ecclesiae. Earum literarum exemplar relinquam apud D. Andersonium nostratem, cui et responsum Genevensium tuae Dominationi resignare mandavi. Nobiles quidem praecipui huius regni mecum egerunt, ut auctor esse velim Regi meo de tollendis omnino Episcopatibus, ut exemplum postea posset manare in vicinam Angliam; quod ego ut faciam, adduci non potero. Interea autem dum hic valetudinem curo, nonnullos libros a me recognitos, et opera diu ante desudata commisi typis; quae ubi fuerint absoluta (erunt autem brevi) Dominationi tuae exhibebuntur. Eram vero usus limitassimo tuo iudicio in eis recognoscendis; nisi malevolorum hominum studia

tantum mihi bonum invidissent, qui ad reliqua maledicta addiderunt insuper, me tecum egisse de restituendo Papismo. Quae res me compulit, ut quatuor aut quinque conciones haberem publice, in quibus fidei mei [sic] professionem sum testatus, in qua Dominus et vivere et mori mihi tribuet. Quod autem (te non consulto, qui primus iure tenes) in publicum prodierim; spero te mihi condonaturum, cum necessitate ipsa eo sum adductus, ut animi mei sententiam exponerem, et vindicare me a plurimis calumniis, quas de me sparserunt falsis rumoribus. Nunc autem cum domum cogitem, nolui praetermittere, quin te salutarem per literas. Nec vero quicquam mihi accidere poterit iucundius, cum in patria fuero; quam mutua literarum necessitudine amicitiam tecum recollere. Eius autem pignus retineo apud me Libellum tuum contra Cartwrightum; et meos, qui mox imprimentur, mandavi ut Dominationi tuae tradarentur. Porro, cum huc adventassem, quosdam equos gradarios, qui erant in meo comitatu, erogavi primariis viris in aula. Equi autem melioris notae. Nunc vero rediturus in patriam cogor emere pro comitatu. Mihi vero ipsi non facile reperio, quem redimam pecunia. Constitueram autem equis ad celeritatem dispositis uti; sed cum id minus liceat propter valetudinem, nondum quae est confirmata; a tua Dominatione commodato postulo equum robustiorem, qui me vehat in Patriam. Polliceor vero sancte [sic] et hominis Christiani optima fide missurum iterum ante Pente constem meliorem, qui tuo usui esse queat. Quodsi pretio adipisci potuissem, non fuisset tuae Dominationi molestus. Caeterum tu mihi maioribus in rebus imperabis. Deus optimus maximus tibi adsit, ut pro dignitate tueri tuam provinciam possis. Bene vale, et nos mutuo ama. Londini.

Tuae Dominationis amantissimus in domino.

Pat. Sanct. Episcopus.

(iv) Adamson to Whitgift, June 16, 1584.

B.M. Harleian MSS. 7004 folio 3.

Pleis your grace immediatlze after my retourninge in Scotland the King his majestze held his parliament where besides many loveable actis his hienes hath restored in integrum the estate of Bishops and hath contramandet the seignoreis, presbitereis not onelie be good reasoun of Scripture and antiquitee, bot likwayis in respect his hienes had livele experience, that they were gret instrumentis of unquietnes and rebelloun be there

populare disordour. I doubt not your Grace hath been sufficientle enformed of the late attemptatis moved be some of our nobilite, wherunto many ministeris being prive and their seignoreis and therfore not able to abyde the triall of the law are fugitive in England where they pretext as I am certaynle enformed, the caus of religioun albeit it be of an undoubted truth, that they have no other caus bot there practizinge counsellinge and allowing of the last seditious factis and the refusinge of the lafull authorite of there ordinareis the Bishops, whereunto notwithstanding the godle and quiet spirites within the realme hath willingle aggreit and subscriyved. The quhilk I have thought moste necessare to advertize your grace, upon whose shoulderis the care of the spirituall estate dothe chefle repose, that your grace may be moste assured, that the king his majeste our master his ententioun is with the sincerite of the worde quhilk his hienes in his heart dothe reverence, to conforme sik an police as may be an example to other common wealthis, as I did show your grace in particulare conference at your awin howss of Lambeth. I am assured divers misreportis wilbe made wnto your grace of the banishment of so many ministeris, bot your Grace shall beleve that there is never one banished, nether have they abidden that notable sentence of John Chrisostome, Ego ex hoc throno non discedam nisi imperatoria vi coactus, for they are fugitive onele upon there awin guiltines. Swa that I am moste assured if her majeste be your grace shalbe sufficientle enformed of the truthe, her hienes will not suffer sik slaunderous persounes under pretext of religioun to abyde in her countrey to infecte the estate of Englande with their seditious practises quhilk they have bene about to establish in this countrey. And for my awin parte your grace may assure her hienes albeit her majeste hath bene otherwayis enformed at my being in England, that after my small credite and habilite I shall endeavour my self to the preservatioun of the true religioun professit in the whole yle and comoun quietnes and mutuall amite of her majeste and our master. In the quhilk poynte if her majeste had further employed me at that tyme I could have done what laye in me. But your grace knawis in what jelose my doings wes, albeit I protest afore god I meant nothing bot in sincerite of heart, wishing next our master best prosperite to her hienes for the conservatioun of the truth in this yland be there concorde. I shall not forgeit your graces Galloway nage, in testimonie of mutuall favour, when any opportunit comodite shall present the self be any sufficient berar, wishing heartle your grace welfare and to assist ws with your lordships prayer, help and gudwill at her hienes hands in maynteininge of this goode work against the pretendit seignoreis, the end

whereof tendis to evert monarcheis and destroy the sceptour of princes and to confounde the whole estate and jurisdiction of the kirk, quhilk I should be verie sore after so long continewance of tyme ~~and~~ to see decaye in our dayis, Nostra secordia et ignavia ad clavum sedemus. It wilbe your graces pleasour to salute my lorde bishope of London in my name and my lord Archbishop of York his grace for the goode **enter**tenement I resaved at his howse, thanking her hienes most humble therfore, committis your grace to the protection of god.  
frome St. Andross the 16 of Junii 1584.

Your gracis verie lovinge and assured brother symmyste and cooperare in the lord his vyneyarde.

**Patrik Archbischof of Sanctandross.**

end. The receat of his letter I signifiet to her majestie at Nonesuch in Sommer Anno 1584.

(v) - to Whitgift, January 10, 1584/5.

B.M. Add. MSS. 32,092, folio 78 verso (copy).

To my good lord and Father in God the  
Archbishoppe of Canterburie.

My verie good Lord and Father, be this pure man your Lordships servand besides infinitt uthers leiffinge and dead Recordis, knawinge your Lordships care and diligence, as a father in the household of my god, I am movit presentlye to salute your good Lordship be this rud letter. Amangis the byvent troubles, quhairby the devill, (as he ever haith) contendit to disturb the happie successe of the Evangell: sa now of late as his last darta be sik organis, as contemne all authoritie, confounde all order, and exempt themselves from all Jurisdiction doth he accursitly proceed. Theise bee, quha under pretext of Religion and greitest puritee of the same, dar blasphem Princes, approve perjurie, animat subjects to bludshed by order of lawe, and damne the order of god his kirk; namelye in Bishoppis, that the reul popular haiffinge place, the enormitees universall may escaip a condigne correctioun: and be the same meanes we beinge freed from the tyrannie of the hure of Babilon, the some of perdition, the Antichrist, the Paip, quha ever thunderit out cursinge against Princis, kingdomis and people; to bewrey the trewghth of god, and thrall mens Conscience to his obediencie; sa theise personis in their pretendit zeale haiff in this haill natioun set out edictis in name of the generall

