

[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 I:

REIGN OF KING HENRY VIII.

KING William the Conqueror, having got possession of the crown of England by the assistance of the See of Rome, and King John having afterward sold it in his wars with the barons, the rights and privileges of the English clergy were delivered up into the hands of the pope, who taxed them at his pleasure, and in process of time drained the kingdom of immense treasures; for, besides all his other dues, arising from annates, first-fruits, Peter-pence, &c., he extorted large sums of money from the clergy for their preferments in the Church. He advanced foreigners to the richest bishoprics, who never resided in their dioceses, nor so much as set foot upon English ground, but sent for all their profits to a foreign country; nay, so covetous was his holiness, that, before livings became void, he sold them provisionally among his Italians, inso-much that neither the king nor the clergy had anything to dispose of, but everything was bargained for beforehand at Rome. This awakened the resentments of the Legislature, who, in the twenty-fifth year of Edward III., passed an act, called the statute of provisors, to establish “that the king and other lords shall present unto benefices of their own, or their ancestors’ foundation, and not the Bishop of Rome.” This act enacted “that all forestalling of benefices to foreigners shall cease; and that the free elections, presentments, and collations of benefices, shall stand in right of the crown, or of any of his majesty’s subjects, as they had formerly enjoyed them, notwithstanding any provisions from Rome.

But still the power of the court of Rome ran very high, for they brought all the trials of titles to advowsons into their own courts beyond sea; and though by the seventh of Richard II. the power of nomination to benefices, without the king’s license, was taken from them, they still claimed the benefit of confirmations, of translations of bishops, and of excommunications; the Archbishops of Canterbury and York might still, by virtue of bulls from Rome, assemble the clergy of their several provinces, at what time and place they thought fit, without leave obtained from the crown; and all the canons and constitutions concluded upon in those synods were binding, without any farther ratification from the king; so that the power of the Church was independent of the civil government. This being represented to the Parliament of the sixteenth of Richard II., they passed the statute commonly called *praemunire*, by which it was enacted, “that if any did purchase translations to benefices, processes, sentences of excommunication, bulls, or any other instruments from the court of Rome, against the king or his crown; or whoever brought them into England, or did receive or execute them, they were declared to be out of the king’s protection, and should forfeit their goods and chattels to the king, and should be attached by their bodies, if they may be found, and brought be-

fore the king and council to answer to the cases aforesaid; or that process should be made against them, by *praemunire facias*, in manner as it is ordained in other statutes of provisors; and other which do sue in any other court in derogation of the regality of the king.”¹ From this time the archbishops called no more convocations by their sole authority, but by license from the king; their synods being formed by writ or precept from the crown, directed to the archbishops, to assemble their clergy, in order to consult upon such affairs as his majesty should lay before them. But still their canons were binding, though confirmed by no authority but their own, till the act of submission of the clergy took place.

About this time flourished the famous John Wickliffe, the morning-star of the Reformation. He was born at Wickliffe, near Richmond, in Yorkshire,² about the year 1324, and was educated in Queen’s College, Oxford, where he was divinity professor, and afterward pastor of Lutterworth in Leicestershire. He flourished in the latter end of the reign of King Edward III. and the beginning of Richard II., about one hundred and thirty years before the Reformation of Luther. The University gave this testimonial of him after his death: “That, from his youth to the time of his death, his conversation was so praiseworthy, that there was never any spot or suspicion noised of him; that in his reading and preaching he behaved like a stout and valiant champion of the faith; and that he had written in logic, philosophy, divinity, morality, and the speculative arts, without an equal.” While he was divinity professor at Oxford, he published certain conclusions—against transubstantiation and against the infallibility of the pope; that the Church of Rome was not the head of all other churches; nor had St. Peter the power of the keys any more than the rest of the apostles; that the New Testament, or Gospel, is a perfect rule of life and manners, and ought to be read by the people.³ He maintained, farther, most of those points by which the Puritans were afterward distinguished; as, that in the sacrament of orders there ought to be but two degrees, presbyters or bishops and deacons; that all human traditions are superfluous and sinful; that we must practise and teach only the laws of Christ; that mystical and significant ceremonies in religious worship are unlawful; and that to restrain men to a prescribed form of prayer is contrary to the liberty granted them by God. These, with some other of Wickliffe’s doctrines against the temporal grandeur of the prelates and their usurped authority, were sent to Rome and condemned by Pope Gregory XI., in a consistory of twenty-three cardinals, in the year 1378. But the pope dying soon after put a stop to the process. Urban, his successor, wrote to young King Richard II. and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the University of Oxford, to put a stop to the progress of Wickliffism; accordingly, Wickliffe was cited before the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his brethren, the prelates, several times, but was always dismissed, either by the interest of the citizens of London, or the powerful interposition of some great lords at court, or some other uncommon providence, which terrified the bishops from passing a peremptory sentence against him for a considerable time; but at

length his new doctrines, as they were called, were condemned, in a convocation of bishops, doctors, and bachelors, held at London by the commandment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1382, and he was deprived of his professorship, his books and writings were ordered to be burned and himself to be imprisoned; but he kept out of the way, and in the time of his retirement wrote a confession of his faith to the pope, in which he declares himself willing to maintain his opinions at Rome, if God had not otherwise visited him with sickness and other infirmities: but it was well for this good man that there were two antipopes at this time at war with each other, one at Rome, and the other at Avignon. In England, also, there was a minority, which was favourable to Wickliffe, insomuch that he ventured out of his retirement, and returned to his parish at Lutterworth, where he quietly departed this life, in the year 1384. This Wickliffe was a wonderful man for the times in which he lived, which were overspread with the thickest darkness of anti-Christian idolatry; he was the first that translated the New Testament into English; but the art of printing not being then found out, it hardly escaped the inquisition of the prelates; at least, it was very scarce when Tyndal translated it a second time in 1526. He preached and published the very same doctrines for substance that afterward obtained at the Reformation; he wrote near two hundred volumes, all which were called in, condemned, and ordered to be burned, together with his bones, by the Council of Constance, in the year 1425, forty-one years after his death; but his doctrine remained, and the number of his disciples, who were distinguished by the name of Lollards, increased after his decease,⁴ which gave occasion to the making sundry other severe laws against heretics.

The clergy made their advantage of the contentions between the houses of York and Lancaster; both parties courting their assistance, which they did not fail to make use of for the support of the Catholic faith, as they called it, and the advancement of their spiritual tyranny over the consciences of men. In the primitive times there were no capital proceedings against heretics, the weapons of the Church being only spiritual; but when it was found that ecclesiastical censures were not sufficient to keep men in a blind subjection to the pope, a decree was obtained in the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, "that all heretics should be delivered over to the civil magistrate to be burned." Here was the spring of that anti-Christian tyranny and oppression of the consciences of men which has since been attended with a sea of Christian blood: the papists learned it from the heathen emperors, and the most zealous Protestants of all nations have taken it up from them. Conscience cannot be convinced by fines and imprisonments, or by fire and fagot; all attempts of this kind serve only to make men hypocrites, and are deservedly branded with the name of persecution. There was no occasion for putting these sanguinary laws in execution among us till the latter end of the fourteenth century; but when the Lollards, or followers of Wickliffe, threatened the papal power, the clergy brought this Italian drug from Rome, and planted it in the Church of England.

In the fifth year of Richard II., it was enacted “that all that preached without license against the Catholic faith, or against the laws of the land, should be arrested, and kept in prison till they justified themselves according to the law and reason of Holy Church. Their commitment was to be by writ from the chancellor, who was to issue forth commissions to the sheriffs and other the king’s ministers, after the bishops had returned the names of the delinquents into the Court of Chancery.

When Richard II. was deposed, and the crown usurped by Henry IV., in order to gain the good-will of the clergy, it was farther enacted, in the second year of his reign,—that if any person were suspected of heresy, the ordinary might detain them in prison till they were canonically purged, or did abjure their errors; provided, always, that the proceedings against them were publicly and judicially ended within three months. If they were convicted, the diocesan, or his commissary, might imprison and fine them at discretion. Those that refused to abjure their error, or, after abjuration, relapsed, were to be delivered over to the secular power, and the mayors, sheriffs, or bailiffs, were to be present, if required, when the bishop, or his commissary, passed sentence, and after sentence they were to receive them, and in some high place burn them to death before the people.” By this law the king’s subjects were put from under his protection, and left to the mercy of the bishops in their spiritual courts, and might, upon suspicion of heresy, be imprisoned and put to death, without presentment or trial by jury, as is the practice in all other criminal cases.

In the beginning of the reign of Henry V., who was a martial prince, a new law passed against the Lollards or Wickliffites,⁵ “that they should forfeit all the lands they had in fee-simple, and all their goods and chattels to the king. All state officers, at their entrance into office, were sworn to use their best endeavours to discover them, and to assist the ordinaries in prosecuting and convicting them.” I find no mention, in any of these acts, of a writ or warrant from the king, *de haeretico comburendo*; the sheriff might proceed to the burning of heretics without it; but it seems the king’s learned counsel advised him to issue out a writ of this kind to the sheriff, by which his majesty took them, in some sort, under his protection again; but it was not as yet necessary by law, nor are there any of them to be found in the rolls before the reign of King Henry VIII.

