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CHAP. V.

FROM THE SEPARATION OF THE PROTESTANT NONCON­FORMISTS TO THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER.

Though all the Puritans of these times would have re­mained within the church, might they have been indulged in the habits and a few ceremonies, yet they were far from being satisfied with the hierarchy. They had other ob­jections besides those for which they were deprived, which they laboured incessantly throughout the whole course of this reign to remove. I will set them before the reader in one view, that he may form a complete judgment of the whole controversy.

First. They complained of the bishops affecting to be thought a superior order to presbyters, and claimed the sole right of ordination, and the use of the keys, or the sole exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. They disliked the temporal dignities and baronies annexed to their office, and their engaging in secular employments and trusts, as tending to exalt them too much above their brethren, and not so agreeable to their characters as ministers of Christ, nor consistent with the due discharge of their spiritual function.

Secondly. They excepted to the titles and offices of arch­deacons, deans, chapters, and other officials, belonging to cathedrals, as having no foundation in Scripture or primi­tive antiquity, but intrenching upon the privileges of the presbyters of the several dioceses.

Thirdly. They complained of the exorbitant power and jurisdiction of the bishops and their chancellors in their spi­ritual courts, as derived from the canon law of the pope, and not from the word of God, or the statute law of the land. They complained of their fining, imprisoning, de­priving, and putting men to excessive charges for small offences; and that the highest censures, such as excommunication and absolution, were in the hands of laymen, and not in the spiritual officers of the church.

Fourthly. They lamented the want of a godly discipline, and were uneasy at the promiscuous and general access of all persons to the Lord’s table. The church being described in her articles as a congregation of faithful persons, they thought it necessary that a power should be lodged somewhere, to inquire into the qualifications of such as desired to be of her communion.

Fifthly. Though they did not dispute the lawfulness of set forms of prayer, provided a due liberty was allowed for prayers of their own composure, before and after sermon; yet they disliked some things in the public liturgy, establish­ed by law; as the frequent repetition of the Lord’s prayer; the interruption of the prayers, by the frequent responses of the people, which in some places seem to be little better than vain repetitions, and are practised in no other Pro­testant church in the world. They excepted to some passages in the offices of marriage and burial, &c. which they very unwillingly complied with; as in the office of marriage, “With my body I thee worship;” and in the office of burial, “In sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life,” to be pronounced over the worst of men, unless in a very few excepted cases.

Sixthly. They disliked the reading of the apocryphal books in the church, while some parts of canonical Scrip­ture were omitted; and though they did not disapprove the homilies, they thought that no man ought to be ordained a minister in the church, who was incapable of preaching and expounding the Scriptures. One of their great com­plaints, therefore, throughout the course of this reign, was, that there were so many dumb ministers, pluralists, and non-residents; and that presentations to benefices were in the hands of the queen, bishops, or lay-patrons, when they ought to arise from the election of the people.

Seventhly. They disapproved of the observation of sun­dry of the church-festivals or holidays, as having no foun­dation in Scripture, or primitive antiquity. We have no example, say they, in the Old or New Testament, of any days appointed in commemoration of saints: to observe the fast in Lent of Friday and Saturday, &c. is unlawful and superstitious; as also buying and selling on the Lord’s day.

Eighthly. They disallowed of the cathedral mode of wor­ship; of singing their prayers, and of the antiphone, or chanting the psalms by turns, which the ecclesiastical com­missioners in king Edward VI’s time advised the laying aside. Nor did they approve of musical instruments, as trumpets, organs, &c. which were not in use in the church for above twelve hundred years after Christ.

Ninthly. They scrupled conformity to certain rites and ceremonies, which were enjoined by the rubric, or the queen’s injunctions; as,

1. To the sign of the cross in baptism, which is no part of the institution as recorded in Scripture; and though it was usual for Christians, in the earlier ages, to cross them­selves, or make a cross in the air upon some occasions, yet there is no express mention of its being used in baptism, till about the fifth century. Besides, it having been abused to superstition by the church of Rome, and been had in such reverence by some Protestants, that baptism itself has been thought imperfect without it, they apprehend it ought to be laid aside. They also disallowed of baptism by midwives, or other women, in cases of sickness; and of the manner of churching women, which looked to them too much like the Jewish purification.

2. They excepted to the use of godfathers and godmo­thers, to the exclusion of parents from being sureties for the education of their own children. If parents were dead, or in a distant country, they were as much for sponsors to undertake for the education of the child, as their adversaries; but when the education of children is by the laws of God and nature intrusted to parents, who are bound to form them to virtue and piety, they apprehended it very unjusti­fiable to release them totally from that promise, and deliver up the child to a stranger; as was then the constant practice, and is since enjoined by the twenty-ninth canon, which says, “No parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as godfather to his own child.” In giving names to children it was their opinion, that Heathenish names should be avoided, as not so fit for Christians; and also, the names of God and Christ, and angels, and the peculiar offices of the Mediator. They also disliked the godfathers answering in the name of the child, and not in their own.

3. They disapproved the custom of confirming children, as soon as they could repeat the Lord’s prayer and their catechism, by which they had a right to come to the sacra­ment, without any other qualification; this might be done by children of five or six years old. They were also dissa­tisfied with that part of the office, where the bishop, laying his hand upon the children, prays that God would by this sign certify them of his favour and goodness, which seems to impute a sacramental efficacy to the imposition of his hands.

4. They excepted against the injunction of kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, which they apprehend­ed not so agreeable to the example of Christ and his apostles, who gave it to his disciples rather in a posture of feast­ing than of adoration. Besides, it has no foundation in an­tiquity for many hundred years after Christ; and having since been grossly abused by the Papists to idolatry, in their worshipping the host, it ought, say they, to be laid aside; and, if it should be allowed, that the posture was indiffer­ent, yet it ought not to be imposed and made a necessary term as communion; nor did they approve of either of the sacraments being administered in private; no, not in cases of danger.

5. To bowing at the name of Jesus, grounded upon a false interpretation of that passage of Scripture, “At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow;” as if greater external reverence was required to that name, than to the person of our blessed Saviour, under the titles of, Lord, Saviour, Christ, Immanuel, &c. and yet upon this mistake was founded the injunction of the queen, and the eighteenth canon, which says, “When in time of divine service the name of Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present.” But the Puritans maintained, that all the names of God and Christ were to be had in equal reverence, and therefore it was beside all reason to bow the knee, or uncover the head, only at the name of Jesus.

6. To the ring in marriage. This they sometimes com­plied with, but wished it altered. It is derived from the Papists, who make marriage a sacrament, and the ring a sort of sacred sign or symbol. The words in the liturgy are, “Then shall they again loose their hands, and the man shall give unto the woman a ring, laying the same upon the book; and the priest taking the ring, shall deliver it to the man, to put it on the fourth finger of the woman’s left hand; and the man holding the ring there, and taught by the priest, shall say, ‘With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow,’ in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” They also disallowed the forbidding of marriage at certain times of the year, and then licensing it for money (say they) is more intolerable. Nor is it lawful to grant licenses that some may marry without the know­ledge of the congregation, who ought to be acquainted with it, lest there should be any secret lets or hindrances.”

7. To the wearing of the surplice, and other ceremonies to be used in divine service; concerning which the church says, in the preface to her liturgy, that though they were devised by men, yet they are reserved for decency, order, and edification. And again, they are apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edi­fied. But the Puritans saw no decency in the vestments; nay, they thought them a disgrace to the Reformation, and in the present circumstances absolutely unlawful, because they had been defiled with superstition and idolatry; and because many pretended Protestants placed a kind of holiness in them. Besides, the wearing them gave countenance to Popery, and looked as if we were fond of being thought a branch of that communion, which we had so justly renounced. But suppose them to be indifferent, they gave great offence to weak minds, and therefore ought not to be imposed, when there was no foundation for the use of them in Scripture or primitive antiquity.