Assemble upon pane of excommunicatioun, that ilke subject sulde subscribe treasoun giud service, perjurie lesun, bludsheid by order of lawe veill sheid: and finallie that it is lesun to subjectes to rebell aiainst a Christian king, and last under the same that no Bischopp sulde be in the lande, as ane estate damnable: quhilk the veritie of Goddis word approvis, all the Ancientes affermis, and by ane maist infallible necessitee all veill reulit Communeveillis must needis haiff. Yf, my giud Lord and Father, the Spiritt of god be Jud the Apostill had not of lik sort forevairnit, it had bene the most difficill to prevent ther evill: bot since they centenne the authoritie, speik evill of sik as are in office, spew out ther awne schame in perjurie, pollut not only our banquettis, bot the haill land be approvinge bludsheid, making themselffis cluddys but rayne, the instabill vavis of the sea, dead trees but frute, degorging their awne schame, errand sterreis confundinge the light of god, and sa electis to them selfis the [blank] of darknesse; I dar not in the market of giud conscience conceill from your giud Lordship nether from your happie Societee the danger of this land be them inducit, and the greit sklander by them giffen to our religioun, quhilk allmoist the haill erth haittis; bot only of god his grait mercie libertie is grantid to us in Britan above our marrowis (quhilk our unworthinesse cannot as becummith us be thankfull feir). It is not unknowing to us (hew ever men say) how besie the devill is be his first begottin the Paip and his Neveys kingis nixt them, and their suppoistes, Papistis and Jesuittis; as the last Locustis of the bettumlesse pitt, to extinguishe the light of god in their two Contrees, with the leffis of boith the Princis, in god his great mercie giffen us, and professinge with us, and now quhilis out of our awne bowells the devill stirrit up the lyke evils and sklanderis. It apperteynit to be vigilant, as I doubt not your Lordship moir cairfully will then I can wish: yit upon Christian dewtye this far as your Lordships naturall sonne I do discharge myself: assuringe your Lordship that my small power salbee allways reddie accordinge to my talent to prevent boith the ane evill and the uther: beinge in the mean tyme maist glad to heare from your Lordship as by this same I craiffe your Lordship godlie advise; quhilk I will participat to my master and soveraigne quha will accept maist gladly of the same. Besyringe hereby maist humbly to be commendit to all my good Lords of your estait fearing god, I humblye crave pardoun of this rud and indigest forme, yit your Lordships allways in god his sonne to be commandit.

From Halyrudhouse this tent of Januer. 1584.

Your Lordships humble as your sonne  
to be employit.

Andrew Melville to Jean Castel, February 23, 1583/4.

B.M. Cotton MSS. Caligula C. IX. fol. 161.

(This letter seemed to present certain difficulties. It is endorsed as from "Adam Melville", but is signed "A. Melvinus", and there is no record of a Scottish minister named Adam Melville. The carelessness of the endorser is shown by his rendering the date as "13<sup>o</sup> Febr." when it is clearly the 23rd., and by his giving Castel's name in the form "Castelle", the Latin dative. The letter is dated 1584, when we should expect 1583, but in writing to a Frenchman Melville would probably follow continental practice, with which he was familiar. Moreover, Melville was certainly in Berwick on February 23, 1583/4, for he had fled on February 17 and Bowes, writing from Berwick on February 24, reported that Melville was in the town (C.S.P. VII. no. 31). On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that he was anywhere but in the south of England a year later. Internal evidence is entirely in favour of the earlier date. Melville makes it clear that he has not been in touch with Castel for some time; a letter of Castel to which Melville is replying had brought news of archbishop Adamson's activities, and Melville sends the Frenchman a description of Adamson's character; finally, Melville declares that he hopes to see Castel soon. All these points are compatible with the earlier date, and all, except perhaps the last, incompatible with the later.)

Accepi literas tuas, mi Castelle, plenas officii et benevolentiae, quibus et studium erga nos tuum et sollicitudinem de nostris ecclesiis significas non vulgariter. Utrumque mihi in hoc tempore valde gratum. Oppertuna sollicitudo, studium etiam perlicundum. Revixi, mihi crede, ad Genevae mentionem, ad nominis tui redintegratam memoriam. Nec potuit quicquam vel optatius vel opportunius accidere tam necessario tempore quam scire pseudarchiepiscopi nostri artes vobis merite ee' [sic] suspectas. Quare non solum longioris, ut tu scribis, ~~sil~~ silentii excusationem accipio libenter, sed etiam magnas tibi et habeo, et ago gratias tum meo tum ecclesiarum nostrarum et fratrum omnium nomine. Quod certius aliquid de isto homine cupis cognoscere, sic habeto. Veterator est, vario, et versatili ingenio, aliud promptum in ore aliud in pectore habens reconditum. Monstrum est ex diversis, et pugnantibus naturae studiis conflatum,

qui vulpem, qui lupum, qui Chamaeleontem dixerit, verum dixerit, sed non totum quod in re est dixerit. Nec dum satis hominis ingenium et mores expresserit. Alieni appetens, sui profusus, et privatum patrimonium et redditus Archiepiscopales helluo decoxit, cum ignominiosa nominis et famae iactura. ... apertum ~~totum~~ ecclesisticae bellum indixit: et impetrata libera legatione, perfusus aulicis blandimentis et veneficiis delibutus, nunc pessimis artibus grassatur apud exteros, in ecclesiarum nostrarum pestem atque perniciem.... quare modis omnibus occurrendum et resistendum quam maturrime isti incendiario atque ~~ἀναστόρ~~, quem tibi tuisque symmystis Colvinus noster suis coloribus depinget: cui tu et fratres fidem habeatis velim. Enim vero ego Londinium cogito, te tuosque symmystas patres, et fratres in Domino mihi plurimum observandos propediem invisurus, et isti personato Apostatae larvam detracturus. Interea tuis fratrumque laboribus Dominus Jesus benedicat.  
Datum Berwici 23o. Febr. 1584.

Tui studiosissimus

A. Melvinus.

addr. praestanti doctrina ac pietate viro, domino J. Castollo ecclesiae Gallicanae apud Londininienses, peregrinantis, pastori vigilantissimo. Londini.

end. 13o. Febr. 1583. Mr. Adam Melvin minister of Scotland, to Mr. J. Castollo, minister of the French church in London, touching the Archebissshoppe of St. Andrewes.

## APPENDIX G.

Andrew Hunter to James Carmichael, January 16, 1585/6.

B.M. Add. MSS. 32,092, fol. 80 verso. (Copy.)

The Lord, whas battayles wee fight, geve us all the spiritt of Constancie and patience, with a joyfull victorie in the ende.

Deare brother, I acknowledge my selfe addetted by promisse to wrytt unto you at all commodiouse occasions concerninge the course of the proceedinge in our contrey, whilk I think good nowe to discharge in a parte. Matters hes fallen out synce the victorie of Sterling not as wee hoped for, nather as good men wald have wished. For nothings was done at Parlement to repayre the ruynes of our desolate kirk. Men sought themselves, and neglected God his cause and frendes. Wicked men, whom lawes baith of God and man wald have justlie punished, are escaped, overseene, and permitted to passe where they pleis. Sum of the verye wicked rejoyes the kinges eare. To end all this thinge shall come, the Lord wha can work light out of darknesse, and order out of confusion, he knawes. In my judgment the Lorde hes disposed of the proceedings verie well, and after a wonderfull maner. For he exercises his awyn, baith of the Nobilitie and the Ministerie, and of the people, after the fashon, that ather at length the deip cursses of ilk sorte of the wicked may appeere and be knawen, and that in end he may heap the most notabill benefitt of all on our distressed nation, I mean a famouse victorie and reformation.: other ells he will haif me in the rank with his deare servants of ald and of layt dayes, wha for a season hes fighten and sealed up the veritie with their bloude, till the wicked of the nation hath waisted the werriours, rooted out the truth, and finallye banished the Lord Jesus from their bounds. I hope for the one; but alace I am affrayed of the other. Brother, Sathan is menifestinge himselfe, as God haith made us manifest. He utters him in that where he would bee. Masses are sayed at Dumfries in the chappell of Glen. Great is the resorte of the inhabitants of that toun thereunto. The Lord Maxwell and Hereys with manye of their frends haith bene thair in proper person. Thair is fower Mass prestes besides the Abbott of new Abbey. Twa of them are Inglishmen, and two Scottesmen. Ye remember one Hault, who escaped out of the castle of Edinburgh, ye haif hard of Aure the old Abat of Dumfarlinges some, but he chaunges his name. And there is one Mr. Alexander Makquhirrie. What the Lord shall

worke out of this he knawys, tyme will trye. Good men  
 and professors of the trueth are beginnunge to take  
 their ald courage. All things hidderunto haith bene  
 bot newes: this moves them. I trust the kingdom of  
 Sathan in this Contrey is yeven at an end. Brother  
 Mr. James, I beseche you and all other our brethren  
 that are thair, pray for us, and haste your selves home  
 to feight the battell, For now the Lord craves of us to  
 beare his standert. Comfort the Brethren of England.  
Desire them not to be discouraged for our tryell, and  
their disapoynted expectation!" The things are necessarie  
 and expedient for us. And they are als acceptable to us,  
 as war the dayes of our flourishing estate, or if wee  
 had attayned to that, which wee hoped for. All things  
 are not lost that are in perrell. The letters which I  
 receaved from Mr Feild, because the tyme is not fytt, they  
 are not delyvered. I await some meit tyme. I delyvered  
 your lettres onto the Toun of Haddington, which was well  
 accepted; first by Johnne Broune, and next by the Counsaill  
 of the Town. They think long of you, and will not admitt  
 Mr. John Ker, ilk aspires to be thair. They knawe now  
 what it is to have you and quhat to want you. The other  
 to the Erle of A: I leift to wrytt that I wald. He is  
 sorowfull for your proceedinges of thinges. Your yonge  
 child which was in dodlieth[sic] is well. Johnne Broun  
 hes tane him to him. All the rest are well. I haf not  
 met with Mr Andro Melvell, nor Mr James. Do my hartie  
 commendations to Mr Feild, Doctour Pennie, the good  
 neighbours on the Brigg, Mr Cloybrogg, Mr. Shotton, and  
 to all others our good acquaintaunce. Wee can hear no  
 worde of Mr. Walter Balcanwhell's wiffe, nor Gilbert  
 Dott. The Lord preserve you for ever. Forget not  
 my commendationis to your wife and the Lorde of Ogill'.  
 From Leith, the 16 of Januarie, 1585.