By virtue of these statutes, the clergy, according to the genius of the popish religion, exercised numberless cruelties upon the people. If any man denied them any degree of respect, or any of those profits they pretended was their due, he was immediately suspected of heresy, imprisoned, and, it may be, put to death; of which some hundreds of examples are, upon record.⁶

Thus stood the laws with respect to religion, when King Henry VIII., second son of King Henry VII, came to the crown; he was born in the year 1491, and bred a scholar: he understood the purity of the Latin tongue, and was well acquainted with school divinity. No sort of flattery pleased him better than to have his wisdom and learning commended. In the beginning he was a most

obedient son of the papacy, and employed his talents in writing against Luther in defence of the seven sacraments of the Church. This book was magnified by the clergy as the most learned performance of the age; and upon presenting it to the pope, his holiness conferred upon the King of England, and his successors, the glorious title of DEFENDER OF THE FAITH;⁷ it was voted in full consistory, and signed by twenty-seven cardinals, in the year 1521.⁸

At the same time, Cardinal Wolsey, the king's favourite, exercised a sovereign power over the whole clergy and people of England in spiritual matters: he was made legate in the year 1519, and accepted of a bull from the pope, contrary to the statute of praemunire, empowering him to superintend and correct what he thought amiss in both the provinces of Canterbury and York, and to appoint all officers in the spiritual courts.⁹ The king also granted him a full power of disposing of all ecclesiastical benefices in the gift of the crown; with a visitatorial power over monasteries, colleges, and all his clergy, exempt or not exempt. By virtue of these vast powers a new court of justice was erected, called the legate's court, the jurisdiction whereof extended to all actions relating to conscience, and numberless rapines and extortions were committed by it under colour of reforming men's manners; all which his majesty connived at, out of zeal to the Church.

But at length, the king, being weary of his Queen Katharine, after he had lived with her almost twenty years, or being troubled in conscience because he had married his brother's wife, and the legitimacy of his daughter had been called in question by some foreign princes, he first separated from her bed, and then moved the pope for a divorce; but the court of Rome having held his majesty in suspense for two or three years for fear of offending the emperor, the queen's nephew, the impatient king, by the advice of Dr. Cranmer, appealed to the principal universities of Europe, and desired their opinions upon these two questions

1. "Whether it was agreeable to the law of God for a man to marry his brother's wife?

2. "Whether the pope could dispense with the law of God? "

All the universities, and most of the learned men of Europe, both Lutherans and papists, except those at Rome, declared for the negative of the two questions. The king laid their determinations before the Parliament and convocation, who agreed with the foreign universities. In the convocation of English clergy, two hundred and fifty-three were for the divorce, and but nineteen against it. Sundry learned books were written for and against the lawfulness of the marriage; one party being encouraged by the king, and the other by the pope and emperor. The pope cited the king to Rome, but his majesty ordered the Earl of Wiltshire to protest against the citation, as contrary to the prerogative of his crown; and sent a letter signed by the cardinal, the Archbishop of Canterbury, four bishops, two dukes, two marquises, thirteen earls, two viscounts, twenty-three barons, twenty-two abbots, and eleven commoners, exhorting his holiness to confirm the judgment of the learned men, and of the

universities of Europe, by annulling his marriage, or else he should be obliged to take other measures. The pope in his answer, after having acknowledged his majesty's favours, told him that the queen's appeal and avocation of the cause to Rome must be granted. The king seeing himself abused, and that the affair of his marriage, which had been already determined by the most learned men in Europe, and had been argued before the legates Campegio and Wolsey, must commence again, began to suspect Wolsey's sincerity; upon which his majesty sent for the seals from him, and soon after commanded his attorney-general to put in an information against him in the King's Bench, because that, notwithstanding the statute of Richard II. against procuring bulls from Rome under the pains of a praemunire, he had received bulls for his legatine power, which for many years he had executed. The cardinal pleaded ignorance of the statute, and submitted to the king's mercy; upon which he was declared to be out of the king's protection, to have forfeited his goods and chattels, and that his person might be seized. The haughty cardinal, not knowing how to bear his disgrace, soon after fell sick and died, declaring that if he had served God as well as he had done his prince, he would not have given him over in his grey hairs.

But the king, not satisfied with his resentments against the cardinal, resolved to be revenged on the pope himself, and accordingly, September 19th, a week before the cardinal's death, he published a proclamation forbidding all persons to purchase anything from Rome under the severest penalties, and resolved to annex the ecclesiastical supremacy to his own crown for the future. It was easy to foresee that the clergy would startle at the king's assuming to himself the pope's supremacy; but his majesty had them at his mercy, for they having acknowledged Cardinal Wolsey's legatine power, and submitted to his jurisdiction, his majesty caused an indictment to be preferred against them in Westminster Hall, and obtained judgment upon the statute of praemunire, whereby the whole body of the clergy were declared to be out of the king's protection, and to have forfeited all their goods and chattels.

In this condition they were glad to submit upon the best terms they could get, but the king would not pardon them but upon these two conditions: (1.) That the two provinces of Canterbury and York should pay into the exchequer £118,840, a vast sum of money in those times. (2.) That they should yield his majesty the title of sole and supreme head of the Church of England, next and immediately under Christ. The former they readily complied with, and promised for the future never to assemble in convocation but by the king's writ; nor to make or execute any canons or constitutions without his majesty's license; but to acknowledge a layman to be supreme head of an ecclesiastical body was such an absurdity, in their opinion, and so inconsistent with their allegiance to the pope, that they could not yield to it without an additional clause, as far as is agreeable to the laws of Christ. The king accepted it with the clause for the present, but a year or two after obtained the confirmation of it in Parliament and convocation without the clause.

The substance of the act of supremacy¹⁰ is as follows: “Albeit the king’s majesty justly and rightfully is, and ought to be, supreme head of the Church of England, and is so recognised by the clergy of this realm in their convocations; yet, nevertheless, for confirmation and corroboration thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ’s religion within this realm of England, &c., be it enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the king, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England; and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well as the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, immunities, profits, and commodities, to the said dignity of supreme head of the said Church belonging and appertaining and that our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which, by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may be lawfully reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, and increase of virtue in Christ’s religion, and for the conversation of peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm; any usage, custom, foreign law, foreign authority, prescription, or anything or things to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Here was the rise of the Reformation. The whole power of reforming heresies and errors in doctrine and worship was transferred from the pope to the king, without any regard to the rights of synods or councils of the clergy, and without a reserve of liberty to such consciences as could not comply with the public standard. This was undoubtedly a change for the better, but is far from being consonant to Scripture or reason.

The Parliament had already forbid all appeals to the court of Rome, in causes testamentary, matrimonial, and in all disputes concerning divorces, tithes, oblations, &c., under penalty of a praemunire,¹¹ and were now voting away annates and first-fruits; and providing “that, in case the pope denied his bulls for electing or consecrating bishops, it should be done without them by the archbishop of the province; that an archbishop might be consecrated by any two bishops whom the king should appoint; and being so consecrated, should enjoy all the rights of his see, any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding.” All which acts passed both houses without any considerable opposition. Thus, while the pope stood trifling about a contested marriage, the king and Parliament took away all his profits, revenues, and authority in the Church of England.

His majesty having now waited six years for a determination of his marriage from the court of Rome, and being now himself head of the Church of England, commanded Dr. Cranmer, lately consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury,¹² to call a court of canonists and divines, and proceed to judgment. Accordingly, his grace summoned Queen Katharine to appear at Dunstable, near

the place where she resided, in person or by proxy, on the 20th of May, 1533, but her majesty refused to appear, adhering to her appeal to the court of Rome; upon which the archbishop, by advice of the court, declared her contumax, and on the 23d of the same month pronounced the king's marriage with her null and void, as being contrary to the laws of God. Soon after which his majesty married Anne Bullen, and procured an act of Parliament for settling the crown upon the heirs of her body, which all his subjects were obliged to swear to.

There was a remarkable appearance of Divine Providence in this affair; for the French king had prevailed with the King of England to refer his cause once more to the court of Rome, upon assurances given that the pope should decide it in his majesty's favour within a limited time; the pope consented, and fixed a time for the return of the king's answer, but the courier not arriving upon the very day, the Imperialists, who dreaded an alliance between the pope and the King of England, persuaded his holiness to give sentence against him; and accordingly, March 23d, the marriage was declared good, and the king was required to take his wife again, otherwise the censures of the Church were to be denounced against him.¹³ Two days after this the courier arrived from England with the king's submission under his hand in due form, but it was then too late, it being hardly decent for the infallible chair to revoke its decrees in so short a time. Such was the crisis of the Reformation

The pope having decided against the king, his majesty determined to take away all his profits and authority over the Church of England at once: accordingly, a bill was brought into the Parliament then sitting, and passed without any protestation, by which it is enacted "that all payments made to the apostolic chamber, and all provisions, bulls, or dispensations, should from thenceforth cease; and that all dispensations or licenses, for things not contrary to the law of God, should be granted within the kingdom, under the seals of the two archbishops in their several provinces. The pope was to have no farther concern in the nomination or confirmation of bishops, which were appointed to be chosen by *conge d'elire* from the crown, as at present. Peter's-pence and all procurations from Rome were abolished. Moreover, all religious houses, exempt or not exempt, were to be subject to the archbishops' visitation, except some monasteries and abbeys which were to be subject to the king."¹⁴ Most of the bishops voted against this bill, but all but one set their hands to it after it was passed, according to the custom of those times. Thus the Church of England became independent of the pope, and all foreign jurisdiction.

Complaints being daily made of the severe proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts against heretics, the Parliament took this matter into consideration, and repealed the act of the second of Henry IV., above mentioned, but left the statutes of Richard II. and Henry V in full force, with this qualification, that heretics should be proceeded against upon presentments by two witnesses at least; that they should be brought to answer in open court; and if they were found guilty, and would not abjure, or were relapsed, they should be adjudged to death, the king's writ *de haeretico comburendo* being first obtained.¹⁵ By

this act the ecclesiastical courts were limited, heretics being now to be tried according to the forms of law, as in other cases.