These things, say they, every one should endeavour to reform in his place, ministers by the word, magistrates by their authority, according to the word of God, and the peo­ple by prayer.

There was no difference in points of doctrine between the Puritans and Conformists:[[1]](#footnote-1) so that if we add but one article more, we have the chief head of controversy between the church of England and the Protestant dissenters at that day; and this is the natural right that every man has to judge for himself, and make profession of that religion he apprehends most agreeable to truth, as far as it does not affect the peace and safety of the government he lives under; without being determined by the prejudices of education, the laws of the civil magistrate, or the decrees of councils, churches, or synods.[[2]](#footnote-2) This principle would effectually put an end to all impositions; and unless it be allowed, I am afraid our separation from the church of Rome can hardly be justified. The Bible, says Mr. Chillingworth, and that only, is the religion of Protestants; and every one, by making use of the helps and assistances that God has put into his hands, must learn and understand it for himself as well as he can.

It will appear hereafter what sort of discipline the Puri­tans would have introduced; but these were the objections that hindered their compliance with the present establish­ment, and for which they were content to suffer the loss of all things. Those who remained within the church became itinerant preachers, lecturers, or chaplains. The chief leaders of the separation, according to Mr. Fuller, were the reverend Mr. Colman, Mr. Button, Mr. Halingham, Mr. Benson, Mr. White, Mr. Rowland, and Mr. Hawkins, all beneficed within the diocese of London. These had their followers of the laity, who forsook their parish churches, and assembled with the deprived ministers in woods and private houses, to worship God without the habits and ceremonies of the church.

The queen, being informed of their proceedings, sent to her commissioners to take effectual measures to keep the laity to their parish-churches, and to let them know, that if they frequented any separate conventicles, or broke through the ecclesiastical laws, they should for the first offence be deprived of their freedom of the city of London, and after that abide what farther punishment she should direct. This was a vast stretch of the prerogative;[[3]](#footnote-3) there being no law as yet to disfranchise any man for not coming to church.

But notwithstanding this threatening message, they went on with their assemblies, and, on the 19th of June 1567, agreed to have a sermon and a communion at Plumbers’-hall, which they hired for that day under pretence of a wed­ding; but here the sheriffs of London detected and broke them up, when they were assembled to the number of about one hundred; most of them were taken into custody, and some sent to the Compter, and next day seven or eight of the chief were brought before the bishop of London, dean Goodman, Mr. archdeacon Watts, and sir Roger Martin, lord-mayor of London.[[4]](#footnote-4) The bishop charged them with absenting from their parish-churches, and with setting up separate assemblies for prayer and preaching, and minister­ing the sacrament.—He told them, that by these proceed­ings they condemned the church of England, which was well reformed according to the word, of God, and those martyrs who had shed their blood for it. To which one of them replied, in the name of the rest, that they condemned them not, but only stood for the truth of God’s word. Then the bishop asked the ancientest of them, Mr. John Smith, what he could answer? who replied, “that they thanked God for the Reformation; that as long as they could hear the word of God. preached without idolatrous gear about it, they never assembled in private houses; but when it came to this point, that all their preachers were displaced who would not subscribe to the apparel, so that they could hear none of them in the church, for the space of seven or eight weeks, except father Coverdale, they be­gan to consult what to do; and remembering there had been a congregation of Protestants in the city of London in queen Mary’s days, and another of English exiles at Geneva, that used a book framed by them there, they resolved to meet privately together, and use the said book.” And, finally, Mr. Smith offered, in the name of the rest, to yield, and do penance at St. Paul’s cross, if the bishop and the commissioners with him, could reprove that book, or any thing else that they held, by the word of God.

The bishop told him, they could not reprove the book, but that was no sufficient answer for his not going to church.[[5]](#footnote-5) To which Mr. Smith replied, that “he would as soon go to mass as to some churches, and particularly to his own parish-church; for the minister that officiated there was a very Papist.” Others said the same of other parish-priests. The bishop asked, if they accused any of them by name; upon which one of them presently named Mr. Bedel, who was there present, but the bishop would not inquire into the accusation.

The dean of Westminster, who was one of the ecclesias­tical commission, charged them with derogating from the queen’s authority of appointing indifferent things in God’s worship. To which one of them answered, that “it lay not in the authority of a prince, nor the liberty of a Christian man, to use and defend that which appertained to Papistry, idolatry, and the pope’s canon law.” Another said, that these things were preferred before the word of God and the ordinances of Christ.” The bishop asked them what was preferred? one of them answered boldly, “that which was upon the bishop’s head, and upon his back; their copes and surplices, and canon laws.” Another said, “that he thought both prince and people ought to obey the word of God.” To which the bishop yielded, except in things that were indifferent, which God had neither commanded nor forbidden; in these he asserted, that princes had authority to order and command. Whereupon several of them cried out, “Prove that,—where find you that?” But the bishop would not enter into the debate, alleging the judgment of the learned Bullinger; to which Mr. Smith replied, that perhaps they could show Bullinger against Bullinger, in the affair of the habits.

The bishop asked them, whether they would be deter­mined by the church of Geneva? Mr. Smith replied, “that they reverenced the learned in Geneva, and in other places, but did not build their faith and religion upon them.” The bishop produced the following passage out of one of Beza’s letters; against them; “that against the bishops and prince’s will, they should exercise their office, they [the ministers of Geneva] did much the more tremble at it.” “Mark (says the bishop) how the learned Beza trembles at your case.” Whereupon one of them said they knew the let­ter well enough, and that it made nothing against them, but rather against the prince and the bishops. Beza and his learned brethren trembled at their case, in proceeding to such extremities with men, as to drive them against their wills to that which they did not care to mention. Their words are these; “We hope that her royal majesty, and so many men of dignity and goodness, will endeavour that care may rather be taken of so many pious and learned brethren, than so great an evil should happen, to wit, that the pastors should be forced, against their consciences, to do that which is evil, and so to involve themselves in other men’s sins, or to give over; for we more dread that third thing, viz. to exercise their ministry contrary to the will of her majesty and the bishops, for causes, which though we hold our peace, may well enough be understood.”[[6]](#footnote-6) How the bishop could think this was levelled against the Nonconformists is hard to understand.

To go on with the examination. One of the prisoners said, that “before they compelled the ceremonies, so that none might officiate without them, all was quiet.” Another (viz. Mr. Hawkins) produced a passage out of Me- lancthon, that “when the opinion of holiness, or necessity, is put unto things indifferent, they darken the light of the gospel.” The bishop replied, “that the ceremonies and habits were not commanded of necessity.” To which Haw­kins rejoined, that they had made them matters of necessity, as many a poor man had felt to his cost, who had been dis­charged of his living for nonconformity. When the bishop had occasionally observed, that he had formerly said mass, but was sorry for it, one of them answered, he went still in the habit of a mass-priest. To which he replied, that he had rather minister without a cope and surplice, but for order’s sake and obedience to the queen. When some of the commissioners urged them with the Reformation of king Edward, one said that “they never went so far in his time, as to make a law that none should preach or minister with­out the garments.” Sundry other expressions of warmth passed on both sides; at length one of them delivered to justice Harris their book of order [the Geneva book], and challenged any of the commissioners to disprove it by the word of God, and they would give over. The bishop said they reproved it not, but they liked not their separate assem­blies to trouble the common quiet of the realm against the queen’s will. But the others insisted on their superior re­gards to the word of God. In conclusion, the prisoners, not yielding to the bishop, were sent to Bridewell, where they, with their brethren, and sundry women, were kept in durance above a year: at length, their patience and con­stancy having been sufficiently tried, an order was sent from the lords of the council to release them;[[7]](#footnote-7) with an admonition to behave themselves better for the future.[[8]](#footnote-8) Accordingly twenty-four men and seven women were discharged.[[9]](#footnote-9) Whether these severities were justifiable by the laws of God or the land, I leave with the reader.