Your brother in God,

Andro: Hunter.

1. Italics in the MS.

APPENDIX H.

## Bancroft and the Scottish Church.

- (i) A letter from John Copcot to Robert Naunton, January 1, 1589/90, enclosing a letter from Richard Bancroft to Naunton and a list of questions.

B.M. Egerton MSS. vol. 2598, ff. 240-245.

(Owing to the condition of the MS. there are some lacunae in the first letter.)

Mr. Nanton. I hartely thanke youe for your letter which I ... being sicke at Lambhith, and not yett thowrowly recovered ... youe should soner have heard of the ... my very good frends here do very well lyke of youre writing ... with whome I trust youe shalbe better acquainted, and if it may please youe to write unto the best of them I assure youe it wilbe very well accepted and youe shall finde them kynde to requite any courtesye that youe shewe: I send youe hereinclosed a letter from Mr D: Bancroft. I hartely praye youe to answeare his desyre to youre power, if any thing be published against him, convey it to him ... with what speed youe can: Thus with my most hartye commendations unto youe with the lyke from youre universitie frends, I commite youe to the tuition of the Almightye. From Corpus Christi colledge in Cambridge the first of January anno 1589.

Youre most assured to his power

John Copcot.

addr. To his very loving frend Mr. Robert Nanton attending upon my Lord Ambassadour in Scotland geve this with speed.

Good Mr. Nanton. Although we have no acquaintance together, yet by the letter yow writt not longe since to Dr. Copcot I find my selfe exceedingly beholden unto yow. Towching the effect of which letter there hath been consideration taken by my good frends. I had written a letter to the chief of the great Rabbies, but bicawse I am certaynly enformed that there is a booke written agaynst my sermon which shall without doubt be printed, I have thought good with some advice to stay the

same. It appeareth likewise by your letter how greatly I am bound to my Lord Ambassador. I doubt not but that both my Lord of Canterbury and my Lord Chauncelour who are acquainted therewithall will give him thanks on my behalfe. The truth is I had no intent to have offended any of the ministers there. You know we are pressed with examples of other churches to the imbracinge of that most counterfeyt and falsly patched up government which is tearmed the presbitery, a meere humane devise devised by shiftinge and sleight, attayned by tiranny and bloud, and mainteyned with untollerable pride and with most straunge boldnes in expoundinge the scriptures and falsifyinge of all antiquitye. In which respect I thought it agreable with my duty and the time beinge called to that place to give warninge by the miserable estate of the Church of Scotland least we should fall into the like desolation. But howsoever it is taken I shall be redy for them, especially if I may crave your favor by satisfyinge the particular poynts contayned in the sheet of paper here inclosed. For other matters towchinge the course which hath been held for the erectinge of that government ever since James the fifte I am well acquainted with yt. I have read of the last stratageme and exployt at Striveling when the kinge was taken. But peradventure yow may learne more therof then is mentioned in our English late chronicle of Scotland. For of that poynt I have litle more then there is contayned. Furthermore I doo perceave upon diverse occasions that the chieftest of the ministers of Scotland (especially Mr Melvin) have procured sondry lettres from Mr. Beza and other learned men beyond the seas concerninge theyr ratifyinge of the church government there established. Which lettres or the copyes of them if by the strength of your device you be able to compasse, they will greatly pleasure me. For thereby it will appere what very false reportes have been made by them both of the kinge and of the Bishops there. Wpon which untrue suggestions the sayd learned men did write otherwise then they wold have done if they had knowen the truth. I can not see how yow can accomplish this poynt except you insinuate your selfe into them as one desirous to embrace theyr devices if yow might see the same confirmed by the judgments of Beza and other learned men of Fraunce etc. Therupon peradventure they will show yow the said lettres. If also yow could procure the copyes of theyr owne lettres sent to Beza etc. that were notable. What paynes yow shall be pleased to take herein, and to certifie me thereof from time to time whilest yow stay there yow may signify unto me with all securitye if yow direct your lettres to Mr. Ashly, one of the clarcks of heremajesties privy counsell. But I wold have yow to seale such lettres as yow write

unto me and to inclose them in a letter to him of my direction to yow, and then I am sure he will be very carefull to deliver them unto me. Mr. Dr. Copcott my very frend I thinke will joyne with me for your good favor in the premisses. Yow may thereby as I suppose furnishe your selfe with good experience and if hereafter yow shall have any occasion wherin I may doo yow any pleasure assure your selfe yow shall commaund me. And so with my harty commendations I committ yow to God.  
from Lambeth the 23 of December 1589.

Your lovinge frend

Rich. Bancroft.

(The questions which Bancroft enclosed are printed in Calderwood's History, V. 78.)

(11) The answers to Bancroft's questions.

N.L.S. MSS. 6.1.13, folio 37.

The 1 2 3 Articles I cane not answeare till my returne.

As to the 4, whether there be no minister allowed but such as be preachers I answeare so far as I knowe I know no minister but doth preach, but for the most part they are very raw scollers scarce understanding the Lattin tonge, being taken from the schooles at xviii yeares of age and presently to the pulpit whereby the most part of the churches of Scotland are cleane destitute of pastors, and those churches that are best served are destitue [sic] more then the halfe of the yeare by reason those that serve them must bestow the better part of the year in suing for that smale pention which the gentlemen of the country can afford them whereby you have neither christing, nor burring nor any divine service upon Sunday Wensday nor Thursday for halfe a yeare together.

As to the 5 I can not answeare directly, neverthelesse for the coming to the church how oft in the week and upon Sunday, but for the country they use not to come upon the weeke day nor scarce upon the Sunday, and for the reperation off their churches they are for the most part pulled downe or els in such reparation as it is a pittie to see them being full off water and mire and it were as good sit under a tree to here the Sermon as in them if it raine. I speake this by experience.

As to the 6 and 7 I can not Answer now.  
For the 8 If a man be injured by any presbiteriall  
consistorie whether may he appeale, I answere I suppose  
he may not appeale to any other court if their censures  
be once inflicted upon him, as for example one of the  
kings court and neere about him, named Fentry, was  
excommunicated. The king did what he could to set him  
free, but nil he wil he he was banished, the court. The  
like did they against one Mr. William Shaw, master of  
the kings works.

The 9 -

The 10. As to the cannon law, it is  
altogither abrogated, their consistories proceeding  
according to thar consciences and as the spirite of God  
shall rule them.

The 12. The ministers have no voice in  
parliament but onely make their request to the parliament,  
neither have the layety any thing to do concerning  
ecclesiasticall affayres, onely they present what they  
would have passe, and if the king thinke good he  
confirmeth it.

17. They attribute no farther to the king  
but as to a private person in ecclesiasticall or church  
affayres (or more properly) a brother among them, onely  
this by his authority he is to defend them and such  
constitutions as they shall make.

18. The ministers mayntenance is but small  
as ii c. li. by yeare or a i c. lli., which is not above  
xxiiii lli. stirling money, or xii lli., whereby they  
complaine not, onely against the king, but against the  
nobility and gentlemen who have the Bishops living and  
teyes in their hands and alow them some small portion  
some xx ll. or xii ll. English money, and that have they  
not well payed except they first shue for it.

19. The ealder or deacons have no allowance.

(iii) Bancroft's apology.

