

[taken from]
THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS,
OR
PROTESTANT NONCOMFORISTS;
FROM
THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688,
COMPRISING

an Account of their Principles;

THEIR ATTEMPTS FOR A FARTHER REFORMATION IN THE CHURCH; THEIR SUFFERINGS;
AND THE LIVES AND CHARACTERS OF THEIR MOST CONSIDERABLE DIVINES.

BY DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

REPRINTED

FROM THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION: WITH HIS LIFE OF THE AUTHOR
AND ACCOUNT OF HIS WRITINGS.
REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY JOHN O. CHOULES, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

V O L. I.

NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
329 & 331 PEARL STREET,
FRANKLIN SQUARE.
1855.

CHAPTER II:

REIGN OF KING EDWARD VI.

THE sole right and authority of reforming the Church of England were now vested in the crown; and, by, the Act of Succession, in the king's council, if he were under age. This was preferable to a foreign jurisdiction; but it can hardly be proved that either the king or his council have a right to judge for the whole nation, and impose upon the people what religion they think best, without their consent. The reformation of the Church of England was begun and carried on by the king, assisted by Archbishop Cranmer and a few select divines. The clergy in convocation did not move in it but as they were directed and overawed by their superiors; nor did they consent till they were modelled to the designs of the court.

Our learned historian, Bishop Burnet,¹ endeavours to justify this conduct, by putting the following question, "What must be done when the major part of a church is, according to the conscience of the supreme civil magistrate, in an error, and the lesser part is in the right?" In answer to this question, his lordship observes, that "there is no promise in Scripture that the majority of pastors shall be in the right; on the contrary, it is certain that truth, separate from interest, has few votaries. Now, as it is not reasonable that the smaller part should depart from their sentiments because opposed by the majority, whose interests led them to oppose the Reformation, therefore they might take sanctuary in the authority of the prince and the law." But is there any promise in Scripture that the king or prince shall be always in the right? or is it reasonable that the majority should depart from their sentiments in religion because the prince, with the minority, are of another mind? If we ask what authority Christian princes have to bind the consciences of their subjects, by penal laws, to worship God after their manner, his lordship answers, This was practised in the Jewish state. But it ought to be remembered that the Jewish state was a theocracy; that God himself was their king, and their chief magistrates only his vicegerents or deputies; that the laws of Moses were the laws of God; and the penalties annexed to them as much of Divine appointment as the laws themselves. It is therefore absurd to make the special commission of the Jewish magistrates a model for the rights of Christian princes. But his lordship adds, "It is the first law in Justinian's code, made by the Emperor Theodosius, that all should everywhere, under severe pain, follow that faith that was received by Damasius, bishop of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria. And why might not the king and laws of England give the like authority to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York?" I answer, Because Theodosius's law was an unreasonable usurpation upon the right of conscience. If the Apostle Paul, who was an inspired person, had not dominion over the faith of the churches, how came the Roman emperor, or other Christian princes, by such a jurisdiction, which has no foundation in the law of nature or in the New Testament?

His lordship goes on, “it is not to be imagined how any changes in religion can be made by sovereign princes, unless an authority be lodged with them of giving the sanction of a law to the sounder, though the lesser part, of church; for as princes and lawgivers are not tied to an implicit obedience to clergymen, but are left to the freedom of their own discerning so they must have a power to choose what side to be of, where things are much inquired into.” And why have not the clergy and the common people the same power? why must they be tied to an implicit faith in their princes and lawgivers? Is there any promise in the Word of God that princes and lawgivers shall be infallible, and always judge right which is the sounder, though the lesser part of a church? “If,” as his lordship adds, “the major part of synods cannot be supposed to be in matters of faith so assisted from Heaven that the lesser part must necessarily acquiesce in their decrees, or that the civil powers must always make laws according to their votes, especially when interest does visibly turn the scale,” how can the prince or civil magistrate depend upon such assistance? Can we be sure that interest or prejudice will never turn the scale with him; or that he has a better acquaintance with the truths of the Gospel than his clergy or people? It is highly reasonable that the prince should choose for himself what side he will be of, when things are much inquired into; but then let the clergy and people have the same liberty, and neither the major nor minor part impose upon the other, as long as they entertain no principles inconsistent with the safety of the government. “When the Christian belief had not the support of law, every bishop taught his own flock the best he could, and gave his neighbours such an account of his faith, at or soon after his consecration, as satisfied them; and so,” says his lordship, “they maintained the unity of the Church.” And why might it not be so still? Is not this better, upon all accounts, than to force people to profess what they cannot believe, or to propagate religion with the sword, as was too much the case with our Reformers? If the penal laws had been taken away, and the points in controversy between Protestants and papists had been left to a free and open debate, while the civil magistrate had stood by and only kept the peace, the Reformation would certainly have taken place in due time, and proceeded in a much more unexceptionable manner than it did.

To return to the history. King Edward VI. came to the crown at the age of nine years and four months; a prince for learning and piety, for acquaintance with the world, and application to business, the very wonder of his age. His father, by his last will and testament, named sixteen persons executors of his will, and regents of the kingdom, till his son should be eighteen years of age: out of these, the Earl of Hertford, the king’s uncle, was chosen protector of the king’s realms, and governor of his person. Besides these, twelve were added as a privy council, to be assisting to them. Among the regents, some were for the old religion, and others for the new; but it soon appeared that the Reformers had the ascendant, the young king having been educated in their principles by his tutor, Dr. Cox, and the new protector, his uncle, being on the same side.

The majority of the bishops and inferior clergy were on the side of popery, but the government was in the hands of the Reformers, who began immediately to relax the rigours of the late reign.² The persecution upon the six articles was stopped; the prison doors were set open; and several who had been forced to quit the kingdom for their religion, returned home, as, Miles Coverdale, afterward Bishop of Exeter; John Hooper, afterward Bishop of Gloucester; John Rogers, the protomartyr; and many others, who were preferred to considerable benefices in the Church. The reforming divines, being delivered from their too awful subjection to the late king, began to open against the abuses of popery. Dr. Ridley and others preached vehemently against images in churches, and inflamed the people, so that in many places they outran the law, and pulled them down without authority. Some preached against the lawfulness of soul-masses and obits; though the late king, by his last will and testament; had left a large sum of money to have them continued at Windsor, where he was buried, and for a frequent distribution of alms for the repose of his soul, and its deliverance out of purgatory; but this charity was soon after converted to other uses. The popish clergy were alarmed at these things, and insisted strongly that till the king, their supreme head, was of age, religion should continue in the state in which King Henry left it. But the Reformers averred that the king's authority was the same while he was a minor as when he was of age; and that they had heard the late king declare his resolution to turn the mass into a communion if he had lived a little longer, upon which they thought it their duty to proceed.

After the solemnity of the king's coronation, the regents appointed a royal visitation, and commanded the clergy to preach nowhere but in their parish churches without license, till the visitation was over. The kingdom was divided into six circuits, two gentlemen, a civilian, a divine, and a register, being appointed for each. The divines were by their preaching to instruct the people in the doctrines of the Reformation, and to bring them off from their old superstitions. The visitation began in the month of August; six of the gravest divines and most popular preachers attended it: their names were Dr. Ridley, Dr. Madew, Mr. Briggs, Cottisford, Joseph, and Farrar. A book of homilies,³ or sermons, upon the chief points of the Christian faith,⁴ drawn up chiefly by Archbishop Cranmer, was printed, and ordered to be left with every parish priest, to supply the defect of preaching, which few of the clergy at that time were capable of performing. Cranmer communicated it to Gardiner, and would fain have gained his approbation of it; but he was so inflamed at being left out of the king's will, that he constantly opposed all innovation till the king should be of age.

With these homilies the visitors were to deliver sundry injunctions from the king, to the number of thirty-six.⁵

The bishops were enjoined to see the articles put in execution, and to preach themselves four times a year, unless they had a reasonable excuse. They were to give orders to none but such as were able to preach, and to recall

their licenses from others. The injunctions were to be observed under the pains of excommunication, sequestration, or deprivation.

In bidding of their prayers, they were to remember the king, their supreme head, the queen-dowager, the king's two sisters, the lord-protector, and the council; the nobility, the clergy, and the commons, of this realm. The custom of bidding prayer, which is still in use in the Church, is a relic of popery. Bishop Burnet⁶ has preserved the form, as it was in use before the Reformation, which was this: After the preacher had named and opened his text, he called on the people to go to their prayers, telling them what they were to pray for. "Ye shall pray," says he, "for the king, for the pope, for the Holy Catholic Church," &c. After which all the people said their beads in a general silence, and the minister kneeled down likewise and said his: they were to say a Pater-noster, Ave Maria, Deus misereatur nostri, Domine salvum fac regem, Gloria Patri, &c., and then the sermon proceeded. How sadly this bidding of prayer has been abused of late by some divines, to the entire omission of the duty itself, is too well known to need a remark!

Most of the bishops complied with the injunctions, except Bonner of London, and Gardiner of Winchester. Bonner offered a reserve, but that not being accepted, he made an absolute submission; nevertheless, he was sent for some time to the Fleet for contempt. Gardiner having protested against the injunctions and homilies as contrary to the law of God, was sent also to the Fleet, where he continued till after the Parliament was over, and was then released by a general act of grace.

