



ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, LUNENBURG, N.S.—See Page 97.

An act of this kind was peculiarly inconsistent in Laud, because of his well-known Church views, which were of a rigorously "high" character. In fact, the promulgation of these views brought him into unpleasant relationship with the members of his university, notably with Dr. George Abbot, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. But while it did this, it also brought him into public notice, with the result that in 1621 he was made Bishop of St. David's. The king (James) had some misgivings in appointing him to this position, for he had doubts as to his being able to rule wisely as a bishop.

While Laud was accused bitterly by rabid Puritans of being in league with Rome, and while he was unhesitatingly called "a black-hearted papist," yet it is certain that his controversy with Fisher, the Jesuit, on the claims of the Papal Church drew forth from him as powerful arguments probably as could be adduced against the arrogant position assumed by the Roman see. This controversy brought him into high favor with Buckingham, and, through him, with Prince Charles. Buckingham's mother had shown a strong desire to go over to the Church of Rome, and the controversy with Fisher was entered upon to prevent this if possible, and, though it had not the desired effect, it brought Laud into favor in high places.

In 1628 he was made Bishop of London, and in 1633, as we have seen, he was advanced to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. At this time he was sixty years old. The position he had to occupy was a trying one, for he was obliged to be as much of a politician as an ecclesiastic.

He was next to the king in importance and power, and at his home, Lambeth Palace, guards of honor, servants in livery, uniformed horsemen, showed that a great man dwelt there. The king required him to live in this great pomp and state, and there were times when, to gratify the frivolous queen, the Archbishop was obliged to witness scenes of worldly festivities which caused great offence to his Puritan foes.

Laud started with this great and powerful faction against him, and every move that he made was treasured up and colored deeply, so as to be brought against him if opportunity for doing so should occur. Yet his offences do not seem to have been very great. He was a man who believed strongly in

having things done externally with all due decency and order. One great cause of offence was the removal of the Lord's table in some of the churches from the body of the church to the east end, and requiring the communicants to receive the Holy Communion kneeling.

One of the first things said of Laud after his elevation to the primacy was that he had been offered a cardinal's hat. As he stood in no favor whatever with Rome, but, owing to his late controversy with Fisher, very much the reverse, it is difficult to understand how this could have been. Perhaps it was a trap laid for him by his enemies; perhaps it was a test by some who really wished to try him; but whatever the reason the proffer was promptly declined. His reply was that he could not "suffer *that* till Rome was otherwise than it was at the present time."

The condition of the clergy at this time was anything but satisfactory. Many of them were without livings or employment of any kind, and in consequence were found engaged in followings and practices which brought no credit upon "the cloth." Laud, therefore, required the enforcement of the canon which required that no person was to be admitted to holy orders unless he had a "title"—unless, that is, there was some place or position that he was immediately to occupy. This rule is largely observed by Anglican bishops at the present day in all parts of the globe. Wandering and unsettled parsons are not to be encouraged.

Laud was also called upon to deal with the "Sunday question," which was a different question then from what it is at the present day.