

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

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.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

WITH HIS LIFE OF THE AUTHOR AND ACCOUNT OF HIS WRITINGS.

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

R. GRIFFIN AND CO., GLASGOW; T. T. AND H. TEGG, DUBLIN;

ALSO J. AND S. A. TEGG, SYDNEY AND HOBART TOWN.

1837.

CHAP. IV.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF QUEEN ELIZABETH'S REIGN, TO THE SEPARATION OF THE PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS.

QUEEN Elizabeth's¹ accession to the crown gave new life to the Reformation: as soon as it was known beyond sea most of the exiles returned home; and those who had hid themselves in the houses of their friends began to appear; but the public religion continued for a time in the same posture the queen found it; the Popish priests kept their livings, and went on celebrating mass. None of the Protestant clergy who had been ejected in the last reign were restored; and orders were given against all innovations without public authority. Though the queen had complied with the changes in her sister's reign, it was well known she was a favourer of the Reformation; but her majesty proceeded with great caution, for fear of raising disturbances in her infant government. No prince ever came to the crown under greater disadvantages. The pope had pronounced her illegitimate; upon which the queen of Scots put in her claim to the crown. All the bishops and clergy of the present establishment were her declared enemies. The nation was at war with France, and the treasury exhausted; the queen therefore, by the advice of her privy council, resolved to make peace with her neighbours as soon as possible, that she might be more at leisure to proceed in her intended alterations of religion; which though very considerable, were not so entire as the best and most learned Protestants of these times desired. The queen inherited the spirit of her father, and affected a great deal of magnificence in her devotions, as well as in her court. She was fond of many of the old rites and ceremonies in which she had been educated. She thought her brother had stripped religion too much of its ornaments; and made the doctrines of the church too narrow in some points. It was therefore with difficulty that she was prevailed on to go the length of king Edward's reformation.²

The only thing her majesty did before the meeting of the parliament, was to prevent pulpit disputes; for some of the reformed that had been preachers in king Edward's time, began to make use of his service-book without authority or licence from their superiors; this alarmed the Popish clergy, and gave occasion to a proclamation, dated December 27, 1558.³ By which all preaching of ministers, or others, was prohibited; and the people were charged to hear no other doctrine or preaching, but the epistle and

¹ Strype's Ann. vol. 1. p. 251, 175.

² Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 376.

³ This proclamation was directed against the Papists as well as the reformed: "for both" says Strype, "took their occasions to speak freely their minds in the pulpits." Strype's Annals, vol. 1. Appendix, p. 3. Camden's Eliz. p. 6.

gospel for the day, and the ten commandments in English, without any exposition or paraphrase whatsoever. The proclamation admits of the litany, the Lord's prayer, and the creed, in English; but no public prayers were to be read in the church but such as were appointed by law, till the meeting of the parliament, which was to be upon the 23d of January.¹

While² the exiles were preparing to return home, conciliatory letters passed between them: those of Geneva desired a mutual forgiveness, and prayed their brethren of Arrow, Basil, Frankfort, Strasburgh, and Worms, to unite with them in preaching God's word, and in endeavouring to obtain such a form of worship as they had seen practised in the best reformed churches. The others replied, that it would not be in their power to appoint what ceremonies should be observed; but they were determined to submit in things indifferent, and hoped those of Geneva would do so too; however, they would join with them in petitioning the queen, that nothing burdensome might be imposed. Both parties congratulated her majesty's accession, in poems, addresses, and dedications of books; but they were reduced to the utmost poverty and distress. They came thread-bare home, bringing nothing with them (says Mr. Strype³) but much experience, as well as learning. Those who could comply with the queen's establishment were quickly preferred, but the rest were neglected, and though suffered to preach in the churches for some time, they were afterward suspended, and reduced to as great poverty as before.

It had been happy, if the sufferings of the exiles had taught them a little more charity and mutual forbearance; or that they had followed the advice of their learned friends and patrons beyond sea, who advised them to go through with the reformation, and clear the church of all the relics of Popery and superstition at once. This was the advice of Gualter, one of the chief divines of Zurich, who in his letter to Dr. Masters, the queen's physician, January 16, 1558-9, wishes, "that the reformers among us would not hearken to the counsels of those men, who when they saw that Popery could not be honestly defended, nor entirely retained, would use all artifices to have the outward face of religion to remain mixed, uncertain, and doubtful; so that while an evangelical reformation is pretended, those things should be obtruded on the church which will make the returning back to Popery, superstition, and idolatry, very easy. We have had the experience of this (says he) for some years in Germany, and know what influence such persons may have: their counsels seem to a carnal judgment, to be full of modesty, and well fitted for carrying on a universal agreement; and we may well believe the common enemy of our salvation will find out proper in-

¹ Burnet's History of the Reform. vol. 2. p. 376-378.

² Strype's Ann. vol, 1. p. 103-105.

³ Annals, vol. 1; p. 129.

struments, by whose means the seeds of Popery may still remain among you. I apprehend, that in the first beginnings, while men may study to avoid the giving some small offence, many things may be suffered under this colour, that they will be continued but for a little while, and yet afterward it will scarce be possible by all the endeavours that can be used to get them removed, at least not without great strugglings.”¹ The letter seems to be written with a prophetic spirit; Masters laid it before the queen, who read it all over, though without effect. Letters of the same strain were written by the learned Bullinger, Peter Martyr, and Weidner, to the earl of Bedford, who had been some time at Zurich; and to Jewel, Sandys, Horn, Cox, Grindal, and the rest of the late exiles, pressing them vehemently to act with zeal and courage, and to take care in the first beginnings to have all things settled upon sure and sound foundations.

The exiles in their answers seem resolved to follow their advices, and make a bold stand for a thorough reformation; and if they had done so, they might have obtained it.—Jewel, in his letter of May 22, 1559, thanks Bullinger for quickening their zeal and courage; and adds, “they were doing what they could; and that all things were coming into a better state.” In another of April 10, “he laments the want of zeal and industry in promoting the Reformation; and that things were managed in so slow and cautious a manner, as if the word of God was not to be received on his own authority.” In another of November 16, “he complains of the queen’s keeping a crucifix in her chapel, with lighted candles; that there was worldly policy in this, which he did not like: that all things were so loose and uncertain with them, that he did not know whether he should not be obliged to return back to Zurich. He complains of the Popish vestments, which he calls the relics of the Amorites, and wishes they were extirpated to the deepest roots.” The like complaints were made by Cox, Grindal, Horn, Pilkington, and others; but they had not the resolution to persevere: had they united counsels, and stood by one another, they might at this juncture have obtained the removal of those grievances which afterward occasioned the separation.

To return to the parliament. The court took such measures about elections as seldom fail of success; the magistrates of the counties and corporations were changed, and the people, who were weary of the late persecutions, were assisted, and encouraged to exert themselves in favour of such representatives as might make them easy; so that when the houses met, the majority were on the side of the Reformation. The temper of the house was first tried by a bill to restore to the crown the firstfruits and tenths, which queen Mary had returned to the church. It passed the commons without much opposition, February 4th, but in the house of lords all the bishops

¹ Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 273.

voted against it.¹ By another act they repealed some of the penal laws, and enacted, that no person should be punished for exercising the religion used in the last year of king Edward. They appointed the public service to be performed in the vulgar tongue. They empowered the queen to nominate bishops to the vacant bishoprics by *conge d'elire*, as at present. They suppressed the religious houses founded by queen Mary, and annexed them to the crown; but the two principal acts passed this session were, the acts of supremacy, and of uniformity of common prayer.

The former is entitled, an act for restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual; and for abolishing foreign power. It is the same for substance with the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII. already mentioned, but the commons incorporated several other bills into it; for besides the title of supreme governor in all causes ecclesiastical and temporal, which is restored to the queen, the act revives those laws of king Henry VIII. and king Edward VI. which had been repealed in the late reign. It forbids all appeals to Rome, and exonerates the subjects from all exactions and impositions heretofore paid to that court; and as it revives king Edward's laws, it repeals a severe act made in the late reign for punishing heresy;² and three other old statutes mentioned in the said act.

Moreover, all persons in any public employ, whether civil or ecclesiastical, are obliged to take an oath in recognition of the queen's right to the crown, and of her supremacy in all causes ecclesiastical and civil, on penalty of forfeiting all their promotions in the church, and of being declared incapable of holding any public office." In short, by this single act of the supremacy, all that had been done by queen Mary was in a manner annulled, and the external policy of the church restored to the same foot as it stood at the death of king Edward VI.

Farther, "The act forbids all writing, printing, teaching, or preaching, and all other deeds or acts whereby any foreign jurisdiction over these realms is defended, upon pain that they and their abettors, being thereof convicted, shall for the first offence forfeit their goods and chattels; and if they are not worth twenty pounds, suffer a year's imprisonment; spiritual persons shall lose their benefices, and all ecclesiastical preferments; for the second offence they shall incur the penalties of a *præmunire*; and the third offence shall be deemed high treason."

There is a remarkable clause in this act, which gave rise to a new court,

¹ Strype, p. 67.

² The repeal of this act, it may not be improper to observe, operated in favour of those only who denied the essential and disseminating tenets of Popery. It was a necessary step, when government was about to establish a reformation which would subvert the reception of those tenets. But it did not proceed from any just notions of the rights of conscience: and, as it appears in the course of this reign, still left those who went beyond the limits fixed by the new establishment, exposed to the heaviest penalties.—ED.

called the court of High Commission.¹ The words are these; “The queen and her successors shall have power, by their letters patent under the great seal, to assign, name, and authorize, as often as they shall think meet, and for as long time as they shall please, persons being natural-born subjects, to use, occupy, and exercise, under her and them, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, &c. to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all, errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, and enormities whatsoever. Provided, that they have no power to determine any thing to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical Scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical Scripture; or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the high court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation.”²

Upon the authority of this clause the queen appointed a certain number of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, who exercised the same power that had been lodged in the hands of one vicegerent in the reign of king Henry VIII. And how sadly they abused their power in this and the two next reigns will appear in the sequel of this history.³ They did not trouble themselves much with the express words of Scripture, or the four first general councils, but entangled their prisoners with oaths *ex officio*, and the inextricable mazes of the Popish canon law; and though all ecclesiastical courts ought to be subject to a prohibition from the courts of Westminster, this privilege was seldom allowed by the commissioners.—The act makes no mention of an arbitrary jurisdiction of fining, imprisoning, or inflicting, corporal punishments on the subjects, and therefore can be construed to ex-

¹ Strype, p. 69. Rapin, p. 236.

² On this statute Mr. Justice Blackstone remarks, that “a man continued still liable to be burnt for what perhaps he did not understand to be heresy, till the ecclesiastical judge so interpreted the words of the canonical Scriptures.” To this a late writer justly adds: “And even at this day, whoever, of the sectaries not tolerated, shall dare to interpret the Holy Scriptures for himself, may be punished by ecclesiastical censures, if an ecclesiastical judge should decree such interpretation to be erroneous.” High Church Politics, p. 66.—ED.

³ In addition to our author’s remark may be subjoined the reflections of a modern writer: “On this foundation,” says he, “was erected, in a subsequent part of her reign, that court of ecclesiastical commission, which, in the sequel, was the source of the most arbitrary proceedings, and of the most shameful tyranny, oppression, and persecution. The powers we have mentioned, as granted to Elizabeth, will appear to many, in the present enlightened and liberal age, to have been unreasonable and enormous, and contrary to the just ends of political government. But the conferring of such powers accorded with the idea of the times, which had no conception of introducing religious changes by the mere operation of reason and argument, and which had not learned to ascertain the true nature, objects, boundaries, and distinctions, of civil and ecclesiastical authority.” History of Knowledge in the New Annual Register for 1789, p. 6.—ED.

tend no farther than to suspension or deprivation; but notwithstanding this, these commissioners sported themselves in all the wanton acts of tyranny and oppression, till their very name became odious to the whole nation; in-somuch that their proceedings were condemned by the united voice of the people, and the court dissolved by act of parliament, with a clause, that no such jurisdiction should be received for the future in any court whatsoever.

Bishop Burnet says,¹ that the supremacy granted by this act is short of the authority that king Henry had; nor is it the whole that the queen claimed, who sometimes stretched her prerogative beyond it. But since it was the basis of the Reformation, and the spring of all its future movements, it will be proper to inquire what powers were thought to be yielded the crown by this act of supremacy, and some others made in support of it. King Henry VIII. in his letter to the convocation of York assures them, that “he claimed nothing more by the supremacy, than what Christian princes in the primitive times assumed to themselves in their own dominions.”² But it is capable of demonstration, that the first Christian emperors did not claim all that jurisdiction over the church in spirituals, that king Henry did, who by the act of the thirty-first of his reign, was made absolute lord over the consciences of his subjects, it being therein enacted, that “whatsoever his majesty should enjoin in matters of religion should be obeyed by all his subjects.”

It is very certain, that the kings and queens of England never pretended to the character of spiritual persons, or to exercise any part of the ecclesiastical function in their own persons; they neither preached nor administered the sacraments, nor pronounced or inflicted the censures of the church; nor did they ever consecrate to the episcopal office, though the right of nomination is in them: these things were done by spiritual persons, or by proper officers in the spiritual courts, deriving their powers from the crown. When the adversaries of the supremacy objected the absurdity of a lay person being head of a spiritual body, the queen endeavoured to remove the difficulty, by declaring in her injunctions to her visitors, “that she did not, nor would she ever, challenge authority and power to minister divine service in the church; nor would she ever challenge any other authority, than her predecessors king Henry VIII. and Edward VI. used.”

But abating this point, it appears very probable, that all the jurisdiction and authority claimed by the pope, as head of the church, in the times preceding the Reformation, was transferred to the king by the act of supremacy, and annexed to the imperial crown of these realms, as far as was con-

¹ Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 586.

² The primitive times, as they are called, did not commence till the beginning of the fourth century, under Constantine the Great; who was the first prince that employed the powers of the state in the affairs of the church.—ED.

sistent with the laws of the land then in being; though since it has undergone some abatements. The words of the learned Mr. Hooker¹ are very express: “If the whole ecclesiastical state should stand in need of being visited and reformed: or when any part of the church is infested with errors, schisms, heresies, &c. whatsoever spiritual powers the legates had from the see of Rome, and exercised in right of the pope for remedying of evils, without violating the laws of God or nature; as much in every degree have our laws fully granted to the king for ever, whether he thinks fit to do it by ecclesiastic synods, or otherwise according to law.”

The truth of this remark will appear, by considering the powers claimed by the crown in this and the following reigns.

1. The kings and queens of England claimed authority in matters of faith, and to be the ultimate judges of what is agreeable or repugnant to the word of God. The act of supremacy says expressly, “that the king has power to redress and amend all errors and heresies; he might enjoin what doctrines he would to be preached, not repugnant to the laws of the land: and if any should preach contrary, he was for the third offence to be judged a heretic, and suffer death; his majesty claimed a right to forbid all preaching for a time, as king Henry VIII. king Edward VI. queen Mary, and Elizabeth, did; or to limit the clergy’s preaching to certain of the thirty-nine articles established by law, as king Charles I. did.” All the forementioned kings and queens published instructions or injunctions concerning matters of faith, without consent of the clergy in convocation assembled; and enforced them upon the clergy under the penalties of a *præmunire*; which made it a little difficult to understand that clause of the twentieth article of the church, which says, the church has authority in matters of faith.

2. With regard to discipline, the kings of England seem to have had the keys at their girdle; for though the old canon law be in force, as far as is consistent with the laws of the land, and the prerogative of the crown, yet the king is the supreme and ultimate judge in the spiritual courts by his delegates, as he is in the courts of common law by his judges. His majesty might appoint a single person of the laity to be his vicar-general in all causes ecclesiastical to reform what was amiss, as king Henry VIII. and Charles I. did, which very much resembled the pope’s legate in the times before the Reformation. By authority of parliament the crown was empowered to appoint thirty-two commissioners, some of the laity and some of the clergy, to reform the canons or ecclesiastical laws; and though the design was not executed, the power was certainly in the king, who might have ratified the new canons, and given them the force of a law, without consent of the clergy in convocation, or of the parliament; and therefore at the coronation of

¹ Eccles. Pol. b. 8 §. 8.

king Charles I. the bishop was directed to pray, “that God would give the king Peter’s key of discipline, and Paul’s doctrine.”

3. As to rites and ceremonies, the act of uniformity¹ says expressly, “that the queen’s majesty, by advice of her ecclesiastical commissioners, or of her metropolitan, may ordain and publish such ceremonies or rites, as may be most for the advancement of God’s glory, and the edifying of the church.” Accordingly her majesty published her injunctions, without sending them into convocation or parliament, and erected a court of high commission for ecclesiastical causes, consisting of commissioners of her own nomination, to see them put in execution. Nay, so jealous was queen Elizabeth of this branch of her prerogative, that she would not suffer her high court of parliament to pass any bill for the amendment or alteration of the ceremonies of the church, it being, as she said, an invasion of her prerogative.

4. The kings of England claimed the sole power of the nomination of bishops; and the deans and chapters were obliged to choose those whom their majesties named, under penalty of a *præmunire*; and after they were chosen and consecrated, they might not act but by commission from the crown. They held their very bishoprics for some time *durante bene placito*; and by the statute of the fifth and sixth of Edward VI. chap. 1. it was enacted, “that archbishops and bishops shall punish by censures of the church all persons that offend,” &c. Which plainly implies, that without such a licence or authority they might not do it;

5. No convocation, or synods of the clergy, can assemble but by a writ or precept from the crown: and when assembled, they can do no business without the king’s letters patent, appointing them the particular subjects they are to debate upon;² and after all, their canons are of no force without the royal sanction.

Upon the whole it is evident, by the express words of several statutes,³ that all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil, was vested in the king, and taken away from the bishops, except by delegation from him. The king was chief in the determination of all causes in the church; he had authority to make laws, ceremonies, and constitutions, and without him no such laws, ceremonies, or constitutions, are or ought to be of force. And, lastly, all appeals which before had been made to Rome, are for ever hereafter to be made to his majesty’s chancery, to be ended and determined, as the manner now is, by delegates.⁴

¹ 1 Eliz. cap. 1.

² Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. and stat. *præmun.*

³ 37 Hen. VIII. cap. 17. 1 Eliz. c. 1.

⁴ Thus the power, which had been for ages exercised by the pope, was transferred to the temporal monarch. The acquisition of this power was highly flattering to the love of

I am sensible, that the constitution of the church has been altered in some things since that time: but let the reader judge, by what has been recited from acts of parliament, of the high powers that were then intrusted with the crown; and how far they were agreeable with the natural or religious rights of mankind. The whole body of the Papists refused the oath of supremacy, as inconsistent with their allegiance to the pope; but the Puritans took it under all these disadvantages, with the queen's explication in her injunctions: that is, that no more was intended, than "that her majesty, under God, had the sovereignty and rule over all persons born in her realms, either ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power had or ought to have authority over them." They apprehended this to be the natural right of all sovereign princes in their dominions, though there has been no statute law for it; but as they did not admit the government of the church to be monarchical, they were of opinion, that no single person, whether layman or ecclesiastic, ought to assume the title of supreme head of the church on earth, in the sense of the acts above mentioned. This appears from the writings of the famous Mr. Cartwright, in his admonition to the parliament;

"The Christian sovereign (says he¹) ought not to be called head under Christ of the particular and visible churches within his dominions: it is a title not fit for any mortal man; for when the apostle says Christ is the head, it is as much as if he had said, Christ and no other is head of the church. No civil magistrate in councils or assemblies for church-matters, can either be chief moderator, overruler, judge, or determiner; nor has he such authority as that, without his consent, it should not be lawful for ecclesiastical persons to make any church-orders or ceremonies. Church-matters ought ordinarily to be handled by church-officers. The principal direction of them is, by God's ordinance, committed to the ministers of the church, and to the ecclesiastical governors: as these meddle not with the making civil laws, so the civil magistrate ought not to ordain ceremonies, or determine controversies in the church, as long as they do not intrench upon his temporal authority. Nevertheless, our meaning is not to seclude the magistrate from our church-assemblies: he may call a council of his clergy, and appoint both time and place; he may be there by himself or his deputy, but not as moderator, determiner, or judge; he may have his voice in the assembly, but the orders and decrees of councils are not made by his authority; for in ancient times the canons of the councils were not called the decrees of the emperors, but of the bishops. It is the prince's province to protect and defend the councils of his clergy, to keep the peace, to see their decrees executed, and

authority in princes, especially as they had been so long under subjection to the pope. To a woman of queen Elizabeth's spirit, it was, independently of every religious consideration, a powerful inducement to support the Reformation.—ED.

¹ **Admonition to Parliament, lib. p. 4. 11.**

to punish the contemners of them, but to exercise no spiritual jurisdiction.”

We shall meet with a fuller declaration of the Puritans upon this head hereafter; in the meantime it may be observed, that the just boundaries of the civil and ecclesiastical powers were not well understood and stated in this age.