There was a spirit of uncommon zeal in these people to suffer all extremities for the cause in which they were engaged. In one of their letters, directed to all the brethren that believed in Christ, the writer, who was but a layman, says,—“The reason why we will not hear our parish­-ministers, is, because they will not stand forth and defend the gospel against the leavings of Popery, for fear of loss of goods, or punishment of body, or danger of imprison­ment, or else for fear of men more than God.” He then calls up their courage, “Awake, O ye cold and lukewarm preachers, out of sleep; gird up yourselves with the truth; come forth and put your necks [to the yoke], and think with Peter, that persecution is no strange thing; for which of the prophets were not persecuted as well as Christ and his apostles; not for evil doing, but for preaching God’s word, and for rebuking the world of sin, and for their faith in Jesus Christ? This is the ordinance of God, and this is the highway to heaven, by corporeal death to eternal life, as Christ saith, John v. Let us never fear death, that is killed [conquered] by Christ, but believe in him and live for ever. ‘There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ.’ ‘O death! where is thy sting? thanks be to God that has given us the victory.’—Let us not then dissemble, as some do, to save their pigs, but be valiant for the truth. Idoubt not, but all they who believe the truth, and will obey it, will consider the cause;[[10]](#footnote-10) and the Lord, for his Christ’s sake, make Ephraim and Manasses to agree, that we may all with one heart and mind unfeignedly seek God’s glory, and the edification of his people, that we may live in all godly peace, unity, and concord! This grant, O Lord, for Christ Jesus’ sake, to whom with thee, and the Holy Ghost, be all praise, glory, and honour, for ever and ever.”

Another in a letter to bishop Grindal, occasioned by his lordship’s discourse to the prisoner at his examination be­fore him, December 19, begins thus; “Please thy our wis­dom, my duty remembered, &c. being grieved at certain words spoken by you, and at your extreme dealing with us of late, I am bold to utter my grief in this manner. You said, if discipline did not tend to peace and unity, it were better refused; whereas our Saviour Christ commandeth discipline as one part of the gospel, most necessary for the church’s peace and order; the apostles practised it, and Mr. Calvin and other learned men, call it the sinews of the church, that keep the members together; and Beza says, where discipline is wanting, there will be a licentious life and a school of wickedness.—Secondly, You seemed to be offended with a late exercise of prayer and fasting, saying, that you had not heard of any exercise of this kind without consent of public authority; to which the example of the Ninevites plainly answers, who proclaimed a fast before they acquainted the king with it; nor did the king blame his subjects for going before him in well-doing, but approved it by doing the like.—Thirdly, You said, you would never ask God mercy for using the apparel;[[11]](#footnote-11) and should appear before him with a better conscience than we; whereas you said in a sermon, as many can witness, that you was sorry, for that you knew you should offend many godly consciences by wearing this apparel; requiring your auditory to have patience for a time, for that you did but use them for a time, to the end you might the sooner abolish them: and now you displace, banish, persecute, and imprison, such as will not wear, nor consent thereunto, and at the same time say, you fear not to appear before God for so doing. But if the Corinthians, for eating meat to the offence of their brethren, are said to sin against Christ, how much more do you, who not only retain the remnants of antichrist, but compel others to the same? Better were it for you to leave your lordly dignity, not given you by Christ, and to suffer affliction for the truth of the gospel, than by enjoying thereof to become a persecutor of your brethren. Con­sider, I pray you, if throughout the whole Scriptures you can find one, that was first a persecutor, and after was per­secuted for the truth, that ever fell to persecuting again and repented. I desire you, in the bowels of Christ, to consider your own case, who by your own confession was once a persecutor, and have since been persecuted; whether displacing, banishing, and imprisoning God’s children more straitly than felons, heretics, or traitors, be persecuting again or no? They that make the best of it, say, you buffet your brethren, which if the master of the house find you so doing you know your reward. I desire you, therefore, in the bowels of Christ, not to restrain us of the liberty of our consciences, but be a means to enlarge our liberty in the truth and sincerity of the gospel; and use your interest, that all the remnants of antichrist may be abolished, with every plant that our heavenly Father has not planted. Signed, Yours in the Lord to command, William White, who joineth with you in every speck of truth, but utterly detesteth whole antichrist, head, body, and tail, never to join with you, or any, in the least joint thereof; nor in any ordinance of man, contrary to the word of God, by his grace unto the church.”

But neither the arguments nor sufferings of the Puritans, nor their great and undissembled piety, had an influence upon the commissioners, who had their spies in all sus­pected places, to prevent their religious assemblies; and gave out strict orders, that no clergyman should be per­mitted to preach in any of the pulpits of London, without a licence from the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of London.

The persecution of the Protestants in France and the Low Countries was hot and terrible about this time. The king of France broke through all his edicts, for the free exercise of the reformed religion; he banished their minis­ters, and much blood was spilt in their religious wars. In the Netherlands the duke d’Alva breathed out nothing but blood and slaughter, putting multitudes to death for religion. This occasioned great numbers to fly into Eng­land, which multiplied the Dutch churches in Norwich, Colchester, Sandwich, Canterbury, Maidstone, Southamp­ton, London, Southwark, and elsewhere. The queen, for their encouragement, allowed them the liberty of their own mode of worship, and as they brought their manufactures over with them, they proved very beneficial to ths trade and commerce of the nation.

Even in England the hearts of all good men were ready to fail, for fear of the return of Popish idolatry; the queen being suddenly seized with a severe fit of sickness this sum­mer [1568], which brought her to the very point of death, and the presumptive heir, Mary, late queen of Scots, being a bigoted Papist. The queen, together with her bodily distemper, was under great terror of mind for her sins, and for not discharging the duty of her high station as she ought: she said, she had forgotten her God! to whom she had made many vows, and been unthankful to him. Prayers were composed, and publicly read in all churches for her majesty’s recovery, in which they petitioned, that God would heal her soul, and cure her mind as well as her body. The Papists were never more sanguine in their ex­pectations, nor the Reformation in greater danger, than now; and yet Bridewell and other prisons were full of Puritans, as appears by a manuscript letter of Mr. Thomas Lever, now before me, dated December 5, 1568, in which he endeavours to comfort the prisoners, and declares, that though the Popish garments and ceremonies were not un­clean in themselves,[[12]](#footnote-12) yet he was determined for himself, by God’s grace, never to wear the square cap and surplice, because they tended neither to decency nor edification, but to offence, dissension, and division, in the church of Christ: nor would he kneel at the communion, because it was a sym­bolizing with Popery, and looked too much like the adora­tion of the host. But at length it pleased Almighty God to dissipate for the present the clouds that hung over the Re­formation, by the queen’s recovery,

[[13]](#footnote-13)This year was published the Bible in folio, called the Bishops’ Bible, with a preface by archbishop Parker. It was only Cranmer’s translation revised and corrected by several bishops and learned men, whose names may be seen in the Records of bishop Burnet’s History of the Reforma­tion.—The design was to set aside the Geneva translation, which had given offence. In the beginning, before the Book of Genesis, is a map of the land of Canaan; before the .New Testament is inserted a map of the places men­tioned in the four evangelists, and the journeys of Christ and his apostles. There are various cuts dispersed through the book, and several genealogical and chronological ta­bles, with the arms of divers noblemen, particularly those of Cranmer and Parker. There are also some references and marginal notes, for the explication of difficult passages.[[14]](#footnote-14) This was the Bible that was read in the churches till the last translation of king James I. took place.