National Library of Scotland MSS. 6.1.13, ff. 46-53(copy).

My singular good Lord. Amongst some other blessings which it hath pleased allmighty God in mercy to vouchsafe me, I have hitherto ascribed a chief place unto your Lordship's goodnes and favor towards me. In respect whereof I have been all wayes most carefull to follow your Lordship with as great duety and love, as if I had been your servaunt, little suspecting that ever I shold have given an occasion to have found your Lordship so highly offended with me. My onely comfort herein is this, that I am sure your Lordship in your conscience cannot accuse me, that I had any purpose so much as in thought to have incurred your displeasure.

When I came by commaundment to wayte upon your Lordship yesterday, havinge read before the litle treatise which lately came owt of Scotland, and suspectinge the occasion why I was sent for, I had in minde some reasons for myne owne excuse. But findinge your Lordship so greatly moved, so many attendinge to speake with yow, the time so shorte, and my self in sorte dismayed, I thought it my best course to wayte some better opportunitie, and by writinge to signifye that to your Lordship which then I had in minde to have delivered unto yow. The humble suite therfore that now I have unto your honor is this, that seinge there is no remedy but that yow will needs complayne to her majestie, yow wold in your justice first be pleased to understand the nature// and qualitie of myne offence.

f.46  
v.

It is true that as your Lordship sayth the pulpitt is not a place to deale in much with princes. I have ever condemned it my selfe, both in our owne and in our neighbours sectaryes, and God knoweth my harte, how farre it was from my entent, to have offended therein, especially against so renowned and vertuous a kinge. The generall drifte of my sermon in that point was, that forasmuch as the malcontents of this state, for the erectinge of a new kingdome, doe presse us so earnestly with the examples of other reformed churches, and namely of Scotland, to lett the people understand, what I had read and receaved concerninge the inconveniences and practises, both there and els where, that findinge the like busy and turbulent humorists amongst us (who labor continually by all meanes possible to infect this land with those corrupt opinions, which if in time they be

not looked into will hazard the estates of all Christian kingdomes) they might through that experience be warned and made more cautious of them. And to this purpose I confesse I brought forth (as the authour of this last pamphlett tearmeth them) two witnesses, a declaration published in the  
 f.47 king's name, and the testimony of one who himselfe had been  
 v. there, and felt more then he liked of that Lordly discipline.

Now, my good Lord, concerninge the declaration it is denyed to be the king's, and the Archbishop of St. Androis is charged to have sett it forth by his owne authoritye. But for mine owne parte, I give small credit to this alphabeticall nameless person J.D. Howsoever this be, may it please yow to consider, whether I may be reproved herein of any rashnes. I have read the Chronicles of Scotland as they have been published by theyr owne adherents, and am well acquainted with the practises of diverse ministers there, ever since Mr. Knox, after his banishment, returned thither again from Geneva. In them I doe finde, how he and his companions stirred up certayne to conspire and take armes against the governour and to make what reformation it pleased them in Church matters, partly by a most wicked pervertinge of the Scriptures in arminge subjects against theyr prince, and partly upon the credit of some of the Genevians, who first did publishe that rebellious doctrine. I am not likewise ignorant by readinge of the rode at Ruthven, 1582, of the sermon then preached at St. Johnstowne, wherin  
 f.47 the preacher (as was then certified by letters from  
 v. Scotland) cursed the men, with all theyr furniture, that shold assiste the kinge; of the rebellious attempt at the Burgh of Strivelinge, 1583; of the kings most grave and princely deliberation how to reforme the foresayd abuses, especially in matters of the Church, and of the undutifull and stubborne behavior of the ministers at Edinburgh, towards his majestie, when before the parlayment (which followed, 1584) he labored by most godly persuasions, to have reduced them unto a better consideration of theyr duties.

And lest your Lordship shold thinke that I am altogether deceaved in the premises, I humbly pray your Lordship to consider what is sett downe in the sayd parlayment, 1584, the rather for that (as I thinke) there will be no exception taken to the same as though it had been held without the king's authoritye. It is there apparent that the king's supremacye was by the ministers so greatly impugned as that theyr former proceedings were prohibited under payne of treason. In the second chapter

f.48 of the sayd parlayment your Lordship shall finde these words: Forasmuch as some persons beinge called before the king's majestie and his secrett counsell to aunswere upon certayne points to have been enquired of them, concerninge some treasonable seditions and contumelious speaches uttered by them in pulpitt, scholes and otherwise, to the disdayne and reproche of his highnes, his progenitours and present counsell, contumeliously declined the judgment of his highnes and his sayd counsell in that behalfe, to the evill example of others to doe the like if timely remedy be not provided, therfore, etc.

cap.3 It furthermore also appereth that the ministers, etc., without any lawfull warrent eyther of the kinge or former parlayments, nay, contrary to the custome of any Christian kingdome or well governed common wealth, did of them selves erect certayne formes of judgments and jurisdictions in spirituall cawses, did oftentimes assemble together and enjoyne to the subjects certayne punishments, did give owt sentences and decrees and put the same in execution, did in the sayd assemblies take upon them to justifie and authorize the fact perpetrate against his highnes person and estate at Ruthven, did in theyr pretended manner make acts therupon, keep the same in register and as it seemed allowed the sayd attempt, although it was publickly condemned by the kinge and estats as treasonable, did call into some doubt the authoritye of the court of parlayment, and travayled to have introduced some innovation against his majesty's firme will, and did use both wicked licentious publicke and private speaches to the cap.8 disdayne contempt and reproch of his majestie, his counsell and proceedings, and to the dishonor and prejudice of his highnes parents progenitors and estate.

cap.4 Against these wicked and disloyall misdemeanors your Lordship may see the penalties apointed in the sayd acts of parlayment. Theyr new erected government was f.48 overthrowen, theyr three estates of parlayment were confirmed, the Bishops with theyr authoritye were v. re-established, and such a reformation was then generally made, as tended greatly to God's glorie, and publicke benefitt of that common wealth.

In the means time (and afterwards also), whilest this parlayment was thus busyed (as Sathan never ceaseth to sow his cocle) diverse very spitefull and slaunderous suggestions were cast abroad by these

companions; that the kinge was declined to poperye, endeavored to hinder the free passage of the gospell, and I know not how many reprochfull calumnious reports they heaped upon him. To the incountringe of which false and yett farre spread rumors by such as for feare became of themselves fugitives, now cometh forth (my good Lord) this offensive declaration, most notably wisely and learnedly penned as I thinke. Wherin the king's sinceritye and constancy in religion is worthily defended, the reasons of his majesty's proceedings are more fully and clearly sett downe and delivered, and the ignominye yett resteth and will doe for ever upon the authors from whence it proceeded.

f.49 These things, right honorable, beinge faithfully wayed in the ballance of Justice and aequitye, wheras I repeated for the purpose mentioned the effect of the sayd declaration, was my rashnes so heynous as it is pretended ?

Besides, I might further adde these reasons for myne owne defence. The declaration was imprinted at Edingburgh by the assignement of Thomas Vautrollier, 1585, cum privelegio regali, it was commonly held in a generall opinion to have been sett owt by the kinge, it was never to my understandinge by any publick acte repealed. The Archbishop (as I gather by it) hath not hitherto been convicted lawfully to have published the same withowt his majesty's allowance. There doth appere no reason why it shold be disavowed, consideringe that the ministers with theyr complices are as deeply towched with notes of disloyaltye in the acts of parlayment themselves as in the sayd declaration. I will not alledge for my self the authoritye of our chronicles, which at that time (I confesse) I had not read. This I doe heare that men of good experience in the affayres of Scotland, had the oversight and allowance for the printinge of them. And thus, my good Lord, I have been bold to imparte unto yow, how probably I erred (if I was deceived) in terminge the sayd declaration to have been published by the kinge.