The powers of the civil magistrate seem chiefly to regard the civil welfare of his subjects: he is to protect them in their properties, and in the peaceable enjoyment of their civil and religious rights; but there is no passage in the New Testament that gives him a commission to be lord of the consciences of his subjects, or to have dominion over their faith. Nor is this agreeable to reason, because religion ought to be the effect of a free and deliberate choice. Why must we believe as the king believes, any more than as the clergy or pope? If every man could believe as he would; or if all men’s understandings were exactly of a size; or if God would accept of a mere outward profession when commanded by law, then it would be reasonable there should be but one religion, and one uniform manner of worship: but to make ecclesiastical laws, obliging men’s practice under severe penalties, without or against the light of their consciences, looks like an invasion of the kingly office of Christ, and must be subversive of all sincerity and virtue.

On the other hand, the jurisdiction of the church is purely spiritual. No man ought to be compelled by rewards or punishments to become a member of any Christian society, or to continue of it any longer than he apprehends it to be his duty. All the ordinances of the church are spiritual, and so are her weapons and censures. The weapons of the church are Scripture and reason, accompanied with prayers and tears. These are her pillars, and the walls of her defence. The censures of the church are admonitions, reproofs, or declarations of persons’ unfitness for her communion, commonly called excommunications, which are of a spiritual nature, and ought not to affect men’s lives, liberties, or estates. No man ought to be cut off from the rights and privileges of a subject, merely because he is disqualified for Christian communion. Nor has any church upon earth authority from Christ to inflict corporal punishments upon those whom she may justly expel her society: these are the weapons of civil magistrates, who may punish the breakers of the laws of their countries, with corporal pains and penalties, as guardians of the civil rights of their subjects; but Christ’s kingdom is not of this world.

If these principles had obtained at the Reformation, there would have been no room for the disturbance of any, whose religious principles were not inconsistent with the safety of the government.¹ Truth and charity

¹ It would have been more consistent with our author’s reasoning, if, instead of “reli-

would have prevailed; the civil powers would have protected the church in her spiritual rights; and the church, by instructing the people in their duty to their superiors, would have supported the state. But the reformers, as well Puritans as others, had different notions. They were for one religion, one uniform mode of worship, one form of discipline or church-government, for the whole nation, with which all must comply outwardly, whatever were their inward sentiments; it was therefore resolved to have an act of parliament to establish a uniformity of public worship, without any indulgence to tender consciences; neither party having the wisdom or courage to oppose such a law, but both endeavouring to be included in it,

To make way for this, the Papists who were in possession of the churches were first to be vanquished; the queen therefore appointed a public disputation in Westminster abbey, before her privy council and both houses of parliament, March 31st, 1559, between nine of the bishops and the like number of Protestant divines, upon these three points:

1st. Whether it was not against Scripture and the custom of the ancient church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in the common prayers and sacraments?—2dly. Whether every church had not authority to appoint, change, and take away, ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same were done to edifying?—3dly. Whether it could be proved by the word of God, that in the mass there was a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and living?

The disputation was to be in writing; but the Papists finding the populace against them, broke it off after the first day, under pretence that the Catholic cause ought not to be submitted to such an arbitration, though they had not these scruples in the reign of queen Mary, when it was known the issue of the conference would be in their favour. The bishops of Winchester and Lincoln said, the doctrine of the Catholic church was already established, and that it was too great an encouragement to heretics, to admit them to discourse against the faith before an unlearned multitude. They added, that the queen had deserved to be excommunicated; and talked of thundering out their anathemas against the privy council, for which they were both sent to the Tower. The reformed had a great advantage by their adversaries quitting the field in this manner; it being concluded from hence,

gious principles,” he had substituted actions. If religious principles are to be the grounds of toleration or protection, according to their supposed consistency or inconsistency with the safety of the civil government, there is not only room for endless disputes concerning this consistency; but men of the best views and characters will be liable to suffer through the imputation of consequences arising from their principles, which they themselves disavow and abhor. Besides, the pernicious tendency of some principles is counteracted by the influence of others, and the good dispositions of those who hold them. Overt acts alone afford a clear definite rule, by which to judge of moral or political character.—ED.

that their cause would not bear the light, which prepared the people for farther changes.

The Papists being vanquished, the next point was to unite the reformed among themselves, and get such an establishment as might make them all easy; for though the troubles at Frankfort were hushed, and letters of forgiveness had passed between the contending parties; and though all the reformers were of one faith, yet they were far from agreeing about discipline and ceremonies, each party being for settling the church according to their own model; some were for the late service and discipline of the English at Geneva; others were for the service-book of king Edward VI. and for withdrawing no farther from the church of Rome than was necessary to recover purity of faith, and the independency of the church upon a foreign power. Rites and ceremonies were, in their opinion, indifferent; and those of the church of Rome preferable to others, because they were venerable and pompous, and because the people had been used to them: these were the sentiments of the queen, who therefore appointed a committee of divines to review king Edward's liturgy, and to see if in any particular it was fit to be changed; their names were, Dr. Parker, Grindal, Cox, Pilkington, May, Bill, Whitehead, and sir Thomas Smith, doctor of the civil law. Their instructions were, to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the belief of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament; but not a word in favour of the stricter Protestants.

Her majesty was afraid of reforming too far; she was desirous to retain images in churches, crucifixes and crosses, vocal and instrumental music, with all the old Popish garments; it is not therefore to be wondered, that in reviewing the liturgy of king Edward, no alterations were made in favour of those who now began to be called Puritans, from their attempting a purer form of worship and discipline than had yet been established. The queen was more concerned for the Papists, and therefore, in the litany this passage was struck out, "From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us." The rubric that declared, that by kneeling at the sacrament no adoration was intended to any corporal presence of Christ, was expunged. The committee of divines left it at the people's liberty to receive the sacrament kneeling or standing, but the queen and parliament restrained it to kneeling; so that the enforcing this ceremony was purely an act of the state. The old festivals with their eves, and the Popish habits, were continued, as they were in the second year of king Edward VI. till the queen should please to take them away; for the words of the statute are, "they shall be retained till other order shall be therein taken by authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of the commissioners authorized under the great seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical." Some of the collects were a little altered; and thus the book was presented to the

two houses and passed into a law,¹ being hardly equal to that which was set out by king Edward, and confirmed by parliament in the fifth year of his reign. For whereas in that liturgy all the garments were laid aside except the surplice, the queen now returned to king Edward's first book, wherein copes and other garments were ordered to be used.

The title of the act is, an act for the uniformity of common prayer and service in the church, and administration of the sacraments. It was brought into the house of commons April 18, and was read a third time April 20. It passed the house of lords April 28, and took place from the 24th of June 1559. Heath, archbishop of York,² made an elegant speech against it, in which among other things he observes very justly, that an act of this consequence ought to have had the consent of the clergy in convocation before it passed into a law. "Not only the orthodox, but even the Arian emperors (says he), ordered that points of faith should be examined in councils; and Gallio by the light of nature knew that a civil judge ought not to meddle with matters of religion." But he was overruled, the act of supremacy, which passed the house the very next day, having vested this power in the crown.³ This statute lying open to common view at the beginning of the Common Prayer-book, it is not worthwhile to transcribe it in this place. I shall only take notice of one clause, by which all ecclesiastical jurisdiction was again delivered up to the crown: "The queen is hereby empowered, with the advice of her commissioners or metropolitan, to ordain and publish such farther ceremonies and rites, as may be for the advancement of God's glory, and edifying his church, and the reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments." And had it not been for this clause of a reserve of power to make what alterations her majesty thought fit, she told archbishop Parker, that she would not have passed the act.

Upon this fatal rock of uniformity in things merely indifferent, in the opinion of the imposers, was the peace of the church of England split. The pretence was decency and order; but it seems a little odd that uniformity should be necessary to the decent worship of God, when in most other things there is a greater beauty in variety. It is not necessary to a decent dress that men's clothes should be always of the same colour and fashion; nor would there be any indecorum or disorder, if in one congregation the sacrament should be administered kneeling, in another sitting, and in a third standing; or if in one and the same congregation the minister were at liberty

¹ Burnet's Hist. of the Ref. vol. 2. p. 390. Strype's Ann. p. 83.

² Mr. Strype says, there is so much learning and such Strokes therein, that We need not doubt but that it is his. Ann. Ref. vol. 1. p. 73. The speech itself is in his Appendix to vol. 1. no. 6. This prelate was always honourably esteemed by the queen, and sometimes had the honour of a visit from her. He lived discreetly in his own house, till by very age he departed this life. Annals, vol. 1. p.143.—ED.

³ D'Ew's Journal, p. 29.

to read prayers either in a black gown or a surplice, supposing the garments to be indifferent, which the makers of this law admitted, though the Puritans denied. The rigorous pressing of this act was the occasion of all the mischiefs that befell the church for above eighty years. What good end could it answer to press men's bodies into the public service, without convincing their minds? If there must be one established form of worship, there should certainly have been an indulgence for tender consciences.—When there was a difference in the church of the Romans about eating flesh, and observing festivals, the apostle did not pinch them with an act of uniformity, but allowed a latitude, Rom. xiv. 5. “Let not him that eateth judge him that eateth not; but let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. Why dost thou judge thy brother? or, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ.” Had our reformers followed this apostolical precedent, the church of England would have made a more glorious figure in the Protestant world, than it did by this compulsive act of uniformity.

Sad were the consequences of these two laws, both to the Papists and Puritans. The Papists in convocation made a stand for the old religion; and in their sixth session agreed upon the following articles, to be presented to the parliament for disburdening their consciences.

1. “That in the sacrament of the altar the natural body of Christ is really present, by virtue of the words of consecration pronounced by the priest..

2. “That after the consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance but God-man.

3. “That in the mass the true body of Christ is offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

4. “That the supreme power of feeding and ruling the church is in St. Peter and his successors.

5. “That the authority of determining matters of faith and discipline belongs only to the pastors of the church, and not to laymen.”

These articles or resolutions were presented to the lord-keeper by their prolocutor Dr. Harpsfield, but his lordship gave them no answer; nor did the convocation move any farther in matters of religion, it being apparent that they were against the Reformation.

As soon as the sessions were ended the oath of supremacy was tendered to the bishops, who all refused it, except Dr. Kitchen, bishop of Landaff, to the number of fourteen; the rest of the sees being vacant. Of the deprived bishops three retired beyond sea, viz. Dr. Pate, bishop of Worcester, Scot of Chester, and Goldwell of St. Asaph; Heath, archbishop of York, was suffered to live at his own house, where the queen went sometimes to visit him; Tonstal and Thirleby bishops of Durham and Ely, resided at Lambeth in the house of archbishop Parker with freedom and ease; the rest were suf-

ferred to go at large upon their parole; only Bonner bishop of London, White of Winchester, and Watson of Lincoln, whose hands had been deeply stained with the blood of the Protestants in the late reign, were made close prisoners; but they had a sufficient maintenance from the queen. Most of the monks returned to a secular life; but the nuns went beyond sea, as did all others who had a mind to live where they might have the free exercise of their religion. Several of the reformed exiles were offered bishoprics, but refused them, on account of the habits and ceremonies, &c. as Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bernard Gilpin, old father Miles Coverdale, Mr. Knox, Mr. Thomas Sampson, and others. Many who accepted, did it with trembling; from the necessity of the times, and in hopes by their interest with the queen to obtain an amendment in the constitution of the church; among these were, Grindal, Parkhurst, Sandys, Pilkington, and others.

The sees were left vacant for some time, to see if any of the old bishops would conform; but neither time nor any thing else could move them; at length, after twelve months. Dr. Matthew Parker was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, by some of the bishops that had been deprived in the late reign, for not one of the present bishops would officiate. This, with some other accidents, gave rise to the story of his being consecrated at the Nag's Head tavern in Cheapside, a fable that has been sufficiently confuted by our church historians;¹ the persons concerned in the consecration were Barlow and Scory, bishops elect of Chichester and Hereford; Miles Coverdale, the deprived bishop of Exeter, and Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford; the two former appeared in their chimere and surplice, but the two latter wore long gowns open at the arms, with a falling cape on the shoulders; the ceremony was performed in a plain manner without gloves or sandals, ring or slippers, mitre or pall, or even without any of the Aaronical garments, only by imposition of hands and prayer. Strange! that the archbishop should be satisfied with this, in his own case, and yet be so zealous to impose the Popish garments upon his brethren.

But still it has been doubted, whether Parker's consecration was perfectly canonical.

1st. Because the persons engaged in it had been legally deprived in the late reign, and were not yet restored. To which it was answered, that having been once consecrated, the episcopal character remained in them, and therefore they might convey it; though Coverdale and Hodgkins never exercised it after this time.

¹ Life of Parker, p. 38. 60, 61. Voltaire, though he knew, or, as a liberal writer observes, should have known, that this story was refuted even by the Puritans themselves, has yet related it as a fact. It was a calumny, to which the custom, of the new-ordained bishops furnishing a grand dinner or entertainment, gave rise. Wendeborn's View of England, vol. 2. p. 300.—Ed.

2dly. Because the consecration ought by law to have been directed according to the statute of the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII. and not according to the form of king Edward's Ordinal for ordaining and consecrating bishops, inasmuch as that book had been set aside in the late reign, and was not yet restored by parliament.

These objections being frequently thrown in the way of the new bishops by the Papists, made them uneasy; they began to doubt of the validity of their consecrations, or at least of their legal title to their bishoprics. The affair was at length brought before parliament, and to silence all future clamours Parker's consecration, and those of his brethren, were confirmed by the two houses, about seven years after they had filled their chairs. .

The archbishop was installed December 17, 1559, soon after which he consecrated several of his brethren, whom the queen had appointed to the vacant sees, as Grindal to the bishopric of London, Horn to Winchester, and Pilkington to Durham, &c. Thus the reformation was restored, and the church of England settled on its present basis. The new bishops being poor, made but a mean figure in comparison of their predecessors: they were unacquainted with courts and equipages, and numerous attendants; but as they grew rich, they quickly rose in their deportment, and assumed a lordly superiority over their brethren.

The hierarchy being now at its standard, it may not be improper to set before the reader in one view the principles upon which it stands; with the different sentiments of the Puritans, by which he will discover the reasons why the reformation proceeded no farther:—

1. The court-reformers apprehended, that every prince had authority to correct all abuses of doctrine and worship, within his own territories. From this principle the parliament submitted the consciences and religion of the whole nation to the disposal of the king; and in case of a minority to his council; so that the king was sole reformer, and might, by commissioners of his own appointment, declare and remove all manner of errors, heresies, &c. and model the doctrine and discipline of the church as he pleased, provided his injunctions did not expressly contradict the statute law of the land.

Thus the reformation took place in sundry material points in the reigns of king Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth, before it had the sanction of parliament or convocation: and though queen Mary disallowed of the supremacy, she made use of it to restore the old religion, before the laws for abolishing it were repealed. Hence also they indulged the foreign Protestants with the liberty of their separate discipline, which they denied to their own countrymen.

The Puritans disowned all foreign authority and jurisdiction over the church as much as their brethren, but could not admit of that extensive

power which the crown claimed by the supremacy, apprehending it unreasonable, that the religion of a whole nation should be at the disposal of a single lay-person; for let the apostle's rule, "that all things be done decently and in order," mean what it will, it was not directed to the prince or civil magistrate. However, they took the oath with the queen's explication in her injunctions, as only restoring her majesty to the ancient and natural rights of sovereign princes over their subjects.

2. It was admitted by the court-reformers, that the church of Rome was a true church, though corrupt in some points of doctrine and government; that all her ministrations were valid, and that the pope was a true bishop of Rome, though not of the universal church. It was thought necessary to maintain this, for the support of the character of our bishops, who could not otherwise derive their succession from the apostles.

But the Puritans affirmed the pope to be antichrist, the church of Rome to be no true church, and all her ministrations to be superstitious and idolatrous; they renounced her communion, and durst not risk the validity of their ordinations upon an uninterrupted line of succession from the apostles through their hands.

3. It was agreed by all, that the Holy Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith; but the bishops and court-reformers did not allow them a standard of discipline or church government, but affirmed that our Saviour and his apostles left it to the discretion of the civil magistrate, in those places where Christianity should obtain, to accommodate the government of the church to the policy of the state.

But the Puritans apprehended the Holy Scriptures to be a standard of church-discipline, as well as doctrine; at least that nothing should be imposed as necessary but what was expressly contained in, or derived from them by necessary consequence. And if it should be proved, that all things necessary to the well government of the church could not be deduced from Holy Scripture, they maintained that the discretionary power was not vested in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual officers of the church.

4. The court-reformers maintained, that the practice of the primitive church for the first four or five centuries was a proper standard of church-government and discipline, and in some respects better than that of the apostles, which, according to them, was only accommodated to the infant state of the church while it was under persecution, whereas theirs was suited to the grandeur of a national establishment. Therefore they only pared off the later corruptions of the Papacy, from the time the pope usurped the title of universal bishop, and left those standing which they could trace a little higher, such as archbishops, metropolitans, archdeacons, suffragans, rural deans, &c. which were not known in the apostolic age, or those immediately following.

Whereas the Puritans were for keeping close to the Scriptures in the main principles of church-government; and for admitting no church-officers or ordinances, but such as are appointed therein. They apprehended that the form of government ordained by the apostles was aristocratical, according to the constitution of the Jewish sanhedrin, and was designed as a pattern for the churches in after-ages, not to be departed from in any of its main principles; and therefore they paid no regard to the customs of the Papacy, or the practice of the earlier ages of Christianity, any farther than they corresponded with the Scriptures.

5. Our reformers maintained, that things indifferent in their own nature, which are neither commanded nor forbidden in the Holy Scriptures, such as rites, ceremonies, habits, &c. might be settled, determined, and made necessary, by the command of the civil magistrate; and that in such cases it was the indispensable duty of all subjects to observe them.

But the Puritans insisted, that those things which Christ had left indifferent ought not to be made necessary by any human laws, but that we are to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free: and farther, that such rites and ceremonies as had been abused to idolatry, and manifestly tended to lead men back to Popery and superstition, were no longer indifferent, but to be rejected as unlawful.

6. Both parties agreed too well in asserting the necessity of a uniformity of public worship, and of using the sword of the magistrate for the support and defence of their respective principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns whenever they could grasp the power into their hands. The standard of uniformity, according to the bishops, was the queen's supremacy and the laws of the land; according to the Puritans, the decrees of provincial and national synods allowed and enforced by the civil magistrate: but neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which is every man's right, as far as is consistent with the peace of the civil government he lives under.

The principle upon which the bishops justified their severities against the Puritans, in this and the following reigns, was the subjects' obligation to obey the laws of their country in all things indifferent, which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the laws of God. And the excellent archbishop Tillotson, in one of his sermons, represents the dissenters as a humorous and perverse set of people, in not complying with the service and ceremonies of the church, for no other reason, says he, but because their superiors require them.—But if this were true, it is a justifiable reason for their dissent, supposing the magistrate requires that which is not within the bounds of his commission. Christ, say the Nonconformists, is the sole law-giver of his church, and has enjoined all things necessary to be observed in it to the end of the world; therefore, where he has indulged a liberty to his

followers, it is as much their duty to maintain it, as to observe any other of his precepts. If the civil magistrate should, by a stretch of the prerogative, dispense with the laws of his country, or enjoin new ones, according to his arbitrary will and pleasure, without consent of parliament, would it deserve the brand of humour or perverseness to refuse obedience, if it were for no other reason, but because we will not submit to an arbitrary dispensing power? Besides, if the magistrate has a power to impose things indifferent, and make them necessary in the service of God; he may dress up religion in any shape, and instead of one ceremony may load it with a hundred.

To return to the history. The Reformation being thus settled, the queen gave out commissions for a general visitation, and published a body of injunctions, consisting of fifty-three articles, commanding her loving subjects obediently to receive, and truly to observe and keep them, according to their offices, degrees, and states. They are almost the same with those of king Edward. I shall therefore only give the reader an abstract of such as we may have occasion to refer to hereafter.