The Parliament that met November the 9th made several alterations in favour of the Reformation. They repealed all laws that made anything treason but what was specified in the act of 25 Edward III., and two of the statutes against Lollardies. They repealed the statute of the six articles, with the acts that followed in explanation of it; all laws in the late reign declaring anything felony that was not so declared before; together with the act that made the king's proclamation of equal authority with an act of Parliament. Besides the repeal of these laws, sundry new ones were enacted,⁷ as "that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be administered in both kinds," agreeably to Christ's first institution, and the practice of the Church for five hundred years: and that all private masses should be put down: an act concerning the admission of bishops into their sees; which sets forth that the manner of choosing bishops by a conge d'elire, being but the shadow of an election all bishops, hereafter, shall be appointed by the king's letters patent only, and shall continue the exercise of their jurisdiction during their natural life, if they behave well.⁸ One of the first patents with this clause is that of Dr. Barlow, bishop of Bath and Wells,⁹ bearing date February 3, in the second year of the king's reign; but all the rest of the bishops afterward took out letters for their bishoprics with the same clause. In this the archbishop had a principal hand, for it was his judgment that the exercise of all episcopal jurisdiction depended upon the prince; and that, as he gave it, he might restrain or take it away at his pleasure.¹⁰

Cranmer thought the exercise of his own episcopal authority ended with the late king's life, and, therefore, would not act as archbishop till he had a new commission from King Edward.¹¹

In the same statute it is declared "that, since all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, was derived from the king, therefore, all processes in the spiritual court should from henceforward be carried on in the king's name, and be sealed with the king's seal, as in the other courts of common law, except the Archbishop of Canterbury's courts, only in all faculties and dispensations; but all collations, presentations, or letters of orders, were to pass under the bishops' proper seals as formerly." By this law, causes concerning wills and marriages were to be tried in the king's name; but this was repealed in the next reign.

Lastly: The Parliament gave the king all the lands for maintenance of chantries not possessed by his father; all legacies given for obits, anniversaries, lamps, in churches; together with all guild lands, which any fraternity enjoyed on the same account:¹² the money was to be converted to the maintenance of grammar-schools, but the hungry courtiers shared it among themselves. After this the houses were prorogued from the 24th of December to the 20th of April following.

The convocation that sat with the Parliament did little; the majority being on the side of popery, the archbishop was afraid of venturing anything of importance with them; nor are any of their proceedings upon record; but Mr. Strype has collected, from the notes of a private member, that the lower house agreed to the communion in both kinds; and that, upon a division about the lawfulness of priests' marriages, fifty-three were for the affirmative, and twenty two for the negative.¹³

The Reformation in Germany lying under great discouragements by the victorious arms of Charles V., who had this year taken the Duke of Saxony prisoner, and dispossessed him of his electorate, several of the foreign Reformers, who had taken sanctuary in those parts, were forced to seek it elsewhere. Among these, Peter Martyr, a Florentine, was invited by the archbishop, in the king's name, into England, and had the divinity-chair given him at Oxford; Bucer had the same at Cambridge; Ochinus and Fagius, two other learned foreigners, had either pensions or canonries, with a dispensation of residence, and did good service in the universities; but Fagius soon after died.

The common people were very much divided in their opinions about religion, some being zealous for preserving the popish rites, and others no less averse to them. The country people were very tenacious of their old shows, as processions, wakes, carrying of candles on Candlemas Day, and palms on Palm Sundays, &c., while others looked upon them as heathenish rites, absolutely inconsistent with the simplicity of the Gospel. This was so effectually represented to the council by Cranmer, that a proclamation was published, February 6, 1548, forbidding the continuance of them. And for putting an end to all contests about images that had been abused to superstition, an order was

published February 11th, that all images whatsoever should be taken out of churches; and the bishops were commanded to execute it in their several dioceses.¹⁴ Thus the churches were emptied of all those pictures and statues which had for divers ages been the objects of the people's adoration.

The clergy were no less divided than the laity, the pulpits clashing one against the another, and tending to stir up sedition and rebellion the king, therefore, after the example of his father, and by advice of his council, issued out a proclamation, September 3d, in the second year of his reign, to prohibit all preaching throughout all his dominions. The words are these: "The king's highness, minding shortly to have one uniform order throughout this realm, and to put an end to all controversies in religion, so far as God shall give grace, doth at this present, and till such time as the said order shall be set forth, inhibit all manner of persons whatsoever to preach in open audience, in the pulpit or otherwise; to the intent that the whole clergy, in the mean space, may apply themselves in prayer to Almighty God for the better achieving the same most godly intent and purpose."

At the same time a committee of divines was appointed to examine and reform the offices of the Church:¹⁵ these were the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; the Bishops of London, Durham, Worcester, Norwich, St. Asaph, Salisbury, Coventry and Lichfield, Carlisle, Bristol, St. David's, Ely, Lincoln, Chichester, Hereford, Westminster, and Rochester; with the Doctors Cox, May, Taylor, Heins, Robertson, and Redmayn. They began with the sacrament of the eucharist, in which they made but little alteration, leaving the office of the mass as it stood, only adding to it so much as changed it into a communion of both kinds. Auricular confession was left indifferent. The priest, having received the sacrament himself, was to turn to the people and read the exhortation then followed a denunciation, requiring such as had not repented to withdraw, lest the devil should enter into them as he did into Judas. After a little pause, to see if any would withdraw, followed a confession of sins and absolution, the same as now in use; after which the sacrament was administered in both kinds, without elevation. This office was published, with a proclamation declaring his majesty's intentions to proceed to a farther reformation, and willing his subjects not to run before his direction, assuring them of his earnest zeal in this affair, and hoping they would quietly tarry for it.

In reforming the other offices, they examined and compared the Romish missals of Sarum, York, Hereford, Bangor, and Lincoln; and out of them composed the morning and evening service, almost in the same form as it stands at present; only there was no confession nor absolution. It would have obviated many objections if the committee had thrown aside the mass-book, and composed a uniform service in the language of Scripture, without any regard to the Church of Rome; but this they were not aware of, or the times would not bear it. From the same materials, they compiled a litany, consisting of many short petitions, interrupted by suffrages; it is the same with that which is now used, except the petition to be delivered from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome,

and all his detestable enormities; which, in the review of the liturgy in Queen Elizabeth's time, was struck out.

In the administration of baptism, a cross was to be made on the child's forehead and breast, and the devil was exorcised to go out, and enter no more into him. The child was to be dipped three times in the font, on the right and left side, and on the breast, if not weak. A white vestment was to be put upon it, in token of innocence; and it was to be anointed on the head, with a short prayer for the unction of the Holy Ghost.

In order to confirmation, those that came were to be catechised; then the bishop was to sign them with the cross, and lay his hands upon them, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

If sick persons desired to be anointed, the priest might do it upon the forehead and breast, only making the sign of the cross, with a short prayer for his recovery.

In the office of burial, the soul of the departed person is recommended to the mercy of God; and the minister is to pray that the sins which he committed in this world may be forgiven him, and that he may be admitted into heaven, and his body raised at the last day.

This was the first service-book or liturgy of King Edward VI. We have no certain account of the use of any liturgies in the first ages of the Church, those of St. Mark, St. James, and that of Alexandria, being manifestly spurious. It is not till the latter end of the fourth century that they are first mentioned; and then it was left to the care of every bishop to draw up a form of prayer for his own church. In St. Austin's time they began to consult about an agreement of prayers, that none should be used without common advice; but still there was no uniformity. Nay, in the darkest-times of popery, there was a vast variety of forms in different sees; witness the offices *secundum usum Sarum*, Bangor, York, &c. But our Reformers split upon this rock, sacrificing the peace of the Church to a mistaken necessity of an exact uniformity of doctrine and worship, in which it was impossible for all men to agree. Had they drawn up divers forms, or left a discretionary latitude for tender consciences, as to some particular phrases, all men would have been easy, and the Church more firmly united than ever.

The like is to be observed as to rites and ceremonies of an indifferent nature. Nothing is more certain than that the Church of Rome indulged a variety. Every religious order (says Bishop Burnet¹⁶) had their peculiar rites, with the saints' days that belonged to their order, and services for them; but our Reformers thought proper to insist upon an exact uniformity of habits and ceremonies for all the clergy; though they knew many of them were exceptionable, having been abused to idolatry, and were a yoke which some of the most resolved Protestants could not bear. Nay, so great a stress was laid upon the square cap and surplice, that, rather than dispense with the use of them to some tender minds, the bishops were content to part with their best friends, and hazard the Reformation into the hands of the papists. If there must be hab-

its and ceremonies for decency and order, why did they not appoint new ones rather than retain the old, which had been idolized by the papists to such a degree as to be thought to have a magical virtue, or a sacramental efficacy? Or, if they meant this, why did they not speak out, and go on with the consecration of them?

The council had it some time under consideration whether those vestments in which the priests used to officiate should be continued. It was objected against them, by those who had been confessors for the Protestant religion, and others, that “the habits were a part of the train of the mass; that the people had such a superstitious opinion of them as to think they gave an efficacy to their prayers, and that Divine service said without this apparel was insignificant whereas, at best, they were but inventions of popery, and ought to be destroyed with that idolatrous religion.”¹⁷ But it was said, on the other hand, by those divines that had stayed in England, and weathered the storm of King Henry’s tyranny by a politic compliance, and concealment of their opinions, that “Church habits and ceremonies were indifferent, and might be appointed by the magistrates; that white was the colour of the priests’ garments in the Mosaical dispensation; and that it was a natural expression of the purity and decency that became priests. That they ought to depart no farther from the Church of Rome than she had departed from the practice of the primitive Church.”