But now commeth the matter wherewithall the king's majestie (as I perceave) and so consequently your Lordship are so highly displeased. After I had delivered in my sermon so much of the sayd declaration as I thought convenyent, I came to an objection, viz., It may

f.49 here be sayd (for they dare say what they list) that now  
 v. the kinge is of an other minde, and that this declaration  
 was made when he had conceaved some displeasure against  
 them. Wherunto the aunswere now sett downe in printe is  
 this:: for the kinge he is not altred; ictus piscator sapit,  
 etc. The difference betwixt my words in the pulpitt, and  
 these here sett downe, there is no man knoweth better than  
 your Lordship. But I will not seeke herein to extenuate  
 my fault, if his majestie shall so account of it, for  
 therein I doe most humbly submitt my selfe to his  
 highnes censure, nothinge doubtinge, seinge there are  
 such strange examples of his princely clemencye towards his  
 owne subjects so notoriously offendinge him, but that  
 he will be content to extend the same unto a stranger who  
 never so much as once conceaved an evill thought against  
 his highnes. Your Lordship, I trust, did never esteem me  
 as a madde man, and surely I had been litle better  
 (consideringe the inviolable league of perfect love and  
 amitye betwixt the Quenes majestie our dread soveraigne  
 Lady and his highnes) if I shold wittingly have spoken  
 any thinge that might have turned to his dishonor.

I write not this my very good Lord to elevate  
 this matter (as I sayd) but doe yeald therein or any other  
 thinge by my humble submission to make such satisfaction,  
 as his majestie shall require at my hands as to acknowlege  
 myselfe abused with credulitye of those arguements which  
 his majestie shall disavow to have proceeded from him.

f.50 And though his majesty's consistorians through the  
 r. overflowinge of theyr charitye, and little knowinge what  
 is most agreable unto the clemencye of a prince, shall  
 instantly insist that I might be punished, I hope his majestie  
 will accept my offer of satisfaction rather to his highnes  
 then to them. My harte is as sincere unto the kinge  
 as the best of theyres, and God is my witnes how farre  
 it was from me by those words of my sermon, so much as  
 to have towched his princely reputation.

It is true, indeed, that at that time I had  
 not read the proclamation published by certayne of his  
 majesty's subjects the second day of November 1585 (as I  
 take yt) at theyr repayre to Striveling, neyther had I  
 seen the king's three conditions then offred unto them,  
 together with theyr answeres resolutions and mutuall  
 conclusions upon the same. If those things had been known  
 unto me (as I am glad they were not) I might more justly

have been blamed to have sett it owt in printe that the kinge is not altered. For that was a memorable alteration in deed which no Englishe man livinge, bearinge a dutifull hart unto his soveraigne, and judginge of others therein by his owne affection, could ever have suspected.

I have hitherto, right honorable, (towching these wordes that the kinge is not altered) writt nothinge to excuse my selfe, but all in may of submission. Now  
 f.50 v. it may please yow to give me leave somewhat to clear them and my selfe from that violent sense which the ministers will needs intrude upon them. I sayd in my sermon that they dare say what they list, and now I have better experience of it. For wheras onely I say the king is not altred, etc., one of those consistorian scribes that hath lately written against some points of my sermon doth affirme that therein I give owt that his majestie is a deadly enemy to the present government established in his kingdome, and watcheth but his time to overthrow yt. And the other in this last treatise sayth owt of the same wordes, that I charge his majestie with deep dissimulation, as affirminge in effect that how beyt the kinge by his writinge speakinge and actions wold seeme to approve the present exercise of the same discipline which so flatly is condemned in the foresayd declaration, yet he doth not approve it in harte, etc. By which most violent wrestinge and interpretation of my wordes, havinge no such sense in them, who seeth not how that as men, that have very lewde conceyts against the kinge, and are guiltye unto themselves of many disloyall attempts (which might justly cawse his majestie at the least to dislike them) they doe indeed nothinge els but take occasion (for what purpose the kinge himselfe I doubt not best knoweth) to disclose and bewray theyr owne imaginations. For sure I am that understandinge no more then I did at that time, my words  
 f.51 r. can carry no such construction, and I durst not for my life so have charged his highnes, besides that it had been meere impietye, if I should so have done. But antiquum obtinent. For wold they be contented to have theyr owne workes and writings thus metamorphosed? I know they wold not. Which might have withhelde them from stirringe up his majestie upon no greater occasion to such offence against me.

Hath not Mr. Knox in his exhortation to England even in our soveraigne's time used other manner of speeches? He derideth and curseth the ordinary phrases of humilitye

and honor which here are given both to the prince and parlayment. He depraveth our forme of common prayer and speaketh very offensively of the times of kinge Edwarde the sixt, and in the said exhortation he is so proud and peremptorye as that he affirmeth that those princes which shall exempt themselves from the yoke (as he termeth it) of discipline (meaninge the regall hierarchie of Geneva as is apparent) and shall disannull the same, are unworthy to raigne over the people. I could remember unto your Lordship some other points of greater importance, which the subjects of Scotland have both written and uttered against the state of England, and yet notwithstandinge how they have been taken in good parte, withowt any such insinuations, and exprobrations as are made in this treatise, viz. what the ministers of Scotland have

f. 51 deserved of her majestie, and how my words might tende  
v. to the breach of the happy amitye betwixt the two Realmes. Paltry fellowes. As though the league of princes did depend upon such giddy heades as eyther theyrs or myne. It if did, the world wold sone be together by the eares. For the consistorian humor is of a strange mixture. They will censure and gall every man but they must not be towched.

Your Lordship seeth how hott and angrye the ministers are in this last treatise (for the author seemeth to write in all theyr names) bicause I used the wordes and speaches before mentioned, and yet even with the same breathe that they complayne of me (such is theyr pride) they write in this sorte of the Church of England: that the same is still under the bondage of an antichristian government, that our Bishops are a hurtfull relique of Romishe confusion, that they thrust with side and shoulder to push all the weake with theyr hornes, till they have scattered them abroad, and to make havocke of the Church by a disguised persecution, and that they doe tirannise above theyr brethren with violence and crueltye. They doe justifie the proceedings of the disturbers of our quiet and animate them to goe forwards as they have begonne. They say they must not cease to commende theyr troubled state unto God in theyr private and publick prayers. They

f. 52 compare our hinderance of theyr discipline unto the  
r. hinderance which God's enemies made to the buildinge of Jerusalem. They call the favorers of our church government a generation of Bishopists, and doe insinuate that there are in courte some craftye miscreants which doe abuse her majestie. Doth not your Lordship wonder at this theyr great

presumption and libertye of speache ? Or should I complayne thereof to the king's majestie, and give it owt of these theyr lewde speeches, as though they might breake the amitye of the two realmes ? Certaynly for myne owne parte I account them as pasquills, and those who are godly both grave and wise, doe make I know no other account of theme.

f.52 Furthermore also, wheras in this treatise the chronicle of Scotland printed in England is so greatly blamed, together with the approvers and publishers of it, of purpose to stirre up the king's majestie to some discontentment, is not theyr blindnes great, theyr understandinge darknes, and are they not indeed more then senselesse ? Why (my Lord) how hath Mr Knox. rayled upon the king's grandfather and grandmother ? and what spitefull suspition doth he leave to the memory of all posteritye both of them and some others, and that in his historye of the church of Scotland printed in London  
v. but secretly as other libells are, withowt authoritye ?  
For Buchanan's history in like sorte as also his booke De jure regni apud scotos, they are nothinge in effect but trompetts of rebellion to arme his subjects against his highnes.

They say as it hath been observed in this treatise that for the disproofe of the declaration there is some intent of writinge a new historye, and then your Lordship shall see how they will deale themselves with his majestie. Owt of question for the time of his highnes government, from his takinge the same upon him, untill the rode of Striveling, 1585, they are like to cover all former actions, with a pretence of his minoritye, as they doe alreadye in this treatise. But I will here leave both them and this matter, fearinge greatly least I trouble your Lordship to long, and I have somewhat to say of my second witnes, as he is tearmed.

Our consistorians doe tell us with very great vehemencye and boldnes, that the cawse why we have no many disorders in the Realme, murder, theft, roges, idlenesse, etc., is for want of theyr presbiteriall government, affirminge that if we had the same, we shold have a very paradise upon this earth. In which respects I confesse I have been carefull from time to time to understande what  
f.53 fruits appered of this new government where it was erected.  
r. So as beinge appointed to preach at Poules crosse the first Sonday in the parlayment, 1588, and knowinge that some hott spiritts were temperinge about this new device

to have it established here, I did by meanes procure some instructions from Mr. Browne, who had travayled, as he sayd through the chieftest parts of Scotland. How truely he reporteth of his experience I will not say. The acts of parlayment doe in some sorte justifie him. And besids, the advertisements which I have receaved since owt of Scotland towching these matters doe make (I assure your Lordship) more then a full supply of the rest. I could tell your Lordship how notably the kinge was abused, 1586, in the Church of St. Giles in Edingburgh, as it was reported by a sawcye minister one John Cooper. Likewise what a malicious dialogue goeth from hande to hande betwixt his majestie and a factious minister one James Gibson, derogatinge much from his highnes, and that with very lewd and scurrilous tearmes. Furthermore what jarres there are amongst the ministers themselves, every one seeking to deface an other, so as in theyr meetings, as I am enformed, there is litle but bablinge pratlinge and quarrelinge. But these things, my  
f.53 good Lord, I reserve to a fitter opportunitie.

v.