But there was another storm gathering abroad, which threatened the Reformation all over Europe; most of the popish princes having entered into a league to extirpate it out of the world: the principal confederates were, the pope, the emperor, the kings of Spain, France, and Portugal; with the duke of Savoy, and some lesser princes: their agreement was, to endeavour by force of arms to depose all Protestant kings or potentates, and to place Catholics in their room; and to displace, banish, and condemn to death, all well-wishers, and assistants of the clergy of Luther and Calvin, while the pope was to thunder out his anathemas against the queen of England, to interdict the kingdom, and to absolve her subjects from their allegiance. In prosecu­tion of this league, war was already begun in France, Hol­land, and in several parts of Germany, with unheard-of cruelties against the reformed. Under these difficulties, the Protestant princes of Germany entered into a league, for their common defence, and invited the queen of England to accede to it. Her majesty sent sir Henry Killigrew over to the elector palatine with a handsome excuse; and at the same time ordered her ambassador in France, to offer her mediation between that king and his Protestant subjects: but the confederacy was not to be broken by treaties; upon which her majesty, by way of self-defence, and to ward off the storm from her own kingdom, assisted the confederate Protestants of France and Holland, with men and money. This was the second time the queen had supported them in their religious wars against their natural kings. The foreign Popish princes reproached her for it; and her majesty’s mi­nisters had much ado to reconcile it to the court-doctrines of passive obedience and nonresistance.

At home the Papists were in motion, having vast expec­tations from certain prophecies, that the queen should not reign above twelve years; their numbers were formidable; and such was their latitude, that it was not easy to bring them within the verge of the laws. In Lancashire the Com­mon Prayer-book was laid aside, churches were shut up, and the mass celebrated openly. The queen sent down com­missioners of inquiry, but all they could do was to bind some of the principal gentlemen to their good behaviour in recognizances of one hundred marks.[[15]](#footnote-15) Two of the colleges of Oxford, viz. New-college and Corpus Christi, were so overrun with Papists, that the bishop of Winchester their visitor was forced to break open the gates of the college, and send for the ecclesiastical commission to reduce them to order.[[16]](#footnote-16) Great numbers of Papists harboured in the inns of court, and in several other places of public resort, ex­pecting with impatience the death of the queen, and the succession of the presumptive heir, Mary, late queen of Scotland.

Towards the latter end of the year, the earls of Northum­berland and Westmoreland, with their friends, to the num­ber of four thousand, broke out into open rebellion; their pretence was, to restore the Popish religion, and deliver the queen of Scots. In the city of Durham they tore the Bible and Common Prayer-book to pieces, and restored the mass in all places wherever they came; but hearing of the ad­vance of the queen’s army under the earl of Suffolk, they fled northward, and mouldered away, without standing a battle: the earl of Northumberland was taken in Scotland, and executed at York, with many of his confederates; but the earl of Westmoreland escaped into Flanders, and died in poverty. No sooner was this rebellion over but the lord Dacres excited another on the borders of Scotland; but after a small skirmish with the governor of Berwick he was de­feated and fled, and the rabble were pardoned. There was a general commotion among the Papists in all parts of the kingdom, who would have united their forces, if the northern rebels had maintained their ground.

To give new life to the Catholic Cause, the pope pub­lished a bull, excommunicating the queen, and absolving her subjects from their allegiance. In this bull he calls her majesty a usurper, and a vassal of iniquity; and having given some instances of her aversion to the Catholic religion, he declares “her a heretic, and an encourager of heretics, and anathematizes all that adhere to her. He deprives her of her royal crown and dignity, and absolves all her subjects from all obligations of fidelity and obedience.[[17]](#footnote-17) He involves all those in the same sentence of excommunication, who presume to obey her orders, commands, or laws, for the fu­ture; and excites all foreign potentates to take up arms against her.” This alarmed the administration, and put them upon their guard; but it quickly appeared that the pope’s thunderbolts had lost their terror; for the Roman Catholic princes not being forward to encourage the court of Rome’s pretended power of excommunicating princes, continued their correspondence with the queen; and her own Roman Catholic subjects remained pretty quiet; though from this time they separated openly from the church. But the queen took hold of the opportunity to require all jus­tices of peace, and other officers in commission, throughout all the counties in England, to subscribe their names to an instrument, professing their conformity and obedience to the act of uniformity in religion, and for due resorting to their parish-churches to hear common-prayer. This affected Puritans as well as Papists. The gentlemen of the inns of court were also cited before the ecclesiastical commission, and examined about their resorting to church, and receiv­ing the sacrament, of which most of them were very negli­gent. This raised a clamour, as if the queen intended to ransack into men’s consciences; in answer to which she published a declaration, that she had no such intention,. “that she did not inquire into the sentiments of people’s mind, but only required an external conformity to the laws; and that all that came to the church, and observed her in­junctions, should be deemed good subjects.” So that if men would be hypocrites, her majesty would leave them to God; but if they would not conform, they must suffer the law.

When the next parliament met they passed a law making it high treason to declare the queen to be a heretic, schis­matic, tyrant, infidel, or usurper; to publish or put in use the pope’s bulls; to be reconciled to the church of Rome, or to receive absolution by virtue of them:[[18]](#footnote-18) the concealing or not discovering offenders against this act, is misprision of treason. A protestation was likewise drawn up, to be taken by all reputed Papists, in these words: “I do profess and confess before God, that queen Elizabeth, my sovereign lady, now reigning in England, is rightfully, and ought to be and continue, queen, and lawfully beareth the imperial crown of these realms, notwithstanding any act or sentence that any pope or bishop has done or given, or can do or give, and that if any pope, or other, say or judge to the contrary, whether he say it as pope, or howsoever, he erreth and affirmeth, holdeth and teacheth, error.” And that the Puritans might not escape without some note of disloyalty, another protestation was drawn up for them;[[19]](#footnote-19) in which they pro­fess before God, that “they believe in their consciences, that queen Elizabeth is and ought to be lawful queen of England, notwithstanding any act or sentence, that any church, synod, consistory, or ecclesiastical assembly, hath done or given, or can give; and that if any say or judge the contrary, in what respect soever he saith it, he erreth and affirmeth, holdeth and teacheth, error and falsehood.”

There was no manner of occasion for this last protesta­tion; for in the midst of these commotions the Puritans continued the queen’s faithful and dutiful subjects, and served her majesty as chaplains in her armies and navy, though they were not admitted into the churches. One would have thought the formidable conspiracies of the Ro­man Catholics should have alienated the queen’s heart from them, and prevailed with her majesty to yield something, for the sake of a firmer union among her Protestant sub­jects: but instead of this, the edge of the laws that were made against Popish recusants, was turned against Protest­ant Nonconformists, which instead of bringing them into the church, like all other methods of severity, drove them farther from it.

This year [1570] died Mr. Andrew Kingsmill, born in Hampshire, and educated in All-Souls college, Oxon, of which he was elected fellow in 1558. He had such a strong memory, that he could readily rehearse in the Greek lan­guage, all St. Paul’s Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and other portions of Scripture *memoritor.* He was a most pious and religious person, undervaluing all worldly profit, in comparison of the assurance of his salvation. In the year 1563, there were only three preachers in the university, of whom Kingsmill was one; but after some time, when con­formity was pressed, and Sampson deprived of his deanery, he withdrew from the kingdom, resolving to live in one ot the best reformed churches for doctrine and discipline, the better to prepare himself for the service of the church;[[20]](#footnote-20) ac­cordingly he lived three years at Geneva, from thence he removed to Lausanne, where he died this year, in the prime of his days, leaving behind him an excellent pattern of piety, devotion, and all manner of virtue.