Towards the latter end of this session, the clergy, assembled in convocation, sent up their submission to the king to be passed in Parliament, which was done accordingly: the contents were, “that the clergy acknowledged all convocations ought to be assembled by the king’s writ; and promised in *verbo sacerdotii*, that they would never make nor execute any new capons or constitutions without the royal assent; and since many canons had been received that were found prejudicial to the king’s prerogative, contrary to the laws of the land, and heavy to the subjects, that, therefore, there should be a committee of thirty-two persons, sixteen of the two houses of Parliament and as many of the clergy, to be named by the king, who should have full power to revise the old canons, and to abrogate, confirm, or alter them, as they found expedient, the king’s assent being obtained.”

This submission was confirmed by Parliament; and by the same act all appeals to Rome were again condemned. If any parties found themselves aggrieved in the archbishops’ courts, an appeal might be made to the king in the Court of Chancery, and the lord-chancellor was to grant a commission under the great seal for a hearing before delegates, whose determination should be final. All exempted abbots were also to appeal to the king; and the act concluded with a proviso “that, till such correction of the canons was made, all those which were then received should remain in force, except such as were contrary to the laws and customs of the realm, or were to the damage or hurt of the king’s prerogative.” Upon the proviso of this act all the proceedings of the commons and other spiritual courts are founded; for the canons not being corrected to this day, the old ones are in force, with the exceptions above mentioned; and this proviso is probably the reason why the canons were not corrected in the following reigns, for now it lies in the breast of the judges to declare what canons are contrary to the laws or rights of the crown, which is more for the king’s prerogative than to make a collection of ecclesiastical laws which should be fixed and immovable.

Before the Parliament +broke up they gave the annates or first-fruits of benefices, and the yearly revenue of the tenth part of all livings, which had been taken from the pope last year, to the king. This displeased the clergy, who were in hopes of being freed from that burden; but they were mistaken, for by the thirty-second of Henry VIII., cap. xlv, a court of record is ordered to be erected, called the court of the first-fruits and tenths, for the levying and government of the said first-fruits forever.

The session being ended, commissioners were sent over the kingdom to administer the oath of succession to all his majesty’s subjects, according to a late act of Parliament, by which it appears that, besides renewing their allegiance to the king, and acknowledging him to be the head of the Church, they declared, upon oath, “the lawfulness of his marriage with Queen Anne, and that they would be true to the issue begotten in it. That the Bishop of Rome

had no more power than any other bishop in his own diocese; that they would submit to all the king's laws, notwithstanding the pope's censures; that in their prayers they would pray first for the king as supreme head of the Church of England; then for the queen [Anne], then for the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other ranks of the clergy." Only Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, lord-chancellor, refused to take the oath, for which they afterward lost their lives.

The separation of the Church of England from Rome contributed something towards the reformation of its doctrines, though the body of the inferior clergy were as stiff for their old opinions as ever, being countenanced and supported by the Duke of Norfolk, by the Lord-chancellor More, by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Fisher of Rochester; but some of the nobility and bishops were for a farther reformation: among these were the new queen, Lord Cromwell, afterward Earl of Essex, Dr. Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, and Latimer of Worcester. As these were more or less in favour with the king, the reformation of religion went forward or backward throughout the whole course of his reign.

The progress of the Reformation in Germany, by the preaching of Luther, Melancthon, and others, with the number of books that were published in those parts, some of which were translated into English, revived learning, and raised people's curiosity to look into the state of religion here at home. One of the first books that was published was the translation of the New Testament by Tyndal, printed at Antwerp. 1526.¹⁶ The next was the Supplication of the Beggars, by Simon Frith of Gray's Inn, 1529. It was levelled against the begging friars, and complains that the common poor were ready to starve, because the alms of the people were intercepted by great companies of lusty, idle friars, who were able to work, and were a burden to the commonwealth. More and Fisher answered the book, endeavouring to move the people's passions by representing the supplications of the souls in purgatory which were relieved by the masses of these friars. But the strength of their arguments lay in the sword of the magistrate, which was now in their hands; for while these gentlemen were in power the clergy made sad havoc among those people who were seeking after Christian knowledge; some were cited into the bishops' courts for teaching their children the Lord's Prayer in English; some for reading forbidden books; some for speaking against the vices of the clergy; some for not coming to confession and the sacrament; and some for not observing the Church fasts; most of whom, through fear of death, did penance and were dismissed; but several of the clergy refusing to abjure, or after abjuration falling into a relapse, suffered death. Among these were the Rev. Mr. Hitton, curate of Maidstone, burned in Smithfield, 1530; the Rev. Mr. Bilney, burned at Norwich, 1531; Mr. Byfield, a monk of St. Edmondsbury; James Bainham, Knt. of the Temple; besides two men and a woman, at York. In the year 1533, Mr. John Frith,¹⁷ an excellent scholar of the University of Cambridge, was burned in Smithfield, with one Hewet, a poor apprentice, for denying the cor-

poreal presence of Christ in the sacrament; but upon the rupture between the king and the pope, and the repeal of the act of King Henry IV. against heretics, the wings of the clergy were clipped, and a stop put to their cruelties for a time.

None were more adverse to the Reformation than the monks and friars: these spoke openly against the king's proceedings, exciting the people to rebellion, and endeavouring to embroil his affairs with foreign princes; the king, therefore, resolved to humble them, and for this purpose appointed a general visitation of the monasteries, the management of which was committed to the Lord Cromwell, with the title of visiter-general, who appointed other commissioners under him, and gave them injunctions and articles of inquiry. Upon this, several abbots and priors, to prevent a scrutiny into their conduct, voluntarily surrendered their houses into the king's hands; others, upon examination, appeared guilty of the greatest frauds and impositions on the simplicity of the people: many of their pretended relics were exposed and destroyed, as the Virgin Mary's milk, showed in eight places; the coals that roasted St. Lawrence; and an angel with one wing that brought over the head of the spear that pierced our Saviour's side; the rood of grace, which was so contrived, that the eyes and lips might move upon occasion; with many others. The images of a great many pretended saints were taken down and burned, and all the rich offerings made at their shrines were seized for the crown, which brought an immense treasure into the exchequer.

Upon the report of the visiters, the Parliament consented to the suppression of the lesser monasteries under £200 a year value, and gave them to the king to the number of three hundred and seventy-six. Their rents amounted to about £32,000 per annum: their plate, jewels, and furniture, to about. £100,000.¹⁸ The churches and cloisters were for the most part pulled down, and the lead, and bells, and other materials, sold. A new court, called the Court of Augmentations of the King's Revenue,¹⁹ was erected, to receive the rents and to dispose of the lands, and bring the profits into the exchequer. Every religious person that was turned out of his cell had 45s. given him in money, of which number there were about ten thousand; and every governor had a pension. But to ease the government of this charge, the monks and friars were put into benefices as fast as they became vacant; by which means it came to pass that the body of the inferior clergy were disguised papists and enemies to the Reformation.

The lesser religious houses being dissolved, the rest followed in a few years: for in the years 1537 and 1539, the greater abbeyes and monasteries were broken up, or surrendered to the crown, to prevent an inquiry into their lives and manners. This raised a great clamour among the people, the monks and friars going up and down the country like beggars, clamouring at the injustice of the suppression. The king, to quiet them, gave back fifteen abbeyes and sixteen nunneries for perpetual alms; but several of the abbots being convicted of plots and conspiracies against his government, his majesty resumed his grants

after two years, and obtained an act of Parliament, whereby he was empowered to erect sundry new cathedral churches and bishoprics, and to endow them out of the profits of the religious houses. The king intended, says Bishop Burnet, to convert £18,000 a year into a revenue for eighteen bishoprics and cathedrals; but of them he only erected six, viz., the bishoprics of Westminster, Chester, Peterborough, Oxford, Gloucester, and Bristol. This was the chief of what his majesty did for religion, which was but a small return of the immense sums that fell into his hands: for the clear rents of all the suppressed houses were cast up at £131,607 6s. 4d per annum, as they were then rated, but were at least ten times as much in value. Most of the abbey lands were given away among the courtiers, or sold at easy rates to the gentry, to engage them by interest against the resumption of them to the Church. In the year 1545, the Parliament gave the king the chantries, colleges, free chapels, hospitals, fraternities, and guilds, with their manors and estates. Seventy manors and parks were alienated from the archbishopric of York, and twelve from Canterbury, and confirmed to the crown. How easily might this king, with his immense revenues, have put an end to the being of Parliaments!

The translation of the New Testament by Tyndal, already mentioned, had a wonderful spread among the people; though the bishops condemned it, and proceeded with the utmost severity against those that read it. They complained of it to the king; upon which his majesty called it in by proclamation in the month of June, 1530, and promised that a more correct translation should be published: but it was impossible to stop the curiosity of the people so long; for, though the bishops bought up and burned all they could meet with, the Testament was reprinted abroad, and sent over to merchants at London, who dispersed the copies privately among their acquaintance and friends.

At length, it was moved in convocation that the whole Bible should be translated into English, and set up in churches; but most of the old clergy were against it. They said this would lay the foundation of innumerable heresies, as it had done in Germany; and that the people were not proper judges of the sense of Scripture: to which it was replied, that the Scriptures were written at first in the vulgar tongue; that our Saviour commanded his hearers to search the Scriptures; and that it was necessary people should do so now, that they might be satisfied that the alterations the king had made in religion were not contrary to the Word of God. These arguments prevailed with the majority to consent that a petition should be presented to the king, that his majesty would please to give order about it.