So as now, right honorable and my singular good Lord, I come to the conclusion of all that hitherto hath been sayd, most humbly beseechinge your honor first that yow will not trouble her majestie with this matter as beinge a thinge urged onely by the uncharitable ministers, and farre from his majesty's most princely disposition as I am perswaded; or if, for the satisfyinge of some, your Lordship will take that way, and not stay upon this my apologye and submission, which I hope yow will, then at your knees I doe most instantly beseech yow, that yow will likewise acquainte her highnes with that which here I have sett downe in parte for myne owne excuse. Your Lordship in your justice if yow will needs doe the one cannot deny me the other, or if yow shold I must be driven to seeke for helpe els where, which I wold be loth to doe, consideringe that your Lordship hath taken upon yow of your goodnes, beinge Chauncelour of that universitie where I was brought up, to be a lovinge patrone of the students therof, and that hitherto I have not hearde but that your Lordship hath ever dealt most honorably with those that in like cases have come unto yow for your helpe and assistance.

And thus, cravinge pardon for my presumption in troublinge yow with so longe a letter I committ your Lordship by my harty prayer unto the tuition of allmighty God.

At Ely house in Holbourne the [blank] of  
octo' 1590.

[No signature]

end. D. Bancroftes letter to my Lord Treasurer concerninge  
the treatise which lately came owt of Scotland.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>A.H.R.</u>	American Historical Review.
Aldis	Aldis, H .G. A list of books printed in Scotland before 1700.
<u>A.P.C.</u>	Acts of the (English) Privy Council.
<u>A.P.S.</u>	Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland.
Bancroft, <u>D.P.</u>	Bancroft, Richard. Daungerous Positions and Proceedings.
<u>B.U.K.</u>	"Book of the Universal Kirk", <u>i.e.</u> , Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies.
Calderwood	Calderwood, David. History of the Kirk of Scotland.
Calvin, <u>Inst.</u>	Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by H . Beveridge, 1846.
<u>C.M.H.</u>	Cambridge Modern History.
<u>C.S.P.</u>	Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, queen of Scots.
<u>D.N.B.</u>	Dictionary of National Biography.
<u>E.H.R.</u>	English Historical Review.
<u>H.M.C.</u>	Historical MSS. Commission.
<u>Informations</u>	Informations, or a Protestation, <u>etc.</u> (see bibliography, section D.)
Kidd	Kidd, B.J. Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation.
Knox	Knox, John. Works, edited by Laing.
Lorimer	Lorimer, Peter. John Knox and the Church of England.
<u>R.P.C.</u>	Register of the Privy Council of Scotland.
<u>S.H.R.</u>	Scottish Historical Review.
S.H.S.	Scottish History Society.
Spottiswoode	Spottiswoode, John. History of the Church of Scotland.
<u>S.T.C.</u>	A Short Title Catalogue.
<u>V.C.H.</u>	Victoria County Histories.
<u>Z.L.</u>	Zurich Letters (Parker Society).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.A. Bibliographical Works.

- Aldis, H .G. A list of books printed in Scotland before 1700. 1904.
- Arber, Ed. A transcript of the registers of the company of stationers. 5 vols. 1875-94.
- Cambridge Modern History, volumes II. and III.
- Cole, G.W. Index to bibliographical papers. 1933.
- Couper, W.J. Robert Waldegrave, King's printer for Scotland. 1916.
- Cowan, Wm. A bibliography of the Book of Common Order 1913.
- Dexter, H .M. The Congregationalism of the last 300 years. 1880.
- Dickson, (R.) and Edmond (J.P.) Annals of Scottish Printing. 1890.
- ~~Georgi, T. Allgemeines Europaisches Bucher Lexikon.~~
- Grässe, J.G.T. Tresor de livres rares et précieuses. 7 vols. 1859-69.
- McKerrow, R.B. A dictionary of printers and booksellers, 1557-1640. 1910.
- Matheson, C. Scottish Historical Clubs, 1908-17. 1928.
- Pollard (A.W.) and Redgrave (G.R.) A short title catalogue. 1926.
- Read, Conyers. Bibliography of British History, 1485-1603. 1933.
- Stair Society. The Sources and Literature of Scots Law. 1936.
- Terry, C.S. Scottish Historical Clubs, 1780-1908. 1909.

B. Manuscripts.

Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Library.

Wodrow MSS. (7 volumes)

MS. biographies by Robert Wodrow.

Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland.

Wodrow MSS. 8vo. vol. 5,  
4to. vol. 20,  
fol. vol. 42, 43, 44, 50.

Morton MSS. vol. V.

Balcarres MSS. vol. VI, VIII.

MSS. vol. 6.1.13.

Edinburgh: Register House.

Warrender Papers, vol. A, B.

Glasgow: University Library.

MS. biographies by Robert Wodrow.

London: British Museum.

Additional MSS. vol. 4736.  
28,571.  
28,695.  
29,546.  
32,092.  
38,139.

Egerton MSS. vol. 1693 and vol. 2598.

Cotton MSS. Caligula B. IV.  
Caligula C. I, III, IV, VIII, IX.  
Cleopatra E. IV.

Harleian MSS. vol. 291.  
594-5.  
5910.  
7581.  
7004.

Lansdowne MSS. vol. 8.  
50.  
109.

Stowe MSS. vol. 155.

London: Lambeth Palace Library.

MSS. vol. 374.

London: Public Record Office.

State Papers, Domestic, of the reign of Edward VI.

State Papers, Domestic, of the reign of Elizabeth.

State Papers, Domestic, Addenda 1547-1625.

State Papers relating to Scotland of the reign  
of Elizabeth.

State Papers relating to Mary, queen of Scots.

### Theses.

- |                   |                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Crockett, Thomas. | The Life of John Erskine of Dun.<br>Edinburgh D. Litt. 1926.                                                                                           |
| Mildon, W.H.      | Puritanism in Hampshire and the<br>Isle of Wight from the reign of<br>Elizabeth to the Restoration.<br>London Ph. D. 1934.                             |
| Sturge, Chas.     | The Life and Times of John Dudley,<br>Earl of Warwick, and Duke of<br>Northumberland.<br>London Ph. D. 1928.                                           |
| Taylor, L.B.      | The Anglican tendencies in the<br>Scottish Reformation and their<br>bearing on the significance of<br>the Concordat of Leith.<br>Oxford B. Litt. 1932. |
| Wadsworth, G.C.   | The General Assembly of 1610.<br>Edinburgh Ph. D. 1930.                                                                                                |

### C. Printed Sources - records, narratives, etc.

- Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies, edited by  
Thomas Thomson for the Maitland Club. 1839-40.
- Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, volumes III.  
and IV. 1814-1816.
- Acts of the Privy Council of England, volumes  
VIII. to XXIV. 1894-1901.
- Bannatyne Club Miscellany, volume I. and  
volume III. 1827, 1855.
- Burn, J.S. (ed.) Livre des anglois à Genève. 1831.
- Calderwood, David. Altare Damascenum: De Regimine Ecclesiae  
Scoticanæ Epistola: Vindiciae contra  
calumnias Johannis Spotsvodi. 1623.
- Calderwood, David. History of the Kirk of Scotland, vols.  
I. - VI. Wodrow Society, 1843.