Besides, “clergy were then so poor that they could scarce afford to buy themselves decent clothes.” But did the priests buy their own garments? could not the parish provide a gown, or some other decent apparel, for the priest to minister in sacred things, as well as a square cap, a surplice, a cope, or a tippet? were these the habits of the primitive clergy before the rise of papacy? But upon these slender reasons the garments were continued, which soon after divided the Reformers among themselves, and gave rise to the two parties of Conformists and Nonconformists; Archbishop Cranmer and Ridley being at the head of the former, and bishop Hooper, Rogers, with the foreign divines, being patrons of the latter.

The Parliament, after several prorogations, met the 24th of November, 1548; and, on the 15th of January following, the act confirming the new liturgy passed both houses, The Bishops of London, Durham, Norwich Carlisle Hereford, Worcester, Westminster, and Chichester protecting. The preamble sets forth “that the Archbishop of Canterbury, with other learned bishops and divines, having, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with one uniform agreement, concluded upon an order of Divine worship agreeably to Scripture and the primitive Church, the Parliament having considered the book, gave the king their most humble thanks, and enacted, that from the feast of Whitsunday, 1549, all divine offices should be performed according to it; and that such of the clergy as refused to do it, or officiated in any other manner, should, upon the first conviction, suffer six months’ imprisonment, and forfeit a year’s profits of his benefice; for the second offence, forfeit all his Church preferments,

and suffer a year's imprisonment; and for the third offence, imprisonment for life. Such as writ or printed against the book were to be fined £10 for the first offence, £20 for the second, and to forfeit all their goods, and be imprisoned for life for the third." It ought to be observed, that this service-book was not laid before the convocation, nor any representative body of the clergy; and whereas it is said to be done by one universal agreement, it is certain that four of the bishops employed in drawing it up protested against it, viz., the Bishops of Norwich, Hereford, Chichester, and Westminster. But if the liturgy had been more perfect than it was, the penalties by which it was imposed were severe and unchristian, contrary to Scripture and primitive antiquity.¹⁸

As soon as the act took place, the council appointed visitors to see that the new liturgy was received all over England. Bonner, who resolved to comply in everything, sent to the dean and residentiary of St. Paul's to use it; and all the clergy were so pliable, that the visitors returned no complaints; only that the Lady Mary continued to have mass said in her house, which, upon the intercession of the emperor, was indulged her for a time.¹⁹ Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, continued still a prisoner in the Tower, without being brought to a trial, for refusing to submit to the council's supremacy while the king was under age, and for some other complaints against him. His imprisonment was certainly illegal: it was unjustifiable to keep a man in prison two years upon a bare complaint; and then, without producing any evidence in support of the charge, to sift him by articles and interrogatories: this looked too much like an inquisition; but the king being in the pope's room (says Bishop Burnet²⁰), there were some things gathered from the canon law, and from the proceedings ex officio, that rather excused than justified the hard measures he met with. When the council sent Secretary Petre to the bishop, to know whether he would subscribe to the use of the service-book, he consented, with some exceptions, which, not being admitted, he was threatened with deprivation.

But the new liturgy did not sit well upon the minds of the country people, who were for going on in their old way, of wakes, processions, church ales, holydays, censing of images, and other theatrical rites, which strike the minds of the vulgar: these, being encouraged by the old monks and friars, rose up in arms in several counties, but were soon dispersed. The most formidable insurrections were those of Devonshire and Norfolk. In Devonshire they were ten thousand strong, and sent the following articles or demands to the king:

1. "That the six articles should be restored.
2. "That mass should be said in Latin.
3. "That the host should be elevated and adored.
4. "That the sacrament should be given but in one kind.
5. "That images should be set up in churches.
6. "That the souls in purgatory should be prayed for.
7. "That the Bible should be called in, and prohibited.
8. "That the new service-book should be laid aside, and the old religion restored."

An answer was sent from court to these demands; but nothing prevailed on the enraged multitude, whom the priests inflamed with all the artifice they could devise, carrying the host about the camp in a cart, that all might see and adore it. They besieged the city of Exeter, and reduced it to the last extremity; but the inhabitants defended it with uncommon bravery, till they were relieved by the Lord Russell, who with a very small force entered the town and dispersed the rebels. The insurrection in Norfolk was headed by one Ket, a tanner, who assumed to himself the power of judicature under an old oak, called from thence the Oak of Reformation. He did not pretend much of religion, but to place new counsellors about the king, in order to suppress the greatness of the gentry, and advance the privileges of the commons. The rebels were twenty thousand strong; but the Earl of Warwick, with six thousand foot and fifteen hundred horse, quickly dispersed them. Several of the leaders of both rebellions were executed, and Ket was hanged in chains. The hardships the Reformers underwent in the late reign from the six articles, should have made them tender of the lives of those who differed from the present standard. Cranmer himself had been a papist, a Lutheran, and was now a Sacramentary, and in every change guilty of inexcusable severities; while he was a Lutheran, he consented to the burning of John Lambert and Anne Askew, for those very doctrines for which he himself afterward suffered. He bore hard upon the papists, stretching the law to keep their most active leaders in prison; and this year he imbrued his hands in the blood of a poor frantic woman, Joan Bocher, more fit for Bedlam than a stake; which was owing, not to any cruelty in the archbishop's temper, but by those miserable persecuting principles by which he was governed.

Among others that fled out of Germany into England, from the Rustic war, there were some that went by the name of Anabaptists [disseminating their errors, and making proselytes], who, besides the principle of adult baptism, held several wild opinions about the Trinity, the Virgin Mary, and the person of Christ.²¹ Complaint being made of them to the council, April 12th, a commission was ordered to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Ely, Worcester [Westminster], Chichester, Lincoln, Rochester [Sir William Petre, Sir Thomas Smith, Dr. Cox, Dr. May], and some others, any three being a quorum, to examine and search after all Anabaptists, heretics, or contemners of the common prayer, whom they were to endeavour to reclaim, and after penance to give them absolution.; but if they continued obstinate, they were to excommunicate, imprison, and deliver them to the secular arm. This was little better than a Protestant inquisition. People had generally thought that all the statutes for burning heretics had been repealed; but it was now said that heretics were to be burned by the common law of England, and that the statutes were only for directing the manner of conviction; so that the repealing them did not take away that which was grounded upon a writ at common law. Several tradesmen that were brought before the commissioners abjured; but Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent, obstinately maintained that "Christ was not truly in-

carnate of the Virgin, whose flesh being sinful, he could not partake of it; but the Word, by the consent of the inward man in the Virgin, took flesh of her.” These were her words: a scholastic nicety not capable of doing much mischief, and far from deserving so severe a punishment. The poor woman could not reconcile the spotless purity of Christ’s human nature with his receiving flesh from a sinful creature; and for this she is declared an obstinate heretic, and delivered over to the secular power to be burned. When the compassionate young king could not prevail with himself to sign the warrant for her execution, Cranmer with his superior learning was employed to persuade him; he argued from the practice of the Jewish Church in stoning blasphemers, which rather silenced his highness than satisfied him for when at last he yielded to the archbishop’s importunity, he told him, with tears in his eyes, that if he did wrong, since it was in submission to his authority, he should answer for it to God.²² This struck the archbishop with surprise, but yet he suffered the sentence to be executed.²³

Nor did his grace renounce his burning principles as long as he was in power; for, about two years after, he went through the same bloody work again. One George Van Paris, a Dutchman, being convicted of saying that God the Father was only God, and that Christ was not very God, was dealt with to abjure, but refusing, he was condemned in the same manner with Joan of Kent, and on the 25th of April, 1552, was burned in Smithfield; he was a man of a strict and virtuous life, and very devout; he suffered with great constancy of mind, kissing the stake and fagots that were to burn him. No part of Archbishop Cranmer’s life exposed him more than this: it was now said by the papists that they saw men of harmless lives might be put to death for heresy by the confession of the Reformers themselves. In all the books published in Queen Mary’s days, justifying her severities against Protestants, these instances were always produced; and when Cranmer himself was brought to the stake, they called it a just retaliation. But neither this, nor any other arguments, could convince the divines of this age of the absurdity and wickedness of putting men to death for conscience’ sake.

Bonner, bishop of London, being accused of remissness in not settling the new service-book throughout his diocese, and being suspected of disaffection to the government, was enjoined to declare publicly, in a sermon at St. Paul’s Cross, his belief of the king’s authority while under age, and his approbation of the new service-book, with some other articles; which he not performing to the council’s satisfaction, was cited before the court of delegates, and after several hearings, in which he behaved with great arrogance, sentence of deprivation was pronounced against him, September 23d, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Ridley, Bishop of Rochester, Secretary Smith, and the Dean of St.