The rigorous execution of the penal laws, made business for the civilians; many were cited into the spiritual courts, and after long attendance, and great charges, were suspend­ed or deprived; the pursuivant, or messenger of the court, was paid by the mile; the fees were exorbitant, which the prisoner must satisfy before he is discharged; the method of proceeding was dilatory and vexatious, though they sel­dom called any witnesses to support the charge, but usually tendered the defendant an oath, to answer the interrogato­ries of the court; and if he refused the oath, they examined him without it, and convicted him upon his own confession; if the prisoner was dismissed, he was almost ruined, with the costs, and bound in a recognizance to appear again whensoever the court should require him. We shall meet with many sad examples of such proceedings in the latter part of this reign. The honest Puritans made conscience of not denying any thing they were charged with, if it was true, though they might certainly have put the accusers on proof of the charge: nay, most of them thought themselves bound to confess the truth, and bear a public testimony to it, before the civil magistrate, though it was made use of to their dis- advantage.[[21]](#footnote-21)

The controversy with the church, which had hitherto been chiefly confined to the habits, to the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the Lord’s supper, began now to open into several more considerable branches, by the lectures of the reverend Mr. Thomas Cartwright, B.D. fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge, and lady Margaret’s professor, a cou­rageous man, a popular preacher, a profound scholar, and master of an elegant Latin style; he was in high esteem in the university, his lectures being frequented by vast crowds of scholars; and when he preached at St. Mary’s they were forced to take down the windows. Beza says of him, that he thought there was not a more learned man under the sun. This divine, in his lectures, disputed against certain blemishes of the English hierarchy, and particularly against these six, which he subscribed with his own hand:[[22]](#footnote-22)

“The names and functions of archbishops and arch­deacons ought to be abolished, as having no foundation in Scripture.—The offices of the lawful ministers of the church, viz. bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to the apostolical institution; the bishops to preach the word of God and pray, and deacons to take care of the poor.—The government of the church ought not to be intrusted with bishops’ chancellors, or the officials of archdeacons; but every church should be governed by its own minister and presbyters.—Ministers ought not to be at large, but every one should have the charge of a certain flock.—No­body should ask, or stand as a candidate, for the ministry.—Bishops should not be created by civil authority, but ought to be fairly chosen by the church.”

These propositions are said to be untrue, dangerous, and tending to the ruin of learning and religion; they were therefore sent to secretary Cecil, chancellor of the uni­versity, who advised the vice-chancellor to silence the author, or oblige him to recant. Cartwright challenged Dr. Whitgift, who preached against him, to a public dispu­tation, which he refused, unless he had the queen’s licence; and Whitgift offered a private debate by writing, which, the other declined, as answering no valuable purpose.

Other dangerous and seditious propositions, as they were called, were collected out of Cartwright’s lectures, and sent to court by Dr. Whitgift, to incense the queen and chan­cellor against him. As,

1. “In reforming the church, it is necessary to reduce all things to the apostolical institution.

2. “No man ought to be admitted into the ministry, but who is capable of preaching.

3. “None but such a minister of the word ought to pray publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments.

4. “Popish ordinations are not valid.

*5.* “Only canonical Scripture ought to be read publicly in the church.

6. “The public liturgy should be so framed, that there be no private praying or reading in the church, but that all the people attend to the prayers of the minister.

7. “The care of burying the dead, does not belong more to the ministerial office, than to the rest of the church.

8. “Equal reverence is due to all canonical Scripture, and to all the names of God; there is therefore no reason why the people should stand at the reading of the gospel, or bow at the name of Jesus.

9. “It is as lawful to sit at the Lord’s table, as to kneel or stand.

10. “The Lord’s supper ought not to be administered in private; nor should baptism be administered by women or lay-persons.

11. “The sign of the cross in baptism is superstitious.

12. “It is reasonable and proper, that the parent should offer his own child to baptism, making a confession of that faith he intends to educate it in, without being obliged to answer in the child’s name, I will, I will not, I believe, &c. nor ought it to be allowed, that women, or persons under age, should be sponsors.

13. “In giving names to children, it is convenient to avoid Paganism, as well as the names and offices of Christ, angels, &c.

14. “It is Papistical to forbid marriages at certain times of the year; and to give licences in those times is intolerable.

15. “Private marriages, that is, such as are not published before the congregation, are highly inconvenient.

lb. “The observation of Lent, and fasting on Fridays and Saturdays, is superstitious.

17.“The observation of festivals is unlawful.

18; “Trading or keeping markets on the Lord’s day, is unlawful.

19. “In ordaining of the ministers the pronouncing those words, ‘Receive thou the Holy Ghost’ is both ridiculous and wicked,

20. “Kings and bishops should not be anointed.”

These were Cartwright’s dangerous doctrines, which he touched occasionally in his lectures, but with no design to create discord, as appears by a testimonial sent to the se­cretary of state in his favour, signed by fifteen considerable names in the university; in which they declare, that they had heard his lectures, and, that “he never touched upon the controversy of the habits; and though he had advanced some propositions with regard to the ministry, according to which he wished things might be regulated, he did it with all imaginable caution and modesty.”[[23]](#footnote-23) Other letters were written in his favour, signed by twenty names or upwards, of whom some were afterward bishops, but it was resolved to make him an example. Cartwright himself sent an ele­gant Latin letter to the secretary, in which he declares, that he waived all occasions of speaking concerning the habits, but owns he had taught that our ministry declined from the ministry of the apostolical church in some points, according to which he wished it might be modelled; how­ever, that he did this with all imaginable caution, as almost the whole university would witness, if they might be al­lowed. He prayed the secretary to hear and judge the cause himself; which was so far from novelty, that it was as venerable for its antiquity as the apostolic age; but though the secretary was convinced,[[24]](#footnote-24) that his behaviour was free from arrogancy, or an intention to cause trouble, and that only as a public reader in the university, he had given notes of the difference between the ministry in the times of the apostles, and the present ministry of the church of England, yet he left him to the mercy of his enemies, who poured upon him all the infamy and disgrace their power would admit. They first denied him his degree of doctor in divinity, then forbade his reading public lectures, and at last deprived him of his fellowship, and expelled him the university. A short and compendious way of confuting an adversary!

Mr. Cartwright being now out of all employment, tra­velled beyond sea, and settled a correspondence with the most celebrated divines in the Protestant universities of Europe. While he was abroad he was chosen minister to the English merchants at Antwerp, and afterward at Middleburgh, where he continued two years with little or no profit to himself; and then returning to England, being earnestly solicited thereunto by letters from Mr. Deering, Fulk, Wiburne, Fox, and Lever, we shall hear more of the sufferings of this eminent divine for his nonconformity.[[25]](#footnote-25)

This year [1570] Grindal bishop of London being trans­lated to York, Sandys bishop of Worcester was removed to London; in his primary visitation, Jan. 10, he charged his clergy, 1. To keep strictly to the Book of Common Prayer. 2. Not to preach without a licence. 3. To wear the apparel, that is, the square cap and scholar’s gown, and in divine service, the surplice. 4. Not to admit any of other parishes to their communion. He also ordered all clerks’ tolerations to be called in; by which it appears that some few of the Non­conformists had been tolerated, or dispensed with hitherto, but now this was at an end.[[26]](#footnote-26) However, the Puritans en­couraged one another by conversation and letters, to stead­fastness in opposition to the corruptions of the church, and not to fear the resentments of their adversaries.

There was a spirit in the parliament, which was convened April 2, 1571, to attempt something in favour of the Puri­tans, upon whom the bishops bore harder every day than other. Mr. Strickland, an ancient gentleman, offered a bill for a farther reformation in the church, April 6, and intro­duced it with a speech, proving, that the Common Prayer­book, with some superstitious remains of Popery in the church, might easily be altered without any danger to re­ligion. He enforced it with a second speech, April 13, upon which the treasurer of the queen’s household stood up, and said, “All matters of ceremonies were to be referred to the queen, and for them to meddle with the royal prerogative was not convenient.” Her majesty was so displeased with Mr. Strickland’s motion, that she sent for him before the council, and forbade him the parliament-house, which alarm­ed the members, and occasioned so many warm speeches, that she thought fit to restore him on the 20th of April. This was a bold stroke at the freedom of parliaments, and carrying the prerogative to its utmost length. But Mr. Strickland moved farther, that a confession of faith should be published and confirmed by parliament, as it was in other Protestant countries; and that a committee might be appointed to confer with the bishops on this head. The committee drew up certain articles, according to those which passed the convo­cation of 1562, but left out others. The archbishop asked them, why they left out the article for homilies, and for the consecrating of bishops, and some others relating to the hierarchy. Mr. Peter Wentworth replied, because they had not yet examined how far they were agreeable to the word of God, having confined themselves chiefly to doctrines.—The archbishop replied, Surely you will refer yourselves wholly to us the bishops in these things? To which. Mr. Wentworth replied, warmly, “No, by the faith I bear to God, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is, for that were but to make you popes. Make you popes who list, for we will make you none.” So the articles relating to discipline were waived, and an act was passed, con­firming all the doctrinal articles agreed upon in the synod of 1562.