But the old bishops were too much disinclined to move in it. The Reformers, therefore, were forced to have recourse to Mr. Tyndal's Bible, which had been printed at Hamburg, 1532, and reprinted three or four years after by Grafton and Whitchurch. The translators were Tyndal, assisted by Miles Coverdale, and Mr. John Rogers, the protomartyr: the Apocrypha was done by Rogers, and some marginal notes were inserted to the whole, which gave offence, and occasioned that Bible to be prohibited. But Archbishop Cranmer,

having now reviewed and corrected it, left out the prologue and notes, and added a preface of his own; and because Tyndal was now put to death for a heretic, his name was laid aside, and it was called Thomas Matthew's Bible, and by some Cranmer's Bible; though it was no more than Tyndal's translation corrected.²⁰ This Bible was allowed by authority, and eagerly read by all sorts of people.

The fall of Queen Anne Bullen, mother of Queen Elizabeth, was a great prejudice to the Reformation. She was a virtuous and pious lady, but airy and indiscreet in her behaviour: the popish party hated her for her religion; and having awakened the king's jealousy, put him upon a nice observance of her carriage, by which she quickly fell under his majesty's displeasure, who ordered her to be sent to the Tower, May 1. On the 15th of the same month she was tried by her peers for incontinence, for a precontract of marriage, and for conspiring the king's death; and though there was little or no evidence, the lords found her guilty, for fear of offending the king; and four days after she was beheaded within the Tower, protesting her innocence to the last. Soon after her execution the king called a Parliament to set aside the succession of the Lady Elizabeth, her daughter, which was done, and the king was empowered to nominate his successor by his last will and testament; so that both his majesty's daughters were now declared illegitimate; but the king having power to settle the succession as he pleased, in case of failure of male heirs, they were still in hopes, and quietly submitted to their father's pleasure.

Complaint being sent to court of the diversity of doctrines delivered in pulpits, the king sent a circular letter to all the bishops, July 12 [1536], forbidding all preaching till Michaelmas; by which time certain articles of religion, most catholic, should be set forth. The king himself framed the articles, and sent them into convocation, where they were agreed to by both houses. An abstract of them will show the state of the Reformation at this time.

1. "All preachers were to instruct the people to believe the whole Bible, and the three creeds, viz., the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian, and to interpret all things according to them.

2. "That baptism was a sacrament instituted by Christ; that it was necessary to salvation; that infants were to be baptized for the pardon of original sin; and that the opinions of the Anabaptists and Pelagians were detestable heresies. [And that those of ripe age, who desired baptism, must join with it repentance and contrition for their sins, with a firm belief of the articles of the faith.]

3. "That penance, that is, contrition, confession, and amendment of life, with works of charity, was necessary to salvation; to which must be added, faith in the mercy of God, that he will justify and pardon us, not for the worthiness of any merit or work done by us, but for the only merits of the blood and passion of Jesus Christ; nevertheless, that a confession to a priest was necessary, if it might be had; and that the absolution of a priest was the same as if it were spoken by God himself, according to our Saviour's words. That auricu-

lar confession was of use for the comfort of men's consciences. And though we are justified only by the satisfaction of Christ, yet the people were to be instructed in the necessity of good works.

4. "That in the sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine, there was, truly and substantially, the same body of Christ that was born of the Virgin.

5. "That justification signified the remission of sins, and a perfect renovation of nature in Christ.

6. "Concerning images: that the use of them was warranted in Scripture; that they served to stir up devotion; and that it was meet they should stand in churches; but the people were to be taught that, in kneeling or worshipping before them, they were not to do it to the image, but to God.

7. "Concerning honouring of saints, they were to be instructed not to expect those favours from them which are to be obtained only from God, but they were to honour them, to praise God for them, and to imitate their virtues.

8. "For praying to saints: that it was good to pray to them to pray for us and with us.

9. "Of ceremonies. The people were to be taught that they were good and lawful, having mystical significations in them; such were the vestments in the worship of God, sprinkling holy water to put us in mind of our baptism and the blood of Christ; giving holy bread, in sign of our union to Christ; bearing candles on Candlemas day, in remembrance of Christ, the spiritual light; giving ashes on Ash Wednesday, to put us in mind of penance and our mortality; bearing palms on Palm Sunday, to show our desire to receive Christ into our hearts as he entered into Jerusalem; creeping to the cross on Good Friday, and kissing it, in memory of his death; with the setting up of the sepulchre on that day, the hallowing the font, and other exorcisms and benedictions.

Lastly. "As to purgatory, they were to declare it good and charitable to pray for souls departed; but since the place they were in, and the pains they suffered, were uncertain by Scripture, they ought to remit them to God's mercy. Therefore, all abuses of this doctrine were to be put away, and the people disengaged from believing that the pope's pardons, or masses said in certain places, or before certain images, could deliver souls out of purgatory."

These articles were signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, seventeen bishops, forty abbots and priors, and fifty archdeacons and proctors of the lower house of convocation: they were published by the king's authority, with a preface in his name requiring all his subjects to accept them, which would encourage him to take farther pains for the honour of God and the welfare of his people. One sees here the dawn of the Reformation; the Scriptures and the ancient creeds are made the standards of faith without the tradition of the Church or decrees of the pope; the doctrine of justification by faith is well stated; four of the seven sacraments are passed over, and purgatory is left doubtful. But transubstantiation, auricular confession, the worshipping of images and saints, still remained.

The court of Rome were not idle spectators of these proceedings; they threatened the king, and spirited up the clergy to rebellion; and when all hopes of accommodation were at an end, the pope pronounced sentence of excommunication against the whole kingdom, depriving his majesty of his crown and dignity, forbidding his subjects to obey him, and all foreign princes to correspond with him; all his leagues with them were dissolved, and his own clergy were commanded to depart the kingdom, and his nobility to rise in arms against him. The king, laying hold of this opportunity, called a Parliament, and obtained an act requiring all his subjects, under the pains of treason, to swear that the king was supreme head of the Church of England; and to strike terror into the popish party, three priors and a monk of the Carthusian order were executed as traitors for refusing the oath, and for saying that the king was not supreme head under Christ of the Church of England; but the two greatest sacrifices were John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, late lord-chancellor of England, who were both beheaded last year, within a fortnight of each other. This quieted the people for a time, but soon after there was an insurrection in Lincolnshire of twenty thousand men, headed by a churchman and directed by a monk; but upon a proclamation of pardon, they dispersed themselves: the same year there was another more formidable in the North, but after some time the rebels were defeated by the Duke of Norfolk, and the heads of them executed, among whom were divers abbots and priests. These commotions incensed the king against the religious houses, as nurseries of sedition, and made him resolve to suppress them all.

In the mean time, his majesty went on boldly against the Church of Rome, and published certain injunctions by his own authority, to regulate the behaviour of the clergy. This was the first act of pure supremacy done by the king, for in all that went before he had the concurrence of the convocation. The injunctions were to this purpose.

1. "That the clergy should twice every quarter publish to the people that the Bishop of Rome's usurped power had no foundation in Scripture, but that the king's supremacy was according to the laws of God.

- 2, 3. "They were to publish the late articles of faith set forth by the king, and likewise the king's proclamation for the abrogation of certain holydays in harvest-time.

4. "They were to dissuade the people from making pilgrimages to saints, and to exhort them to stay at home and mind their families, and keep God's commandments.

5. "They were to exhort them to teach their children the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and Ten Commandments, in English.²¹

6. "They were to take care that the sacraments were reverently administered in their parishes.

7. "That the clergy do not frequent taverns and alehouses, nor sit long at games, but give themselves to the study of the Scriptures and a good life.

8. "Every beneficed person of £20 a year that did not reside, was to pay the fortieth part of his benefice to the poor.

9. "Every incumbent of £100 a year to maintain one scholar at the university; and so many hundreds a year so many scholars.

10. "The fifth part of the profits of livings to be given to the repair of the vicarage house, if it be in decay."

Thus the very same opinions, for which the followers of Wickliffe and Luther had been burned a few years before, were enjoined by the king's authority.

This year a very remarkable book was printed by Batchelor, the king's printer, *cum privilegio*, called "The Institution of a Christian Man." It was called the "Bishop's Book," because it was composed by sundry bishops, as Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Stokeley of London, Gardiner of Winchester, Sampson of Chichester, Reps of Norwich, Goodrick of Ely, Latimer of Worcester, Shaxton of Salisbury, Fox of Hereford, Barlow of St. David's, and some other divines. It is divided into several chapters, and contains an explanation of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Ave Maria, Justification, and Purgatory. "The book maintains the local descent of Christ into hell, and that all articles of faith are to be interpreted according to Scripture and the first four general councils. It defends the seven sacraments, and under the sacrament of the altar, affirms that the body of Christ that suffered on the cross is substantially present under the form of bread and wine. It maintains but two orders of the clergy, and avers that no one bishop has authority over another according to the Word of God. The invocation of saints is restrained to intercession, forasmuch as they have it not in their own power to bestow any blessings upon us. It maintains that no church should be consecrated to any being but God. It gives liberty to work on saints' days, especially in harvest time. It maintains the doctrine of passive obedience. In the article of justification, it says we are justified only by the merits and satisfaction of Christ, and that no good works on our part can procure the Divine favour or prevail for our justification."²²

This book was recommended and subscribed by the two archbishops, nineteen bishops, and the lower house of convocation, among whom were Gardiner, Bonner, and others, who put their brethren to death for these doctrines in the reign of Queen Mary; but the reason of their present compliance might be, because all their hopes from the succession of the Princess Mary were now defeated, Queen Jane being brought to bed of a son October the 12th, 1538, who was baptized Edward, and succeeded his father.