Paul's. It was thought hard to proceed to such extremities with a man for a mere omission, for Bonner pleaded that he forgot the article of the king's authority in his sermon; and it was yet harder to add imprisonment to deprivation: but he, lived to take a severe revenge upon his judges in the next reign. The vacant see was filled up with Dr. Ridley, who, on the 24th of February, 1549-50, was declared Bishop of London and Westminster, the two bishoprics being united in him; but his consecration was deferred to the next year.

The Parliament that met the 14th of November revived the act of the late king, empowering his majesty to reform the canon law, by naming thirty-two persons, viz., sixteen of the spirituality, of whom four to be bishops; and sixteen of the temporality, of whom four to be common lawyers, who within three years should compile a body of ecclesiastical laws, which, not being contrary to the statute law, should be published by the king's warrant under the great seal, and have the force of laws in the ecclesiastical courts. This design was formed, and very far advanced in King Henry VIII.'s time, but the troubles that attended the last part of his reign prevented the finishing it. It was now resumed, and in pursuance of this act a commission was first given to eight persons, viz., two bishops, two divines, two doctors of law, and two common lawyers, who were to prepare materials for the review of the thirty-two; but the preface to the printed book says that Cranmer did almost the whole himself.²⁴ It was not finished till the month of February, 1552-53, when another commission was granted to thirty-two persons to revise it, of whom the former eight were a part, viz., eight bishops, eight divines, eight civilians, and eight common lawyers; they divided themselves into four classes, and the amendments of each class were communicated to the whole. Thus the work was finished, being digested into fifty-one titles. It was translated into Latin by Dr. Hadden and Sir John Cheek; but before it received the royal confirmation the king died; nor was it ever revived in the succeeding reigns. Archbishop Parker first published it in the year 1571, under the title of *Reformatio Legum Anglicarum, &c.*, and it was reprinted 1640. By this book Cranmer seems to have softened his burning principles; for though, under the third title of judgments for heresy, he lays a very heavy load upon the back of an obstinate heretic, as that "he shall be declared infamous, incapable of public trust, or of being witness in any court, or of having power to make a will, or of having the benefit of the law," yet there is no mention of capital proceedings.

Another remarkable act, passed this session,²⁵ was for ordaining ministers; it appoints "that such forms of ordaining ministers as should be set forth by the advice of six prelates and six divine; to be named by the king, and authorized under the great seal, should be used after April next, and no other." Here is no mention again of a convocation or synod of divines; nor do the Parliament reserve to themselves a right of judgment, but intrust everything absolutely with the crown. The committee soon finished their Ordinal, which is almost the same with that now in use. They take no notice in their book of the lower orders in the Church of Rome, as subdeacons, readers, acolytes, &c., but confine

themselves to bishops, priests, and deacons; and here it is observable that the form of ordaining a priest and a bishop is the same we yet use, there being no express mention in the words of ordination whether it be for the one or the other office:²⁶ this has been altered of late years, since a distinction of the two orders has been so generally admitted; but that was not the received doctrine of these times.²⁷ The committee struck out most of the modern rites of the Church of Rome, and contented themselves, says Bishop Burnet, with those mentioned in Scripture, viz., imposition of hands, and prayer. The gloves, the sandals, the mitre, the ring, and crosier, which had been used in consecrating bishops, were laid aside. The anointing, the giving consecrated vestments, the delivering into the hands vessels for consecrating the eucharist, with a power to offer sacrifice for the dead and living, which had been the custom in the ordination of a priest, were also omitted. But when the bishop ordained, he was to lay one hand on the priest's head, and with his other hand to give him a Bible, with a chalice and bread in it. The chalice and bread are now omitted, as is the pastoral staff in the consecration of a bishop. By the rule of this Ordinal, a deacon was not to be ordained before twenty-one, a priest before twenty-four, nor a bishop before he was thirty years of age.

The council went on with pressing the new liturgy upon the people, who were still inclined in many places to the old service; but, to put it out of their power to continue it, it was ordered that all clergymen should deliver up, to such persons whom the king should appoint, all their old antiphonals, missals, grails, processions, legends, pies, portuasses, &c., and to see to the observing one uniform order in the Church; which the Parliament confirmed, requiring, farther, all that had any images in their house that had belonged to any church, to deface them; and to dash out of their primers all prayers to the saints.

1550. Ridley, being now bishop of London, resolved upon a visitation of his diocese. His injunctions were, as usual, to inquire into the doctrines and manners of the clergy;²⁸ but the council sent him a letter in his majesty's name, to see that all altars were taken down, and to require the churchwardens of every parish to provide a table decently covered, and to place it in such part of the choir or chancel as should be most meet, so that the ministers and communicants should be separated from the rest of the people. The same injunctions were given to the rest of the bishops, as appears by the collection of Bishop Sparrow. Ridley began with his own cathedral at St. Paul's, where he ordered the wall on the back side of the altar to be broken down, and a decent table to be placed in its room; and this was done in most churches throughout the province of Canterbury. The reasons for this alteration were these

1. "Because our Saviour instituted the sacrament at a table, and not at an altar.
2. "Because Christ is not to be sacrificed over again, but his body and blood to be spiritually eaten and drunk at the holy supper; for which a table is more proper than an altar.

3. "Because the Holy Ghost, speaking of the Lord's Supper, calls it the Lord's table, 1 Cor., x., 21, but nowhere an altar.

4. "The canons of the Council of Nice, as well as the fathers St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, call it the Lord's table; and though they sometimes call it an altar, it is to be understood figuratively.

5. "An altar has relation to a sacrifice; so that if we retain the one we must admit the other; which would give great countenance to mass-priests.

6. "There are many passages in ancient writers that show that communion-tables were of wood; that they were made like tables;²⁹ and that those who fled into churches for sanctuary did hide themselves under them.

7. "The most learned foreign divines have declared against altars; as Bucer, Oecolampadius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Calvin, P. Martyr, Joannes Alasco, Hedio, Capito, &c., and have removed them out of their several churches: only the Lutheran churches retain them."³⁰ Ridley, Cranmer, Latimer, and the rest of the English Reformers, were of opinion that the retaining altars would serve only to nourish in people's minds the superstitious opinion of a propitiatory mass, and would minister an occasion of offence and division among the godly; and the next age will show they were not mistaken in their conjectures. But some of the bishops refused to comply with the council's order; as Day, bishop of Chichester, and Heath of Worcester, insisting on the apostle's words to the Hebrews, "We have an altar;" and, rather than comply, they suffered themselves to be deprived of their bishoprics for contumacy, October, 1551. Preachers were sent into the countries to rectify the people's prejudices, which had a very good effect; and if they had taken the same methods with respect to the habits, and other relics of popery, these would hardly have kept their ground; and the Reformers would have acted a more consistent and prudent part.

The sad consequences of retaining the popish garments in the service of the Church began to appear this year: a debate, one would think, of small consequence, but at this time apprehended of great importance to the Reformation.

The people, having been bred up in a superstitious veneration for the priests' garments, were taught that they were sacred; that without them no administrations were valid; that there was a sort of virtue conveyed into them by consecration; and, in a word, that they were of the same importance to a Christian clergyman as the priests' garments of old were in their ministrations; it was time, therefore, to disabuse them. The debate began upon occasion of Dr. Hooper's nomination to the bishopric of Gloucester, in the room of Dr. Wakeman, who died in December, 1549.

Dr. Hooper was a zealous, pious, and learned man: he went out of England in the latter end of King Henry's reign, and lived at Zurich at a time when all Germany was in a flame on account of the Interim, which was a form of worship contrived to keep up the exterior face of popery, with the softenings of some other senses put upon things. Upon this arose a great and important

question among the Germans concerning the use of things indifferent.³¹ It was said, "If things were indifferent in themselves, they were lawful; and that it was the subject's duty to obey when commanded." So the old popish rites were kept up, on purpose to draw the people more easily back to popery. Out of this another question arose, "whether it was lawful to obey in things indifferent, when it was certain they were enjoined with an ill design." To which it was replied, that the designs of legislators were not to be inquired into. This created a vast distraction in the country some conformed to the Interim; but the major part were firm to their principles, and were turned out of their livings for disobedience. Those who complied were for the most part Lutherans, and carried the name of Adiaphorists, from the Greek word that signifies things indifferent. But the rest of the Reformed were for shaking off all the relics of popery, with the hazard of all that was dear to them in the world; particularly at Zurich, where Hooper was, they were zealous against any compliance with the Interim, or the use of the old rites prescribed by it.

With these principles Hooper came over to England, and applied himself to preaching and explaining the Scriptures to the people; he was in the pulpit almost every day in the week, and his sermons were so popular, that all the churches were crowded where he preached.³² His fame soon reached the court, where Dr. Poynt and he were appointed to preach all the Lent sermons. He was also sent to preach throughout the counties of Kent and Essex, in order to reconcile the people to the Reformation. At length, in the month of July, 1550, he was appointed Bishop of Gloucester by letters patent from the king, but declined it, for two reasons:

1. Because of the form of the oath, which he calls foul and impious. And,
2. By reason of the Aaronical habits.

By the oath is meant the oath of supremacy,³³ which was in this form: "By God, by the saints, and by the Holy Ghost;" which Hooper thought impious, because God only ought to be appealed to in an oath, forasmuch as he only knows the thoughts of men. The young king, being convinced of this, struck out the words with his own pen.³⁴

But the scruple about the habits was not so easily got over. The king and council were inclined to dispense with them; but Ridley and the rest of the bishops that had worn the habits were of another mind, saying "the thing was indifferent, and, therefore, the law ought to be obeyed." This had such an influence upon the council, that all Hooper's objections were afterward heard with great prejudice. It discovered but an ill spirit in the Reformers not to suffer Hooper to decline his bishopric, nor yet to dispense with those habits which he thought unlawful. Hooper was as much for the clergy's wearing a decent and distinct habit from the laity as Ridley, but prayed to be excused from the old symbolizing popish garments,

1. Because they had no countenance in Scripture or primitive antiquity.
2. Because they were the inventions of antichrist, and were introduced into the Church in the corruptest ages of Christianity.