The act is entitled, “For reformation of disorders in the ministers of the church;”[[27]](#footnote-27) “and enjoins all that have any ecclesiastical livings, to declare their assent before the bishop of the diocess to all the articles of religion, which only concern the confession of the true faith, and the doc­trine of the sacraments, comprised in the book imprinted, and entitled, ‘Articles, whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops, &c. and the whole clergy, in the convocation of 1562, for avoiding diversity of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion;’ and to subscribe them; which was to be testified by the bishop of the diocese, under his seal; which testimonial he was to read publicly with the said articles, as the con­fession of his faith, in his church on Sunday, in the time of divine service, or else to be deprived. If any clergyman maintained any doctrine repugnant to the said articles, the bishop might deprive him. None were to be admitted to any benefice with cure, except he was a deacon of the age of twenty-three years, and would subscribe, and declare his unfeigned assent to the articles above mentioned. Nor might any administer the sacraments under twenty-four years of age.”

It appears from the words of this statute, that those ar­ticles of the church which relate to its discipline were not designed to be the terms of ministerial conformity; and if the queen and the bishops had governed themselves accord­ingly, the separation had been stifled in its infancy; for there was hardly a Puritan in England that refused sub­scription to the doctrinal articles: if all the thirty-nine ar­ticles had been established, there had been no need of the following clause, “which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments.” And yet notwithstanding this act, many that held benefices and ecclesiastical preferments, and that offered to conform to the statute, were deprived in the following part of this reign; which was owing to the bishops’ servile compliance with the prerogative, and pressing subscription to more than the law required.[[28]](#footnote-28)

It deserves farther to be taken notice of, that by a clause in this act the parliament admits of ordination by presby­ters without a bishop; which was afterward disallowed by the bishops in this reign, as well as at the restoration of king Charles II. when the church was deprived of great numbers of learned and useful preachers, who scrupled the matter of reordination, as they would at this time, if it had been insisted on. Many of the present clergy had been ex­iles for religion, and had been ordained abroad, according to the custom of foreign churches, but would not be re­ordained, any more than those of the Popish communion; therefore to put an end to all disputes the statute includes both; the words are these, “that every person under the degree of a bishop, that doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God’s word and sacraments, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than the form set forth in parliament in the time of the late king Ed­ward VI. or now used in the reign of our most sovereign lady queen Elizabeth, shall, before Christmas next, declare his assent, and subscribe the articles aforesaid.” The mean­ing of which clause, says Mr. Strype, is undoubtedly to comprehend Papists, and likewise such as received their orders in some of the foreign reformed churches, when they were in exile under queen Mary.[[29]](#footnote-29)

It is probable that the controverted clause of the twentieth article, “the church has power to decree rites and ceremo­nies, and authority in controversies of faith,” was not among the articles of 1562, as has been shown under that year; though it might be (according to Laud and Heylin) inserted in the convocation-book of 1751, but what has this to do with the act of parliament, which refers to a book printed nine years before? besides, it is absurd to charge the Puri­tans with striking out the clause, as archbishop Laud has done; they having no share in the government of the church at this time, nor interest to obtain the least abatement in their favour; nor does it appear that they disapproved the clause under proper regulations: one might rather suppose, that the queen should take umbrage at it as an invasion of her prerogative, and that therefore some zealous church­man, finding the articles defective upon the head of the church’s authority, might insert it privately, to avoid the danger of a præmunire.

But after all, subscription to the doctrinal articles of the church only, has been reckoned a very great grievance by many pious and learned divines, both in church and out of it; for it is next to impossible to frame thirty-six proposi­tions in any human words, to which ten thousand clergymen can give their hearty assent and consent. Some that agree to the doctrine itself may dissent from the words and phrases by which it is expressed; and others that agree to the capital doctrines of Christianity, may have some doubts about the deeper and more abstruse points of speculation. It would be hard to deprive a man of his living, and shut him out from all usefulness in the church, because he doubts of the local descent of Christ into hell; or, whether the best actions of men before their conversion have the nature of sins;[[30]](#footnote-30) or that every thing in the three creeds, commonly called the Apostles’, the Nicene, and the Athanasian,[[31]](#footnote-31) may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture, and are there­fore to be believed and received.+ Wise and good men may have different sentiments upon the doctrine of the decrees, which are a depth which no man can fathom. These, and some other things, have galled the consciences of the clergy, and driven them to evasions destructive to morality, and the peace of their own minds. Some have subscribed them as articles of peace, contrary to the very title, which says, they “are for avoiding the diversity of opinions.” Others have tortured the. words to a meaning contrary to the known sense of the compilers. Some subscribe them with a secret reserve, as far as they are agreeable to the word of God; and so they may subscribe the council of Trent, or even Mahomet’s Alcoran. Others subscribe them not as doctrines which they believe, but as doctrines that they will not openly contradict and oppose; and others, I am informed, put no sense upon the articles at all, but only subscribe them as a test of their obedience to their superiors, who require this of them as the legal way to preferment in the church. How hard must it be for men of learning and pro­bity to submit to these shifts! when no kinds of subscriptions can be a barrier against ignorant or dishonest minds. Of what advantage is uniformity of profession without an agreement in principles? If the fundamental articles of our faith were drawn up in the language of Holy Scripture; or if those who were appointed to examine into the learning and other qualifications of ministers, were to be judges of their orthodox confessions of faith, it would answer a bet­ter purpose than subscription to human creeds and articles. Though the commons were forbid to concern themselves with the discipline of the church, they ventured to present an address to the queen,[[32]](#footnote-32) complaining, “that for lack of true discipline in the church, great numbers are admitted ministers that are infamous in their lives and conversations; and among those that are of ability, their gifts in many places are useless, by reason of pluralities and nonresidency, whereby infinite numbers of your majesty’s subjects are like to perish for lack of knowledge. By means of this, together with the common blaspheming of the Lord’s name, the most wicked licentiousness of life, the abuse of excom­munication, the commutation of penance, the great numbers of atheists, schismatics daily springing up, and the increase of Papists, the Protestant religion is in imminent danger'; wherefore in regard first and principally to the glory of God, and next in discharge of our bounden duty to your majesty; besides, being moved with pity towards so many thousands of your majesty’s subjects, daily in danger of being lost for want of the food of the word, and true dis­cipline; we the commons in this present parliament as­sembled, are humbly bold to open the griefs, and to seek the salving of the sores of our country, and to beseech your majesty, seeing the same is of so great importance, if the parliament at this time may not be so long continued, as that by good and godly laws provision may be made for supply and reformation of these great and grievous wants and abuses, that yet by such other means, as to your majes­ty’s wisdom shall seem meet, a perfect redress of the same may be had; by which the number of your majesty’s faithful subjects will be increased, Popery will be destroyed, the glory of God will be promoted, and your majesty’s renown will be recommended to all posterity.” But the queen broke up the parliament without taking any notice of the suppli­cation.