The translation of the Bible, already mentioned, was this year printed and published. Cromwell procured the king's warrant for all his majesty's subjects to read it without control; and, by his injunctions, commanded one to be set up publicly in all the churches in England, that the people might read it. His majesty farther enjoined the clergy to preach the necessity of faith and repentance, and against trusting in pilgrimages and other men's works; to order such im-

ages as had been abused to superstition to be taken down, and to tell the people that praying to them was no less than idolatry; but still, transubstantiation, the seven sacraments, the communion in one kind only, purgatory, auricular confession, praying for the dead, the celibacy of the clergy, sprinkling of holy water, invocation of saints, some images in churches, with most of the superstitious rites and ceremonies of the popish church, were retained.

Here his majesty made a stand; for after this the Reformation fluctuated, and, upon the whole, went rather backward than forward; which was owing to several causes, as (1.) To the unhappy death of the queen in childbed, who had possession of the king's heart, and was a promoter of the Reformation. (2.) To the king's disagreement with the Protestant princes of Germany, who would not put him at the head of their league, because he would not abandon the doctrine of transubstantiation and permit the communion in both kinds. (3.) To the king's displeasure against the archbishop and the other bishops of the new learning, because he could not prevail with them to give consent in Parliament that the king should appropriate all the suppressed monasteries to his own use. (4.) To his majesty's unhappy marriage with the Lady Anne of Cleves, a Protestant; which was promoted by the Reformers, and proved the ruin of the Lord Cromwell, who was at that time the bulwark of the Reformation. (5.) To the artifice and abject submission of Gardiner, Bonner, and other popish bishops, who, by flattering the king's imperious temper, and complying with his dictates, prejudiced him against the reformed. And, lastly, To his majesty's growing infirmities, which made him so peevish and positive that it was dangerous to advise to anything that was not known to be agreeable to his sovereign will and pleasure.

The king began to discover his zeal against the Sacramentaries [and Anabaptists²³] (as those were called who denied the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist), by prohibiting the importing of all foreign books, or printing any portions of Scripture till they had been examined by himself and council, or by the bishop of the diocese; by punishing all that denied the old rites, and by forbidding all to argue against the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, on pain of death. For breaking this last order, he condemned to the flames this very year that faithful witness to the truth, John Lambert, who had been minister of the English congregation at Antwerp, and afterward taught school in London; but hearing Dr. Taylor preach concerning the real presence, he offered him a paper of reasons against it. Taylor carried the paper to Cranmer, who was then a Lutheran, and endeavoured to make him retract; but Lambert, unhappily, appealed to the King, who, after a kind of mock trial in Westminster Hall, in presence of the bishops, nobility, and judges, passed sentence of death upon him, condemning him to be burned as an incorrigible heretic. Cranmer was appointed to dispute against him, and Cromwell to read the sentence. He was soon after executed in Smithfield in a most barbarous manner; his last words in the flames were, "None but Christ! None but Christ!"²⁴

The Parliament that met next spring disserved the Reformation, and brought religion back to the standard in which it continued to the king's death, by the act [31 Hen. VIII., cap. xlv.] commonly known by the name of the bloody statute, or the statute of the six articles: it was entitled, An act for abolishing Diversity of Opinions in certain Articles concerning Christian Religion. The six articles were these:²⁵

1. "That in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine, but under these forms the natural body and blood of Christ are present.

2. "That communion in both kinds is not necessary to salvation to all persons by the law of God, but that both the flesh and blood of Christ are together in each of the kinds.

3. "That priests may not marry by the law of God.

4. "That vows of chastity ought to be observed by the law of God.

5. "That private masses ought to be continued, which, as it is agreeable to God's law, so men receive great benefit by them.

6. "That auricular confession is expedient and necessary, and ought to be retained in the Church."

It was farther enacted, that if any did speak, preach, or write against the first article, they should be judged heretics, and be burned without any abjuration, and forfeit their real and personal estate to the king. Those who preached, or obstinately disputed against the other articles, were to suffer death as felons, without benefit of clergy; and those who, either in word or writing, declared against them, were to be prisoners during the king's pleasure, and to forfeit their goods and chattels for the first offence, and for the second to suffer death. All ecclesiastical incumbents were to read this act in their churches once a quarter.

As soon as the six articles took place, Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, and Latimer of Worcester, resigned their bishoprics, and being presented for speaking against the act, they were imprisoned. Latimer continued a prisoner to the king's death, but Shaxton, being threatened with the fire, turned apostate, and proved a cruel persecutor of the Protestants in Queen Mary's reign. Commissions were issued out to the archbishops, bishops, and their commissaries, to hold a sessions quarterly, or oftener, and to proceed upon presentments by a jury according to law; which they did most severely, insomuch that in a very little time five hundred persons were put in prison, and involved in the guilt of the statute; but Cranmer and Cromwell obtained their pardon, which mortified the popish clergy to such a degree, that they proceeded no farther till Cromwell fell.

Another very remarkable act of Parliament, passed this session was concerning obedience to the King's proclamations. It enacts, that the king, with advice of his council, may set forth proclamations with pains and penalties, which shall be obeyed as fully as an act of Parliament, provided they be not contrary to the laws and customs in being, and do not extend so far as that the

subject should suffer in estate, liberty, or person. An act of attainder was also passed against sixteen persons, some for denying the supremacy, and others without any particular crime mentioned; none of them were brought to a trial, nor is there any mention in the records of any witnesses examined.²⁶ There never had been an example of such arbitrary proceedings before in England; yet this precedent was followed by several others in the course of this reign. By another statute, it was enacted that the councillors of the king's successor, if he were under age, might set forth proclamations in his name, which were to be obeyed in the same manner with those set forth by the King himself. I mention this, because upon this act was founded the validity of all the changes of religion in the minority of Edward VI.²⁷

Next year [1546] happened the fall of Lord Cromwell, one of the great pillars of the Reformation. He had been lately constituted the king's vicegerent in ecclesiastical affairs, and made a speech in Parliament, April 12th, under that character. On the 14th of April the king created him Earl of Essex, and Knight of the Garter; but within two months he was arrested at the council-table for high treason, and sent to the Tower, and on the 28th of July was beheaded by virtue of a bill of attainder, without being brought to a trial, or once allowed to speak for himself. He was accused of executing certain orders and directions, for which he had very probably the king's warrant, and, therefore, was not admitted to make answer. But the true cause of his fall²⁸ was the share he had in the king's marriage with the Lady Anne of Cleves, whom his majesty took an aversion to as soon as he saw her, and was, therefore, determined to show his resentments against the promoters of it: but his majesty soon after lamented the loss of his honest and faithful servant when it was too late.

Two days after the death of Cromwell there was a very odd execution of Protestants and papists at the same time and place. The Protestants were Dr. Barnes, Mr. Gerrard, and Mr. Jerome, all clergymen and Lutherans; they were sent to the tower for offensive sermons preached at the Spittle in the Easter week, and were attainted of heresy by the Parliament without being brought to a hearing. Four papists, viz., Gregory Buttolph, Adam Damplin, Edmund Brindholme, and Clement Philpot, were by the same act attainted for denying the king's supremacy, and adhering to the Bishop of Rome. The Protestants were burned, and the papists hanged: the former cleared themselves of heresy by rehearsing the articles of their faith at the stake, and died with great devotion and piety; and the latter, though grieved to be drawn in the same hurdle with them they accounted heretics, declared their hearty forgiveness of all their enemies.

About this time [1543] was published a very remarkable treatise, called A Necessary Erudition for a Christian Man. It was drawn up by a committee of bishops and divines, and was afterward read and approved by the lords spiritual and temporal, and the lower house of Parliament. A great part of it was corrected by the king's own hand, and the whole was published by his order, with a preface in the name of King Henry VIII., dedicated to all his faithful sub-

jects. It was called the King's Book, and was designed for a standard of Christian belief.²⁹ The reader, therefore, will judge by the abstract below, of the sentiments of our first Reformers in sundry points of doctrine and discipline,³⁰ which then constituted the established doctrine of the Church of England; for by the statute of 32 Hen. VIII, cap. xxvi., it is enacted "that all decrees and ordinances which shall be made and ordained by the archbishops, bishops, and doctors, and shall be published with the king's advice and confirmation, by his letters patent, in and upon the matters of Christian faith, and lawful rights and ceremonies, shall be in every point thereof believed, obeyed, and performed, to all intents and purposes, upon the pains therein comprised; provided nothing be ordained contrary to the laws of the realm." How near the book above mentioned comes to the qualifications of this statute, is obvious to the reader. It is no less evident that by the same act the king was in a manner invested with the infallibility of the pope, and had the consciences and faith of his people at his absolute disposal.

By this abstract of the erudition of a Christian man,²⁹ it appears, farther, that our reformers built pretty much upon the plan of St. Austin, with relation to the doctrines of justification and grace. The sacraments and ceremonies are so contrived as to be consistent with the six articles established by Parliament. But with regard to discipline, Cranmer and his brethren were for being directed wholly by the civil magistrate, which has since been distinguished by the name of Erastianism. Accordingly, they took out commissions to hold their bishoprics during the king's pleasure, and to exercise their jurisdiction by his authority only.