3. Because they had been abused to superstition and idolatry, particularly in the pompous celebration of the mass; and, therefore, were not indifferent.

4. To continue the use of these garments was, in his opinion, to symbolize with antichrist, to mislead the people, and was inconsistent with the simplicity of the Christian religion.

Cranmer was inclined to yield to these reasons; but Ridley and Goodrick insisted strongly on obedience to the laws, affirming that, "in matters of rites and ceremonies, custom was a good argument for the continuance of those that had been long used." But this argument seemed to go too far, because it might be used for the retaining all those other rites and ceremonies of popery which had been long used in the Church, but were now abolished by these Reformers themselves.

Hooper, not willing to rely upon his own judgment, wrote to Bucer at Cambridge, and to Peter Martyr at Oxford, who gave their opinions against the habits, as inventions of antichrist, and wished them removed, as will appear more fully in the reign of Queen Elizabeth,³⁵ but were of opinion, since the bishops were so resolute, that he might acquiesce in the use of them for a time, till they were taken away by law; and the rather, because the Reformation was in its infancy, and it would give occasion of triumph to the common enemy to see the Reformers at variance among themselves. The divines of Switzerland and Geneva were of the same mind, being unwilling that a clergyman of so much learning and piety, and so zealous for the Reformation as Hooper was, should be silenced; they therefore advised him to comply for the present, that he might be the more capable, by his authority and influence in the Church, to get them laid aside. But these reasons not satisfying Hooper's conscience, he continued to refuse for above nine months.

The governing prelates being provoked with his stiffness, resolved not to suffer such a precedent of disobedience to the ecclesiastical laws to go unpunished. Hooper must be a bishop, and must be consecrated in the manner others had been, and wear the habits the law appointed; and to force him to comply, he was served with an order of council, first to silence him, and then to confine him to his house. The doctor thought this usage very severe: to miss his promotion was no disappointment; but to be persecuted about clothes, by men of the same faith with himself, and to lose his liberty because he would not be a bishop, and in the fashion, this, says Mr. Collyer, was possibly more than he well understood. After some time, Hooper was committed to the custody of Cranmer, who, not being able to bring him to conformity, complained to the council, who thereupon ordered him into the Fleet, where he continued some months, to the reproach of the Reformers. At length he laid his case before the Earl of Warwick, who, by the king's own motion, wrote to the archbishop to dispense with the habit at his consecration; but Cranmer alleged the danger of a praemunire; upon which a letter was sent from the king and council to the archbishop and other bishops to be concerned in the consecration, warranting them to dispense with the garments, and discharging them of all manner of

dangers, penalties, and forfeitures they might incur any manner of way by omitting the same; but though this letter was dated August the 5th, yet such was the reluctance of Cranmer and Ridley, that Hooper was not consecrated till March following; in which time, says Bishop Burnet,³⁶ the matter was in some sort compromised, Hooper consenting to be robed in his habits at his consecration, when he preached before the king, or in his cathedral, or in any public place, but to be dispensed with at other times.

Accordingly,³⁷ being appointed to preach before the king, he came forth, says Mr. Fox, like a new player on the stage; his upper garment was a long scarlet chymere down to the foot; and under that a white linen rochet that covered all his shoulders. and a four-square cap on his head; but he took it patiently, for the public profit of the Church.³⁸ After this, Hooper retired to his diocese, and preached sometimes two or three times a day, to crowds of people that hungered for the word of life: he was impartial and zealous in the faithful discharge of every branch of his episcopal character, even beyond his strength, and was himself a pattern of what he taught to others.

In the king's letter to the archbishop, Hooper is said to be a divine of great knowledge, deep judgment, and long study, both in the Scriptures and profane learning, as also a person of good discretion, ready utterance, and of an honest life; but all these qualifications must be buried in silence and a prison, at a time when there was a famine of the Word, rather than the above mentioned uniformity in dress be dispensed with.

Most of the reforming clergy were with Hooper in this controversy; several that had submitted to the habits in the late reign laid them aside in this, as the Bishops Latimer and Coverdale, Dr. Taylor, Philpot, Bradford, and others, who laid down their lives for the Protestant faith.³⁹ In some ordinations, Cranmer and Ridley dispensed with the habits; for Mr. Thomas Sampson, parson of Bread-street, London, afterward one of the heads of the Puritans, and successively Dean of Chichester and Christ Church, in a letter to Secretary Cecil, writes, "That at his ordination by Cranmer and Ridley, he excepted against the apparel, and was, nevertheless, permitted and admitted."⁴⁰ If they had not done so on some occasions, there would not have been clergymen to support the Reformation. Bishop Burnet says they saw their error, and designed to procure an act to abolish the popish garments; but whether this were so or not, it is certain that in the next reign they repented their conduct; for when Ridley was in prison he wrote a letter to Hooper, in which he calls him "his dear brother and fellow-elder in Christ," and desires a mutual forgiveness and reconciliation. And when he and Cranmer came to be degraded, they smiled at the ridiculous attire with which they were clothed, and declared they had long since laid aside all regards to that pageantry.⁴¹

This behaviour of the bishops towards the king's natural-born subjects was the more extraordinary, because a latitude was allowed to foreign Protestants to worship God after the manner of their country, without any regard to the popish vestments; for this year a church of German refugees was established at

St. Austin's in London, and erected into a corporation under the direction of John a Lasco, superintendent of all the foreign churches in London, with whom were joined four other ministers; and, as a mark of favour, three hundred and eighty of the congregation were made denizens of England. The preamble to the patent sets forth that the German Church made profession, of pure and uncorrupted religion, and was instructed in truly Christian and apostolical opinions and rites.⁴² In the patent which incorporates them there is the following clause: "Item. We command, and peremptorily enjoin our lord mayor, aldermen, and magistrates of the city of London, and their successors, with all archbishops, bishops, justices of the peace, and all officers and ministers whatsoever, that they permit the said superintendent and ministers to enjoy and exercise their own proper rites and ceremonies, and their own proper and peculiar ecclesiastical discipline, though differing from the rites and ceremonies used in our kingdom, without impediment, let, or disturbance; any law, proclamation, or injunction heretofore published to the contrary notwithstanding."

John a Lasco was a Polander of noble birth and, according to the words of the patent, a man very famous for learning, and for integrity of life and manners. He was in high esteem with the great Erasmus, who says that he, though an old man, had profited much by his conversation. And Peter Martyr calls him his most learned patron.⁴³ But he did not please the ruling prelates, because he took part with Hooper, and wrote against the popish garments, and for the posture of sitting rather than kneeling at the Lord's Supper.⁴⁴

1551. Upon the translation of Ridley to the see of London, Dr. Poynt was declared Bishop of Rochester, and Coverdale, coadjutor to Veysey, Bishop of Exeter. The see of Winchester had been two years as good as vacant by the long imprisonment of Gardiner, who had been confined all this time without being brought to a trial: the bishop complained of this to the council, who thereupon issued out a commission to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Ely, and Lincoln, with Secretary Petre, Judge Hales, two civilians, and two Masters in Chancery, to proceed against him for contempt. It was objected to him, that he refused to preach concerning the king's power while under age; that he had been negligent in obeying the king's injunctions, and was so obstinate that he would not ask the king mercy. It was the declared opinion of the popish clergy at this time, that the king's laws were to be obeyed, but not the orders of his council; and, therefore, that all things should remain as the late king left them, till the present king, now a child, came of age. This the rebels in Devon pleaded, as well as the Lady Mary and others. For the same opinion Gardiner was deprived of his bishopric, April 18th,⁴⁵ upon which he appealed to the king when at age; and so his process ended, and he was sent back to the Tower, where he lay till Queen Mary discharged him. Nothing can be said in vindication of this severity but this, that both he and Bonner had taken out commissions, with the rest of the bishops, to hold their bishoprics only during the king's pleasure, which gave the regents a right to

displace them whensoever they pleased. Dr. Poynt was translated from Rochester to Winchester; Dr. Story was made Bishop of Rochester; and Veysey resigning, Coverdale was made Bishop of Exeter in his room; so that now the bench of bishops had a majority for the Reformation.