Artic. 1. "All ecclesiastical persons shall see that the act of supremacy be duly observed, and shall preach four times a year against yielding obedience to any foreign jurisdiction.—2. They shall not set forth or extol the dignity of any images, relics, or miracles, but shall declare the abuses of the same, and that all grace is from God.—3. Parsons shall preach once every month upon works of faith, mercy, and charity, commanded by God; and shall inform the people, that works of man's devising, such as pilgrimages, setting up of candles, praying upon beads, &c. are offensive to God.—4. Parsons having cure of souls shall preach in person once a quarter at least, or else read one of the homilies prescribed by the queen to be read every Sunday in the churches where there is no sermon.—5. Every holy day, when there is no sermon, they shall recite from the pulpit the Pater-Noster, Creed, and ten commandments.—6. Within three months every parish shall provide a Bible, and within twelve months Erasmus's Paraphrase upon the Gospels in English, and set them up in their several churches.—7. The clergy shall not haunt ale-houses or taverns, or spend their time idly at dice, cards, tables, or any other unlawful game.—8. None shall be admitted to preach in churches without licence from the queen, or her visitors; or from the archbishop or bishop of the diocese.—16. All parsons under the degree of M. A. shall buy for their own use the New Testament in Latin and English, with paraphrases, within three months after this visitation.—17. They shall learn out of the Scripture some comfortable sentences for the sick.—18. There shall be no Popish processions; nor shall any persons walk about the church, or depart out of it, while the priest is reading the Scriptures.—19. Nevertheless the perambulation of parishes or processions with the curates shall continue, who shall make a suitable exhortation.—20. Holy days

shall be strictly observed, except in harvest-time after divine service.—21. Curates may not admit to the holy communion, persons that live openly in sin without repentance; or that are at variance with their neighbours, till they are reconciled.—22. Curates, &c. shall teach the people not obstinately to violate the laudable ceremonies of the church.—23. Also, they shall take away, utterly extinguish, and destroy, all shrines, coverings of shrines; all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass-windows, or elsewhere, within their churches and houses; preserving nevertheless, or repairing, both the walls and glass-windows; and they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like in their several houses.—28. Due reverence shall be paid to the ministers of the gospel.—29. No priest or deacon shall marry without allowance of the bishop of his diocese, and two justices of the peace; nor without consent of the parents of the woman (if she have any), or others that are nearest of kin, upon penalty of being incapable of holding any ecclesiastical promotion, or ministering in the word and sacraments. Nor shall bishops marry without allowance of their metropolitan, and such commissioners as the queen shall appoint.—30. All archbishops and bishops, and all that preach or administer the sacraments, or that shall be admitted into any ecclesiastical vocation, or into either of the universities, shall wear such garments, and square caps, as were worn in the latter end of the reign of king Edward VI.—33. No person shall absent from his parish-church, and resort to another, but upon an extraordinary occasion.—34. No innholders or public-houses, shall sell meat or drink in time of divine service.—35. None shall keep in their houses any abused images, tables, pictures, paintings, and other monuments of feigned miracles.—36. No man shall disturb the minister in his sermon; nor mock or make a jest of him.—37. No man, woman, or child, shall be otherways busied in time of divine service, but shall give due attendance to what is read and preached.—40. No person shall teach school but such as are allowed by the ordinary.—41. Schoolmasters shall exhort their children to love and reverence the true religion now allowed by authority.—42. They shall teach their scholars certain sentences of scriptures tending to godliness.—43. None shall be admitted to any spiritual cure that are utterly unlearned.—44. The parson or curate of the parish shall instruct the children of his parish for half an hour before evening prayer on every holy day and second Sunday in the year, in the catechism, and shall teach them the Lord's prayer, Creed, and ten commandments.—45. All the ordinaries shall exhibit to the visitors a copy of the book containing the causes, why any have been imprisoned, famished, or put to death, for religion in the late reign.—46. Overseers in every parish shall see that all the parishioners duly resort to church; and

shall present defaulters to the ordinary.—47. Churchwardens shall deliver to the queen's Visitors an inventory of all their church-furniture, as vestments, copes, plate, books, and especially of grayles, couchers, legends, processions, manuals, hymnals, portuesses, and such-like, appertaining to the church.—48. The litany and prayers shall be read weekly on Wednesdays and Fridays.—49. Singing men shall be continued and maintained in collegiate churches, and there shall be a modest and distinct song so used in all parts of the common prayers in the church, that the same may be as plainly understood as if it were read without singing; and yet nevertheless, for the comforting such as delight in music, it may be permitted that in the beginning or end of the common prayer, there may be sung a hymn, or such-like song, in the best sort of melody and music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentences of the hymn may be understood and perceived.— 50. There shall be no vain and contentious disputes in matters of religion; nor the use of opprobrious words, as Papist, papistical, heretic, schismatic, or Sacramentary. Offenders to be remitted to the ordinary.—51. No book or pamphlet shall be printed or made public without licence from the queen, or six of her privy council, or her ecclesiastical Commissioners, or from the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishop of London, the chancellors of both universities, the bishop being ordinary, and the archdeacon also of the place, where any such book shall be printed, or two of them, whereof the ordinary to be always one: the names of the licensers to be printed at the end. Ancient and profane authors are excepted.—52. In time of reading the litany, and all other collects and common prayer, all the people shall devoutly kneel; and when the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or other ways pronounced in the church, due reverence shall be made of all persons with lowness of courtesy, and uncovering the heads of the men, as has been heretofore accustomed.”

These injunctions were to be read in the churches once every quarter of a year.

An appendix was added, containing one form of bidding prayer; and an order relating to tables in churches, which enjoins, “that no altar be taken down but by oversight of the curate and churchwardens, or one of them at least. Wherein no riotous or disorderly manner shall be used; and that the holy table in every church be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood, and there to stand covered, saying when the sacrament is to be administered; at which time it shall be so placed within the chancel, as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants, and the communicants also more conveniently. and in more numbers, communicate with the said minister; and after the communion done the holy table shall be placed where it stood before.”

The penalties for disobeying these injunctions, were, suspension, deprivation, sequestration of fruits and benefices, excommunication, and such other corrections as to those who have ecclesiastical jurisdiction under her majesty should seem meet.

The major part of the visitors were laymen, any two of whom were empowered to examine into the true state of all churches; to suspend or deprive such clergymen as were unworthy, and to put others into their places; ¹to proceed against the obstinate by imprisonment, church-censures, or any other legal methods. They were to reserve pensions for such as quitted their benefices by resignation; to examine into the condition of all that were imprisoned on the Account of religion, and to discharge them; and to restore all such to their benefices who had been unlawfully deprived in the late times.

This was the first high commission, which was issued about Midsummer 1559. It gave offence to many, that the queen should give lay-visitors authority to proceed by ecclesiastical censures; but this was no more than is frequently done by lay-chancellors in the ecclesiastical courts.² It was much more unjustifiable for the commissioners to go beyond the censures of the church, by fines, imprisonments, and inquisitory oaths, to the ruin of some hundreds of families, without the authority of that statute which gave them being, or any other.

Mr. Strype assures us, that the visitors took effectual care to have all the instruments and utensils of idolatry and superstition demolished and destroyed out of the churches where God's pure service was to be performed; such as roods, i.e. images of Christ upon the cross, with Mary and John standing by; also images of tutelary saints of the churches that were dedicated to them, Popish books, altars, and the like. But it does not appear that either the second or twenty-third article of injunctions empowered them absolutely to remove all images out of churches; the queen herself was as yet undetermined in that matter.³ Bishop Jewel, in his letter to Peter Martyr, February 4th 1560, says, there was to be a conference about the lawfulness of images in churches the day following, between Parker and Cox who were for them, and himself and Grindal who were against them; and if they prevail, says he, I will be no longer a bishop.⁴ However, it is certain, that the visitors commanded the prebendaries and archdeacon of London to see that the cathedral church of St. Paul's be purged and freed from all and singular images, idols, and altars; and in the place of the altars to provide a decent table for the ordinary celebration of the Lord's supper; and accord-

¹ Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 400.

² This, Dr. Warner observes, was justifying one abuse by another.—ED.

³ Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 290.

⁴ Pierce's Vind. p. 38.

ingly the roods and high altar were taken away.¹

The populace was on the side of the Reformation,² having been provoked with the cruelties of the late times: great numbers attended the commissioners, and brought into Cheapside, Paul's churchyard, and Smithfield, the roods and crucifixes that were taken down, and in some places the vestments of the priests, copes, surplices, altar-cloths, books, banners, sepulchres, and burnt them to ashes, as it were, to make atonement for the blood of the martyrs which had been shed there. Nay, they went farther, and in their furious zeal broke the painted glass-windows, rased out some ancient inscriptions, and spoiled those monuments of the dead that had any ensigns of Popery upon them. "The divines of this time (says Mr. Strype) could have been content to have been without all relics and ceremonies of the Roman church, that there might not be the least compliance with Popish devotions." And it had not been the worse for the church of England if their successors had been of the same mind.

But the queen disliked these proceedings;³ she had a crucifix with the blessed Virgin and St. John, still in her chapel; and when Sandys bishop of Worcester spoke to her against it, she threatened to deprive him. The crucifix was after some time removed, but replaced in 1570. To put some stop to these proceedings, her majesty issued out a proclamation, dated September 19th, in the second year of her reign, prohibiting "the defacing or breaking any parcel of any monument, tomb, or grave, or other inscription, in memory of any person deceased, or breaking any images of kings, princes, or nobles, &c. set up only in memory of them to posterity, and not for any religious honour; or the defacing or breaking any images in glass-windows in any churches, without consent of the ordinary." It was with great difficulty, and not without a sort of protestation from the bishops, that her majesty consented to have so many monuments of idolatry, as are mentioned in her twenty-third injunction, removed out of churches; but she would not part with her altar, or her crucifix, nor with lighted candles, out of her own chapel. The gentlemen and singing children appeared there in their surpic-

¹ Strype's Ann. vol. 1. p. 175.

² The following anecdotes mark the strong disposition of the people towards a reformation, and are pleasing specimens of the skill and ingenuity with which queen Elizabeth knew how to suit herself to their wishes. On her releasing the prisoners, confined in the former reign on account of religion, one Rainsford told the queen that he had a petition to present to her, in behalf of other prisoners, called Matthew, Mark, Lake, and John. She readily replied, that she must first consult the prisoners themselves, and learn of them whether they desired that liberty which he had asked for them. At the time of her coronation, from one of the principal arches through which she was conducted, a boy personating Truth was let down, and presented her with a Bible. She received it on her knees, kissed it, and placing it in her bosom, said "she preferred that above all the other presents that were on that day made her." History of Knowledge in the New Annual Register for 1789, p. 4. and Burnet's History of the Reformation abridged, 8vo. p. 344.—ED.

³ Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 291. Life of Parker, p. 46. 310. Strype's Annals, vol. 1. p. 175, 176.

es, and the priests in their copes; the altar was furnished with rich plate, and two gilt candlesticks with lighted candles, and a massy crucifix of silver in the midst: the service was sung not only with the sound of organs, but with the artificial music of cornets, sackbuts, &c. on solemn festivals. The ceremonies observed, by the knights of the garter in their adoration towards the altar, which had been abolished by king Edward, and revived by queen Mary, were retained. In short, the service performed in the queen's chapel, and in sundry cathedrals, was so splendid and showy, that foreigners could not distinguish it from the Roman, except that it was performed in the English tongue. By this method most of the Popish laity were deceived into conformity, and came regularly to church for nine or ten years, till the pope, being out of all hopes of an accommodation, forbid them, by excommunicating the queen, and laying the whole kingdom under an interdict.

When the visitors had gone through the kingdom, and made their report of the obedience given her majesty's laws and injunctions, it appeared that not above two hundred and forty-three clergymen had quitted their livings, viz. fourteen bishops, and three bishops elect; one abbot, four priors, one abbess, twelve deans, fourteen archdeacons, sixty canons or prebendaries, one hundred beneficed clergy, fifteen heads of colleges in Oxford and Cambridge; to which maybe added about twenty doctors in several faculties. In one of the volumes in the Cotton-library the number is one hundred and ninety-two; D'Ew's Journal mentions but one hundred and seventy-seven; bishop Burnet one hundred and ninety-nine; but Camden and cardinal Allen reckon as above. Most of the inferior beneficed clergy kept their places, as they had done through all the changes of the three last reigns; and without all question if the queen had died, and the old religion had been restored, they would have turned again; but the bishops and some of the dignified clergy having sworn to the supremacy under king Henry, and renounced it again under queen Mary, they thought it might reflect a dishonour upon their character to change again, and therefore they resolved to hold together, and by their weight endeavour to distress the Reformation. Upon so great an alteration of religion the number of recusants out of nine thousand four hundred parochial benefices was inconsiderable; and yet it was impossible to find Protestants of a tolerable capacity to supply the vacancies, because many of the stricter sort, who had been exiles for religion, could not come up to the terms of conformity, and the queen's injunctions.¹

It may seem strange, that amidst all this concern for the new form of worship, no notice should be taken of the doctrinal articles which king Edward had published for avoiding diversities of opinions, though her majesty might have enjoined them, by virtue of her supremacy under the great seal,

¹ Strype's Ann. vol, 1, p. 72, 73.

as well as her brother; but the bishops durst not venture them into convocation, because the majority were for the old religion, and the queen was not very fond of her brother's doctrines. To supply this defeat for the present, the bishops drew up a declaration of their faith,¹ which all churchmen were obliged to read publicly at their entrance upon their cures.

These were the terms of ministerial conformity at this time,—the oath of supremacy, compliance with the act of uniformity, and this declaration of faith. There was no dispute among the reformers about the first and last of these qualifications, but they differed upon the second; many of the learned exiles, and others, refusing to accept of livings in the church according to the act of uniformity, and the queen's injunctions. If the Popish habits and ceremonies had been left indifferent, or other decent ones appointed in their room, the seeds of division had been prevented; but as the case stood, it was next to a miracle that the Reformation had not fallen back into the hands of the Papists; and if some of the Puritans had not complied for the present, in hopes of the removal of these grievances in more settled times, this would have been the sad consequence; for it was impossible, with all the assistance they could get from both universities, to fill up the parochial vacancies with men of learning and character. Many churches were disfurnished for a considerable time, and not a few mechanics, altogether as unlearned as the most remarkable of those that were ejected, were preferred to dignities and livings, who being disregarded by the people, brought great discredit on the Reformation, while others of the first rank for learning, piety, and usefulness, in their functions, were laid by in silence. There was little or no preaching all over the country; the bishop of Bangor writes, that "he had but two preachers in all his diocess."² It was enough if the parson could read the service, and sometimes a homily. The bishops were sensible of the calamity; but instead of opening the door a little wider, to let in some of the more conscientious and zealous reformers, they admitted the meanest and most illiterate who would come up to the terms of the laws; and published a second book of homilies for their farther assistance.

It is hard to say, at this distance of time, how far the bishops were to blame for their servile and abject compliance with the queen; yet one is ready to think, that those who had drunk so deep of the cup of persecution, and had seen the dreadful effects of it, in the fiery trial of their brethren the martyrs, should have insisted as one man, upon a latitude for their conscientious brethren in points of indifference; whereas their zeal ran in a quite different channel; for when the spiritual sword was put into their hands, they were too forward in brandishing it over the heads of others, and even

¹ See this declaration, Appendix No. 1.

² M. S, p, 886.

to outrun the laws, by suspending, depriving, fining, and imprisoning, men of true learning and piety, popular preachers declared enemies of Popery and superstition, and of the same faith with themselves, who were fearful of a sinful compliance with things that had been abused to idolatry.

All the exiles were now come home, except a few of the Puritan stamp that stayed at Geneva to finish their translation of the Bible begun in the late reign. The persons concerned in it were, Miles Coverdale, Christ. Goodman, John Knox, Ant. Gibbs, Thomas Sampson, William Cole of Corpus Christi college, Oxon, and William Whittingham: they compared Tyndal's old English Bible first with the Hebrew, and then with the best modern translations; they divided the chapters into verses, which the former translators had not done; they added some figures, maps, and tables, and published the whole in 1560, at Geneva, in quarto, printed by Rowland Harle, with a dedication to the queen, and an epistle to the reader, dated April 10th, which are left out in the later editions, because they touched somewhat severely upon certain ceremonies retained in the church of England, which they excited her majesty to remove, as having a Popish aspect; and because the translators had published marginal notes, some of which were thought to affect the queen's prerogative, and to allow the subject to resist wicked and tyrannical kings; therefore when the proprietors, petitioned the secretary of state for reprinting it in England for public use, in the year 1565, it was refused, and the impression stopped, till after the death of the archbishop in the year 1576.¹ The author of the troubles at Frankfort, published in the year 1575, complains that if the Geneva Bible be such as no enemy of God can justly find fault with, then may men marvel that such a work, being so profitable, should find so small favour, as not to be printed again."² The exceptionable notes were on Exodus xv. 19, where disobedience to kings is allowed; 2 Chron. xix; 16, where Asa is censured for stopping short at the deposing of his mother, and not executing her; Rev. ix. 3, where the locusts that come out of the smoke are said to be heretics, false teachers, worldly, subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, doctors, bachelors, and masters. But notwithstanding these, and some other exceptionable passages in the notes, the Geneva Bible was reprinted in the years 1576 and 1579, and was in such repute, that some, who had been curious to search into the number of its editions, say, that by the queen's own printers it was printed above thirty times. However, for a present supply Tyndal and Coverdale's translation, printed in the reign of king Henry VIII. was revised and published for the use of the church of England, till the bishops should publish a more correct

¹ Life of Parker, p. 206.

² Hickman against Heylin, p. 179.

one; which they had now undertaken.

Together with the exiles, the Dutch and German Protestants, who in the reign of king Edward VI. had the church in Austin-friars assigned them for a place of worship, returned to England with John a Lasco, a Polonian, their superintendant. They petitioned the queen to restore them to their church and privileges, which her majesty declined for some time, because she would not admit of a stranger to be superintendant of a church within her bishop's diocess. To take off this objection Alasco resigned, and the people chose Grindal bishop of London their superintendent, and then the queen confirmed their charter, which they still enjoy, though they never chose another superintendent after him. The French Protestants were also restored to their church in Threadneedle-street, which they yet enjoy.

The Reformation took place this year in Scotland, by the preaching of Mr. John Knox, a bold and courageous Scots divine, who shunned no danger, nor feared the face of any man in the cause of religion. He had been a preacher in England in king Edward's time, then an exile at Frankfort, and at last one of the ministers of the English congregation at Geneva, from whence he arrived at Edinburgh, May 2d, 1559, being forty-five years of age, and settled at Perth, but was a sort of evangelist over the whole kingdom. He maintained this position, that if kings and princes refused to reform religion, inferior magistrates and the people, being directed and instructed in the truth by their preachers, may lawfully reform within their own bounds themselves; and if all or the far greater part be enlightened by the truth, they may make a public reformation. Upon this principle the Scots reformers humbly petitioned the queen-dowager, regent for her daughter [Mary], now in France, for liberty to assemble publicly or privately for prayer, for reading and explaining the Holy Scriptures, and administering the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper in the vulgar tongue; and the latter in both kinds, according to Christ's institution. This reasonable petition not being admitted, certain noblemen and barons formed an association, resolving to venture their lives and fortunes in this cause; and they encouraged as many of the curates of the parishes within their districts as were willing to read the prayers and lessons in English, but not to expound the Scriptures till God should dispose the queen to grant them liberty. This being executed at Perth and the neighbouring parts without disturbance, the association spread, and was signed by great numbers, even in the capital city of Edinburgh. Upon this they presented another petition, representing to the regent the unseasonableness of her rigour against the Protestants, considering their numbers; but she was deaf to all moderate councils. At the meeting of the parliament, the congregation, or heads of the association, presented the regent with sundry articles relating to liberty of conscience, to lay before the house, which she suppressed, and would

not suffer to be debated; whereupon they drew up the following protestation, and desired it might be recorded: "that since they could not procure a reformation, agreeable to the word of God, from the government, that it might be lawful for them to follow the dictates of their consciences. That none that joined with them in the profession of the true faith should be liable to any civil penalties, or incur any damages for so doing. They protest, that if any tumults arise on the score of religion, the imputation ought not to lie upon them who now humbly entreat for a regular remedy; and that in all other things they will be most loyal subjects." The regent acquainted the court of France with the situation of affairs, and received an order to suffer no other religion but the Roman Catholic to be professed, with a promise of large supplies of forces to support her. Upon this she summoned the magistrates of Perth, and the reformed ministers, to appear before her at Stirling, with a design to have them banished by a solemn decree. The ministers appeared accordingly, being attended by vast crowds of people armed and prepared to defend them, agreeably to the custom of Scotland, which allowed criminals to come to their trials attended with their relations and friends. The regent, astonished at the sight, prayed John Areskin to persuade the multitude to retire, and gave her parole that nothing should be decreed against the ministers; but they were no sooner gone quietly home than she condemned them for nonappearance.

This news being brought to Perth, the burghers, encouraged by great numbers of the nobility and neighbouring gentry, formed an army of seven thousand men under the command of the earl of Glencairne, for the defence of their ministers against the regent, who was marching with an army of French and Scots to drive them out of their country; but being informed of the preparation of the burghers she consented to a treaty, by which it was agreed, that she should be received with honour into the city, and be suffered to lodge in it some days, provided she would promise to make no alteration in religion, but refer all to the parliament; the Scots forces on both sides to be dismissed: but the reformed had no sooner disbanded their army, and opened their gates to the regent, than she broke all the articles, set up the mass, and left a garrison of French in the town, resolving to make it a place of arms. Upon this notorious breach of treaty, as well as the regent's declaration, that promises were not to be kept with heretics, the congregations of Fife, Perth, Dundee, Angus, Mearns, and Montrose, raised a little army, and signed an engagement to assist each other in maintaining the Reformation with their lives and fortunes. Mr. Knox encouraged them by his sermons; and the populace being warmed, pulled down altars and images, plundered the monasteries, and dismantled the churches of their superstitious ornaments. The regent marched against them at the head of two thousand French, and two thousand Scots in French pay; but being afraid to

venture a battle, she retreated to Dunbar, and the confederates made themselves masters of Perth, Scone, Stirling, and Lithgow. At length a truce was concluded, by which the ministers of the congregation had liberty to preach in the pulpits of Edinburgh for the present; but the regent, having soon after received large recruits from France, repossessed herself of Leith, and ordered it to be fortified, and stored with all necessary provisions; the confederates desired her to demolish the works, alleging it to be a violation of the truce; but she commanded them upon their allegiance to be quiet and lay down their arms; and marching directly to Edinburgh, she obliged them to desert the city and retire to Stirling, whither the French troops followed them, and dispersed them into the mountains. In this low condition they published a proclamation, discharging the regent of her authority, and threatening to treat as enemies all that obeyed her orders; but not being able to stand their ground, they threw themselves into the arms of queen Elizabeth; who, being sensible of the danger of the Protestant religion, and of her own crown, if Scotland should become entirely Popish, under the government of a queen of France, who claimed the crown of England, entered into an alliance to support the confederate Protestants in their religion and civil liberties, and signed the treaty at Berwick, Feb. 27, 1560.