But notwithstanding this reformation of doctrine, the old popish forms of worship were continued till this year [1544], when a faint attempt was made to reform them. A form of procession was published in English, by the king's authority, entitled *An Exhortation to Prayer*, thought meet by His Majesty and his Clergy to be read to the People; also a Litany, with Suffrages to be said or sung in the Time of the Processions. In the litany they invoke the blessed Virgin, the angels, archangels, and all holy orders of blessed spirits; all holy patriarchs; prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins, and all the blessed company of heaven, to pray for them. The rest of the litany is in a manner the very same as now in use, only a few more collects were placed at the end, with some psalms, and a paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer. The preface is an exhortation to the duty of prayer, and says that it is convenient, and very acceptable to God, to use private prayer in our mother-tongue, that, by understanding what we ask,³⁰ we may more earnestly and fervently desire the same. The hand of Cranmer was, no doubt, in this performance, but it was little regarded, though a mandate was sent to Bonner, bishop of London, to publish it.³¹

But Cranmer's power was now very much weakened; he strove against the stream, and could accomplish nothing farther, except a small mitigation of the rigorous prosecution of the six articles; for by the thirty-fifth of Henry VIII., cap. v., it is enacted "that persons shall not be convicted upon this statute but

by the oaths of twelve men; that the prosecution shall be within a year; and that, if any one preaches against the six articles, he shall be informed against within forty days." This rendered the prosecution more difficult; and yet, after all, several were burned at this time for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation, as Mrs. Anne Askew, Mr. Belenian, Adams, Lascels, and others. The books of Tyndal, Frith, Joy, Barnes, and other Protestants, were ordered to be burned; and the importation of all foreign books relating to religion was forbid, without special license from the king.

Upon the whole, the Reformation went very much backward the three or four last years of the king's life, as appears by the statute of 35 Henry VIII., cap. i., which leads the people back into the darkest parts of popery. It says "that recourse must be had to the Catholic and apostolic Church for the decision of controversies; and therefore all books of the Old and New Testament in English, being of Tyndal's false translation, or comprising any matter of Christian religion, articles of faith, or Holy Scripture, contrary to the doctrine set forth by the king [in the six articles], 1540, or to be set forth by the king, shall be abolished. No person shall sing or rhyme contrary to the said doctrine. No person shall retain any English books or writings against the holy and blessed sacrament of the altar, or other books abolished by the king's proclamation. There shall be no annotations or preambles in Bibles or New Testaments in English. The Bible shall not be read in English in any church. No woman, or artificers, apprentices, journeymen, serving-men, husbandmen, or labourers, shall read the New Testament in English. Nothing shall be taught or maintained contrary to the king's instructions. If any spiritual person shall be convicted of preaching or maintaining anything contrary to the king's instructions already made, or hereafter to be made, he shall for the first offence recant, for the second bear a fagot, and for the third be burned.

Here is popery and spiritual slavery in its full extent. Indeed, the pope is discharged of his jurisdiction and authority, but a like authority is vested in the king. His majesty's instructions are as binding as the pope's canons, and upon as severe penalties. He is absolute lord of the consciences of his subjects. No bishop or spiritual person may preach any doctrine but what he approves, nor do any act of government in the Church but by his special commission: This seems to have been given his majesty by the act of supremacy, and is farther confirmed by one of the last statutes of his reign [37 Henry VIII., cap. xvii], which declares that "archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from his royal majesty, and that his majesty is the only supreme head of the Church of England and Ireland; to whom, by Holy Scripture, all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct all manner of heresies, errors, vices, and sins whatsoever, and to all such persons as his majesty shall appoint thereunto."

This was carrying the regal power to the utmost length. Here is no reserve of privilege for convocations, councils, or colleges of bishops; the king may

ask their advice, or call them in to his aid and assistance, but his majesty has not only a negative voice upon their proceedings, but may himself, by his letters patent, publish injunctions in matters of religion, for correcting all errors in doctrine and worship. His proclamations have the force of a law, and all his subjects are obliged to believe, obey, and profess according to them, under the highest penalties.³²

Thus matters stood when this great and absolute monarch died of an ulcer in his leg, being so corpulent that he was forced to be let up and down stairs with an engine. The humour in his leg made him so peevish, that scarce anybody durst speak to him of the affairs of his kingdom or of another life. He signed his will December 30, 1546, and died January 28th following, in the thirty-eighth year of his reign, and the fifty-sixth of his age. He ought to be ranked (says Bishop Burnet) among the ill princes, but not among the worst.³³

FOOTNOTE

1 Fuller's Church History, book iv., p 145-148.

2 See the very valuable. Life. of Wickliffe, published by the Rev. Mr. Lewis, of Margate, which begins thus: "John de Wickliffe was born, very probably, about the year 1324, in the parish of Wickliffe, near Richmond, in Yorkshire, and was first admitted commoner of Queen's College, Oxford, then newly founded by Robert Eggesfield, S.T.B., but was soon after removed to Merton College, where he was first probationer and afterward fellow. He was advanced to the professor's chair, 1372. It appears by this ingenious writer, as well as by the Catalogus Testium, that Wickliffe was for 'rejecting all human rites, and new shadows or traditions in religion; and with regard to the identity of the order of bishops and priests in the apostolic age, he is very positive. *Unum audacter assero*, one thing I boldly assert, that in the primitive Church, or in the time of the Apostle Paul, two orders of clergy were thought sufficient, viz., priest and deacon; and I do also say, that in the time of Paul, *fuit idem presbter atque episcopus*, a priest and a bishop were one and the same: for in those times the distinct orders of pope, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, officials, and deans were not invented."

Mr. Neal's review of the first volume of the History of the Puritans, subjoined to the quarto edition of this history, vol. i., p. 890.—ED.

To Mr. Neal's account of Wickliffe's sentiments, it may be added, that he advanced some tenets which not only symbolize with, but directly led to, the peculiar opinions of those who, called Baptists, have in subsequent ages formed a large body of dissenters, viz., "that wise men leave that as impertinent which is not plainly expressed in Scripture; that those are fools and presumptuous which affirm such infants not to be saved which die without baptism; that baptism doth not confer, but only signify grace, which was given before. He also denied that all sins are abolished in baptism; and asserted that children may be saved without baptism; and that the baptism of water profiteth not, without the baptism of the Spirit."—Fuller's Church History, b. iv., p. 130. Trialogus, lib. iv., cap. i.—ED.

3 Fox's Martyrol. Pierce's Vindicat., p. 4, 5.

4 Knighton, a canon of Leicester and a contemporary of Wickliffe, tells us that in the year 1382 "their number very much increased, and that, starting like saplings from the root of a tree, they were multiplied, and filled every place within the compass of the land."—Dr. Vaughan's Life of Wickliffe, vol. ii., p 154. 2d edition —C.

5 It marks the profaneness, as well as cruelty of the act here quoted by Mr. Neal, that it was not directed merely against the avowed followers of Wickliffe, as such, but against the perusal of the Scriptures in English: for it enacted, "that whatsoever they were that should read the Scriptures in the mother tongue (which was then called Wicleue's learning), they should forfeit land, catel, lif, and godes, for theyr heyres forever, and so be condemned for heretykes to God, enemies to the crowne, and most arrant traitors to the lande."—Emlyn's Complete Collection of State Trials, p. 48, as quoted in Dr. Flemming's Palladium, p. 30, note.

So great an alarm did the doctrine of Wickliffe raise, and so high did the fear of its spread rise, that by the statute of 5 Rich. II. and 2 Hen. IV., c. 15, it was enacted, as part of the sheriff's oath, "that he should seek to redress all errors and heresies, commonly called Lollards." And it is a striking instance of the permanent footing which error and absurdity, and even iniquity gain, when once established by law, that this clause was preserved in the oath long after the Reformation, even to the first of Charles I., when Sir Edward Coke, on being appointed

sheriff of the county of Buckingham, objected to it, and ever since it has been left out.—The Complete Sheriff, p. 17.—ED.

6 Thus, in the reign of Edward IV., John Keyser was committed to jail, by Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, on the suspicion of heresy, because, having been excommunicated, he said “that, notwithstanding the archbishop or his commissary had excommunicated him, yet before God he was not excommunicated, for his corn yielded as well as his neighbours.”“ Thus, also, in the reign of Henry VII. Hillary Warner was arrested on the charge of heresy because he said “that he was not bound to pay tithe to the curate of the parish where he lived.”

Coke’s Institutes, 3 inst., p. 42, quoted in a treatise on heresy as cognizable in the spiritual courts, p. 22, 23.—ED.

7 Mr. Fox observes, that though “this book carried the king’s name in the title, it was another who ministered the notion and framed the style. But, whoever had the labour of the book, the king had the thanks and the reward.”—Acts and Monuments of Martyrs, vol. ii., p. 57. It has been said that the jester at the court, seeing Henry overcome with joy, asked the reason; and when told that it was because his holiness had conferred upon him this new title, he replied, “My good Harry, let me and thee defend each other, and let the faith alone to defend itself.” “If this was uttered as a serious joke,” says a writer, “the fool was, undoubtedly, the wisest man of the two.”—C.

8 “The extravagant praises which he received for this performance,” observes Dr. Warner, “meeting with so much pride and conceitedness in his nature, made him from this time impatient of all contradictions on religious subjects, and to set up himself for the standard of truth, by which his people were to regulate their belief.”—Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii., p. 228. We are surprised, in the event, to see this prince, who was now “the pride of popery, become its scourge.” Such are the fluctuations in human characters and affairs, and so unsearchable are the ways of Providence!—ED.

11 24 Henry VIII., cap. xii.