It was therefore resolved, in council, to reform the doctrine of the Church. Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley were appointed to this work, who framed forty-two articles upon the chief points of the Christian faith; copies of which were sent to the other bishops and learned divines, for their corrections and amendments; after which, the archbishop reviewed them a second time, and having given them his last hand, presented them to the council, where they received the royal sanction.⁴⁶ This was another high act of the supremacy; for the articles were not brought into Parliament, nor agreed upon in convocation,⁴⁷ as they ought to have been, and as the title seems to express when this was afterward objected to Cranmer as a fraud in the next reign, he owned the charge, but said he was ignorant of the title, and complained of it to the council, who told him the book was so entitled because it was published in the time of the convocation; which was no better than a collusion. It is entitled, “Articles agreed upon by the bishops and other learned men in the convocation held at London, in the year 1552, for the avoiding diversity of opinions, and establishing consent touching true religion. Published by the king’s authority.” These articles are for substance the same with those now in use, being reduced to the number of thirty-nine in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, where the reader will meet with the corrections and alterations.⁴⁸ The controverted clause of the twentieth article, that the Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, is not in King Edward’s articles, nor does it appear how it came into Queen Elizabeth’s. It is evident, by the title of the articles, that they were designed as articles of truth, and not of peace, as some have since imagined, who subscribed them rather as a compromise, not to teach any doctrine contrary to them, than as a declaration that they believed according to them. This was a notion the imposers never thought of, nor does there appear any reason for this conceit. So that (says Bishop Burnet⁴⁹) those who subscribed did either believe them to be true, or else they did grossly prevaricate.

With the book of articles was printed a short catechism,⁵⁰ with a preface prefixed in the king’s name. It is supposed to be drawn up by Bishop Poynt, but revised by the rest of the bishops and other learned men. It is dated May 7th, about seven weeks before the king’s death; [and in the first impression of the articles it was printed before them.⁵¹]

1552. The next work the Reformers were employed in was a second correction of the Common Prayer Book. Some things they added, and others that had been retained through the necessity of the times were struck out. The most considerable amendments were these. The daily service opened with a short confession of sins, and of absolution to such as should repent. The communion began with a rehearsal of the Ten Commandments, the congregation being on

their knees; and a pause was made between the rehearsal of every commandment, for the people's devotions. A rubric was also added, concerning the posture of kneeling, which declares that there was no adoration intended thereby to the bread and wine, which was gross idolatry: nor did they think the very flesh and blood of Christ there present. This clause was struck out by Queen Elizabeth, to give a latitude to papists and Lutherans, but was inserted again at the restoration of King Charles II., at the request of the Puritans. Besides these amendments, sundry old rites and ceremonies, which had been retained in the former book, were discontinued; as the use of oil in confirmation and extreme unction; prayer for the dead in the office of burial; and in the communion service, auricular confession, the use of the cross in the eucharist, and in confirmation. In short, the whole liturgy was, in a manner, reduced to the form in which it appears at present, excepting some small variations that have since been made for the clearing some ambiguities. By this book of Common Prayer, says Mr. Strype,⁵² all copes and vestments were forbidden throughout England; the prebendaries of St. Paul's left off their hoods, and the bishops their crosses, &c., as by act of Parliament is more at length set forth.

When the Parliament met January 23d, the new Common Prayer Book was brought into the house, with an ordinal or form of ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons, both which passed the houses without any considerable opposition. The act requires "all persons, after the feast of Allhallows next, to come to common prayer every Sunday and holyday, under pain of the censures of the Church. All archbishops and bishops are required to endeavour the due execution of this act; and whereas divers doubts had been raised about the service-book, it is said the king and Parliament had now caused it to be perused, explained, and made more perfect." The new service-book was to take place in all churches after the feast of All Saints, under the same penalties that had been enacted to the former book three years before.⁵³

By another act of this session, the marriages of the clergy, if performed according to the service-book, were declared good and valid, and their children inheritable according to law; and by another, the bishopric of Westminster was suppressed, and reunited to the see of London. Dr. Heath, bishop of Worcester, and Day of Chichester, were both deprived this year [1553], with Tonsal, bishop of Durham, whose bishopric was designed to be divided into two; but the act never took effect.

One of the last things the king set his hand to was a royal visitation, in order to examine what plate, jewels, and other furniture were in the churches. The visitors were to leave in every church one or two chalices of silver, with linen for the communion-table and for surplices, but to bring in the best of the church furniture into the king's treasury, and to sell the linen copes, altar-cloths, &c., and give the money to the poor. The pretence was, the calling in the superfluous plate that lay in churches more for pomp than use. Some have called this by no better name than sacrilege, or church theft, and it really was

no better. But it ought to be remembered, the young king was now languishing under a consumption, and near his end.

It must, however, be confessed, that in the course of this as well as the last reign, there was a very great alienation of church-lands: the chantry-lands were sold -among the laity, some of whom held five or six prebendaries or canonries, while the clergy themselves were in want. Bishop Latimer complains, in one of his sermons, “that the revenues of the Church were seized by the rich laity, and that the incumbent was only a proprietor in title; that many benefices were let out to farm by secular men, or given to their servants as a consideration for keeping their hounds, hawks, and horses; and that the poor clergy were reduced to such short allowance that they were forced to go to service, to turn clerks of the kitchen, surveyors, receivers,” &c. And Camden complains “that avarice and sacrilege had strangely the ascendant at this time; that estates formerly settled for the support of religion and the poor were ridiculed as superstitious endowments, first miscalled and then plundered.” The bishops were too easy in parting with the lands and manors belonging to their bishoprics, and the courtiers were too eager in grasping at everything they could lay their hands upon.⁵⁴ If the revenues of the Church had been abused to superstition, they might have been converted to other religious uses; or if too great a proportion of the riches of the kingdom was in the hands of the Church, they should have made an ample provision for the maintenance of the clergy, and the endowment of smaller livings, before they had enriched their friends and families.

Nor were the lives of many who were zealous for the Reformation free from scandal: the courtiers and great men indulged themselves in a dissolute and licentious life, and the clergy were not without their blemishes. Some that embraced the Reformation were far from adorning their profession, but rather disposed the people to return to their old superstitions: nevertheless, there were many great and shining lights among them, who preached and prayed fervently against the corruptions of the times, and were an example to their flocks, by the strictness and severity of their lives and manners, but their numbers were small in comparison to the many that were otherwise, turning the doctrines of grace into lasciviousness.⁵⁵

We have now seen the length of King Edward’s reformation. It was an adventurous undertaking for a few bishops and privy-councillors to change the religion of a nation only by the advantage of the supremacy of a minor, without the consent of the people in Parliament or convocation, and under the eye of a presumptive heir, who was a declared enemy of all their proceedings, as was the case in the former part of this reign. We have taken notice of the mistaken principles of the Reformers in making use of the civil power to force men to conformity, and of their stretching the laws to reach at those whom they could not fairly come at any other way. But, notwithstanding these and some other blemishes, they were great and good men, and valiant in the cause of truth, as appears by their sealing it with their blood. They made as quick

advances, perhaps, in restoring religion towards its primitive simplicity as the circumstances of the time would admit; and it is evident they designed to go farther, and not make this the last standard of the Reformation. Indeed, Queen Elizabeth thought her brother had gone too far, by stripping religion of too many ornaments, and, therefore, when she came to the crown, she was hardly persuaded to restore it to the condition in which he left it. King James I., King Charles I., Archbishop Laud, and all their admirers, instead of removing farther from the superstitious pomps of the Church of Rome, have been for returning back to them, and have appealed to the settlement of Queen Elizabeth as the purest standard.⁵⁶

But the Reformers themselves were of another mind, as appears by the sermons of Latimer, Hooper, Bradford, and others; by the letters of Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and John a Lasco,⁵⁷ who, in his book *De Ordinatione Ecclesiarum Peregrinarum in Anglia*, dedicated to Sigismund, king of Poland, 1555, says “that King Edward desired that the rites and ceremonies used under popery should be purged out by degrees; that it was his pleasure that strangers should have churches to perform all things according to apostolical observation only, that by this means the English churches might be excited to embrace apostolical purity with the unanimous consent of the states of the kingdom.” He adds, “that the king was at the head of this project, and that Cranmer promoted it, but that some great persons stood in the way.” As a farther evidence of this, a passage was left in the preface of one of their service-books to this purpose:⁵⁸ “that they had gone as far as they could in reforming the Church, considering the times they lived in, and hoped they that came after them would, as they might, do more.” King Edward, in his Diary,⁵⁹ laments that he could not restore the primitive discipline according to his heart’s desire, because several of the bishops, some for age, some for ignorance, some for their ill name, and some out of love to popery, were unwilling to it. And the Church herself, in one of her public offices, laments the want of a godly discipline to this day.

Martin Bucer, a German divine, and professor of divinity in Cambridge, a person in high esteem with the young king, drew up a plan and presented it to his majesty, in which he writes largely of ecclesiastical discipline.⁶⁰ The king having read it, set himself to write a general discourse about reformation, but did not live to finish it. Bucer proposed⁶¹ that there might be a strict discipline, to exclude scandalous livers from the sacrament, that the old popish habits might be laid aside. He did not like the half office of communion, or second service, to be said at the altar when there was no sacrament. He approved not of godfathers answering in the child’s name so well as in their own. He presses much the sanctification of the Lord’s Day, and that there might be many fastings, but was against the observation of Lent. He would have the pastoral function restored to what it ought to be; that bishops, throwing off all secular cares, should give them selves to their spiritual employments. He advises that coadjutors might be given to some, and a council of presbyters appointed for

them all. He would have rural bishops set over twenty or thirty parishes, who should gather their clergy often together, and inspect them closely; and that a provincial synod should meet twice a year, when a secular man, in the king's name, should be appointed to observe their proceedings.