Among other articles of this treaty it was stipulated, that the queen should send forces into Scotland, to continue there till Scotland was restored to its liberties and privileges, and the French driven out of the kingdom. Accordingly, her majesty sent an army of seven thousand foot, and twelve hundred horse, which joined the confederate army of like force.¹ This army was afterward reinforced by a large detachment from the northern marches, under the command of the duke of Norfolk; after which they took the city of Leith, and obliged the queen-regent to shut herself up in the castle of Edinburgh, where she died June 10th. The French offered to restore Calais, if the queen would recall her forces from Scotland; but she refused. At length the troubles of France requiring all their forces at home, plenipotentiaries were sent into Scotland to treat with Elizabeth about withdrawing the French forces out of that kingdom, and restoring the Scots to their parliamentary government. The treaty was concluded the beginning of August, whereby a general amnesty was granted; the English and French forces were to withdraw in two months, and a parliament to be called with all convenient speed, to settle the affairs of religion and the kingdom; but Francis and Mary refused to ratify it.

Before the parliament met Francis died, and left Mary queen of Scots a young widow. The late treaty not being ratified, the parliament had no direct authority from the crown, but assembled by virtue of the late treaty,

¹ Rapin, vol. 8. p. 271.

and received the following petitions from the barons and gentlemen concerning religion:

1. "That the doctrines of the Roman church should be suppressed by act of parliament, in those exceptionable points therein mentioned.

2. "That the discipline of the ancient church be revived.

3. "That the pope's usurped authority be discharged." All which was voted, and the ministers were desired to draw up a confession of faith, which they expressed in twenty-five articles, agreeable to the sentiments of Calvin, and the foreign reformers. The confession being read in parliament was carried but with three dissenting voices; the Popish prelates offering nothing in defence of their religion.

By another act the pope's authority was abolished, and reading mass was made punishable, for the first offence with loss of goods; for the second banishment; and for the third death. This was carrying matters too far; for to judge men to death for matters of mere conscience that do not affect the government; is not to be justified. "To affirm that we are in the right, and others in the wrong (says Mr. Collyer¹), is foreign to the point; for every one that suffers for religion thinks himself in the right, and therefore ought not to be destroyed for his sincerity, for the prejudices of education, or the want of a better understanding, unless his opinions have mutiny and treason in them, and shake the foundations of civil society."

Upon the breaking up of the parliament a commission was directed to Mr. Knox, Willock, Spotiswood, and some other divines, to draw up a scheme of discipline for the church, which they did pretty much upon the Geneva plan, only admitting superintendents in the room of bishops, and rejecting imposition of hands in the ordination of ministers, because that miracle was ceased, which they apprehended to accompany that ceremony. Their words are these:² "Other ceremonies than the public approbation of the people, and declaration of the chief minister, that the person there presented is appointed to serve the church, we cannot approve; for albeit the apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not necessary." They also appointed ten or twelve superintendents to plant and erect kirks, and to appoint ministers in such counties as should be committed to their care, where there were none already. But then they add, these men must not live like idle bishops, but must preach themselves twice or thrice a week, and visit their districts every three or four months, to inspect the lives and behaviour of the parochial ministers, to redress grievances, or bring them before an Assembly of the kirk. The superintendents were to be chosen by the ministers and elders of

¹ Collyer's Eccl. Hist. p. 468.

² First Book of Discipline, p. 31.

the several provinces; and to be deprived by them for misbehaviour. The assemblies of the kirk were divided into classical, provincial, and national, in which the last resort of all kirk-jurisdiction was lodged.

When this plan of discipline was laid before the estates, it was referred to farther consideration, and had not a parliamentary sanction, as the reformers expected. But after the recess of the parliament several noblemen, barons, and chief gentlemen, of the nation, met together at the instance of Mr. Knox, and signed it, resolving to abide by the new discipline, till it should be confirmed or altered by parliament. From this time the old hierarchical government was disused, and the kirk was governed by general, provincial, and classical assemblies, with superintendents, though there was no law for it till some years after.

To return to England. The Popish bishops behaved rudely towards the queen and her new bishops. They admonished her majesty by letter to return to the religion of her ancestors, and threatened her with the censures of the church, in case she refused. This not prevailing, pope Pius IV. himself exhorted her by letter, dated May 5, 1570, to reject evil counsellors, and obey his fatherly admonitions, assuring her, that if she would return to the bosom of the church, he would receive her with like affectionate love as the father in the gospel received his son. Parpalio, the nuncio that was sent with this letter, offered in the pope's name to confirm the English liturgy, to allow of the sacrament in both kinds, and to disannul the sentence against her mother's marriage; but the queen would not part with her supremacy.¹ Another nuncio, the abbot Martmegues, was sent this summer with other proposals, but was stopped in Flanders and forbid to set foot in the realm. The emperor and other Roman Catholic princes, interceded with the queen to grant her subjects of their religion churches to officiate in after their own manner, and to keep up a separate communion; but her majesty was too politic to trust them; upon which they entered upon more desperate measures, as will be seen hereafter.²

Archbishop Parker visited his diocese this summer, and found it in a deplorable condition; the major part of the beneficed clergy being either mechanics or mass-priests in disguise; many churches were shut up, and in those that were open not a sermon was to be heard in some counties within the compass of twenty miles; the people perished for lack of knowledge, while men who were capable of instructing them were kept out of the church, or at least denied all preferment in it. But the queen was not so much concerned for this, as for maintaining her supremacy; his grace there-

¹ Foxes and firebrands, part 3.p. 15, 18.

Elizabeth (as Dr. Warner expresses it) was not to be won with either threats or entreaties to part with her supremacy; of which she was as fond as the king her father."—ED.

² Strype's Ann. p, 408.

fore, by her order, drew up a form of subscription to be made by all that held any ecclesiastical preferment,¹ wherein they acknowledge and confess, "that the restoring the supremacy to the crown, and the abolishing all foreign power, as well as the administration of the sacraments according to the Book of Common Prayer, and the queen's injunctions, is agreeable to the word of God and the practice of the primitive church." Which most that favoured the Reformation, as well as great numbers of timeserving priests, complied with; but some refused and were deprived.

The next thing the archbishop undertook was settling the calendar, and the order of lessons to be read throughout the year, which his grace, as one of the ecclesiastical commissioners, procured letters under the great seal to reform.² Before this time it was left to the discretion of the minister to change the chapters to be read in course for some others that were more for edification; and even after this new regulation the bishops recommended it; for in the preface to the second book of homilies published in the year 1564, there is a serious admonition to all ministers ecclesiastical, to be diligent and faithful in their high functions; in which, among others, is this remarkable instruction to the curates or ministers.³ "If one or other chapter of the Old Testament falls in order to be read on Sundays or holidays, it shall be well done to spend your time to consider well of some other chapter in the New Testament of more edification, for which it may be changed. By this your prudence and diligence in your office will appear, so that your people may have cause to glorify God for you, and be the readier to embrace your labours." If this indulgence had been continued, one considerable difficulty to the Puritans had been removed, viz. their obligation to read the Apocrypha lessons; and surely there could be no great danger in this, when the minister was confined within the canon of Scripture.

But this liberty was not long permitted, though the admonition being never legally reversed, archbishop Abbot was of opinion, that it was in force in his time, and ought to have been allowed the clergy throughout the course of this reign.⁴ His words are these, in his book entitled, *Hill's Reasons Unmasked*, p. 317: "It is not only permitted to the minister, but recommended to him, if wisely and quietly he do read canonical Scripture, where the Apocrypha upon good judgment seemeth not so fit; or any chapter of the canonical may be conceived not to have in it so much edification before the simple, as some other parts of the same canonical scriptures may be thought to have." But the governing bishops were of another mind, they would trust nothing to the discretion of the minister, nor vary a tittle from

¹ Life of Parker, p. 77.

² M. S. penes me, p. 88.

³ Life of Parker, p. 84.

⁴ Strype's Annals, p. 117.

the act of uniformity.

Hitherto there were few or no peculiar lessons for holidays and particular Sundays, but the chapters of the Old and New Testament were read in course, without any interruption or variation; so it is in the Common Prayer-book of 1549, fol.¹ In the second edition of that book under king Edward VI. there were proper lessons for some few holidays, but none for Sundays; but now there was a table of proper lessons for the whole year, thus entitled, "Proper lessons to be read for the first lesson, both at morning and evening prayer, on the Sundays throughout the year; and for some also the second lessons." It begins with the Sundays of Advent, and appoints Isa. i. for matins, and Isa. ii. for even-song. There is another table for proper lessons on holidays, beginning with St. Andrew; and a third table for proper psalms on certain days, as Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, &c. At the end of this common prayer-book, printed by Jug and Cawood, 1560, were certain prayers for private and family use, which in the later editions are either shortened or left out. Mr. Strype cannot account for this conduct, but says, it was great pity that the people were disfurnished of those assistances they so much wanted: but the design seems to have been, to confine all devotion to the church, and to give no liberty to clergy or laity, even in their closets or families, to vary from the public forms. An admonition was published at the same time, and set up in all churches, forbidding all parsons under the degree of a master of arts, to preach or expound the Scriptures, or to innovate or alter anything, or use any other rite but only what is set forth by authority; these were only to read the homilies.² And whereas by reason of the scarcity of ministers, the bishops had admitted into the ministry sundry artificers, and others not brought up to learning, and some that were of base occupation, it was now desired, that no more tradesmen should be ordained, till the convocation met and took some better order in this affair.

But it was impossible to comply with this admonition; for so many churches in country towns and villages were vacant, that in some places there was no preaching, nor so much as reading a homily, for many months together. In sundry parishes it was hard to find persons to baptize or bury the dead; the bishops therefore were obliged to admit of pluralists, nonresidents, civilians, and to ordain such as offered themselves, how meanly soever they were qualified, while others who had some scruples about conformity, stood by unprovided for; the learned and industrious Mr. John Fox the martyrologist was of this number, for in a letter to his friend Dr. Humphreys, lately chosen president of Magdalen-college, Oxon, he writes thus;

¹ Life of Parker, p. 83.

² Life of Parker, p. 90.

I still wear the same clothes, and remain in the same sordid condition, that England received me in, when I first came home out of Germany, nor do I change my degree or order, which is that of the Mendicants; or, if you will, of the friars-preachers.” Thus pleasantly did this grave and learned divine reproach the ingratitude of the times. The Puritans complained of these hardships to the queen, but there was no remedy.

The two universities could give little or no assistance to the reformers; for the professors and tutors, being of the Popish religion, had trained up the youth in their own principles for the last six or seven years. Some of the heads of colleges were displaced this summer, and Protestants put in their room; but it was a long time before they could supply the necessities of the church. There were only three Protestant preachers in the university of Oxford in the year 1563, and they were all Puritans, viz. Dr. Humphreys, Mr. Kingsmill, and Mr. Sampson; and though by the next year the clergy were so modelled, that the bishops procured a convocation that favoured the Reformation, yet they were such poor scholars that many of them could hardly write their names.

Indeed the Reformation went heavily on. The queen could scarcely be persuaded to part with images, nor consent to the marriage of the clergy; for she commanded that no head or member of any collegiate or cathedral church, should bring a wife or any other woman within the precincts of it, to abide in the same, on pain of forfeiture of all ecclesiastical promotions:¹ and her majesty would have absolutely forbid the marriage of all her clergy, if secretary Cecil had not briskly interposed. She repented that she had made any married men bishops; and told the archbishop in anger, that she intended to publish other injunctions, which his grace understood to be in favour of Popery; upon which the archbishop wrote to the secretary, that he was sorry the queen’s mind was so turned; but in such a case he should think it his duty to obey God rather than man. Upon the whole, the queen was so far from improving her brother’s reformation, that she often repented she had gone so far.²

Her majesty’s second parliament met the 12th of January 1562, in which a remarkable act was passed, for assurance of the queen’s royal power over all states and subjects within her dominions. It was a confirmation of the act of supremacy. “All persons that by writing, printing, preach-

¹ Life of Parker, p. 107. 109.

² Of this Dr. Warner gives the following instances: when the dean of St. Paul’s, in a sermon at court, spoke with some dislike of the sign of the cross, her majesty called aloud to him from her closet, commanding him to desist from that ungodly digression, and to return to his text. At another time, when one of her chaplains preached a sermon on Good-Friday, in defence of the real presence, which without guessing at her sentiments he would scarce have ventured on, she openly gave him thanks for his pains and piety. Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 427.—Ed.

ing, or teaching, maintained the pope's authority within this realm, incurred a præmunire for the first offence, and the second was high treason. The oath of supremacy was to be taken by all in holy orders, by all graduates in the universities, lawyers, schoolmasters, and all other officers of any court whatsoever; and by all knights, citizens, and burgesses, in parliament."¹ But the archbishop by the queen's order wrote to the bishops, not to tender the oath but in case of necessity, and never to press it a second time without his special direction; so that none of the Popish bishops or divines were burdened with it, except Bonner and one or two more.

The convocation was opened at St. Paul's the day after the meeting of the parliament. Mr. Day, provost of Eton, preached the sermon, and Alexander Nowel, dean of St. Paul's, was chosen prolocutor. Her majesty having directed letters of licence to review the doctrine and discipline of the church, they began with the doctrine, and reduced the forty-two articles of king Edward VI. to the number of thirty-nine, as at present, the following articles being omitted: Article 39. The resurrection of the dead is not passed already. Art. 40. The souls of men deceased do neither perish with their bodies nor sleep idly. Art. 41. Of the Millenarians. Art. 42. All men not to be saved at last. Some of the other articles underwent a new division, two being joined into one, and in other parts one is divided into two; but there is no remarkable variation in the doctrine.²

It has been warmly disputed, whether the first clause of the twentieth article, "The church has power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith," was a part of the article which passed the synod, and was afterward confirmed by parliament in the year 1571. It is certain that it is not among king Edward's articles; nor is it in that original manuscript of the articles subscribed by both houses of convocation with their own hands, still preserved in Bene't-college library among the rest of archbishop Parker's papers. The records of this convocation were burnt in the fire of London, so that there is no appealing to them; but archbishop Laud says, that he sent to the public records in his office, and the notary returned him the twentieth article with the clause; and that afterward he found the book of articles subscribed by the lower house of convocation in 1571, with the clause. Heylen says, that he consulted the records of convo-

¹ Life of Parker, p. 126.

² The eighth article of Edward VI. had a clause imputing to the Anabaptists, as the Pelagians, the opinion, that original sin consisted in following of Adam: in this revisal of the articles the part of the clause charging the Anabaptists with that opinion was left out. That article concerning baptism stated also the grounds of administering that rite to infants in this manner: "The custom of the church for baptizing young children is both to be commended, and by all means to be retained in the church." It seems by this that the first reformers did not found the practice of infant-baptism upon Scripture; but took it only as a commendable custom, that had been used in the Christian church, and therefore ought to be retained. Crosby's History of the English Baptists, vol. 1. p. 54.—ED.

cation, and that the contested clause was in the book; and yet Fuller, a much fairer writer, who had the liberty of perusing the same records, declares he could not decide the controversy.¹ The fact is this; the statute of 1571 expressly confirms English articles comprised in an imprinted book, entitled, "Articles, whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London in the year 1562, according to the computation of the church of England; for the avoiding diversity of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion: put forth by the queen's authority." Now there were only two editions of the articles in English before this time, both which have the same numerical title with that transcribed in the statute, and both, says my author, want the clause of the church's power. But Mr. Strype, in his Life of Archbishop Parker, says, that the clause is to be found in two printed copies of 1563, which I believe very few have seen.² However, till the original MS. Above mentioned can be set aside, which is carefully marked as to the number of pages, and the number of lines and articles in each page, it seems more probable that the clause was some way or other surreptitiously inserted by those who were friends of the church's power, than struck out by the Puritans, as Laud and his followers have published to the world; for it is hard to suppose, that a foul copy, as this is pretended to be, should be so carefully marked and subscribed by every member of the synod with their own hands, and yet not be perfect: but it is not improbable that the notary or registrar, who transcribed the articles into the convocation-book, with the names of them that subscribed, might by direction of his superiors privately insert it: and so it might appear in the records of 1571, though it was not in the original draught. The controversy is of no great moment to the present clergy, because it is certain the clause was a part of the article confirmed by parliament at the restoration of king Charles II. 1662; though how far it was consistent with the act of supremacy, which lodged the ultimate power of determining matters of faith and discipline in the crown, I must leave with the reader. The synod itself seemed to be apprehensive of the danger of a *præmunire*, and therefore after their names these words were cautiously added; "*Ista subscriptio facta est ab omnibus sub hac protestatione, quod nihil statuunt in præjudicium cujusquam sena-*

¹ Church History, b. 9. p. 74.

² The celebrated Mr. Anthony Collins discussed the question concerning the genuineness of this clause, in several publications: and professed to demonstrate that it was not a part of the articles agreed on by the convocations of 1562 and 1571. His first pamphlet was entitled, *Priestcraft in Perfection*. Its appearance gave a general alarm to the clergy; and a variety of pamphlets, sermons, and larger works, in reply to it, issued forth from the press. The two principal of which Mr. Collins answered in 1724, in "*An historical and critical essay on the thirty-nine articles of the church of England.*" See *British Biography*, vol. 9. p. 275. 278, &c.—ED.

tus consulti, sed tantum supplicem libellum petitiones suas continentem humiliter offerunt:" i.e. "This subscription is made by all with this protestation, that they determine nothing in prejudice of any act of parliament, but only humbly offer this little book to the queen or parliament, containing their requests and petitions."

The articles were concluded, and the subscription finished, in the chapter-house of St. Paul's, January 31, 1562, in the ninth session of convocation.¹ All the bishops subscribed, except Gloucester and Rochester, who I believe were absent. Of the lower house there were upwards of a hundred hands; but whatever their learning was, many of them wrote so ill that it was hard to read their names. Among the subscribers are several of the learned exiles, who were dissatisfied with the constitution; as the reverend Mr. Beseley, Watts, Cole, Mullyns, Sampson, Pullan, Spencer, Wisdom, Nowel, Heton, Beaumont, Pedder, Lever, Pownal, Wilson, Croley, and others. But the articles did not pass into a law, and become a part of the establishment, till nine years after, though some of the more rigid bishops of the ecclesiastical commission insisted upon subscription from this time.

The next considerable affair that came under debate, was the rites and ceremonies of the church; and here, first, bishop Sandys brought in a paper of advice to move her majesty, "That private baptism, and baptism by women, may be taken out of the Common Prayer-book. That the cross in baptism may be disallowed as needless and superstitious. That commissioners may be appointed to reform the ecclesiastical laws."

Another paper was presented to the house with the following requests, signed by thirty-three names.

"That the psalms may be sung distinctly by the whole congregation; and that organs maybe laid aside. That none may baptize but ministers; and that they may leave off the sign of the cross. That at the ministration of the communion the posture of kneeling may be left indifferent. That the use of copes and surplices may be taken away; so that all ministers in their ministry use a grave, comely, and side garment, as they commonly do in preaching. That ministers be not compelled to wear such gowns and caps, as the enemies of Christ's gospel have chosen to be the special array of their priesthood. That the words in the thirty-third article, concerning the punishment of those who do not in all things conform to the public order about ceremonies, may be mitigated. That all the saints' days, festivals, and holidays, bearing the name of a creature, may be abrogated; or at least a commemoration only of them reserved by sermons, homilies, or common prayer, for the better instructing the people in history; and that after service men may go to work."

¹ Strype's Ann. p. 329.

I have subjoined the names of the subscribers to this paper, that the reader may take notice what considerable persons they were for learning and ability, as well as numbers, that desired a farther reformation in the church.¹

This paper not being approved, another was brought into the lower house February 13, containing the following articles to be approved or rejected.²

“That all Sundays in the year, and principal feasts of Christ, be kept holidays; and that all other holidays be abrogated. That in all parish-churches the minister in the common prayer turn his face towards the people, and there read distinctly the service appointed, that the people may hear and be edified. That in baptism the cross may be omitted, as tending to

¹ Alexander Nowel, dean of St. Paul’s and prolocutor.

Sampson, dean of Christ-church, Oxon.

Lawrence Nowel, dean of Litchfield.

Ellis, dean of Hereford.

Day, provost of Eton.

Dodds, dean of Exon.

Mullins, archdeacon of London.

Fullan, archdeacon of Colchester.

Lever, archdeacon of Coventry.

Bemont, archdeacon of Huntingdon.

Spencer, archdeacon of Chichester.

Croley, archdeacon of Hereford.

Heton, archdeacon of Gloucester.

Rogers, archdeacon of St. Asaph.

Kemp, archdeacon of St. Alban’s.

Prat, archdeacon of St. David’s.

Longland, archdeacon of Bucks.

Watts, archdeacon of Middlesex.

Proctors

Calfhil, Church of Oxon.

Walker, Clergy of Suffolk.