- Calendar of Papers relating to the Borders. ed. J. Bain.  
2 vols. 1894.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1547-80, etc.,  
and Addenda 1547-65 etc. 1856 etc.
- Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland,  
ed. M.J. Thorpe. 2 vols. 1858.
- Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary,  
queen of Scots. 11 vols. 1898 etc.
- Camden, Wm. Annales. ed. Hearne, 3 vols. 1717.
- Cardwell, E. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church  
of England. 1839.
- Colville, J. Original Letters, 1582-1603.  
Bannatyne Club. 1858.
- Elizabeth and James VI. Correspondence.  
Camden Society. 1849.
- Fleming, D.H. (ed.) Register of the Kirk Session of St. Andrews.  
S.H.S. 2 vols. 1889.
- Forbes, Pat. Public Transactions of the reign of queen  
Elizabeth. 2 vols. 1740-1.
- Fuller, T. The Church-History of Britain.  
1655.
- Gee (Henry) and Hardy (W.J.) Documents illustrative of  
English Church History. 1896.
- Gorham, G.C. Gleanings (1533-88). 1857.
- Gray, Patrick master of. Letters and Papers.  
Bannatyne Club. 1835.
- Haynes, Sam. State Papers. 1740.
- Historical MSS. Commission Reports. 1870 etc.
- Huguenot Society (London). Publications.
- James VI. Correspondence with Cecil and others.  
Camden Society. 1861.
- Keith, Robt. History of the affairs of Church and State  
in Scotland. 3 vols. 1844-50.
- Kidd, B.J. Documents illustrative of the Continental  
Reformation. 1911.
- Knox, John. Works, ed. David Laing.  
6 vols. 1846-64.
- Lesley, John. The History of Scotland, 1436-1561.  
Bannatyne Club. 1830
- Lincoln Record Society. State of the Church in the reigns  
of Elizabeth and James I. vol. I. 1926.
- Maitland Club Miscellany, parts i and ii. 1833-4.
- Melville, Jas. Autobiography and Diary.  
Wodrow Society. 1842.

- Melville, Sir Jas. Memoirs of his own life.  
Bannatyne Club. 1827.
- Murdin, Wm. State Papers. 1759.
- Napier, M. Memoirs of John Napier of Merchiston.  
1834.
- Naunton, Sir R. Fragmenta Regalia. ed. Arber,  
1870.
- Prothero, G.W. Select Statutes and other  
constitutional documents. 4th. edn. 1913
- Register of Ministers, Readers and Exhorters.  
Maitland Club. 1830.
- Register of the Privy Council of Scotland.  
vols. I-VI. 1877-84.
- Richter, A.L. Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen  
des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. 2 vols. 1846.
- Row, John. The History of the Kirk of Scotland.  
Wodrow Society. 1842.
- Scot, Wm. An Apologetical Narration.  
Wodrow Society. 1846.
- Scottish History Society Misc. I. 1893.
- Sparrow, Anth. A Collection of Articles, Injunctions,  
Canons, etc. 2nd. edn. 1671.
- Spottiswoode, J. History of the Church of Scotland.  
Spottiswoode Society. 1851.
- Spottiswoode, J. Refutatio Libelli de Regimine  
Ecclesiae Scoticanæ. 1620.
- Statutes of the Realm. vols. 3 and 4. 1817, 1819.
- Stow, John. Chronicles. 1605.
- Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation.  
4 vols. in 7 parts. 1824.
- Strype, John. Ecclesiastical Memorials.  
3 vols. in 6 parts. 1822.
- Strype, John. Life and Acts of Edmund Grindal.  
1821.
- Strype, John. Life and Acts of John Whitgift.  
3 vols. 1822.
- Strype, John. Life and Acts of Matthew Parker.  
3 vols. 1821.
- Thomson, Thos. (ed.) The Historie and Life of King  
James the Sext. Bannatyne Club. 1825.
- Usher, R.G. The Presbyterian Movement in the  
Reign of Elizabeth. Camden Soc. 1905.
- Walsingham, Fr. Journal. Camden Society  
Miscellany VI. 1871.
- Warrender Papers, ed. Annie I. Cameron. 2 vols.  
Scottish History Society. 1931, 2.

D. Works of Sixteenth Century Writers.

- Abstract (An) of certain acts of parliament. 1584.
- Adamson, Pat. De sacro pastoris munere tractatus, and  
Poemata Sacra, cum aliis opusculis.  
ed. Volusemus. 1619.
- Arber, Ed. (ed.) A Brieff Discours of the Troubles at  
Frankfort. 1907.
- Arber, Ed. (ed.) An English Garner. 10 vols. 1903.
- Aylmer, John. An Harborowe for faithfull and trewe  
subiectes.... 1559.
- Bacon, Fras. Life and Letters, ed. Spedding.  
7 vols. 1861.
- Bancroft, Rich. A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse the  
9 of Februarie ... 1588. 1588.
- Bancroft, Rich. A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.  
1593.
- Bancroft, Rich. Daungerous Positions and Proceedings.  
1593.
- Bannatyne, R Memorials of Transactions in Scotland,  
Richard. 1569-1573. Bannatyne Club. 1836.
- Barlow, Wm. The Summe and Substance of the Conference...  
at Hampton Court. 1604.
- Barrowe, Henry. A Brief Discoverie of the False Church.  
1590.
- Barrowe, Henry. (?) A petition directed to her most  
excellent maiestie. ?1590.
- Becon, Thos. Catechism. Parker Society. 1844.
- Bernard, Nich. Clavi Trabales. 1661.
- Beza, Theo. A briefe and pithie summe of the Christian  
faith. (trans. Robert Fyll.) 1565.
- Beza, Theo. A Confession of Faith made by Common Consent  
of divers reformed Churches beyond the seas;  
with an exhortation to the reformation of  
the church. 1571.
- Beza, Theo. A discourse of the true and visible marks  
of the Catholick Church. 1582.
- Beza, Theo. Epistolae. 1574.
- Beza, Theo. Icones ... virorum ... illustrium.  
1580.
- Beza, Theo. The iudgement of a most reuerend and  
learned man .... ?1580.
- Boke (The) of the discrypcyon of the images of a verye  
chrysten bysshop and of a counterfayte  
bysshop. ?1536.
- Bradford, John. Sermons, Meditations, etc.  
Parker Society. 1848.

- Bridges, John. A defence of the government established in the Church of England. 1587.
- Browne, Robt. A New Year's Gift. ed. C. Burrage. 1904.
- Browne, Robt. A True and Short Declaration .... ?1584.
- Bruce, Robt. Sermons. 1591.
- Bucer, Martin. Scripta Anglicana. 1577.
- Buchanan, Geo. De Jure Regni apud Scotos. 1579.
- Bullinger, Hen. Decades. Parker Soc. 4 vols. 1849-52.
- Bullinger, Hen. De scripturae sanctae autoritate...; deque episcoporum ... institutione et functione. 1538.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. ed. H. Beveridge. 3 vols. 1846.
- Calvin, John. Letters. ed. J. Bonnet. 2 vols. 1855.
- Calvin, John. Opera. Corpus Reformationum edition. 1834, *etc.*
- Campbell, M.G. (ed.) Discipline or Book of Order of the Reformed Churches of France. 1924.
- Cardwell, Ed. (ed.) The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, a new edition. 1850.
- Carmichael, Jas. Grammaticae Latinae, de Etymologia, liber secundus. 1587.
- Cartwright, Thos. A Reply to an answer .... 1574.
- The Second Replie.... 1575.
- The Rest of the Second Replie. 1577.
- Cooper, Thos. An Admonition to the people of England. 1589.
- Cosin, Rich. Conspiracie for pretended reformation. 1592.
- Cranmer, Thos. Works. Parker Soc. 2 vols. 1844, 6.
- Davidson, John. Ane Dialog betuix a clerk and ane courteour. 1573.
- Davidson, John. D. Bancrofts rashnes in rayling against the church of Scotland. 1590.
- Declaration (A) of the king's majestie's intencion and meaning toward the lait actis of parliament. 1585.
- Directory (A) of church government. facsimile reprint. 1872.
- Erastus, Thos. Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis. 1589.
- (translation by Robert Lee 1844.)

- Fenner, Dudley. A counter-poyson to the answerer to the abstract .... 1584.  
(Copcot replied to this work in his sermon at Paul's Cross in 1584, and Fenner produced A defence of the reasons of the counter-poyson .... 1586.  
Copcot wrote an answer to this defence, and it, with his sermon, is in Lambeth Palace MSS. vol. 374.
- Fenner, Dudley. A defence of the godlie ministers, against the slaunders of D. Bridges .... 1587.
- Fenner, Dudley. Certain godly and learned treatises. 1592.
- Ferguson, David. Tracts MDLXIII-MDLXXII. Bannatyne Club. 1860.
- Frere (W.H.) and Douglas (C.E.). (ed.) Puritan Manifestoes. 1907.
- Fulke, Wm. Works. Parker Society. 1843,8.
- Gilby, Anth. A pleasaunte dialogue, betweene a souldiour of Barwicke and an English chaplaine. 1581.
- Goodman, Chr. How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their subjects .... 1558.
- Grindal, Edmund. Remains. Parker Society. 1843.
- Hooker, Rich. Works, ed. Keble, Church and Paget. 3 vols. 1888.
- Hooper, John. Early Writings) Parker Society. 1843,52.  
Later Writings)
- Informations, or a protestation ... and a treatise ... from Scotland, etc. 1608.
- James VI. and I. Political Works. ed. McIlwain. 1918.
- Jewel, John. Works. Parker Society. 4 vols. 1845-50.
- Knox, John. Historie of the Church of Scotland. 1587.
- Lasco, John à. Opera, ed. Kuyper. 2 vols. 1866.
- Latimer, Hugh. Sermons) Parker Society. 1844,5.  
Remains)
- Lloyd, Chas. (ed.) Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the reign of Henry VIII. 1825.
- Marprelate, Martin. see under Petheram, John.
- Melville, Andrew. Pro supplici evangelicorum ministrorum in Anglia (i.e., Anti-cami-tami-categoria). published with Calderwood's Parasynagma Perthense. 1620.
- Mornay, Philip de. A treatise of the church. Translated by John Field. 1579.
- Mosse, Miles. Scotland's Welcome. 1603.