The convocation which sat with this parliament assem­bled April 3d, 1571, when the reverend Mr. Gilbert Alcock presented a supplication to them in behalf of the deprived ministers, praying their interest with the queen for a redress of their grievances:[[33]](#footnote-33) “If a godly minister (says he) omit but the least ceremony, for conscience’ sake, he is immediate­ly indicted, deprived, cast into prison, and his goods wasted and destroyed; he is kept from his wife and children, and at last excommunicated. We therefore beseech your fatherhoods to pity our case, and take from us these stumbling-­blocks.” But the convocation were of another spirit, and, instead of removing their burdens, increased them; by framing certain new canons of discipline against the Puri­tans; as, that the bishops should call in all their licences for preaching, and give out new ones to those who were best qualified;[[34]](#footnote-34) and among the qualifications they insist not only upon subscription to the doctrines of the church enjoined by parliament, but upon subscription to the Com­mon Prayer-book, and ordinal for consecration of arch­bishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, as containing no­thing contrary to the word of God. And they declare, that all such preachers as do not subscribe, or that disturb people’s minds with contrary doctrine, shall be excommu­nicated. But as these canons never had the sanction of the broad seal, surely the enforcing them upon the Puritans was a stretch of power hardly to be justified. Bishop Grindal confessed they had not the force of a law, and might possibly involve them in a præmunire; and yet the bi­shops urged them upon the clergy of their several dioceses. They cancelled all the licences of preachers, and insisted peremptorily on the subscription above mentioned.

The complaints of the ministers, under these hardships, reached the ears of the elector palatine of the Rhine, who was pleased to order the learned Zanchy, professor of divinity in the university of Heidelburgh, to write to the queen of England in their behalf, beseeching her majesty, not to insist upon subscriptions, or upon wearing the habits, which gave such offence to great numbers of the clergy, and was like to make a schism in the church.[[35]](#footnote-35) The letter was enclosed to bishop Grindal; who, when he had read it, would not so much as deliver it to the queen, for fear of disobliging her majesty, whose resolution was to put an end to all distinctions in the church, by pressing the act of uni­formity. Instead therefore of relaxing to the Puritans, orders were sent to all churchwardens, “not to suffer any to read, pray, preach, or minister the sacraments, in any churches, chapels, or private places, without a new licence from the queen or the archbishop, or bishop of the diocese, to be dated since May 1571.” The more resolved Puritans were therefore reduced to the necessity of assembling in private, or of laying down their ministry.

Though all the bishops were obliged to go into these measures of the court, yet some were so sensible of the want of discipline, and of preaching the word, that they permitted their clergy to enter into associations for the pro­moting of both. The ministers of the town of Northampton, with the consent and approbation of Dr. Scambier their bishop, the mayor of the town, and the justices of the coun­try, agreed upon the following regulations for worship and discipline:[[36]](#footnote-36)

“That singing and playing of organs in the choir shall be put down, and common prayer read in the body of the church, with a psalm before and after sermon. That every Tuesday and Thursday there shall be a lecture from nine to ten in the morning, in the chief church of the town, be­ginning with the confession in the Book of Common Prayer, and ending with prayer and a confession of faith. Every Sunday and holiday shall be a sermon after morning prayer, with a psalm before and after. Service shall be ended in every parish-church by nine in the morning every Sunday and holidays, to the end that people may resort to the ser­mon in the chief church, except they have a sermon in their own. None shall walk abroad, or sit idly in the streets, in time of divine service. The youth shall every Sunday evening be examined in a portion of Calvin’s catechism, which the reader shall expound for an hour. There shall be a general communion once a quarter in every parish, with a sermon. A fortnight before each communion, the minis­ter with the churchwardens shall go from house to house, to take the names of the communicants, and examine into their lives; and the party that is not in charity with his neighbour shall be put from the communion. After the communion the minister shall visit every house, to under­stand who have not received the communion, and why. Every communion-day each parish shall have two commu­nions, one beginning at five in the morning, with a sermon of an hour, and ending at eight, for servants; the other from nine to twelve for masters and dames. The manner of the communion shall be according to the order of the queen’s book, saving that the people being in their confes­sion upon their knees, shall rise up from their pews and so pass to the communion-table, where they shall receive the sacrament in companies, and then return to their pews, the minister reading in the pulpit. The communion-table shall stand in the body of the church, according to the book, at the upper end of the middle aisle, having three ministers, one in the middle to deliver the bread, the other two at each end for the cup, the ministers often calling upon the people to remember the poor. The communion to end with a psalm.—Excessive ringing of bells on the Lord’s day is prohibited; and carrying of the bell before corpses in the streets, and bidding prayers for the dead, which was used till within these two years, is restrained.”

Here was a sort of association, or voluntary discipline, introduced, independent of the queen’s injunctions, or ca­nons of the church; this was what the Puritans were con­tending for, and would gladly have acquiesced in, if it might have been established by a law.

Besides these attempts for discipline, the clergy with leave of their bishop, encouraged religious exercises among them­selves, for the interpretation of some texts of Scripture, one speaking to it orderly after another; these were called prophesyings from the apostolical direction, 1 Cor. xiv.31, “Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all be comforted.” They also conferred among themselves, touch­ing sound doctrine and good life and manners.

The regulations or orders for these exercises in North­ampton, were these:—

“That every minister at his first allowance to be of this exercise, shall by subscription declare his consent, in Christ’s true religion with his brethren, and submit to the discipline and order of the same. The names of all the members shall be written in a table; three of whom shall be concerned at each exercise; the first, beginning and ending with prayer, shall explain his text, and confute foolish interpretations, and then make a practical reflection, but not dilate to a common-place. Those that speak after may add any thing they think the other has omitted, tending to explain the text; but may not repeat what has been said, nor oppose their predecessor, unless he has spoken contrary to the Scriptures. The exercise to continue from nine to eleven; the first speaker to end in three quarters of an hour, the se­cond and third not to exceed each one quarter of an hour; one of the moderators always to conclude. After the exer­cise is over, and the auditors dismissed, the president shall call the learned brethren to him to give him their judgment of the performances, when it shall be lawful for any of the brethren to oppose their objections against them in writing, which shall be answered before the next exercise. If any break orders, the president shall command him, in the name of the eternal God, to be silent; and after the exercise, he shall be reprimanded. When the exercise is finished, the next speaker shall be appointed, and his text given him.”

The confession of faith, which the members of these prophesyings signed at their admission, was to the following purpose:—

“That they believed the word of God, contained in the Old and New Testament, to be a perfect rule of faith and manners; that it ought to be read and known by all people, and that the authority of it exceeds all authority, not of the pope only, but of the church also; and of councils, fathers, men, and angels.

“They condemn, as a tyrannous yoke, whatsoever men have set up of their own invention, to make articles of faith, and the binding men’s consciences by their laws and insti­tutes: in sum, all those manners and fashions of serving God, which men have brought in without the authority of the word for the warrant thereof, though recommended by custom, by unwritten traditions, or any other names what­soever; of which sort are the pope’s supremacy, purgatory, transubstantiation, man’s merits, free-will, justification by works, praying in an unknown tongue, and distinction of meats, apparel, and days, and briefly all the ceremonies, and whole order of Papistry, which they call the hierarchy; which are a devilish confusion, established as it were in spite of God, and to the reproach of religion.

“And we content ourselves (say they) with the simpli­city of this pure word of God, and doctrine thereof; a sum­mary of which is in the Apostles’ creed; resolving to try and examine, and also to judge all other doctrines whatsoever by this pure word, as by a certain rule and perfect touch­stone. And to this word of God we humbly submit our­selves, and all our doings, willing and ready to be judged, reformed, or farther instructed, thereby, in all points of re­ligion.”

Mr. Strype calls this, a well-minded and religiously-dis­posed combination of both bishop, magistrates, and people. It was designed to stir up an emulation in the clergy to study the Scriptures, that they may be more capable of in­structing the people in Christian knowledge; and though men of loose principles censured it, yet the ecclesiastical commissioners, who had a special letter from the queen, to inquire into novelties, and were acquainted with the scheme above mentioned, gave them as yet neither check nor dis­turbance; but when her majesty was informed that they were nurseries of Puritanism, and tended to promote alter­ations in the government of the church, she quickly sup­pressed them, as will be seen in its proper place.