Saul, Dean and chapter of Gloucester.

Wiburne, Church of Rochester.

Savage, Clergy of Gloucester. ’

W. Bonner, Church of Somerset.

Avys, Chrch of Wigorn.

Wilson, Church of Wigorn, Worcester.

Nevynson, Clergy of Canterbury.

Tremayne, Clergy of Exeter.

Renyger, , Dean and chapter of Winton.

Roberts, Clergy of Norwich.

Reeve, Dean and chapter of Westminster.

Hills, Clergy of Oxon.

² Strype’s Ann. p. 337.

superstition. Forasmuch as divers communicants are not able to kneel for age and sickness at the sacrament, and others kneel and knock superstitiously, that therefore the order of kneeling may be left to the discretion of the ordinary. That it be sufficient for the minister in time of saying divine service, and ministering of the sacraments (once) to wear a surplice; and that no minister say service, or minister the sacraments, but in a comely garment or habit. That the use of organs be removed.”

These propositions were the subject of warm debates; some approving and others rejecting them. In conclusion, the house being divided, it appeared upon the scrutiny, that the majority of those present were for approving them, forty-three against thirty-five; but when the proxies were counted, the scale was turned; those who were for the propositions being fifty-eight, and those against them fifty-nine; so that by the majority of one single voice, and that not a person present to hear the debates but a proxy, it was determined to make no alteration in the ceremonies, nor any abatements of the present establishment,¹

¹ The names of the forty-three that approved of the above articles were,

Dean Nowel, prolocutor, St. Paul's.
 Mr. archdeacon Lever, Coventry.
 Dean Pedder, Wigorniensis.
 Mr. archdeacon Watts, Middlesex.
 Dean Nowel, of Litchfield.
 Mr. archdeacon Spencer, Cicestrensh
 Mr. Besely, proct. clcr. Cant.
 Mr. Nevynson, proct. clcr. Cant.
 Mr. Bower, proct. clcr. Somers.
 Mr. Ebden, proct. clcr. Wint.
 Mr. archdeacon Longland, Bucks.
 Mr. Lancaster, thesaurar, Sarum.
 Mr. archdeacon Weston, Lcwensis,
 Mr. archdeacon Wisdom, Eliensis.
 Mr. Saul. proct. dec. cap. GIouc.
 Mr. Walker, proct. Suffolk.
 Mr. Becon.
 Mr. Proctor, proct. clcr. Sussex.
 Mr. Cocerel, proct. clcr. Surrey.
 Mr. archdeacon Tod, Bedf.
 Mr. archdeacon Croley, Hereford.
 Mr. Soreby, proct, clcr. Cicest.
 Mr. Bradbridge, caneellar. Cicest.
 Mr. Hills, proct. clcr. Oxon.
 Mr. Savage, proct. clcr. GIouc.
 Mr. archdeacon Pullan, Colchest.
 Mr. Wilson, proct. Wigorn.
 Mr. Burton.
 Mr. archdeacon Beihont, Hnntingd.
 Mr. Wiburne, proct. eccl. Roff.
 Mr. Day, prov. Eton.
 Mr. Reeve, proc. dec. cap. Westm..
 Mr. Roberts, proct. clcr. Norw.

I mention these names, not to detract from the merit of those who appeared for the present establishment; for many of them would have voted for the alterations, had they not been awed by their superiors, or afraid of a præmunire; whereas, if the contrary vote had prevailed, it was only to address the queen or parliament, to alter the service-book in those particulars: but I mention them to show, that the voice of half the clergy in convocation, and of no less numbers out of it, were for amendments, or at least a latitude in the observation of the rites and ceremonies of the church. Indeed it was very unkind, that when such considerable abatements had been made in favour of the Roman Catholics, nothing should be indulged to those of the same faith, and who had suffered in the same cause with themselves, especially when the controversy was about points which one party apprehended to be sinful, and the other acknowledged to be indifferent. Sundry other papers and petitions were drawn up, by the lower house of convocation, in favour of a farther reformation, but nothing passed into a law.

The church having carried their point against the Puritans in convocation, we are now to see what use they made of their victory. The plague being in London and several parts of the country this summer, put a little stop to their zeal for uniformity at present; some were indulged, but none preferred that scrupled the habits. In proof of this we may produce the examples of two of the worthiest and most learned divines of the age; one was father Miles Coverdale, formerly bishop of Exeter, who with Tyndal and Rogers first translated the Bible into English after Wickliffe. This prelate was born in Yorkshire, bred at Cambridge, and proceeded doctor in divinity in the university of Tubing. Returning to England in the reign of king Edward, he was made bishop of Exeter, 1551.¹ Upon the accession of queen Mary he was imprisoned, and narrowly escaped the fire; but by the intercession of the king of Denmark was sent over into that country, and coming back at her death, assisted at the consecration of queen Elizabeth's first archbishop of Canterbury; yet because he could not comply with the ceremonies and habits he was neglected, and had no preferment. This reverend man, says Mr. Strype,² being now old and poor, Grindal bishop of London

Mr. Calfhil, proct. cler. Loud, and Oxon,

Mr. Godwin, proct. cler. Linc.

Mr. archdeacon Prat, St. David's.

Mr. Tremayn, proct. cler. Exon.

Mr. archdeacon Heton, Glouc.

Mr. archdeacon Kemp, St. Alban's.

Mr. Avys, proct. eccl. Wigorn.

Mr. Renyger, proct. dec. cap. Wint.

Mr. dean Elis, Hereford.

Mr. dean Sampson, Oxon.

¹ Fuller's Worthies, b. 3. p. 198.

² Ann. p. 405.

gave him the small living of St. Magnus, at the Bridge foot, where he preached quietly about two years; but not coming up to the conformity required, he was persecuted thence, and obliged to relinquish his parish a little before his death, which happened May 20, 1567, at the age of eighty-one.¹ He was a celebrated preacher, admired and followed by all the Puritans; but the act of uniformity brought down his reverend hairs with sorrow to the grave. He was buried in St. Bartholomew's behind the Exchange, and was attended to his grave with vast crowds of people.

The other was that venerable man Mr. John Fox, the martyrologist, a grave, learned, and painful divine, and exile for religion, who employed his time abroad in writing the acts and monuments of that church which would hardly receive him into her bosom, and in collecting materials relating to the martyrdom of those that suffered for religion in the reigns of king Henry VIII. and queen Mary; all which he published, first in Latin for the benefit of foreigners, and then in English for the service of his own country, in the year 1561. No book ever gave such a mortal wound to Popery as this; it was dedicated to the queen, and was in such high reputation, that it was ordered to be set up in the churches; where it raised in the people an invincible horror and detestation of that religion which had shed so much innocent blood. Queen Elizabeth had a particular esteem for Mr. Fox; but this excellent and laborious divine, though reduced to very great poverty and want, had no preferment in the church because he scrupled the habits, till at length, by the intercession of some great friend, he obtained a prebend in the church of Sarum, which he made a shift to hold till his death, though not without some disturbance from the bishops.²

The parochial clergy, both in city and country, had an aversion to the habits; they wore them sometimes in obedience to the law, but more frequently administered without them; for which some were cited into the spiritual courts, and admonished, the bishops not having yet assumed the courage of proceeding to suspension and deprivation. At length the matter was laid before the queen, as appears by a paper found among secretary Cecil's MSS. dated February 24, 1564, which acquaints her majesty, that "some perform divine service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some in a seat made in the church, some in the pulpit with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book, some intermix psalms in metre; some say with a surplice, and others without one.

¹ Life of Parker, p. 149.

² Strype's Annals, vol. 1. p. 130.

Bishop Warburton says, that he was also installed in the third prebend of Durham, October 14, 1572, but held it not long; Bellamy succeeding to the same stall, October 31, 1573. Supplement to Warburton's works, p. 456.—ED.

“The table stands in the body of the church in some places, in others it stands in the chancel; in some places the table stands altarwise, distant from the wall a yard; in others in the middle of the chancel, north and south; in some places the table is joined, in others it stands upon tressels; in some the table has a carpet, in others none.

“Some administer the communion with surplice and cap; some with surplice alone;¹ others with none; some with chalice, others with a communion-cup, others with a common cup; some with unleavened bread, and some with leavened.

“Some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some baptize in a font, some in a basin; some sign with the sign of the cross, others sign not; some minister in a surplice, others without; some with a square cap, some with a round cap, some with a button-cap, some with a hat; some in scholars’ clothes, some in others.”

Her majesty was highly displeased with this report, and especially that her laws were so little regarded; she therefore directed a letter to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, dated January 25th, “to confer with the bishops of the ecclesiastical commission, and to inquire what diversities there were among the clergy in doctrine, rites, and ceremonies, and to take effectual methods that an exact order and uniformity be maintained in all external rites and ceremonies, as by law and good usages are provided for; and that none hereafter be admitted to any ecclesiastical preferment, but who is well disposed to common order, and shall formally promise to comply with it.”² To give countenance to this severity, it was reported that some of the warmer Puritans had turned the habits into ridicule, and given unhandsome language to those that wore them; which, according to Mr. Strype, was the occasion of their being pressed afterward with so much rigour: but whatever gave occasion to the persecution that followed, or whoever was at the head of it, supposing the insinuation to be just, it was very hard that so great a number of useful ministers, who neither censured their brethren, nor abused their indulgence by an unmannerly behaviour, should be turned out of their benefices for the indiscretion of a few. The bishops, in their letters to the foreign divines, had promised not to urge their brethren in these things, and when opportunity served to seek reformation of them; but now they took themselves to be released from their promises, and set at liberty by the queen’s express command to the contrary; their meaning being, that they would not do it with their own accord, without direction from above.

The Puritans and their friends, foreseeing the storm, did what they

¹ Life of Parker, p. 152.

² Ibid. p. 154.

could to avert it. Pilkington bishop of Durham wrote to the earl of Leicester, October 25th, to use his interest with the queen in their behalf. He said, “that compulsion should not be used in things of liberty. He prayed the earl to consider, how all reformed countries had cast away Popish apparel, with the pope, and yet we contend to keep it as a holy relic.¹ That many ministers would rather leave their livings than comply; and the realm had a great scarcity of teachers; many places being destitute of any. That it would give incurable offence to foreign Protestants; and since we have forsaken Popery as wicked, I do not see (says the bishop) how their apparel can become saints and professors of the gospel.” Whittingham dean of Durham wrote to the same purpose. He dreaded the consequence of imposing that as necessary, which at best was only indifferent, and in the opinion of many wise and learned men superstitious. “If the apparel which the clergy wear at present (says he), seems not so modest and grave as their vocation requires, or does not sufficiently distinguish them from men of other callings, they refuse not to wear that which shall be thought, by godly magistrates, most decent for these uses; provided they may keep themselves ever pure from the defiled robe of antichrist. Many Papists (says he) enjoy their livings and liberty, who have not sworn obedience, nor do any part of their duty to their miserable flock.² Alas! my lord, that such compulsion should be used towards us, and such great lenity towards the Papists. Oh! noble earl, be our patron and stay in this behalf, that we may not lose that liberty, that hitherto by the queen’s benignity we have enjoyed.” Other letters were written to the same purpose; and all made what friends they could among the couriers.

The nobility were divided, and the queen herself seemed to be at a stand, but the archbishop spirited her forward; and having received her majesty’s letter, authorizing him to proceed, he entered upon the displeasing work with vigour and resolution. The bishops Jewel and Horn preached at Paul’s cross to reconcile the people to the habits. Jewel said, he did not come to defend them, but to show that they were indifferent, and might be complied with. Horn went a little farther, and wished those cut off from the church, that troubled it about white or black garments, round or square caps. The Puritans were not allowed to preach against the habits, but they expostulated with the bishops, and told them, that in their opinions, those ought rather to be cut off, which stopped the course of the gospel, and that grieved and offended their weak brethren, by urging the remnants of antichrist more than God’s commandments, and by punishing the refusers of them more extremely than the breakers of God’s laws.

The archbishop, with the bishops of London, Ely, Winchester, and Lin-

¹ Life of Parker, p. 155. and Appendix, p. 40.

² Life of Parker, p. 157. and Appendix, p. 43.

coln, framed sundry articles to enforce the habits, which were afterward published under the title of Advertisements. But when his grace brought them to court, the queen refused to give them her sanction. The archbishop, chafed at the disappointment, said that the court had put him upon framing the Advertisements; and if they would not go on, they had better never have done anything; nay, if the council would not lend their helping hand against the Nonconformists, as they had done heretofore in Hooper's days, they should only be laughed at for all they had done.¹ But still the queen was so cold, that when the bishop of London came to court, she spoke not a word to him about the redressing the neglect of conformity in the city of London, where it was most disregarded. Upon which the archbishop applied to the secretary, desiring another letter from the queen, to back their endeavours for conformity, adding, in some heat, "If you remedy it not by letter, I will no more strive against the stream, fume or chide who will."

But the wearing the Popish garments being one of the grand principles of nonconformity, it will be proper to set before the reader the sentiments of some learned performers upon this controversy, which employed the pens of the most judicious divines of the age.

We have related the unfriendly behaviour of the bishops Cranmer and Ridley towards Hooper; and that those very prelates who once threatened his life for refusing the habits, if we may credit Mr. Fox's Latin edition of the Book of Martyrs, lived to see their mistakes and repent:² for when Brooks bishop of Gloucester came to Oxford, to degrade bishop Ridley, he refused to put on the surplice, and while they were putting it on him, whether he would or no, he vehemently inveighed against the apparel, calling it "foolish, abominable, and too fond for a vice in a play."

Bishop Latimer also derided the garments; and when they pulled off his surplice at his degradation, "Now (says he) I can make no more holy water."

In the articles against bishop Farrar in king Edward's reign, it was objected, article forty-nine, that he had vowed never to wear the cap, but that he came into his cathedral with a long gown and hat; which he did not deny, alleging he did it to avoid superstition, and without any offence to the people.

When the Popish vestments were put upon Dr. Taylor, the martyr, in order to his degradation, he walked about with his hands by his sides, saying, "How say you, my lord, am I not a goodly fool? If I were in Cheapside, would not the boys laugh at these foolish toys and apish trumpery?" And when the surplice was pulled off, "Now (says he) I am rid of a fool's coat."

¹ Life of Parker, p. 159.

² Fox's Book of Martyrs, vol. 3. p. 500. Strype's Ann. vol. 2. p. 555.

When they were pulling the same off from archbishop Cranmer, he meekly replied, “All this needed not, I myself had done with this gear long ago.”

Dr. Heyler testifies, that John Rogers the protomartyr peremptorily refused to wear the habits unless the Popish priests were enjoined to wear upon their sleeves, by way of distinction, a chalice with a host. The same he asserts concerning Philpot, a very eminent martyr; and concerning one Tymes a deacon, who was likewise martyred in queen Mary’s reign.

The holy martyr John Bradford, as well as Mr. Sampson and some others, excepted against the habits at their entrance into holy orders, and were ordained without them.

Bucer and Peter Martyr, professors of our two famous universities, were both against the habits, and refused to wear them. Bucer being asked, why he did not wear the square cap, answered, Because his head was not square.¹ And Martyr, in one of his letters after his return home, says, “When I was at Oxford, I would never use those white garments in the choir, though I was a canon in the church; and I am satisfied in my own reasons for what I did.”² In the same letter, Bucer says he would be content to suffer some great pain in his body; upon condition that these things were utterly taken away.³ And, in such case as we are now [1550], he willeth that in no case they should be received. He adds, in his letter from Cambridge to a friend beyond sea, dated 12th January 1550, that no foreigner was consulted about the purity of ceremonies, “de puritate rituum scito hie neminem extraneum de his rebus rogari.” And though both he and Peter Martyr thought they might be borne with for a season; yet in our case, he would not have them suffered to remain.

These were the sentiments of our first reformers in the reign of king Edward VI. and queen Mary.

Upon restoring the Protestant religion under queen Elizabeth, the same sentiments concerning the habits prevailed among all the reformers at first, though they disagreed upon the grand question, whether they should desert their ministry rather than comply.

Mr. Strype, in his Life of Archbishop Parker, a most cruel persecutor of the Puritans, says, that he was not fond of the cap, the surplice, and the wafer-bread, and such-like injunctions, and would have been pleased with a toleration; that he gloried in having been consecrated without the Aaronical garments; but that his concern for his prince’s honour made him resolute that her royal will might take place.

Dr. Horn bishop of Winchester, in his letter to Gualter, says, “that the

¹ Life of Parker, Appendix, p. 41.

² Hist. Ref. p. 65.

³ Ann. Ref. vol. 2. p. 554, 555.

act of parliament which enjoined the vestments, was made before they were in office, so that they had no hand in making it;¹ but they had obeyed the law, thinking the matter to be of an indifferent nature; and they had reason to apprehend, that if they had deserted their stations on that account, their enemies might have come into their places;² but he hoped to procure an alteration of the act in the next parliament, though he believed it would meet with great opposition from the Papists.” Yet this very bishop a little after wished them cut off from the church that troubled it about white or black garments.

Bishop Jewel calls the vestments “the habits of the stage, the relics of the Amorites, and wishes they may be extirpated to the roots, that all the remnants of former errors, with all the rubbish, and even the dust that yet remained, might be taken away.” But he adds, the queen is fixed; and so was his lordship soon after, when he refused the learned Dr. Humphreys a benefice within his diocese on this account, and called all the Nonconformists men of squeamish stomachs.³

Bishop Pilkington complains “that the disputes which began about the vestments were now carried farther, even to the whole constitution; that pious persons lamented this, atheists laughed, and the Papists blew the coals; and that the blame of all was cast upon the bishops. He urged that it might be considered, that all reformed churches had cast away Popish apparel with the pope; that many ministers would rather leave their livings than wear them; and he was well satisfied that it was not an apparel becoming those that profess godliness. I confess (says he) we suffer many things against our hearts, groaning under them; but we cannot take them away, though we were ever so much set upon it. We are under authority, and can innovate nothing without the queen; nor can we alter the laws; the only thing left to our choice is, whether we will bear these things, or break the peace of the church.”⁴

Bishop Grindal was a considerable time in suspense, whether he should accept a bishopric with the Popish vestments. He consulted Peter Martyr on this head, and says, that all the bishops that had been beyond the sea had dealt with the queen to let the habits fall; but she was inflexible. This made them submit to the laws, and wait for a fit opportunity to reverse them. Upon this principle he conformed and was consecrated; and in one of his letters, he calls God to witness, that it did not lie at their (the bishops’) door, that the habits were not quite taken away.

Dr. Sandys bishop of Worcester, and Parkhurst of Norwich,, inveigh

¹ Pierce’s Vindication, p. 44.

² Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 289. 294. Life of Parker, p. 154.

³ MS. p. 873.

⁴ Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 316.

severely against the habits, and they with the rest of the bishops threaten to declaim against them, “till they are sent to hell from whence they came.”¹ Sandys, in one of his letters to Parker, says, “I hope we shall not be forced to use the vestments, but that the meaning of the law is, that others in the meantime shall not take them away, but that they shall remain for the queen.”

Dr. Guest bishop of Rochester wrote against the ceremonies to secretary Cecil, and gave it as his opinion, “that having been evil used, and once taken away, they ought not to be used again, because the Galatians were commanded, to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free; and because we are to abstain from all appearance of evil. The gospel teaches us to put away needless ceremonies, and to worship God in spirit and truth; whereas these ceremonies were no better than the devices of men, and had been abused to idolatry. He declares openly against the cross, against images in churches, and against a variety of garments in the service of God. If a surplice be thought proper for one (says his lordship), it should serve for all divine offices.—The bishop is for the people’s receiving the sacrament into their hands, according to the example of Christ and the primitive church, and not for putting it into the people’s mouths: and as for the posture, that it should be rather standing than kneeling: but that this should be left to every one’s choice.”²

Not one of the first set of bishops after the Reformation approved of the habits, or argued for their continuance from Scripture, antiquity, or decency, but submitted to them out of necessity, and to keep the church in the queen’s favour.³ How much are the times altered! our first reformers never ascribed any holiness or virtue to the vestments, but wished and prayed for their removal;⁴ whereas several modern conformists have made them essential to their ministrations, and have represented religion as naked and defective without them.

But the question that divided the reformers, was the lawfulness of wearing habits that had been consecrated to idolatrous and superstitious uses,

¹ Bishop Burnet quotes this as concerning the corruptions of the spiritual courts, vol. 3. T.

² MS. p. 891. Strype’s Annals, vol. 1. p. 38. Appendix, no. 14.

³ Strype’s Annals, vol. 1. p. 177.

⁴ Bishop Warburton asks here, “Who ascribes any holiness or virtue to them now, I pray?” In reply it is sufficient to observe, that Mr. Neal refers to the time when he wrote, about thirty-six years before the bishop’s strictures appear to have been penned, and not many years after Dr. Nichols, in his defence of the church of England, had called ministers’ ordinary habit profane; and when Dr. Grey (System of Ecclesiastical Law, p. 55.) had carried the notion of decency, in this respect, very high, representing “the church, as by a prescript form of decent and comely apparel, providing to have its ministers known to the people, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the special messengers and ministers of Almighty God.” This representation approximates very much to the idea of holiness and virtue.—ED.

and were the very marks and badges of that religion they had renounced. Upon this they consulted the foreign divines, who all agreed in the reasonableness of abolishing the habits, but were divided in their sentiments about the lawfulness of wearing them in the meantime: some were afraid of the return of Lutheranism or Popery, if the ministers should desert their stations in the church; and others apprehended, that if they did not reject them at first, they should never obtain their removal afterward.