12 Cranmer’s elevation took place in 1533. “He appears to have accepted the distinction with reluctance, and the best friends of his reputation must regard his compliance with some degree of regret. He was destitute of that fortitude and determination of mind which so high a station required. He was timid and vacillating; honest in his purposes, but irresolute in his conduct. In a private station, or in a calmer age, he would have maintained an irreproachable character; but at present he needs all the sympathy which his martyrdom inspires to retain for him a high place in the respect of impartial men.”—Dr. Price’s History of Nonconformity, vol. i., p. 8.—C.

13 Burnet’s Hist. Ref., vol. i., p. 135.

14 25 Henry VIII., cap. xx., xxi.

15 25 Henry VIII., cap. xlv.

16 Of this edition, which consisted of fifteen hundred copies, only one is supposed to exist; that copy is preserved in the library of the Baptist College, Bristol, England. The scarceness of this edition is easily accounted for: t^o The book that had the greatest authority and influence was Tindal’s translation of the New Testament, of which the bishops made great complaints, and said it was full of errors. But Tonsal, then Bishop of London, being a man of invincible moderation, would do nobody any hurt, yet endeavoured, as he could, to get their books into his hands; so, being at Antwerp in the year 1529, he sent for one Packington, an English merchant there, and desired him to see how many New Testaments of Tindal’s translation he might have for money. Packington, who was a secret favourer of Tindal, told him what the bishop proposed. Tindal was very glad of it; for, being convinced of some faults in his work, he was designing a new and more correct edition; but he was poor, and the former impression not being sold off, he could not go about it; so he gave Packington all the copies that lay in his hands, for which the bishop paid the price, and brought them over, and burned them publicly in Cheapside. This had such a hateful appearance in it, being generally called a burning of the Word of God, that people from thence concluded there must be a visible contra-

riety between that book and the doctrines of those who so handled it; by which both their prejudice against the clergy, and their desire of reading the New Testament, were increased. So that next year, when the second edition was finished, many were brought over, and Constantine (a coadjutor of Tindal) being taken in England, the lord-chancellor, in a private examination, promised him that no hurt should be done him if he would reveal who encouraged and supported him at Antwerp; which he accepted of, and told that the greatest encouragement they had was from the Bishop of London, who had bought up half the impression. This made all that heard of it laugh heartily, though more judicious persons discerned the great temper of that learned bishop in it.”—Burnet’s *Reform.*, i., 260.—C.

17 Mr. Frith wrote a tract, published with his other works, London, 1573, entitled “A Declaration of Baptism.”

Sir James Bainham seems, from his examination before the Bishop of London, Dec. 15, 1531, to have been an opposer of infant baptism.—Crosby’s *Hist. of the English Baptists*, vol. i., p. 21.

Fox’s *Martyrs*, vol. ii., p. 227, 241, 256, 445.—C.

18 Burnet’s *Hist. Ref.*, vol. i., p. 223.

19 27 Henry VIII., cap. xxvii., xxviii.

20 “Cranmer began with the New Testament, an English copy of which he divided into eight or ten parts, and sent to the most learned men of his day for their correction. These were returned to Lambeth at the appointed time, with the exception of the Acts of the Apostles, which had been intrusted to Stokesley, bishop of London, who wrote to Cranmer, “I marvel what my Lord of Canterbury meaneth, that he thus abuseth the people, in giving them liberty to read the Scriptures, which doth nothing else but infect them with heresy. I have bestowed never an hour upon my portion, nor ever will. And therefore my lord shall have this book again, for I will never be guilty of bringing the simple people into error.”* So perverted were the views of the dignitaries of the Church, and so determined the opposition which Cranmer encountered in his labours for its reformation. His personal sense of the value of the Scriptures, and deep conviction of their importance, led him to persevere in his design, and secured his ultimate success.”—Dr. Price’s *Hist. of Nonconformity*, vol. i., p. 49.—C.

* When Cranmer expressed his surprise at the conduct of Stokesley, we are told that Mr. Thomas Lawney, who stood by, remarked, “I can tell your grace why my Lord of London will not bestow any labour or pains this way. Your grace knoweth well that his portion is a piece of the New Testament; but he, being persuaded that Christ had bequeathed him nothing in his Testament, thought it mere madness to bestow any labour or pains where no gain was to be gotten. And, besides this, it is the Acts of the Apostles, which were simple, poor fellows, and therefore my Lord of London disdained to have to do with any of them.” Strype’s *Cranmer*, vol. i., p. 48, 49, 59, 82.—C

21 And every incumbent was to explain these, one article a day, until the people were instructed in them.”—Maddox’s *Vindic.*, p. 299.—ED.

22 Strype’s *Mem. of Cranmer*, p. 51.

23 In the articles of religion set forth in 1536, the sect of Anabaptists is mentioned and condemned. Fourteen Hollanders, accused of holding their opinions, were put to death in 1535, and ten saved themselves by recantation. In 1428, there were in the diocese of Norwich one hundred and twenty who held that infants were sufficiently baptized if their parents were baptized before them; that Christian people be sufficiently baptized in the blood of Christ, and need no water; and that the sacrament of baptism used in the Church by water is but a light matter, and of small effect. Three of these persons were burned alive. Long before this, it was a charge laid against the Lollards that they held these opinions, and would not baptize their new-born children.—See Fox as quoted by Crosby, vol. i., p. 24, 40, 41.—ED.

24 Lambert having heard Dr. Taylor preach on the presence of Christ in the sacrament, he sought an interview with him, and stated his objections to the received doctrine, which he afterward committed to writing. Taylor showed this paper to Dr. Barnes, a Lutheran, and they reported the matter to Cranmer, who summoned Lambert into the archiepiscopal court. It is deserving of notice that Cranmer, Taylor, and Barnes, the chief agents in Lambert’s death,

were themselves brought to the stake as heretics! Dr. Price's *Hist. of Noncon.*, vol. i., p. 49, 50.—C.

25 Cranmer alone had the courage to oppose the passing these articles.—W

26 Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, vol. i., p. 263.

27 In this year sixteen men and fifteen women were banished for opposing infant baptism. they went to Delft, in Holland, and were there prosecuted and put to death as Anabaptists; the men being beheaded, and the women drowned. Among other injunctions issued out in 1539, was one against those who embraced the opinions, or possessed books containing the opinions, of Sacramentarians and Anabaptists. Crosby, b. i., p. 42.—ED.

28 Dr. Maddox remarks on this statement of the cause of Cromwell's fall, that it is expressly contradicted by Bishop Burnet, who, speaking of the king's creating him Earl of Essex, upon his marriage with Anne of Cleves, adds, "This shows that the true causes of Cromwell's fall must be founded in some other thing than his making up the king's marriage, who had never thus raised his title if he had intended so soon to pull him down."—*Hist. Ref.*, vol. i., p. 275.

In reply to this, Mr. Neal says, "Let the reader judge: his (i.e., Bishop Burnet's) words are these 'An unfortunate marriage, to which he advised the king, not proving acceptable, and he being unwilling to destroy what himself had brought about, was the occasion of his disgrace and destruction.'—Vol. iii., p. 172. If his lordship has contradicted this in any other place (which I apprehend he has not), he must answer for it himself."

It may be observed, that these two passages stand in a very voluminous work, at a great distance from one another, so that the apparent inconsistency might escape the bishop's notice; while his remark in the first can have little force, when applied to the conduct of a prince so capricious and fluctuating in his attachments as was Henry VIII., and who soon grew disgusted with his queen. It is with no propriety that Mr. Neal's accuracy and fidelity are, in this instance, impeached: it justifies his representation, that nearly the same is given by Fuller in his *Church History*, b. v., p. 231. "Match-makers," says he, "betwixt private persons seldom find great love for their pains; betwixt princes, often fall into danger, as here it proved in the Lord Cromwell, the grand contriver of the king's marriage with Anne of Cleves."

The cause of Cromwell's disgrace is more fully and judiciously investigated by Dr. Warner, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii., p. 197, 198.—ED.

29 Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, vol. i., p. 286.

30 It begins with a description of Faith, "of which (says the book) there are two acceptations. (I.) It is sometimes taken for 'a belief or persuasion wrought by God in men's hearts, whereby they assent and take for true all the words and sayings of God revealed in Scripture.' This faith, if it proceeds no farther, is but a dead faith. (2.) Faith is sometimes considered in conjunction with hope and charity, and so it signifies 'a sure confidence and hope to obtain whatsoever God has promised for Christ's sake, and is accompanied with a hearty love to God, and obedience to his commands.' This is a lively and effectual faith, and is the perfect faith of a Christian. It is by this faith that we are justified, as it is joined with hope and charity, and includes an obedience to the whole doctrine and religion of Christ. But whether there be any special particular knowledge, whereby men may be certain and assured that they are among the predestinate, which shall to the end persevere in their calling, we cannot find either in the Scriptures or doctors; the promises of God being conditional, so that, though his promise stands, we may fail of the blessing for want of fulfilling our obligation."

After the chapter of Faith follows an excellent paraphrase on the twelve articles of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, or the salutation of the angel to the blessed Virgin, and the Ten Commandments; and here the second commandment is shortened, the words "for I the Lord thy God," &c., being left out, and only those that go before set down. Images are said to be profitable to stir up the mind to emulation, though we may not give them godly honour; nevertheless, censing and kneeling before them is allowed. Invocation of saints as

intercessors is declared lawful; and the fourth commandment only ceremonial, and obliging the Jews.