Cranmer was of the same mind. He disliked the present way of governing the Church by convocations as they are now formed, in which deans, archdeacons, and cathedrals have an interest far superior in number to those elected to represent the clergy. These, says Bishop Burnet,⁶² can in no sort pretend to be more than a part of our civil constitution. They have no foundation in Scripture, nor any warrant from the first ages of the Church; but did arise from the model set forth by Charles the Great, and formed according to the feudal law, by which a right of giving subsidies was vested in all who were possessed of such tenures as qualified them to contribute towards the support of the state. Nor was Cranmer satisfied with the liturgy, though it had been twice reformed, if we may give credit to the learned Bullinger,⁶³ who told the exiles at Frankfurt "that the archbishop had drawn up a book of prayers a hundred times more perfect than that which was then in being; but the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and convocation, and other enemies."⁶⁴

The king was of the same sentiments; but his untimely death, which happened in the sixteenth year of his age and seventh of his reign, put an end to all his noble designs for perfecting the Reformation. He was, indeed, an incomparable prince, of most promising expectations, and, in the judgment of the most impartial persons, the very phoenix of his age. It was more than whispered that he was poisoned. But it is very surprising that a Protestant divine, Heylin, in his History of the Reformation,⁶⁵ should say that he was ill-principled; that his reign was unfortunate; and that his death was not an infelicity to the Church," only because he was apprehensive he would have reduced the hierarchy to a more primitive standard. With good King Edward died all farther advances of the Reformation; for the alterations that were made afterward by Queen Elizabeth hardly came up to his standard.⁶⁶

We may observe, from the history of this reign,

1st. That in matters of faith the first Reformers followed the doctrine of St. Austin in the controverted points of original sin, predestination, justification by faith alone, effectual grace, and good works.

2dly. That they were not satisfied with the present discipline of the Church, though they thought they might submit to it till it should be amended by the authority of the Legislature.

3dly. That they believed but two orders of churchmen in Holy Scripture, viz., bishops and deacons; and, consequently, that bishops and priests were but different ranks or degrees of the same order.

4thly. That they gave the right hand of fellowship to foreign churches, and ministers that had not been ordained by bishops; there being no dispute about

reordination in order to any church preferment, till the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign!

In all which points most of our modern churchmen have departed from them.⁶⁷

[To Mr. Neal's remarks on the reign of Edward VI. it may be added, that the Reformation was all along conducted in a manner inconsistent with the principles on which it was founded. The principles on which the justification of it rested were, the right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith. Yet the Reformation was limited to the conceptions and ideas of those who were in power. No liberty was granted to the consciences of dissidents; no discussion of points on which they themselves had not doubts was permitted: such as held sentiments different from their model, and pursued their inquiries farther, without consideration of their numbers or their characters, so far from being allowed to propose their opinions, or to hold separate assemblies for religious worship, agreeably to their own views of things, were stigmatized as heretics, and pursued unto death. Besides the instances Mr. Neal mentions, the Anabaptists were excepted out of the king's general pardon, that came out in 1550;⁶⁸ they were also burned in divers towns in the kingdom, and met death with singular intrepidity and cheerfulness.⁶⁹

Thus inquiry was stifled; and the Reformation was really not the result of a comprehensive view and calm investigation of all the doctrines and practices which had been long established, but the triumph of power in discarding a few articles and practices which more particularly struck the minds of those who were in government. These persons gained; and have exclusively possessed, the honourable title of Reformers, without any respect to, nay, with a contemptuous disregard of, those who saw farther, and, in point of numbers, carried weight. Bishop Latimer, in a sermon before the king, reported, on the authority of a credible person, that there were, in one town, five hundred Anabaptists.⁷⁰ The Reformers, in thus proscribing inquiry and reformation beyond their own standard, were not consistent with themselves; for they acknowledged that corruptions had been a thousand years introducing, which could not be all discovered and thrown out at once.⁷¹ By this concession they justified the principle, while they punished the conduct of those who acting upon it, endeavoured to discover and wished to reject more corruption.]—ED.

FOOTNOTES

1 Hist. Ref., vol. ii., in preface.

2 The heads of the two parties were these: For the Reformation—King Edward, duke of Somerset, protector; Dr. Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury; Dr. Holgate, archbishop of York; Sir

W. Paget, secretary of state; Lord-viscount Lisle, lord-admiral; Dr. Holbeach, bishop of Lincoln; Dr. Goodrick, bishop of Ely; Dr. Latimer, bishop of Worcester; Dr. Ridley, elect of Rochester. For the old religion—Princess Mary; Wriothesley, earl of Southampton, lord-chancellor; Dr. Tonstal, bishop of Durham; Dr. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester; Dr. Bonner, bishop of London.

3 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 27.

4 The book consisted of twelve discourses, on the following arguments: 1. Concerning the use of the Scriptures. 2. Of the misery of mankind by sin. 3. Of their salvation by Christ. 4. Of a true and lively faith. 5. Of good works. 6. Of Christian love and charity. 7. Against swearing and perjury. 8. Against apostasy. 9. Against the fear of death. 10. An exhortation to obedience. 11. Against whoredom and adultery. 12. Against strife and contention about matters of religion. These titles of the homilies are taken Verbatim from Bishop Burnet.—*Neal's Review*.

5 The chief were,

1. "That all ecclesiastical persons observe the laws relating to the king's supremacy.

2. "That they preach once a quarter against pilgrimages and praying to images, and exhort to works of faith and charity.

3. "That images abused with pilgrimages and offerings be taken down; that no wax candles or tapers be burned before them; but only two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament shall remain still, to signify that Christ is the light of the world."

The limitation in this article giving occasion to great heats among the people, some affirming their images had been so abused, and others not, the council sent orders to see them all taken down.

4. "That when there is no sermon, the Paternoster, the Creed, and Ten Commandments, shall be recited out of the pulpit to the parishioners.

5. "That within three months every church be provided with a Bible; and, within twelve months, with Erasmus's Paraphrase on the New Testament.

9. "That they examine such who come to confession, whether they can recite the Paternoster, Creed, and Ten Commandments in English, before they receive the sacrament of the altar, else they ought not to come to God's board.

21. "That in time of high mass the Epistle and Gospel shall be read in English; and that one chapter in the New Testament be read at matins, and one in the Old at even-song.

23. "No processions shall be used about churches or churchyards; but immediately before high mass the litany shall be said or sung in English; and all ringing of bells (save one) utterly forborne.

24. "That the holydays, at the first beginning godly instituted and ordained, be wholly given to God, in hearing the Word of God read and taught; in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offences to God, and promising amendment; in reconciling themselves to their neighbours, receiving the communion, Visiting the sick, &c. Only it shall be lawful in time of harvest to labour upon holy and festival days, in order to save that thing which God hath sent; and that scrupulosity to abstain from working on those days does grievously offend God.

28. "That they take away all shrines, coverings of shrines, tables, candlesticks, trindills, or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and other monuments of feigned miracles, so that no memory of them remain in walls or windows; exhorting the people to do the like in their several houses."

The rest of the articles related to the advancement of learning, to the encouragement of preaching, and correcting some very gross abuses.

6 Hist. Ref., vol. ii, p. 30, and Collection of Records, b. i., No. 8.

7 1 Edw: VI., Cap. i.

8 1 Edw. VI., cap ii.,

9 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 218.

10 Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, p. 141. App., p. 53.

11 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 42.

12 Edw. VI., cap. 42.

13 Strype's Life of Cran., p. 156.

14 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 61, 64.

15 Id. ib.

16 Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 72.

17 Fuller's Church History, b. vii., 1 402

18 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 93, 95.

19 The intercession of the Emperor Carolus was supported by the requisition of the council, and urged by the importance of preserving amity with him. But the king, amiable as his temper appears to have been, with tears opposed the advice of his council, and finally denied. the emperor's suit.—Fox, as quoted by Crosby, b. i., p. 44.—ED.

20 Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 152.

21 It is to be wished that Mr. Neal had not characterized, in this style, the sentiments of these persons; but had contented himself, without insinuating his own judgment of their tenets, with giving his readers the words of Bishop Burnet; for calling their opinions wild notions will have a tendency with many to soften their resentment against the persecuting measures which Mr. Neal justly condemns, and be considered as furnishing an apology for them. Bishop Burnet says, "Upon Luther's first preaching in Germany, there arose many who, building on some of his principles, carried things much farther than he did. The chief foundation he laid down was, that the Scripture was to be the only rule of Christians." Upon this many argued that the mysteries of the Trinity, and Christ's incarnation and sufferings, of the fall of man, and the aids of grace, were indeed philosophical subtleties, and only pretended to be deduced from Scripture, as almost all opinions of religion were, and therefore they rejected them. Among these the baptism of infants was one. They held that to be no baptism, and so were rebaptized. But from this, which was most taken notice of, as being a visible thing, they carried all the general name of Anabaptists.—Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 114, &c.—ED.

22 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 112.