Dr. Humphreys and Sampson, two heads of the Nonconformists, wrote to Zurich the following reasons against the lawfulness of wearing the habits: “that they did not think the prescribing habits to the clergy merely a civil thing; nor that the habits now prescribed were decent; for how can that habit be decent that serves only to dress up the theatrical pomp of Popery? The Papists glory in this, that these habits were brought in by them, for which they vouch Otho’s Constitutions and the Roman Pontifical.—They add, that in king Edward’s time the surplice was not universally used nor pressed, whereas the copes then taken away are now to be restored. This is not to extirpate Popery, but to plant it again, and instead of going forward in reformation, to go backward. We do not place religion in habits (say they), but we oppose them that do [the Papists]. Besides, it gives some authority to servitude, to depart from our liberty. We hate contention, nor do we desert our churches, and leave them exposed to wolves, but we are driven from them. We leave our brethren to stand and fall to their own master, and desire the same favourable forbearance from them. All that is pretended is, that the habits are not unlawful; not that they are good and expedient; but forasmuch as the habits of the clergy are visible marks of their profession, they ought not to be taken from their enemies. The ancient fathers had their habits, but not peculiar to bishops, nor distinct from the laity. The instances of St. John and Cyprian are singular. In Tertullian’s time the *pallium* was the common habit of old Christians. Chrysostom speaks of white garments, but with no approbation; he rather finds fault with them: nor do we condemn things indifferent as unlawful; but we wish there might be a free synod to settle this matter, in which things may not be carried according to the minds of one or two persons. The doctrine of our church is now pure, and why should there be any defect in our worship? why should we borrow anything from Popery? why should we not agree in rites, as well as in doctrine, with the other reformed churches? we have a good opinion of our bishops, and bear with their state and pomp; we once bore the same cross with them, and preached the same Christ with them; why then are we now turned out of our benefices, and some put in prison, only for habits, and publicly defamed?”¹

¹ Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 311.

“But the dispute is not only about a cap and surplice; there are other grievances which ought to be redressed or dispensed with; as, 1. Music and organs in divine worship. 2. The sponsors in baptism, answering in the child’s name. 3. The cross in baptism. 4. Kneeling at the sacrament, and the use of unleavened bread. 5. There is also a want of discipline in the church. 6. The marriage of the clergy is not legitimated, but their children are looked upon by some as bastards. 7. Marriage is not to be performed without a ring. 8. Women are not to be churched without the veil. 9. The court of faculties; pluralities; licences for nonresidence, for eating flesh in Lent, &c. are insufferable grievances. 10. Ministers have not a free liberty to preach without subscribing to the use and approbation of all the ceremonies.¹ And, lastly, the article which explained the manner of Christ’s presence in the sacrament is taken away.”

The bishops alleged, in vindication of their compliance with these things, the necessity of the time; the queen’s intransigence; the indifferent nature of the things required, and their fears of the loss of the whole reformation, if they should desert their stations in the church; promising not to urge them upon their brethren who were dissatisfied; but to endeavour their removal in a proper season.

The learned foreigners gave their opinions upon this nice question with caution and reserve. Peter Martyr in his letter to Grindal² writes thus: “As for the habits to be used in holy things, since they carry an appearance of the mass, and are merely remainders of Popery, it is (says he) the opinion of the learned Bullinger, the chief minister of Zurich, that they are to be refrained from, lest by your example a thing that is scandalous should be confirmed; but (he adds) though I have been always against the use of such ornaments, yet I see the present danger, lest you should be put from the office of preaching. There may also be some hopes, that as images and altars are taken away, so also those appearances of the mass may be removed, if you and others, who have taken upon you episcopacy, labour in it.—I am therefore more backward to advise you rather to refuse the bishopric than to submit to the use of those vestures; and yet, because I am sensible scandals of this kind are to be avoided, I am more willing to yield to Bullinger’s opinion aforesaid.” But after all he advises him to do nothing against his conscience.

Bullinger and Gualter, ministers of Zurich, in their letters to Horn and Grindal, “lament the unhappy breach in the church of England, and approve of the zeal of those divines, who wish to have the house of God purged from all the dregs of Popery. They are not pleased with them who first

¹ Hist. Ref. in Records, p. 335.

² Strype’s Life of Grindal, p. 29, 30. Ann. vol. 1. p. 173.

made the laws about habits, nor with those who zealously maintain them. They declare that they acted unwisely, if they were of the reformed side; but if they were disguised enemies, that they had been laying snares with ill designs. They are therefore absolutely against the imposition of these, and other grievances; but they think many things of this sort should be submitted to, rather than men should forsake the ministry at this juncture, lest the whole reformation should be lost; but that they should press the queen and the nobility to go on and complete the reformation, so gloriously begun.”¹

These divines wrote also to the earl of Bedford, and acquainted him, that they were sorry to hear that not only the vestments, but many other things, were retained in the church, which savoured plainly of Popery. They complain of the bishops printing their letter, and that their private opinion about the lawfulness of wearing the habits for the present, should be made use of to cast reproaches on persons, for whom they should rather have compassion in their sufferings, than study to aggravate them. They pray his lordship to intercede with the queen and nobility for their brethren that were then under sufferings, who deserved a very great regard, forasmuch as it had appeared what true zeal they had for religion, since the only thing they desired was, that the church should be purged from all the dregs of Popery. This cause (say they) in general is such, that those who promote it are worthy of the highest dignity. They do therefore earnestly pray his lordship at this time, to exert himself, and employ all the interest he has in the queen and nobility, that the church of England, so happily reformed to the admiration of the whole world, may not be defiled with the remnants of Popery. To retain these things will look like giddiness (say these divines); it will offend the weak, and give great scandal to their neighbours in France and Scotland, who are yet under the cross; and the very Papists will justify their tyrannical impositions by such proceedings.”²

The divines of Geneva were more peremptory in their advices; for in their letter of October 24th, 1564, signed by Theodore Beza, and seventeen of his brethren, they say, “if the case were theirs they would not receive the ministry upon these conditions if it were proffered, much less would they sue for it. As for those who have hitherto complied, if they are obliged not only to wink at manifest abuses, but to approve of those things which ought to be redressed, what thing else can we advise them to, but that they should retire to a private life. As for the Popish habits, those men that are authors of their being imposed, do deserve most evil of the church, and shall verily answer it at the dreadful bar of Christ’s judgment.” They then argue very strongly against the habits; and having advised the ministers not to lay

¹ Hist. Ref. vol. 3. 508. MS. p. 889.

² Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 313.

down their ministry presently, for fear of the return of Popery, they conclude thus: “Nevertheless, if ministers are commanded not only to tolerate these things, but by their subscriptions to allow them as lawful, what else can we advise them to, but that having witnessed their innocence, and tried all other means in the fear of the Lord, they should give over their functions to open wrong?” They then declare their opinions against the cross in baptism; the validity of baptism by midwives; the power of the keys being in the hands of lay-chancellors and bishops’ courts; and conclude with an exhortation and prayer for unity, and a more perfect reformation in the English church.

Though the Reformation in Scotland was not fully established, yet the superintendent ministers, and commissioners of charges within that realm, directed a letter the very first opportunity, to their brethren the bishops, and pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman antichrist, and do profess with them the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. It was dated from Edinburgh, December, 28th, 1566, and signed by John Spotswood, and nine of his brethren, preachers of Christ Jesus. The letter does not enter into the debate, whether the habits are simply indifferent or not; but pleads in a most earnest and pathetic manner for toleration and forbearance, and that the deprived ministers may be restored. “If surplice, corner-cap, and tippet (say they), have been badges of idolatry, what have the preachers of Christian liberty, and the open rebukers of all superstition, to do with the dregs of the Roman beast? Our brethren that of conscience refuse that unprofitable apparel, do neither damn yours, nor molest you that use such vain trifles. If ye shall do the like by them, we doubt not but you will therein please God, and comfort the hearts of many.” But the whole letter breathes such an excellent spirit, that I cannot forbear recommending it to the reader’s perusal in the Appendix.

It is evident upon the whole, that it was the unanimous opinion of the foreign divines, that the habits ought to be laid aside by authority; and that in the meantime they should not be urged upon those that scrupled them: but they were not so well agreed in the lawfulness of wearing them till they were taken away; though their fears of the return of Popery, if the ministers should desert their stations; their compassion to the souls of the people, who were perishing for lack of knowledge.; and their hopes, that the queen would quickly be prevailed with to remove them; made most of them apprehend they might be dispensed with for the present.

The English laity were more averse to the habits than the clergy; as their hatred of Popery increased, so did their aversion to the garments. There was a strong party in the very court against them, among whom was the great earl of Leicester, sir Francis Knollys, vice-chamberlain; Burleigh, lord-treasurer; sir Francis Walsingham, secretary of state; the earls of Bed-

ford, Warwick, and others. But the Protestant populace throughout the nation were so inflamed, that nothing but an awful subjection to authority could have kept them within bounds. Great numbers refused to frequent those places of worship where service was ministered in that dress; they would not salute such ministers in the streets, nor keep them company; nay, if we may believe Dr. Whitgift, in his defence against Cartwright, “they spit in their faces, reviled them as they went along, and showed such-like rude behaviour,”¹ because they took them for Papists in disguise, for time-servers, and half-faced Protestants, that would be content with the return of that religion whose badge they wore.² There was indeed a warm spirit in the people, against everything which came from that pretended church, whose garments had been so lately died with the blood of their friends and relations. Upon the whole, I leave the reader to determine, how far the wisdom and moderation of the queen can be vindicated, in imposing these habits on the clergy; or the bishops be excused for imprisoning, suspending, and depriving, some of the most useful preachers in the kingdom, on account of things which in their own opinion were but barely tolerable, but in the judgment of their brethren were absolutely sinful.

We have already mentioned the queen’s letter of January 25th; in obedience to which archbishop Parker wrote to his brethren of the ecclesiastical commission, and in particular to Grindal bishop of London (there being in that city the greatest number of clergy, and of the best learning, that refused the apparel), to consult proper methods to reduce them to an exact uniformity.³ After some debate the commissioners agreed upon certain advertisements (as they were called), partly for due order in preaching and administering the sacraments, and partly for the apparel of persons ecclesiastical.⁴

¹ Strype’s Annals, vol. 1. p. 178. 460. 602. Mem. Cranmer, p. 363. Life of Parker, p. 77.

² The grounds, on which such a suspicion might rest, may be seen in Mr. Neal’s Review, in the quarto edition of his History, vol. 1. p. 881, 882.

³ Life of Parker, p. 161.

⁴ The articles for preaching declare, “that all licences granted before March 1st, 1564, shall be void and of none effect; and that all that shall be thought meet for the office of preaching shall be admitted again, paying no more than fourpence for the writing, parchment, and wax; and that those who were not approved as preachers, might read the homilies.

“In the ministration of the communion in cathedrals and collegiate churches, the principal ministers shall wear a cope with gospeller and epistoler agreeably; but at all other prayers to be said at the communion-table, they shall wear no copes, but surplices only: deans and prebendaries shall wear a surplice with a silk hood in the choir; and when they preach a hood.

“Every minister saying the public prayers, or administering the sacraments, &c. shall wear a surplice with sleeves; and the parish shall provide a decent table standing on a frame for the communion-table; and the ten commandments shall be set on the east wall over the said table.

By the first of these articles, all preachers throughout the nation were disqualified at once; and by the last, they subscribed, and promised not to preach or expound the Scriptures, without a licence from the bishop, which was not to be obtained without a promise under the hand of an absolute conformity to the ceremonies. Here the commissioners surely broke through the act of submission, by which they are obliged never to make or execute any canons or constitutions without the royal assent. But the bishops presumed upon their interest with her majesty; they knew her mind, though she refused, for political reasons, to ratify their advertisements, telling them that the oath of canonical obedience was sufficient to bind the inferior clergy to their duty, without the interposition of the crown.

Parker therefore went on; and having cited the Puritan clergy to Lambeth, he admonished some, and threatened others:¹ but Grindal withdrew, being naturally averse to methods of severity, and afraid of a *præmunire*. His grace took a great deal of pains to gain him over, and by his arguments, says Strype, brought him to a good resolution.—He also applied to the council for the queen's and their assistance; and to the secretary of state, beseeching him to spirit up the bishop of London to his duty, which was done accordingly. What pains will some men take to draw their brethren into a snare, and force them to be partners in oppression and cruelty!

Among those that the archbishop cited before him were the reverend Mr. Thomas Sampson, dean of Christ-church, and Dr. Lawrence Humphreys (*regius professor of divinity*), president of Magdalen-college, Oxon, men of high renown throughout the nation for learning, piety, and zeal for the Reformation, and exiles for religion in queen Mary's reign. Upon their appearance the archbishop urged them with the opinions of Bucer and Peter

“ All dignitaries in cathedral churches, doctors, bachelors of divinity and law, having ecclesiastical livings, shall wear in their common apparel a broad side-gown with sleeves, strait at the hands, without any cuffs or falling capes, and tippets of sarsenet, and a square cap, but no hats, except in their journeying. The inferior clergy are to wear long gowns and caps of the same fashion; except in case of poverty, when they may wear short gowns.”

To these advertisements certain protestations were annexed, to be made, promised, and subscribed, by such as shall hereafter be admitted to any office or cure in the church. “And here every clergyman subscribed, and promised not to preach or expound the Scriptures, without special licence of the bishop under his seal, but only to read the homilies; and likewise to observe, keep, and maintain, such order and uniformity in all external polity, rites, and ceremonies, of the church, as by laws, good usages, and orders, are already well provided and established.”

These advertisements were enjoined the clergy by the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of London and Rochester (*commissioners in causes ecclesiastical*), and by the bishops of Winchester, Ely, and some others. The preface says, “that they do not prescribe these rules as equivalent with the word of God, or as of necessity to bind the consciences of the queen's subjects, in their own nature considered; or as adding any efficacy or holiness to public prayer, or to the sacraments; but as temporal orders merely ecclesiastical, without any vain superstition, and as rules of decency, distinction, and order, for the time.”

¹ Life of Parker, p. 161. 216.

Martyr; but the authority of these divines not being sufficient to remove their scruples, they were ordered not to depart the city without leave. After long attendance, and many checks from some of the council for their refractoriness, they framed a supplicatory letter in a very elegant but submissive style, and sent it to the archbishop, and the rest of the ecclesiastical commissioners, March 20th, “in which they protest before God, what a bitter grief it was to them, that there should be such dissensions about a cap and surplice among persons of the same faith. They allege the authorities of St. Austin, Socrates, and Theodoret, to show that in their times there was a variety of rites and observances which break not unity and concord. They beseech the bishops therefore, if there was any fellowship in Christ, that they would follow the direction of St. Paul about things in their own nature indifferent, ‘that every one should be persuaded in his own mind.’ Conscience (say they) is a tender thing, and all men cannot look upon the same things as indifferent; if therefore these habits seem so to you, you are not to be condemned by us; on the other hand, if they do not appear so to us, we ought not to be vexed by you. They then appeal to antiquity, to the practice of other reformed churches, and to the consciences of the bishops themselves; and conclude thus: wherefore we most humbly pray, that a thing which is the care and pleasure of Papists, and which you [the bishops] have no great value for yourselves, and which we refuse not from any contempt of authority, but from an aversion to the common enemy, may not be our snare nor our crime.”¹

¹ In one of their examinations the archbishop put nine questions to them, to which they gave the following answers:

Quest. 1. “Is the surplice a thing evil and wicked; or is it indifferent?”

Answ. “Though the surplice in substance be indifferent, yet in the present circumstance it is not, being of the same nature with the vestis peregrina, or the apparel of idolatry, for which God by the prophet threatens to visit.

Quest. 2. “If it be not indifferent, for what cause?”

Answ. “Because things that have been consecrated to idolatry are not indifferent.

Quest. 3. “Whether the ordinary [or bishop] detesting Papistry, may enjoin the surplice to be worn, and enforce his injunction?”

Answ. “It may be said to such a one, in Tertullian’s words, ‘*Si tu diaboli pompam oderis, quicquid ex ea attigeris, id scias esse idolatriam.*’ That is, ‘If thou hatest the pomp and pageantry of the devil, whatsoever of it thou meddlest with, is idolatry.’ Which if he believes he will not enforce the injunction.

Quest. 4. “Whether the cope be a thing indifferent, being prescribed by law for decency and reverence, and not in respect of superstition or holiness?”

Answ. “Decency is not promoted by a cope, which was devised to deface the sacrament. St. Jerome says, that the gold, ordained by God for reverence and decency of the Jewish temple, is not to be admitted to beautify the church of Christ; and if so, much less copes brought in by Papists, and continued in their service as proper ornaments of their religion.

Quest. 5. “Whether anything that is indifferent may be enjoined as godly, to the use of common prayer and sacraments?”

Answ. “If it be merely indifferent, as time, place, and such necessary circumstances of divine worship, for the which there may be brought a ground out of Scripture, we think it

The ecclesiastical commissioners were very much divided in their opinions, how to proceed with these men. Some were for answering the reasons given below, and for enforcing the habits with a protestation, that they wished them taken away. Others were for connivance; and others for a compromise: accordingly a pacific proposition was drawn up which Humphreys and Sampson were willing to subscribe, with the reserve of the apostle, "All things are lawful, but all things edify not." But the archbishop, who was at the head of the commission, would abate nothing; for on the 29th of April, 1561, he told them peremptorily in open court, that they should conform to the habits; that is, to wear the square cap, and no hats, in their long gowns; to wear the surplice with non-regents' hoods in the choirs, according to ancient custom; and to communicate kneeling in wafer-bread; or else they should part with their preferment. To which our divines replied, that their consciences could not comply with these injunctions, be the event what it might.¹ Upon this they were both put under confinement; but the storm fell chiefly upon Sampson, who was detained in prison a con-

may.

Quest. 6. "Whether the civil magistrate may constitute by law an abstinence from meats on certain days?"

Answ. "Because of abstinence a manifest commodity ariseth to the commonwealth in policy, if it be sufficiently guarded against superstition, he may appoint it, due regard being had to persons and times.

Quest. 7. "Whether a law may be made for the difference of ministers' apparel from laymen?"

Answ. "Whether such prescription to a minister of the gospel of Christ be lawful may be doubted, because no such thing is decreed in the New Testament; nor did the primitive church appoint any such thing, but would rather that ministers should be distinguished from the laity *doctrina, non veste*, by their doctrine, not by their garments.

Quest. 8. "Whether ministers going in such apparel as the Papists used, ought to be condemned of any preacher for so doing?"

Answ. "We judge no man; to his own master he stands or falls.

Quest. 9. "Whether such preachers ought to be reformed, or restrained, or no?"

Answ. "Irenæus will not have brethren restrained from brotherly communion for diversity in ceremonies, provided there be unity of faith and charity; and it is to be wished that there may be the like charitable permission among us."

To these answers, our divines subjoined some other arguments against wearing and enforcing the habits; as, (1.) Apparel ought to be worn as meat ought to be eaten; but according to St. Paul, meat offered to idols ought not to be eaten, therefore Popish apparel ought not to be worn. (2.) We ought not to give offence in matters of their indifference, therefore the bishops who are of this opinion ought not to enforce the habits. (3.) Popish garments have many superstitious mystical significations, for which purpose they are consecrated by the Papists; we ought therefore to consecrate them also, or lay them wholly aside. (4.) Our ministrations are supposed by some not to be valid, or acceptable to God, unless performed in Popish apparel; and this being a prevailing opinion, we apprehend it highly necessary to disabuse the people. (5.) Things indifferent ought not to be made necessary, because then they change their nature, and we lose our Christian liberty. (6.) If we are bound to wear Popish apparel when commanded, we may be obliged to have shaven crowns, and to make use of oil, spittle, cream, and all the rest of the Papistical additions to the ordinances of Christ. Strype's Ann. vol. 1. p. 459.