- Ordinatio Ecclesiastica Regnorum Daniae 1537.
- Oxford University The answers of the Vicechancelour,  
the Doctors, the Proctors, and other the  
Heads of Houses in the Universitie of  
Oxford. 1603.
- Parker, Correspondence. Parker Society. 1853.  
Matthew.
- Parker Society. Original letters relative to the  
English reformation. 2 vols. 1844-7.  
Zurich Letters. 2 vols. 1842-5.
- Parte (A) of a Register. 1593.
- Penry, John. A Briefe Discoverie .... ?1589.
- Penry, John.(?) An humble motion .... 1590.
- Petheram, John. Puritan Discipline Tracts. 5 vols. 1842-6.
- Pilkington, Works. Parker Society. 1842.  
James.
- Poynet, John. A short treatise of politicke power. 1556.
- Remonstrance (A). (The reply to Udall's Demonstration  
of Discipline.) 1590.
- Rogers, T. The catholic doctrine of the Church  
of England. Parker Society. 1854.
- Saravia, De diversis ministrorum evangelii  
Hadrian. gradibus. Trans. by A.W.S. 1840.
- Seconde Parte of a Register. ed. Peel. 2 vols. 1915.
- Smeton, Thos. Ad virulentem Archibaldi Hamiltonii  
apostatae dialogum ... responsio. 1579.
- Stoughton, An assertion for true and Christian  
William. Church-Policie. 1604.
- Sutcliffe, A treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline 1590.  
Matthew. An answer to a certaine libel supplicatorie ...  
1592.
- An answer unto a certaine calumnious letter ...  
1595.
- Throkmorton, The defence of Iob Throkmorton .... 1594.  
Job.
- Travers, A defence of the ecclesiasticall discipline  
Walter. ordayned of God .... 1588.
- Ecclesiasticae disciplinae ... explicatio. 1574.  
Trans. Cartwright. 1574.
- Tyndale, Wm. Doctrinal treatises. Parker Society. 1848.
- Udall, John. The state of the Church of England ...  
(i.e., "Diotrephes") ed. Arber. 1880.
- A demonstration of the trueth of that  
discipline .... 1588.
- ed. Arber. 1880.

- Udall, John. A new discovery of old pontificall practises  
... evinced by their tyrannicall persecution  
of ... John Udall. 1643.  
Whitgift, Works. Parker Society. 3 vols. 1851-3.  
John.  
Wodrow Society Miscellany I. 1844.

### E. Secondary Books.

- Allen, J.W. Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century. 1928.  
Arber, Ed. An introductory sketch to the Martin Marprelate controversy. 1879.  
Baird, H.M. The rise of the Huguenots in France. 2 vols. 1880.  
Theodore Beza. 1899.  
Bonnard, G. La controverse de Martin Marprelate. 1916.  
Borgeaud, Chas. Histoire de l'Université de Genève - L'Académie de Calvin, 1559-1798. 1900.  
Botfield, Beriah. Preface to Original Letters relating to the Ecclesiastical Affairs of Scotland. Bannatyne Club. 1851.  
Brandt, Gerard. History of the Reformation in and about the Low Countries. Engl. trans. 4 vols. 1720.  
Brook. Lives of the Puritans. 3 vols. 1813.  
Benjamin.  
Brown, P.H. John Knox. 2 vols. 1895.  
Burnet, Gilbert. History of the Reformation, ed. Pocock. 7 vols. 1865.  
Burrage, Champlin. The Early English Dissenters. 2 vols. 1912.  
The true story of Robert Browne. 1906.  
John Penry 1913.  
Child, G.W. Church and state under the Tudors. 1890.  
Choisy, E. La Théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin. 1897.  
L'état chrétien calviniste à Genève au temps de Théodore de Bèze. 1902.  
Craven, J.B. Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, 1560-1860. 1907.  
Dale, R.W. A history of English congregationalism. 1907.  
Dalton, Hermann. Johannes à Lasco. 1881.  
(Trans. in part by M.J. Evans, 1886.)  
Davids, T.W. Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity in Essex. 1863.  
Eells, Hastings. Martin Bucer. 1931.  
Figgis, J.N. From Gerson to Grotius, 1414-1625. 1907.

- Figgis, J.N. The Divine Right of Kings. 2nd. edn. 1914.
- Frere, W.H. The English Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 1904.
- Gee, Henry. The Elizabethan Prayer Book and ornaments. 1902.
- Gillon, R.M. John Davidson of Prestonpans. 1936.
- Hannay, R.K. Foundation of the College of Edinburgh (in History of the University of Edinburgh, 1583-1933, 1933.)
- Harvey, A.E. Martin Bucer in England. 1906.
- Henderson, G.D. The Scottish Ruling Elder. 1935.
- Hewat, K. Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation. 1920.
- Heylin, Peter. Aërius Redivivus. 2nd. edn. 1672.
- Hill, Geoff. The English Dioceses. 1900.
- Hume, David. The history of the house and race of Douglas and Angus. 2 vols. 1743.
- Huraut, Ernest. John Knox et ses relations avec les églises réformées du continent. 1902.
- Keith, Robt. Catalogue of Scottish bishops. 1824.
- Kennedy, W.P.M. Elizabethan Episcopal Administration. 3 vols. 1924.
- Lindsay, T.M. A history of the reformation. 2 vols. 1906-7.
- Lorimer, Peter. John Knox and the Church of England. 1875.
- McCrie, Thos. The life of Andrew Melville. 2nd. edn. 2 vols. 1824.
- The life of John Knox. 2nd. edn. 2 vols. 1813.  
1 vol. edn. 1840, reprinted 1874.
- MacEwen, A.R. A history of the Church in Scotland. vol. II. 1918.
- MacGreger, Janet G. The Scottish presbyterian polity. A study of its origins in the sixteenth century. 1926.
- McMillan, Wm. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638. 1931.
- Makower, F. Die Verfassung der Kirche von England. 1894.  
Engl. trans. 1895.
- Martin, Chas. Les Protestants anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin, 1555-1560.. 1915.
- Neal, Daniel. History of the Puritans. new edn. 1822.
- Nicolas, N.H. Life of William Davison. 1823.
- Pascal, Geo. Jean de Lasco. 1894.
- Pearson, A.F.S. Church and State. 1928.

- Pearson, A.F.S. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism. 1925.
- Peel, Albert. The first congregational churches. 1920.
- Petrie, Alex. A compendious history of the catholick church. 2 vols. 1662.
- Pierce, Wm. An historical introduction to the Marprelate Tracts. 1909.
- Pierce, Wm. John Penry's life and writings. 1923.
- Pierce, Wm. The Marprelate Tracts. 1911.
- Read, Conyers. Mr Secretary Walsingham and the policy of queen Elizabeth. 1925.
- Reyburn, H..Y. Calvin and Scotland (Scottish Church History Society vol. I) 1926.
- Reyburn, H.Y. John Calvin, his life letters and work. 1914.
- Scott, Hew. Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae. 7 vols. 1915.
- Smyth, C.H. Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI. 1926.
- Usher, R.G. The Reconstruction of the English Church. 2 vols. 1910.
- Vetter, Theo. Relations between England and Zurich during the reformation. 1904.
- White, F.O. Lives of the Elizabethan bishops. 1898.
- Wilson, H.A. Episcopacy and Unity. 1912.
- Wodrow, Robt. Collections upon the lives of the reformers and most eminent ministers.  
Maitland Club. 2 vols. 1834-5.  
Biographical collections.  
New Spalding Club. 1890.