23 Mr. Neal, representing Joan Bocher as a poor, frantic woman, more fit for Bedlam than the stake, and as obstinately maintaining her opinion, has not spoken so respectfully of her as her

character and the truth of the case required. The charge of obstinacy wants propriety and candour; for though an opinion in the account of others may be a great and hurtful error, it cannot, without insincerity and the violation of conscience, be renounced by the person who has embraced it until his judgment is convinced of its falsehood. Arguments which produce conviction in one mind, do not carry the same degree of clearness and strength to other minds; and men are very incompetent judges of the nature and force of evidence necessary to leave on others the impressions they themselves feel. The extraordinary efforts used to bring Joan Bother to retract her opinion, show her to have been a person of note, whose opinions carried more weight and respect than it can be supposed would the chimeras of a frantic woman. The account which Mr. Strype gives of her is truly honourable. "She was," he says, "a great disperser of Tyndal's New Testament, translated by him into English, and printed at Colen, and was a great reader of Scripture herself. Which book, also, she dispersed in the court, and so became known to certain women of quality, and was more particularly acquainted with Mrs. Anne Ascue. She used, for the more secrecy, to tie the books with strings under her apparel and so pass with them into the court."* By this it appears that she hazarded her life in dangerous times, to bring others to the knowledge of God's Word; and by Mr. Neal's own account, her sentiments, were they ever so erroneous, were taken up out of respect to Christ, "for she could not reconcile the spotless purity of Christ's human nature with his receiving flesh from a sinful creature."—ED.

When condemned to die, we are informed she said to her judges, "It is a goodly matter to consider your ignorance. It was not long ago since you burned Anne Askew for a piece of bread, and yet came yourselves soon after to believe and profess the same doctrine for which you burned her. And now, forsooth, you will needs burn me for a piece of flesh, and in the end you will come to believe this also, when you have read the Scriptures and understand them." Where was Cranmer's conscience, that this statement did not arouse him? I scarcely know a more painful and humiliating fact than the part he took in this criminal affair. It did not arise from cruelty of disposition, for his heart was humane and benevolent, but from the perverted views he had early imbibed in an intolerant and unchristian school. How bitter must the recollection of it have been during his own imprisonment at Oxford—Strype's Mem., vol: ii., i., 335.—C.

* Strype's Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. ii., p. 214, as quoted in Lindsey's Apology, fourth edition, p. 43, and in his Historical View of the Unitarian Doctrine of Worship, p. 87.

24 Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 271.

25 3 and 4 of Edward VI., cap. xii.

26 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. u., p. 144. Collyer's Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 290.

27 For a full Vindication of the above assertions, see Mr. Neal's Review, p. 860-864 of the first volume of the quarto edition of his history.—ED.

28 Among the other articles which he put to the inferior clergy, this was one: "Whether may Anabaptists or others, use private conventicles, with different opinions and forms from those established, and with other questions about baptism and marriages."—Crosby, vol. i., p. 31—ED.

29 Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 150. Strype's Ann., vol. i., p. 160.,

30 Strype's Ann., vol. i.; p.162. Hist. Ref., vol. iii. p 158 Strype's Ann., vol. i., p. 162.

31 Hist. Ref., vol. iii., p. 199.

32 He was chaplain to the Duke of Somerset. Fuller says he was well skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew.—C.

33 Mr. Fuller, when he wrote his Church History, conceived that the oath Bishop Hooper refused was that of canonical obedience, but when he published his Worthies he was convinced of his mistake, and corrected it.—*Neal's Review*.—ED.

34 Hist. Ref., vol. iii., p. 203.

35 Collyer's Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 297.

36 Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 166.

37 Mr. Neal, in his Review, adds from Mr. Fox, that "Bishop Hooper was constrained to appear once in public attired after the manner of other bishops, which, unless he had done, some think there was a contrivance to take away his life; for his servant told me," says Mr. Fox, "that the Duke of Suffolk sent such word to Hooper, who was not himself ignorant of what was doing."—ED.

38 Fuller's Abel Redivivus, p. 173.

39 Pierce's Vind., p. 31-33.

40 Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 192.

41 Bishop Maddox maintained that the habits put on those Reformers were the popish habits, which was the ground of their dislike. Mr. Neal, in his Review, controverts the truth, and exposes the futility, of this distinction.—ED.

42 Burnet's Hist. Ref., in Records, vol. ii., No. 51.

43 Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 239.

44 About the end of December, 1550, after many cavils in the state, Bishop Burnet informs us that an act passed for the king's general pardon, wherein the Anabaptists were excepted.—*Crosby*, vol. i., p. 50.

45 Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 191.

46 Hist. Ref., vol. iii., p. 210.

47 Bishop Maddox objected to this representation, and said it was confuted by Archbishop Wake, who had examined the matter fully. Mr. Neal rests the Vindication of his state of it on the authority of Bishop Burnet, supported by the remark of Mr. Collyer, who says, "'Tis pretty plain they were passed by some members of convocation only, delegated by both houses, as appears by the Very title, articles, &c., agreed upon in the synod of London, by the bishops and certain other learned men."—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 325. *Neal's Review*.—ED.

48 An alteration in the twenty-eighth article is not noticed by Mr. Neal, in the place to which he refers. The last clause of the article was laid down in these words: "The custom of the Church for baptizing young children is both to be commended, and by all means to be retained

in the Church.” This clause was left out of Queen Elizabeth’s articles. It seems by this, however, observes Crosby, “that the first Reformers did not found the practice of infant baptism upon Scripture, but took it only as a commendable custom, that had been used in the Christian Church, and, therefore, ought to be retained.”—*Hist. Eng. Bapt.*, vol. i., p. 54, 55. But what shall we think of, rather, how should we lament the bigotry and illiberality of those times, when men were harassed and put to death for declining a religious practice, which they who enjoined it did not pretend to enforce on the authority of Scripture, but only as a custom of the churches: a plea which would have equally justified all those other religious ceremonies which, they themselves, notwithstanding this sanction, rejected!—ED.

49 *Hist. Ref.*, vol. ii., p. 169.

50 *Ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 211, 214.

51 Neal’s Review.

52 *Life of Cranmer*, p. 290.

53 Burnet’s *Hist. Ref.*, vol. ii., p. 190.

54 *Hist. Ref.* vol. iii., p. 218.

55 *Strype’s Life of Cranmer*, p. 290.

56 It is evident to the careful student of history, that the Reformation in England produced its happiest effects in the days of Edward; that the Church of England has never been so *pure* as soon after its transition from popery; and that its subsequent alterations have ever been in favour of Romanism.—C.

57 *Voet.*, *Eccl. Pol.*, lib. ii., cap. vi., part i., p. 421.

58 The following quotation, Mr. Neal, in answer to Bishop Maddox, observes, is transcribed from Mr. Pierce’s *Vindication*, p. 11, where it is to be found verbatim, with his authority; and in *Bennett’s Memorial of the Reformation*, p. 50, Mr. Strype intimates that a farther reformation was intended (*Life of Cran.*, p. 299); and Bishop Burnet adds, that in many of the letters to foreign divines, it is asserted that both Cranmer and Ridley intended to procure an act for abolishing the habits.—ED.

59 *King Edward’s Remains*, num. 2.

60 Burnet’s *Hist. Ref.*, vol. ii., p. 156.

61 Bucer died in 1551, and was consulted on the review of the *Common Prayer*, 1550. But Mr. Neal has introduced his sentiments in this place, because he was here giving a summary of the changes in King Edward’s reign. And in reply to Bishop Maddox, who, after Bishop Burnet, says that the most material things to which Bucer excepted were corrected afterward, Mr. Neal observes, that they who will be at the pains to read over the abstract of his book, entitled “Of the Kingdom of Christ,” in *Collyer’s Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 296, &c., must be of another mind.—*Review*.—ED.

62 *Hist. Ref.*, vol. iii., p. 214.

63 Strype's *Life of Cranmer*, p. 266. *Bennet's Mem.*, p. 52.

64 The troubles at Frankfort, in the *Phoenix*, vol. ii., p. 82, and *Pierce's Vindic.*, p. 12, 13. Mr. Pierce remarks that this is reported, as is plain to him who looks into the book itself, not on the testimony of Bullinger, as Strype represents it, but by one of Dr. Cox's party on his own knowledge.—Review.—ED.

65 Pref. p. 4, part vii., p 141.

66 "It is praise enough for young Edward," remarks Sir James Mackintosh, "that his gentleness as well as his docility, disposed him not to spill blood. The fact, however, that the blood of no Roman Catholic was spilt on account of religion in Edward's reign, is indisputable. The Protestant Church of England did not strike the first blow. If this proceeded from the virtue of the counsellors of Edward, we must allow it to outweigh their faults; if it followed from their fortune, they ought to have been envied by their antagonists. Truth and justice require it to be positively pronounced, that Gardiner and Bonner cannot plead the example of Cranmer and Latimer for the body persecution which involved in its course the destruction of the Protestant prelates. The anti-Trinitarian and the Anabaptist, if they had regained power, might, indeed, have urged such a mitigation; but the Roman Catholic had not even the odious excuse of retaliation."—*Hist. of England*, ii., 271. 319.—C.

67 It is with pleasure that mention is made of the liberal and able essay of Archbishop Whately on the Nature of Christ's Kingdom; this work takes essentially different ground from that held by the larger part of the English and American Episcopalians.—C.

68 Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, vol. ii., p. 143.

69 Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, vol. i., p. 62.

70 Crosby's *Hist.*, vol. i., p. 63.

71 Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, vol. ii., p. 190.