¹ Life of Parker, p. 185.

siderable time, as a terror to others; and by special order from the queen, was deprived of his deanery; nor could he ever obtain, after this, any higher preferment in the church, than the government of a poor hospital.¹

Humphreys's place was not at the queen's disposal; however, he durst not return to Oxford, even after he had obtained his release out of prison, but retired to one Mrs. Warcup's in Berkshire, a most devout woman, who had run all hazards for harbouring the persecuted Protestants in the late times: from hence he wrote a most excellent letter to the queen, in which he "beseeches her majesty's favour about the habits, forasmuch as she well knew that the controversy was about things in their own nature indifferent, and in which liberty of conscience ought not to be restrained. He protests his own and his brethren's loyalty, and then expostulates with her majesty, why her mercy should be shut against them, when it was open to all others? Did she say she would not yield to subjects? Yet she might spare miserable men. Would she not rescind a public act? Yet she might relax and suspend. Would she not take away a law? Yet she might grant a toleration. Was it not fit to indulge some men's affections? Yet it was most fit and equal not to force the minds of men. He therefore earnestly beseeched her to consider the majesty of the glorious gospel, the equity of the cause, the fewness of the labourers, the greatness of the harvest, the multitude of the tares, and the heaviness of the punishment." Humphreys made so many friends at court, that at length he obtained a toleration, but had no preferment in the church, till ten or twelve years after, when he was persuaded to wear the habits.² For although the bishop of Winchester presented him to a small living within the diocese of Salisbury, Jewel refused to admit him, and said he was determined to abide by his resolution till he had good assurance of his conformity. The Oxford historian³ says, Dr. Humphreys was a moderate conscientious Nonconformist, a great and general scholar, an able linguist, a deep divine: and that for his excellency of style, exactness of method, and substance of matter, in his writings, he went beyond most of our theologians.⁴

¹ Mr. Neal appears not to have known, that Mr. Sampson was also appointed a prebendary in St. Paul's cathedral; and was permitted by the queen to be a theological lecturer in Whittingdon-college in London.—And in justice to archbishop Parker, it should be added, that some favour, though it does not appear what, was on his application, granted to Mr. Sampson, by the chapter of Christ-church, and he also strongly solicited the secretary, "that as the queen's pleasure had been executed upon him for example to the terror of others, it might yet be mollified to the commendation of her clemency." *British Biography*, vol. 3. p. 20, note, and p. 22. *Warner's Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 2. p. 433.—ED.

² MS. p. 873. *Strype's Annals*. vol. 2. p. 451. *Life of Parker*, p. 185.

³ *Athen. Ox.* p. 242.

⁴ "That Dr. Humphreys's want of preferment, till 1576, was owing to his Puritanical principles is evident (says Mr. Neal in his Review), from the testimony of lord Burleigh and Mr. Strype, whose words are these; 'In the latter end of the year 1576, he (lord Burleigh) did Humphreys the honour to write to him, hinting that his nonconformity seemed to

As Sampson was thus deprived, so were others who would not enter into bonds to wear the square cap.¹ Of this number was George Withers, a man of good learning, preacher of Bury St. Edmonds, in Suffolk; but at the pressing instances of the people, he sent a letter to the archbishop to let him know, he would rather strain his conscience a little, than discourage the godly, or let the wicked have their mind. He afterward preached at Cambridge, and pressed the university to destroy the superstitious paintings in the glass-windows which occasioned some disorder; upon which, not long after, he travelled to Geneva, Zurich, and other places, and after some years, returned and became parish minister of Danbury in Essex, submitting to the rites for peace's sake, though he did not approve of them, which was the case of many others.

While the case of the Oxford divines was under consideration, his grace was consulting how to reduce the London Puritans: he was afraid to press them with the advertisements, because the queen could not be prevailed with to put the seal to them; he therefore sent them again to the secretary with a letter to the queen, praying, that if not all, yet at least those articles that related to the apparel might be returned with some authority.² But the queen was firm to her former resolution; she would give no authority to the advertisements; but, to support her commissioners, issued a proclamation, peremptorily requiring uniformity in the habits, upon pain of prohibition from preaching, and deprivation.

Hereupon the archbishop consulted with men learned in the civil law, what method to proceed in; and then concluded, with the consent of the rest of the commissioners, to summons the whole body of pastors and curates, within the city of London, to appear at Lambeth, and to examine every one of them upon this question. Whether they would promise conformity to the apparel established by law, and testify the same by subscription of their hands? Those who demurred were immediately to be suspended, and after three months deprived of their livings. To prepare the way for this general citation, it was thought proper, first to summon the reverend Mr. John Fox the martyrologist, that the reputation of his great piety might give the greater countenance to the proceedings of the commissioners; but when they called upon him to subscribe, he took his Greek Testament out of his pock-

be the chief impediment of his preferment, the queen, and some other honourable persons at court, considering him as forgetful of his duty in disobeying her injunctions. This impediment being surmounted, to what-ever considerations or influence it was owing, he was made dean of Gloucester, and afterward dean of Winchester. This last dignity and his professorship, notwithstanding his non-subscribing, Fuller says, he held as long as he lived. But then it appears by Strype, that the lord-treasurer was his particular friend, and had prevailed with him to wear the habits.' "Maddox's Vindication, p. 324, 325; and Neal's Review, p. 898.—ED.

¹ Life of Parker, p. 187. 192.199.

² Ibid. p. 212. 214.

et, and said, "To this I will subscribe." And when they offered him the canons, he refused, saying, "I have nothing in the church but a prebend in Salisbury, and much good may it do you if you take it from me." But the commissioners had not courage enough to deprive a divine of so much merit, who held up the ashes of Smithfield before their eyes.

The 26th of March being the day appointed for the appearance of the London clergy, the archbishop desired the secretary of state, with some of the nobility and queen's council, to countenance the proceedings of the commissioners with their presence, but they refused to be concerned in such disagreeable work. When the ministers appeared in court, Mr. Thomas Cole, a clergyman, being placed by the side of the commissioners in priestly apparel, the bishop's chancellor from the bench addressed them in these words: "My masters, and ye ministers of London, the council's pleasure is, that strictly ye keep the unity of apparel, like this man who stands here canonically habited with a square cap, a scholar's gown priest-like, a tippet; and in the church a linen surplice. Ye that will subscribe, write *Volo*; those that will not subscribe, write *Nolo*: be brief, make no words." When some of the clergy offered to speak, he interrupted them, and cried, "Peace, peace.—Apparitor, call over the churches, and ye masters answer presently *sub pana contemptus*."¹ Great was the anguish and distress of those ministers, who cried out for compassion to themselves and families, saying, "We shall be killed in our souls for this pollution of ours." After much persuasion and many threatenings, sixty-one out of a hundred were prevailed with to subscribe, and thirty-seven absolutely refused; of which last number, as the archbishop acknowledged, were the best, and some preachers.² These were immediately suspended, and put from all manner of ministry, with signification, that if they did not conform within three months they were to be deprived. The archbishop imagined that their behaviour would have been rough and clamorous, but contrary to his expectations, it was reasonable, quiet, and modest.

The ministers gave in a paper of reasons [see below] for refusing the apparel.³

¹ Life of Grindal, p. 98. Strype's Annals, p. 463.

² Life of Parker, p. 215.

³ Reasons grounded upon the Scriptures, whereby we are persuaded not-to admit the use of the outward apparel, and ministering garments of the pope's church.

1st. Our Saviour saith, "Take heed that you contemn not one of these little ones; for he that offendeth one of these little ones that believeth in me, it were good for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." To offend the little ones in Christ, is to speak or do any thing whereby the simple Christians may take occasion either to like that which is evil, or to dislike that which is good. Now for us to admit the use of these things may occasion this mischief, therefore in consenting to them we should offend many of these little ones.

Farther, St. Paul saith, "If any man that is infirm shall see thee that hast knowledge sit-

ting at meat at the idols' table, will not his conscience be stirred up to eat that which is offered to idols? and so the weak brother, for whom Christ died, shall perish in thy knowledge; and in sinning after this sort against the brethren, and wounding their weak consciences, ye do sin against Christ." 1 Cor. viii.10–12. This place proveth, that whatsoever is done by him that has knowledge, or seems. To have it, in such sort that he may seem to allow that as good, which in itself cannot be other than evil, is an occasion for the weak to allow and approve of the thing that is evil, and to dislike that that is good, though the doing it be indifferent of itself in him that has knowledge. To set at the idols' table, or to eat things offered to idols, is in him that has knowledge a thing indifferent, for he knows that the idol is nothing, and that every creature of God is good, and to be received with thanksgiving, without asking any questions for conscience' sake. But to do this in the presence of him that thinks that none can do so but he must be partaker of idolatry, is to encourage him to like idolatry, and to dislike the true service of God; for none can like both. Now the case of eating and drinking, and of wearing apparel, is in this point the same, for though to wear the outward and ministering garments of the pope's church is in itself indifferent, yet to wear them in presence of the infirm and weak brethren, who do not understand the indifference of them, may occasion them to like the pomp of the pope's ministration, which of itself is evil, and to dislike the simple ministration of Christ, which in itself is good.

"2dly. We may not use any thing that is repugnant to Christian liberty, nor maintain an opinion of holiness where none is; nor consent to idolatry, nor deny the truth, nor discourage the godly, and encourage the wicked, nor destroy the church of God, which we are bound to edify, nor show disobedience where God commanded us to obey; all which we should do, if we should consent to wear the outward and ministering garments of the pope's church: as appears by the following passages of Scripture: by St. Paul's exhortation, Gal. v. 1. 'Stand fast in the liberty, wherewith Christ has made you free:' by the example of Christ, Matt, xv. 2, 3. who would not have his disciples maintain an opinion of holiness which the Pharisees had in washing hands: by the doctrine of St. Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 15. where he teacheth, that there 'can be no agreement between Christ and Belial:' by the example of Daniel, chap. vi. who, making his prayer to God contrary to the commandment of the king; set open his window towards Jerusalem, lest he might seem to deny his profession, or consent to the wicked: by the example of St, Paul, who rebuked Peter sharply, because he did by his dissimulation discourage the godly that from among the Heathen were converted to Christ, and encourage the superstitious Jews: and again, by his doctrine, 2 Cor. xiii. where he teacheth, that ministers have power to edify, but not to destroy. It is farther evident, from the examples of the patriarchs and prophets, who in worshipping God would not use the rites and ceremonies of the idolatrous: and to conclude, from the doctrine and example of Peter and John, Acts, iv. who refusing to obey the commandment of the rulers, in ceasing to preach Christ, said, 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to obey you rather than God, be you yourselves judges.'

"3dly. For a farther proof we may bring the testimony and practice of the ancient fathers:

"Tertullian, in his book *De Carona Militis*, compares those men to dumb idols, who wear anything like the decking of the idols. Again, he saith, '*Si in idolio recumbere alienum est a fide, quid in idoli habitu videri?*' 'If it be a matter of infidelity to sit at the idols' feasts, what is it to be seen in the habit or apparel of the idol?'

"St. Austin, in his eighty-sixth epistle to Casulanus, warneth him not to fast on the same day, lest thereby he might seem to consent with the wicked Manichees.

"The fourth council of Toletane [Toledo], canon fifth, to avoid consent with heretics, decreed, that in baptism the body of the baptized should be but once dipped.

"The great clerk Origen, as Epiphanius writeth, tom. 1. b. 2. hæres. 64, because he delivered palm to those that offered to the image of Serapis, although he openly said, '*Venite accipite non frondes simulachri sed frondes Christi;*' 'Come and receive the boughs, not of the image but of Christ; yet was he for this, and such-like doings, excommunicated and past out of the church, by those martyrs and confessors that were at Athens.

"In the tripartite history, b. 6. chap. 30. it is said, that the Christian soldiers, who by the

To their declaration, and everything else that was offered, from the danger of the Reformation, and the ruin of so many poor families, the commissioners replied, it was not their business to argue and debate, but to execute the queen's injunctions. Archbishop Parker seemed pleased with the resolution of his chancellor, and said, "that he did not doubt, when the ministers had

subtlety of Julian were brought to offer incense to the idol, when they perceived their fault, ran forth into the streets, professing the religion of Christ, testifying themselves to be Christians, and confessing that their hands had offended unadvisedly, but that now they were ready to give their whole bodies to the most cruel torments and pains for Christ.

"Farther, to prove that wearing the ministering garments of the pope's church, is to confirm the opinion of the necessity and holiness of the same, and to show consent to idolatry, let it be remembered, that the first devisers of them have taught, that of necessity they must be had; and have made laws to punish and deprive those that had them not; as appears in the pontifical *De Clerico faciendo*, that is, of the ordering of a clerk, where the surplice is termed the habit or garment of the holy religion. And Durandus in his third book, entitled *Rationale Divinor*, calls it the linen garment which those men that are occupied in any manner at the service of the altar and holy things, must wear over their common apparel.

"Lindwood also, in his constitutions for the province of England, *De Habitu Clericali*, affirms the necessity of this habit; so does Ottobonus and others, appointing grievous punishments for those that refuse to wear them; yea, and the pontifical teaches, that when a clerk has by murder, or otherwise, deserved to die, he must be degraded, by plucking violently from him those garments with these words, 'Auctoritate Dei Omnipotentis, Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti,' &c. 'By the authority of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by our authority, we take from thee the habit of the clergy, and we make thee naked and bare of the ornaments of religion; and we do depose, degrade, spoil, and strip, thee of thy clergy order, benefice, and privilege; and as one that is unworthy of the profession of a clerk, we bring thee back again into the servitude and shame of the secular habit.'

"These things being thus weighed, with the warning that St. Paul giveth, 1 Thess. chap. v. where he commands us to abstain from all appearance of evil, we cannot but think that in using of these things we should beat back those that are coming from superstition, and confirm those that are grown in superstition, and consequently overthrow that which we have been labouring to build, and incur the danger of that horrible curse that our Saviour has pronounced, 'Woe to the world because of offences?'

"Knowing therefore how horrible a thing it is to fall into the hands of the living God, by doing that which our consciences (grounded upon the truth of God's word, and the example and doctrine of ancient fathers) do tell us were evil done, and to the great discrediting of the truth whereof we profess to be teachers; we have thought good to yield ourselves into the hands of men, to suffer whatsoever God hath appointed us to suffer, for the preferring of the commandments of God and a clear conscience, before the commandments of men; in complying with which we cannot escape the condemnation of our consciences; keeping always in memory that horrible saying of John in his First Epistle, 'If our conscience condemn us, God is greater than our conscience and not forgetting the saying of the Psalmist, 'It is good to trust in the Lord, and not to trust in man,' Psal. cxviii. 'It is good to trust in the Lord, and not to trust in princes.' And again, Psal. cxlvi. 'Trust not in princes, nor in the children of men, in whom there is no health, whose spirit shall depart out of them, and they shall return to the earth from whence they came, and in that day all their devices shall come to nought.'

"Not despising men therefore, but trusting in God only, we seek to serve him with a clear conscience, so long as we shall live here, assuring ourselves that those things that we shall suffer for doing so, shall be a testimony to the world, that great reward is laid up for us in heaven, where we doubt not but to rest for ever, with them that have before our days suffered for the like," MS. pones me, p. 57, &c.

felt the smart of poverty and want, they would comply; for the wood (says he) is yet but green.”¹ He declared farther, that he was fully bent to go through with the work he had begun; and the rather, because the queen would have him try with his own authority what he could do for order. This raised his ambition, and put him upon soliciting the secretary of state by letter for his countenance; in one of which he tells him, that, “if he was not better backed there would be fewer Winchesters, as is desired,” referring to Stephen Gardiner, the bloody persecuting bishop of Winchester in queen Mary’s reign; “but for my part (says he), so that my prince may win honour, I will be very gladly the rock of offence; since ‘the Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man can do to me;’ nor will I be amused or daunted *fremat mundus ruat cesium*.”² These were the weapons, and this the language, of one whom Mr. Strype calls the mild and gentle archbishop!

The Nonconformists had juster thoughts of him; he was at the head of all their sufferings, and pushed them forward with unrelenting vigour. The queen might have been softened; the secretary of state and courtiers declared they could not keep pace with him; Grindal relented, and the bishop of Durham declared he would rather lay down his bishopric than suffer such proceedings in his diocese. But Parker was above these reproaches, and instead of relaxing, framed such injunctions for the London clergy as had never been heard of in a Protestant kingdom, or a free government. The commissioners obliged every clergyman that had cure of souls to swear obedience; 1. To all the queen’s injunctions and letters patent. 2. To all letters from the lords of the privy council. 3. To the articles and injunctions of their metropolitan.³ 4. To the articles and mandates of their bishop, archdeacon, chancellors, somners, receivers, &c. and in a word, to be subject to the control of all their superiors with patience.⁴ To gird these injunctions close upon the Puritans, there was appointed in every parish four or eight censors, spies, or jurats, to take cognizance of all offences given or taken. These were under oath enjoined to take particular notice of the conformity of the clergy and of the parishioners, and to give in their presentments when required; so that it was impossible for an honest Puritan to escape the high commission.

By these methods of severity, religion and virtue were discountenanced for the sake of their pretended ornaments; the consciences of good men were entangled, and the Reformation exposed to the utmost hazard.⁵ Many

¹ Life of Parker, p. 215.

² Ibid, p. 219, 220, &c.

³ Strype’s Ann. p. 463.

⁴ Dr. Warner calls this an oath of a most extraordinary nature under a free government, and adds, “with this unrelenting rigour did the archbishop carry on the severity against the Puritans, and almost he alone.” Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 435.—ED.

⁵ Life of Parker, p. 224.

churches were shut up in the city of London for want of ministers, to the grief of all good men, and the inexpressible pleasure of the Papists, who rejoiced to see the reformers weakening their own hands, by silencing such numbers of the most useful and popular preachers, while the country was in distress for want of them. Bishop Sandys, in one of his sermons before the queen some years after, tells her majesty, “that many of her people, especially in the northern parts, perished for want of saving food. Many there are (says he) that hear not a sermon in seven years, I might safely say in seventeen: their blood will be required at somebody’s hands.”¹

But to make thorough work with the refusers of the habits, the archbishop called in all licences, according to the advertisements, and appointed all preachers throughout his whole province to take out new ones; this was to reach those who were neither incumbents nor curates in parishes, but lecturers or occasional preachers. All parsons and curates were forbid to suffer any to preach in their churches upon any former licences given by the archbishop; and such as took out new licences bound themselves for the future, not to disturb the public establishment, or vary from it. And because some, when they had been discharged from their ministry in one diocese for non-conformity, got a settlement in another, it was now appointed that such curates as came out of other dioceses should not be allowed to preach without letters testimonial from the ordinary where they last served. But those Puritans who could not with a good conscience take out new licences kept their old ones, and made the best use of them they could.² “They travelled up and down the countries, from church to church, preaching where they could get leave, as if they were apostles,” says bishop Jewel; and so they were with regard to their poverty, for silver and gold they had none: but his lordship adds, “and they take money for their labours.” An unpardonable crime! that honest men of a liberal education, that had parted with their livings in the church for a good conscience, should endeavour after a very poor manner to live by the gospel.

There was still one door of entrance in the ministry left open to the Puritans, which the archbishop used all his interest to shut, but could not prevail. It was a privilege granted the university of Cambridge by pope Alexander VI. to license twelve ministers yearly, to preach anywhere throughout England, without obtaining licences from any of the bishops. The bull says, that the chancellor of the university (who was then Fisher, bishop of Rochester) and his successors, shall license twelve preachers yearly, under the common seal of the university, who shall have liberty to preach, &c. *durante vita naturali.*” The archbishop sent to secretary Cecil their chancellor,

¹ Life of Grindal, p. 99. Pierce, p. 52.

² Life of Parker, p. 189.

praying him to set aside this practice; 1. Because the present licences varied from the original bull, being given out by the vice-chancellor, whereas they ought to be in the name of the chancellor only. 2. Because it was unreasonable to give licences *durante vita naturali*, i.e. for life; whereas they ought to be only *quam diu nobis placuerint*, and *dum laudabiliter gesserint*, i.e. during our pleasure, or as long as they behave well.¹ 3. But that which troubled the archbishop most, was the clause that infringed his own and his brethren's jurisdiction, that they might preach without a licence from any of the bishops. And yet this clause is in the letters patent of queen Elizabeth, granted to the university for this purpose; the words are, "Licentia ordinari-orum locorum super hoc minime requisita." This was thought insufferable; the vice-chancellor therefore was sent for to town to defend the privilege of the university, which he did to the satisfaction of the chancellor; but the archbishop was so angry, that he declared he would not admit any of their licences without the chancellor's name; nor could he imagine that the vice-chancellor, by his pretended experience and skill in the civil law, could inform his honour of anything that he was not capable of answering. But here his grace met with a disappointment, for the university retained their privilege, and made use of it to the relief of the Puritans.²

In the queen's progress this year [1565], her majesty visited the university of Cambridge, and continued there five days, being entertained by the scholars with speeches and disputations. On the third day of her being there [August 7th], a philosophy act was kept by Thomas Byng, of Peter-house, on these two questions. 1. Whether monarchy be not the best form of government? 2. Whether frequent alterations of the laws are dangerous? The opponents were, Mr. Thomas Cartwright, fellow of Trinity-college; Mr. Chadderton, of Queen's; Mr. Preston and Mr. Clark, of King's college; who performed their parts to the satisfaction of the queen, and the whole audience; but it seems Preston pleased her majesty best, and was made her scholar, with the settlement of a salary. The divinity-questions were, 1.

¹ Ibid, p, 193.

² Bishop Madox inveighs against them for availing themselves of a bull granted by the pope, whom they affirmed to be antichrist, and when they loaded the queen and, bishops with heavy accusations as encouragers of Popery, The bishop's reflections are also pointed against our historian for mentioning this conduct without a censure. To which Mr. Neal replies, that this grant from pope Alexander VI. the advantage of which the Puritans enjoyed, had been confirmed to the university by letters patent from queen Elizabeth herself; a copy of which may be seen in the Appendix to Strype's Life of archbishop Parker, p. 69. Mr. Neal also properly asks, "Would the Protestants in France have shut up their churches, if the antichristian powers would have given them a licence to preach? Nay, would they not have preached without any licence at all, if they had not been dragooned out of the country?" He asserts for himself, "if he were a missionary, and could spread the Christian faith, by virtue of a licence from the pope, or the grand seignior, or the emperor of China, in their dominions, he would not scruple to accept it, but be thankful to the Divine Providence that had opened such a door." Appendix to the Review.—ED.