Then follows an article of Free-will, which is described, “‘A certain power of the will joined with reason, whereby a reasonable creature, without constraint in things of reason, discerneth and willeth good and evil; but it willeth not that that is acceptable to God unless it be holpen with grace, but that which is ill it willeth of itself.’ Our wills were perfect in the state of innocence, but are much impaired by the fall of Adam; the high powers of reason and freedom of will being wounded and corrupted, and all men thereby brought into such blindness and infirmity that they cannot avoid sin except they are made free by special grace, that is, by the supernatural working of the Holy Ghost. The light of reason is unable to conceive the things that appertain to eternal life, though there remains a sufficient freedom of will in things pertaining to the present life. ‘Without me,’ says the Scripture, ‘you can do nothing;’ therefore, when men feel that, notwithstanding their diligence, they are not able to do that which they desire, they ought with a steadfast faith and devotion to ask of him, who gave the beginning, that he would vouchsafe to perform it. But preachers are to take care so to moderate themselves, that they neither so preach the grace of God as to take away free-will, and make God the author of sin, nor so extol freewill as to injure the grace of God.”

In the article of Justification, it asserts, “that all the posterity of Adam are born in original sin, and are hereby guilty of everlasting death and damnation; but that God sent his own Son, being naturally God, to take our nature and redeem us, which he could not have done but by virtue of the union of his two natures.” It then speaks of a twofold justification: the first is upon our believing, and is obtained by repentance and a lively faith in the passion and merits of our blessed Saviour, and joining therewith a full purpose to amend our lives for the future. The second, or final justification at death, or the last judgment, implies, farther, the exercise of all Christian graces, and the following the motions of the Spirit of God in doing good works, which will be considered and recompensed in the day of judgment. When the Scripture speaks of justification by faith without mentioning any other grace, it must not be understood of a naked faith, but of a lively, operative faith, as before described, and refers to our first justification: thus we are justified by free grace; and, whatever share good works may have in our final justification, they cannot derogate from the grace of God, because all our good works come of the free mercy and grace of God, and are done by his assistance; so that all boasting is excluded.”

This leads to the article of Good Works, “which are said to be absolutely necessary to salvation; but they are not outward corporeal works, but inward spiritual works; as the love and fear of God, patience, humility, &c. Nor are they superstitious works of men’s invention; nor only moral works done by the power of reason, and the natural will of man, without faith in Christ; which, though they are good in kind, do not merit everlasting life; but such outward and inward good works as are done by faith in Christ, out of love to God, and in obedience to his commands, and which cannot be performed by man’s power without Divine assistance. Now these are of two sorts (I.) Such as are done by persons already justified; and these, though imperfect, are accepted for Christ’s sake, and are meritorious towards the attaining ever lasting life. (2.) Other works are of an inferior sort, as fasting, alms-deeds, and other fruits of penance, which are of no avail without faith. But, after all, justification and remission of sins is the free gift of the grace of God; and it does not derogate from that grace to ascribe the dignity to good works above mentioned, because all our good works come of the grace of God.”

The chapter of Prayer for Souls Departed leaves the matter in suspense: “It is good and charitable to do it; but because it is not known what condition departed souls are in, we ought only to recommend them to the mercy of God.”

In the chapter of the Sacraments, “all the seven sacraments are maintained, and in particular the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist.”

In the sacrament of Orders, the book maintains no real distinction between bishops and priests; it says that “St. Paul consecrated and ordered bishops by imposition of hands; but that there is no certain rule prescribed in Scripture for the nomination, election, or presentation of them; this is left to the positive laws of every country. That the office of the said ministers is to preach the word, to minister the sacraments, to bind and loose, to excommunicate those that will not be reformed, and to pray for the universal Church; but that they may not execute their office without license from the civil magistrate. The sacraments do not receive efficacy or strength from the ministration of the priest or bishop, but from God; the said ministers being only officers, to administer with their hands those corporeal things by which God gives grace, agreeably to St. Ambrose, who writes thus: ‘The priest lays his hands upon us, but it is God that gives grace; the priest lays on us his beseeching hands, but God blesseth us with his mighty hand.’ “

Concerning the order of Deacons, the book says, “Their office in the primitive Church was partly to minister meat and drink, and other necessities, to the poor, and partly to minister to the bishops and priests; Then follows this remarkable passage: “Of these two orders only, that is to say, priests and deacons, Scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred of the apostles by prayer and imposition of hands; but the primitive Church afterward appointed inferior degrees, as sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, &c.; but lest, peradventure, it might be thought by some that such authorities, powers, and jurisdictions, as patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and metropolitans now have, or heretofore at any time ‘have had, justly and lawfully over other bishops, were given them by God in Holy Scripture, we think it expedient and necessary that all men should be advertised and taught, that all such lawful power and authority of any one bishop over another, were and be given them by the consent, ordinances, and positive laws of men only, and not by any ordinance of God in Holy Scripture; and all such power and authority which any bishop has used over another, which have not been given him by such consent and ordinance of men, are in very deed no lawful power, but plain usurpation and tyranny.”

To the view which Mr. Neal has given of the doctrinal sentiments contained in this piece, which was also called the bishop’s book, it is proper to add the idea it gave of the duty of subjects to their prince. Its commentary on the fifth commandment runs thus “Subjects be bound not to withdraw their fealty, truth, love, and obedience towards their prince, for any cause, whatsoever it be.” In the exposition of the sixth commandment, the same principles of passive obedience and non-resistance are inculcated, and it is asserted “that God hath assigned no judges over princes in this world, but will have the judgment of them reserved to himself.”—ED.

Though the Institution of a Christian Man is a book now disused, the same sentiments, connected with the idea of the *jure divino* of kings, still run through the homilies, the articles, the canons, and the rubric of the Church of England, and have been again and again sanctioned by the resolutions and orders of our convocations: Bishop Blake, on his deathbed, solemnly professed “that the religion of the Church of England had taught him the doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience, and that he took it to be the distinguishing character of that church.” High-Church Politics, p. 75, 89, and the note in the last page.—ED.

It is not easy to say what sincere or complete alliance there can be between the Church and State, when the dogmas of the former are in such glaring repugnance to the constitution of the latter; when the former educates slaves, the latter freemen; when the former sanctions the tyranny of kings, the latter is founded in the rights of the people. In this respect, surely, the Church needs a reform.—ED.

29 Dr. Warner observes, on this performance, that there were so many absurdities of the old religion still retained, so much metaphysical jargon about the merit of good works, about the essential parts and consequences of faith, about free-will and grace, that this book, instead of promoting the Reformation, visibly put it back.—Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 205.

This work was reprinted by Bishop Lloyd, in 1825, under the title of *Formularies of Faith* put forth by authority in the reign of Henry VIII.—C.

30 Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, vol. i., p. 331, and the *Records*, b. iii., No. 28.

31 Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, vol. iii., p. 164.

32 "When the religion of a people is made to depend on the pleasure of their rulers, it is necessarily subjected to a thousand infusions foreign from its nature. The kingly or magisterial office is essentially political. Its power may be wielded by an irreligious, immoral, or profane man; a despiser of Christianity, or a blasphemer of God. What, therefore, can be more monstrous than to attach to such an office a controlling power over the faith and worship of the Church to constitute its occupant the supreme head of that body, which is represented as a congregation of faithful men? The Christian faith addresses men individually, soliciting an examination of its character, and demanding an intelligent and hearty obedience. But where the pleasure of a king is permitted to regulate the faith of a nation, authority is substituted for reason, and the promptings of fear supplant the perceptions of evidence, and the confiding attachment of an enlightened piety. This is the radical defect of the English Reformation. The people were prohibited from proceeding farther than the king authorized. They were to believe as he taught, and to worship as he enjoined. Suspending their own reason, extinguishing the light divine within them, they were to follow their monarch, licentious and bloodthirsty as he was, in all matters pertaining to the moral government and eternal welfare of their souls."—Dr. Price's *Hist. Nonconformity*, vol. i., p. 63, 64.—C.

33 The policy of the king continued to vacillate to the close of his life, which happened on the 28th of January, 1547. Of his character little need be said. In early life, his personal qualities were brilliant and imposing, and the contrast he furnished to his prudent and parsimonious father attached an unwonted degree of popularity to the commencement of his reign. But his temper grew capricious, and his disposition cruel, as he advanced in years. Casting aside the tenderness of his youth, he became ferocious and bloodthirsty; the indiscriminate persecutor of all parties, according as his humour or policy might suggest. His claim to our attention is founded on the religious revolution he effected. The part he acted in this great change invested him with a false glory, which has misled the judgment and perverted the sympathies of his countrymen. His intimate connexion with the first movements of ecclesiastical reform has obtained him credit for religious principles of which he was wholly destitute. The adulatory style in which he was addressed by the contending religionists of his day has been mistaken for the sober expressions of truth; and his name, in consequence, has passed current as a reformer of religion, a purifier of the temple of God. A veil has thus been cast over the enormities of his life, which has preserved him from the execration to which he is so justly obnoxious. The motives by which he was actuated, in his separation from the papacy, were anything but religious. The divorce which he caused Cranmer to pronounce in 1533, as it was designed to make way for his own gratification, so it precipitated him into a course of measures, from the spiritual bearings of which his heart was utterly estranged. He sought only the satisfaction of his own evil passions. The man who could profane with blood the sanctuary of domestic joys; who could win, with flattering speech, the confiding attachment of the female heart, and then consign the beautiful form, in whose best affections he was enshrined, to the block; who could raise talent from obscurity, avail himself of its services, and then with brutal indifference, reward them with a public execution, retained so little of the image of humanity, as to be infinitely removed from the spirit and temper of Christ."—Doct. Price's *Hist. Nonconformity*, vol. i., p. 60, 61.—C.