Whether the authority of the Scripture is greater than that of the church? 2. Whether the civil magistrate has authority in ecclesiastical affairs? These were the tests of the times. At the close of the disputation, the queen made a short and elegant oration in Latin, encouraging the scholars to pursue their studies, with a promise of her countenance and protection.

But this learned body was soon after thrown into confusion, by the controversy of the habits, especially of the surplice. Dr. Longworth, master of St. John's, being absent from his college, the students of that house came to chapel on a festival-day, without their hoods and surplices,¹ to the number of three hundred, and continued to do so for some time; the master at his return making no complaint, nor attempting to recover them to uniformity. In Trinity-college, all,² except three, declared against the surplice, and many in other colleges were ready to follow their example. The news of this being sent to court, it was easy to foresee an impending storm: several members of the university wrote to the secretary, humbly beseeching his intercession with the queen, that they might not be forced to receive a Popish ceremony, which they had laid aside; assuring him before God, that nothing but reason, and the quiet enjoyment of their consciences, had induced them to do as they had done. But Cecil sent them an angry answer, admonishing them to return quietly to the habits, as they had used them before. He also wrote to the vice-chancellor, requiring him to call together the heads of the colleges, and let them know, that as they tendered the honour of God, the preservation of Christian unity, the reputation of the university, the favour of the queen, and his own good-will to them, they should continue the use of the habits.

The heads of colleges being sensible of the risk the university would run of being disfurnished of students, if the habits were pressed, applied again to their chancellor Cecil, to intercede with the queen for a dispensation; one of their letters was signed by the master of Trinity-college, Dr. Beaumont, who had been an exile; John Whitgift, afterward archbishop of Canterbury; Roger Kelk, master of Magdalen-college; Richard Longworth, master of St. John's, Matthew Hutton, master of Pembroke-hall, afterward archbishop of York; and many others. In their letter they acquaint his honour, "that a great many persons in the university, of piety and learning, were fully persuaded of the unlawfulness of the habits; and therefore if conformity were urged, they would be forced to desert their stations, and thus the university would be stripped of its ornaments; they therefore give it as their humble opinion, that indulgence in this matter would be attended with no inconveniences; but on the other hand, they were afraid religion and

¹ However they had worn them before. Bishop Madox.

² By the instigation of T. Cartwright. lb. from Strype.

learning would suffer very much by rigour and imposition.”¹ This letter was resented at court, and especially by the ecclesiastical commission; Longworth, master of St. John’s, was sent for before the commissioners, and obliged to sign a recantation, and read it publicly in the church; the rest made their peace by letters of submission: all the heads of colleges were commanded to assist the vice-chancellor in bringing the scholars to a uniformity in the habits, which nevertheless they could not accomplish for many years. Whitgift, seeing which way the tide of preferment ran, drew his pen in defence of the hierarchy in all its branches, and became a most potent advocate for the habits. But the university of Cambridge was still a sanctuary for the Puritans.

To return to the Puritan clergy: April 2d, Mr. Crowley, the suspended minister of Cripplegate, seeing a corpse coming to be buried at his church, attended with clerks in their surplices singing before it, threatened to shut the churchdoors against them; but the singing men resisted, resolving to go through with their work, till the alderman’s deputy threatened to lay them by the heels for breaking the peace; upon which they shrunk away, but complained to the archbishop, who sending for Crowley, deprived him of his living, and confined him to his house, for saying, he would not suffer the wolf to come to his flock. He also bound the deputy in £100 to be ready when he shall be called for.² This Mr. Crowley was a learned man, and had been an exile in queen Mary’s days, at Frankfort; he was very diligent in disputing against certain priests in the Tower, and took a great deal of pains to bring them over to their allegiance to the queen, upon the principle of the unlawfulness of deposing princes upon any pretence whatsoever. He wrote divers learned books, and died a Nonconformist, in the year 1588, and was buried in the church of Cripplegate. Among the deprived ministers, some betook themselves to the study of physic, and others to secular employments; some went into Scotland, or beyond sea; others got to be chaplains in gentlemen’s families; but many who had large families were reduced to beggary. Many churches were now shut up, and the people ready to mutiny for want of ministers. Six hundred persons came to a church in London, to receive the communion on Palm-Sunday, but the doors were shut, there being none to officiate. The cries of the people reached the court; the secretary wrote to the archbishop to supply the churches, and release the prisoners; but his grace was inexorable; and had rather the people should have no sermons or sacraments, than have them without the surplice and cap. He acquainted the secretary in a letter, “that when the queen put him upon what he had done, he told her that these precise folks would offer their

¹ Life of Parker, p. 194. App. p. 69.

² Life of Parker, p. 218, 219.

goods and bodies to prison, rather than relent; and her highness then willed him to imprison them.¹ He confessed, that there were many parishes unserved; that he underwent many hard speeches, and much resistance from the people; but nothing more than was to be expected. That he had sent his chaplains into the city, to serve in some of the great parishes, but they could not administer the sacrament, because the officers of the parish had provided neither surplice nor wafer-bread. That on Palm-Sunday, one of his chaplains designing to administer the sacrament to some that desired it, the table was made ready, but while he was reading the chapter of the passion, one of the parishioners drew from the table both the cup and the wafer-bread, because the bread was not common; and so the people were disappointed, and his chaplain derided. That divers churchwardens would provide neither surplice nor wafer-bread. He acquainted the secretary farther, that he had talked with several of the new preachers, who were movers of sedition and disorder, that he had commanded them silence, and had put some into prison. That on Maunday-Thursday he had many of the bishop of London's parishioners, churchwardens, and others, before him; but that he was fully tired, for some ministers would not obey their suspensions, but preached in defiance of them.—Some churchwardens would not provide the church-furniture; and others opposed and disturbed those that were sent to officiate in the prescribed apparel. He then calls upon the secretary to spirit up [Grindal] bishop of London, to his duty; and assures him, that he had spoken to him to no purpose; that he was younger, and nearer the city, and had vacant priests in his church, who might supply the places of the deprived ministers; he therefore bewailed that he should be put upon the oversight of the parishes of London, which was another man's charge; and that the burden should be laid on his neck, when other men drew back.”² The truth is, Grindal was weary of the unpleasant work, and having a real concern to promote the preaching of the word of God, he could not act against the ministers, otherwise than as he was pushed forwards; and when the eyes of his superiors were turned another way, he would relax again. When the secretary and archbishop sent to him to provide for his charge, and fill up the vacant pulpits; he told them it was impossible, there being no preachers; all he could do was to supply the churches by turns, which was far from stopping the murmurs of the people.

This was the sad condition of the city of London; the very bread of life being taken from the people, for the sake of a few trifling ceremonies: and if it was thus in the city, how much worse must it be in those distant countries, where her majesty's injunctions were rigidly executed? And yet with

¹ Life of Parker, p. 228.

² Life of Parker, p. 229.

all this rigour, it was not in the power of the queen and her bishops, to reconcile the clergy and common people to the habits. The queen herself was in earnest, and her archbishop went into the most servile measures, to fulfil the commands of his royal mistress; the high-commission was furious, but the council were backward to countenance their proceedings.

All applications to the queen and her commissioners being ineffectual, the suspended ministers thought it their duty to lay their case before the world; accordingly they published a small treatise in this year [1566], in vindication of their conduct, entitled, “A declaration of the doings of those ministers of God’s word and sacraments in the city of London, which have refused to wear the upper apparel, and ministering garments of the pope’s church.” In this book they show, “that neither the prophets in the Old Testament, nor the apostles in the New, were distinguished by their garments; that the linen garment was peculiar to the priesthood of Aaron, and had a signification of something to be fulfilled in Christ and his church. That a distinction of garments in the Christian church did not generally obtain till long after the rising of antichrist; for the whole clergy of Ravenna, writing to the emperor Carolus Calvus, in the year of our Lord 876, say, We are distinguished from the laity not by our clothes, but by our doctrines; not by our habits, but our conversation. That the surplice, or white linen garment, came from the Egyptians into the Jewish church; and that pope Sylvester, about the year 320, was the first that appointed the sacrament to be administered in a white linen garment; giving this reason for it, because the body of Christ was buried in a white linen cloth.—They represent how all these garments had been abused to idolatry, sorcery, and all kinds of conjurations; for (say they) the Popish priests can perform none of their pretended consecrations of holy water, transubstantiation of the body of Christ, conjurations of the devil out of places or persons possessed, without a surplice, or an albe, or some hallowed stole.—They argue against the habits as an offence to weak Christians, an encouragement to ignorant and obstinate Papists, and as an affection to return to their communion.—That at best they were but human appointments, and came within the apostle’s reproof, Col. ii. 20, 22. ‘Why as though living in the world are ye subject to ordinances, after the commandments and doctrines of men? which all are to perish with the using. Touch not, taste not, handle not?—That supposing the garments were indifferent (which they did not grant), yet they ought not to be imposed, because it was an infringement of the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.—Lastly, they call in the suffrages of foreign divines, who all condemned the habits, though they were not willing to hazard the Reformation in its infancy for them. Even bishop Ridley, who contended so zealously for the habits, when Dr. Brooks at his degradation would have persuaded him to put on the surplice with the rest of the massing garments,

absolutely refused, saying, 'If you put the surplice upon me, it shall be against my will.' And when they forced it upon him, he inveighed against the apparel, as foolish and abominable."

At the end of the book is a prayer, in which are these words;—"Are not the relics of Romish idolatry stoutly retained? Are we not bereaved of some of our pastors, who by word and example sought to free thy flock from these offences? Ah, good Lord! these are now by power put down from pastoral care; they are forbid to feed us; their voice we cannot hear. This is our great discomfort; this is the joy and triumph of antichrist; and, which is more heavy, the increase of this misery is of some threatened, of the wicked hoped for, and of us feared, as thy judgments against us for our sins."—At the conclusion is the Lord's prayer and Creed, after this manner, "In thy name, O Christ our captain, we ask these things, and pray unto thee, O heavenly Father, saying, Our Father," &c.—After this, "O Lord, increase our faith, whereof we make confession, I believe in God the Father Almighty," &c. And in the end is this sentence, "Arise, O Lord, and let thine enemies be confounded."¹

Other pamphlets of the same kind were published in defence of the suspended ministers, which the bishops appointed their chaplains to answer. Mr. Strype is of opinion, that the archbishop himself published an answer to their declaration; but whoever be the author, he is a man of a bad spirit, and abusive language:² the ministers printed a reply, entitled, "An answer for the time, to the examination put in print with the author's name, pretending to maintain the apparel prescribed, against the declaration of the ministers of London:" it answers the adversary paragraph by paragraph with good temper and judgment. But the bishops printed some new testimonies of foreign divines, without their consent, with a collection of tracts, of obedience to the magistrate, and Melancthon's exposition of Rom. xiii. 1. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers from whence they conclude, that because things are barely tolerably though offensive, dangerous, and in their own opinions to be removed out of the church as soon as an opportunity shall offer, yet in the meantime they may be imposed under the penalties of suspension, deprivation, and imprisonment, from a mistaken interpretation of the apostle's words, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers."

The Puritans replied to all these attempts of their adversaries; their tracts were eagerly sought after, and had a wide spread among the people; upon which the commissioners had recourse to their last remedy, which was the farther restraint of the press. They complained to the council, that

¹ Strype's Annals, p. 555. Pierce, p. 61.

² Pierce's Vindication, p. 62.

notwithstanding the queen's injunctions, the differences in the church were kept open by the printing and publishing seditious libels; and hereupon procured the following decree of the star-chamber, viz.

1. "That no person shall print or publish any book against the queen's injunctions, ordinances, or letters patent, set forth or to be set forth, or against the meaning of them.¹

2. "That such offenders should forfeit all their books and copies, and suffer three months' imprisonment, and never practise the art of printing any more.

3. "That no person should sell, bind, or stitch, such books, upon pain of twenty shillings for every book.

4. "That all forfeited books should be brought to Stationers'-hall, and half the money forfeited to be reserved for the queen, the rest for the informer, and the books to be destroyed or made waste-paper.

5. "That the wardens of the company may from time to time search all suspected places, and open all packs, dry fats, &c. wherein paper or foreign books may be contained; and enter all warehouses where they have reasonable suspicion, and seize all books and pamphlets against the queen's ordinances, and bring the offender before the ecclesiastical commissioners.

6. "All stationers, booksellers, and merchants, trading in books, shall enter into recognizances of reasonable sums of money, to observe the premises, or pay the forfeitures."

This was signed by eight of the privy council, and by the bishops of Canterbury and London, with five more of the ecclesiastical commission, and published June 29th, 1566, in the eighth year of the queen's reign.²

The Puritans being thus foreclosed, and shut out of the church by sequestrations, imprisonments, the taking away of their licences to preach, and the restraint of the press, most of them were at a loss how to behave, being unwilling to separate from the church where the word and sacraments were truly administered, though defiled with some Popish superstitions; of the number were Dr. Humphreys, Sampson, Fox the martyrologist, Lever, Whittingham, Johnson, and others, who continued preaching up and down, as they had opportunity, and could be dispensed with for the habits, though they were excluded all parochial preferment.

¹ Life of Parker, p. 221.

² Life of Parker, p. 222.

It is a just remark of a modern writer here, "that without entering into the controversy between the bishops and the Puritans, we may at least venture to affirm, that the former did no credit to their cause by this arbitrary restraint of the press. This is an expedient utterly incompatible with the very notion of a free state, and therefore ever to be detested by the friends of liberty. And it is an expedient which can never be of any service to the cause of truth; whatever it may to error, superstition, or tyranny. British Biography, vol. 3. p. 25.—ED. *

But there were great numbers of the common people, who abhorred the habits as much as the ministers, and would not frequent the churches where they were used, thinking it as unlawful to countenance such superstitions with their presence, as if they themselves were to put on the garments. These were distressed where to hear; some stayed without the church till service was over, and the minister was entering upon his prayer before sermon; others flocked after father Coverdale, who preached without the habits; but being turned out of his church at St. Magnus, London-bridge, they were obliged to send to his house on Saturdays, to know where they might hear him the next day: the government took umbrage at this, insomuch that the good old man was obliged to tell his friends, that he durst not inform them any more of his preaching for fear of offending his Superiors. At length, after having waited about eight weeks to see if the queen would have compassion on them, several of the deprived ministers had a solemn consultation with their friends, in which, after prayer, and a serious debate about the lawfulness and necessity of separating from the established church, they came to this agreement, that since they could not have the word of God preached, nor the sacraments administered without idolatrous gear (as they called it), and since there had been a separate congregation in London, and another at Geneva in queen Mary's time, which used a book and order of preaching, administration of sacraments, and discipline, that the great Mr. Calvin had approved of, and which was free from the superstitions of the English service; that therefore it was their duty, in their present circumstances, to break off from the public churches, and to assemble, as they had opportunity, in private houses, or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner that might not offend against the light of their consciences.¹ Had the use of habits and a few ceremonies been left discretionary, both ministers and people had been easy; but it was the compelling these things by law, as they told the archbishop, that made them separate.

It was debated among them, whether they should use, as much of the common prayer and service of the church as was not offensive, or resolve at once, since they were cut off from the church of England, to set up the purest and best form of worship, most consonant to the Holy Scriptures, and to the practice of the foreign reformers; the latter of these was concluded upon, and accordingly they laid aside the English liturgy, and made use of the Geneva service-book.

Here was the era or date of the separation, a most unhappy event, says Mr. Strype, whereby "people of the same country, of the same religion, and of the same judgment in doctrine, parted communions; one part being obliged to go aside into secret houses and chambers, to serve God by them-

¹ Life of Parker, p. 241.

selves, which begat strangeness between neighbours, Christians, and Protestants.” And not only strangeness, but unspeakable mischiefs to the nation in this and the following reigns. The breach might easily have been made up at first, but it widened by degrees; the passions of the contending parties increased, till the fire, which for some years was burning under ground, broke out into a civil war, and with unspeakable fury destroyed the constitution both of church and state.

I leave the reader to judge at whose door the beginnings of these sorrows are to be laid, each party casting the blame on the other. The Conformists charged the deprived ministers with disobedience to the queen, and obstinacy, preciseness, and with breaking the peace of the church for matters of no consequence to salvation. The ministers, on the other hand, thought it cruel usage to be turned out of the church for things which their adversaries acknowledged to be of mere indifference; whereas they took it upon their consciences, and were ready to aver in the most solemn manner, that they deemed them unlawful. They complied as far as they could with the establishment while they were within it, by using as much of the liturgy as was not offensive, and by taking the oath of supremacy; they were as dutiful subjects to the queen as the bishops, and declared themselves ready to obey their sovereign in all things lawful; and when they could not obey, patiently to suffer her displeasure. After all this, to impute the behaviour of the Nonconformists to obstinacy and peevishness, was very uncharitable. What could move them to part with their livings, or support them under the loss, but the testimony of a good conscience? When they could not but be sensible their nonconformity would be followed with poverty and disgrace, with the loss of their characters and usefulness in the church; and with numberless unforeseen calamities to themselves and families, unless it should please God in his allwise providence, to soften the queen’s heart in their favour.

In Scotland all things were in confusion. The young queen Mary, after the death of her husband Francis II. returned into her own country, August 21st, 1561, upon ill terms with queen Elizabeth, who could not brook her assuming the arms of England, and putting in her claim to the crown, on the pretence of her bastardy, which most of the Popish powers maintained, because she was born during the life of queen Katharine, whose marriage had been declared valid by the pope. Elizabeth offered her a safe conduct, if she would ratify the treaty of Edinburgh; but she chose rather to run all risks than submit. Mary was a bigoted Papist, and her juvenile amours and follies soon entangled her government, and lost her crown. As soon as she arrived in Scotland she had the mortification to see the whole nation turned Protestant, and the Reformation established by laws so secure and strict, that only herself was allowed the liberty of mass in her own chapel, and

that without pomp or ostentation. The Protestants of Scotland, by the preaching of Mr. Knox, and others, having imbibed the strongest aversion to Popery, were for removing at the greatest distance from its superstitions. The general assembly petitioned her majesty, to ratify the acts of parliament for abolishing the mass, and for obliging all her subjects to frequent the reformed worship. But she replied, that she saw no impiety in the mass, and was determined not to quit the religion in which she was educated, being satisfied it was founded on the word of God. To which the general assembly answered a little coarsely, that Turkism stood upon as good ground as Popery; and then required her, in the name of the eternal God, to inform herself better, by frequenting sermons, and conferring with learned men; but her majesty gave no ear to their counsels.

In the year 1564, the queen married Henry Stuart, lord Darnley, who was joined with her in the government. By him she was brought to bed of a son June 15th, 1566, afterward James I. king of England; and while she was with child of him, she received a fright by her husband's coming into her chamber with his servants, and putting to death her favourite David Rizzio an Italian musician, who was sitting with her at table. This was thought to have such an influence upon the prince that was born of her, that he never loved the sight of a sword. Soon after this the king himself was found murdered in a garden, the house in which the murder was committed being blown up with gunpowder, to prevent the discovery. Upon the king's death the earl of Bothwell became the queen's favourite, and as soon as he had obtained a divorce from his lawful wife, she took him into her marriage-bed, to her very great infamy, and the regret of the whole Scots' nation, who took up arms to revenge the late king's murder, and dissolve the present incestuous marriage. When the two armies were ready to engage, Bothwell fled to Dunbar; and the queen being apprehend give her soldiers would not fight in such an infamous cause, surrendered herself to the confederates, who shut her up in the castle of Lock Levin, and obliged her to resign the crown to her young son, under the regency of the earl of Murray. From hence she made her escape into England in the year 1568, where she was detained prisoner by queen Elizabeth almost eighteen years, and then put to death. Bothwell turned pirate, and being taken by the Danes, was shut up for ten years in a noisome prison in Denmark, till he lost his senses and died mad.¹

The earl of Murray being regent of Scotland, convened a parliament and assembly at Edinburgh, in which the pope's authority was again discharged, and the act of parliament of the year 1560, for renouncing the jurisdiction of the court of Rome, was confirmed, and all acts passed in for-

¹ Rapin, p. 357.

mer reigns, for the support of Popish idolatry, were annulled.—The new confession of faith was ratified, and the Protestant ministers, and those of their communion, declared to be the only true and holy kirk within that realm. The examination and admission of ministers, is declared to be only in the power and disposition of the church; with a saving clause for lay-patrons. By another act, the kings at their coronation, for the future, are to take an oath to maintain the reformed religion then professed; and by another, none but such as profess the reformed religion are capable of being judges or proctors, or of practising in any of the courts of justice; except those who held offices hereditary, or for life.

The general assembly declared their approbation of the discipline of the reformed churches of Geneva and Switzerland; and for a parity among ministers, in opposition to the claim of the bishops, as a superior order. All church affairs were managed by provincial, classical, and national assemblies; but these acts of the general assembly not being confirmed by parliament, episcopal government was not legally abolished, but tacitly suspended till the king came of age. However, the general assembly showed their power of the keys at this time, by deposing the bishop of Orkney for marrying the queen to Bothwell, who was supposed to have murdered the late king; and by making the countess of Argyle do penance for assisting at the ceremony.