This year [1571] put a period to the life of the eminent John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury, author of the famous Apo­logy for the Church of England. He was born in Devon­shire, 1522, and educated in Christ-church college, Oxon. where he proceeded M.A. 1544. In king Edward’s reign he was a zealous promoter of the Reformation; but not having the courage of a martyr, he yielded to some things against his conscience in the reign of queen Mary, for which he asked pardon of God and the church among the exiles in Germany, where he continued a confessor of the gospel till queen Elizabeth’s accession, when he returned home, and was preferred to the bishopric of Salisbury, in 1559. He was one of the most learned men among the reformers, a Calvinist in doctrine, but for absolute obedience to his so­vereign in all things of an indifferent nature, which led him not only to comply with all the queen’s injunctions about the habits, when he did not approve them, but to bear hard upon the consciences of his brethren who were not satisfied to comply. He published several treatises in his lifetime, and others were printed after his death; but that which gained him greatest reputation, was his Apology, which was translated into the foreign languages, and ordered to be chained in all the churches in England.[[37]](#footnote-37) He was a truly pious man, and died in a comfortable frame of mind. Some of his last words were, “I have not so lived that I am ashamed to die; neither am I afraid to die, for we have a gracious Lord.” There is laid up for me a crown of right­eousness. Christ is my righteousness. Lord, let thy servant depart in peace;” which he did at Monkton-Farley, Septem­ber 23, 1571, in the fiftieth year of his age, and lies buried in the middle of the choir of the cathedral of Salisbury.

In the same year died the Rev. Mr. David Whitehead, a great scholar, and a most excellent professor of divinity.—He was educated in Oxford, and was chaplain to queen Anne Bullen, and one of the four divines nominated by archbishop Cranmer to bishoprics in Ireland. In the be­ginning of queen Mary’s reign he went into voluntary exile, and resided at Frankfort, where he answered the objections of Dr. Horn, concerning church-discipline and worship. Upon his return into England he was chosen one of the dis­putants against the Popish bishops, and showed himself so profound a divine, that the queen, out of her high esteem for him, offered him the archbishopric of Canterbury: but he refused it from Puritanical principles, and would accept of no preferment in the church, as it then stood: he excused himself to the queen, by saying, he could live plentifully on the gospel without any preferment; and accordingly did so: he went up and down like an apostle, preaching the word where it was wanted: and spent his life in celibacy, which gained him the higher esteem with the queen, who had no great affection for married priests. He died this year in a good old age;[[38]](#footnote-38) but in what church or chapel he was buried I know not.

Our archbishop was very busy this summer, with the bi­shops of Winchester and Ely, in harassing the Puritans; for which purpose he summoned before him the principal clergy of both provinces who were disaffected to the uni­formity established by law, and acquainted them, that if they intended to continue their ministry, they must take out new licences, and subscribe the articles, framed according to a new act of parliament, for reforming certain disorders in ministers; otherwise they might resign quietly or be de­prived. He took in the bishops above mentioned to coun­tenance his proceedings; but Grindal declared he would not be concerned, if his grace proceeded to suspension and deprivation: upon which Parker wrote back, that “he thought it high time to set about it; and however the world may judge, he would serve God and his prince, and put her laws in execution; that Grindal was too timorous, there being no danger of a præmunire; that the queen was con­tent the late book of articles (though it had not the broad seal) should be prosecuted; and in case it should hereafter be repealed there was no fear of a præmunire, but only of a fine at her pleasure, which he was persuaded her majesty, out of love to the church, would not levy: but Grindal being now at York wisely declined the affair.”[[39]](#footnote-39)

In the month of June the archbishop cited the chief Puritans about London to Lambeth,[[40]](#footnote-40) viz. Messrs. Good­man, Lever, Sampson, Walker, Wyburn, Goff, Percival, Deering, Field, Browne, Johnson, and others. These di­vines being willing to live peaceably, offered to subscribe the articles of religion as far as concerned the doctrine and sacraments only, and the Book of Common Prayer, as far as it tended to edification, it being acknowledged on all hands, that there were some imperfections in it; but they prayed, with respect to the apparel, that neither party might con­demn the other, but that those that wore them, and those that did not, might live in unity and concord. How reasons able soever this was, the archbishop told them peremptorily, that they must come up to the standard of the queen’s in­junctions, or be deprived.[[41]](#footnote-41) Goodman was also required to renounce a book that he had written many years ago, when he was an exile, against the government of women; which he refused, and was therefore suspended. Mr. Strype says, that he was at length brought to a revocation of it, and signed a protestation before the commissioners at Lambeth, April 23, 1571, concerning his dutiful obedience to the queen’s majesty’s person and her lawful government.[[42]](#footnote-42) Lever quietly resigned his prebend in the church of Dur­ham. Browne being domestic chaplain to the duke of Nor­folk, his patron undertook to screen him; but the arch­bishop sent him word, that no place within her majesty’s dominions was exempt from the jurisdiction of the commis­sioners, and therefore if his grace did not forthwith send up his chaplain, they should be forced to use other methods. This was that Robert Browne who afterward gave name to that denomination of dissenters called Brownists; but his family and relations covered him for the present.—Johnson was domestic chaplain to the lord-keeper Bacon, at Gorambury, where he used to preach, and administer the sacrament in his family: he had also some place at St. Al­ban’s, and was fellow of King’s college, Cambridge. He appeared before the commissioners in July, but refusing to subscribe to the Book of Common Prayer as agreeable to the word of God, he was suspended, though he assured them he used the book, and thought for charity’s sake it might be suffered, till God should grant a time of more perfect re­formation; that he would wear the apparel, though he judged it neither expedient nor for edification; and that he was willing to subscribe all the doctrinal articles of the church, according to the late act of parliament: but the commissioners insisting peremptorily upon an absolute sub­scription, as above, he was suspended, and resigned his pre­bend in the church of Norwich; but about two years after he fell into farther troubles, which cost him his life.

The learned Beza [in 1572] wrote to the bishops not to be the instruments of such severities; and being informed that a parliament was shortly to be called, in which a con­sultation was to be had concerning the establishing of re­ligion, he excited the lord-treasurer to endeavour some re­formation of discipline: “for I will not dissemble (says he) that not a few complain of divers things wanting in the church; and when I say not a few, I do not mean that worse sort whom nothing pleases but what is perfect and absolute in all respects; but I understand godly men, learned men, and some that arc best affected to God’s church, and lovers of their nation. I look upon the reformation of discipline as of great importance to the peace and welfare of the na­tion, and the strengthening of the Reformation; and there­fore there is nothing the queen’s majesty and her council should sooner think of than this, however great and difficult the work might be, especially since the English nation af­fords so many divines of prudence, learning, and judgment, in these affairs: if they, together with the bishops, to whom indeed especially, but not alone, this care belongs, would deliberate hereupon, I doubt not but such things would follow whence other nations would take example.”

Thus did this learned divine intercede for the recovery of discipline, and the ease of tender and scrupulous consciences. But this was more than our archbishop thanked him for, says Mr. Strype, after he had taken so much pains in press­ing the act of uniformity.[[43]](#footnote-43)

The parliament met May 8, 1572; the lord-keeper opened it with a speech, in which he recommended to the houses, in the queen’s name, “to see that the laws relating to the discipline and ceremonies of the church were put in due execution; and that if any farther laws were wanting they should consider of them; and so, says his lordship, *gladius Radium juvabit,* the civil sword will support the eccle­siastical, as beforetime has been used.”[[44]](#footnote-44) But the parlia­ment, seeing the ill use the queen and bishops made of their spiritual power, instead of framing new laws to enforce the ceremonies, ordered two bills to be brought in to regulate them; in one of which the hardships that the Puritans com­plained of were redressed.[[45]](#footnote-45) The bills passed smoothly through the commons, and were referred to a select committee of both houses, which alarmed the bishops, and gave the queen such offence, that two days after she sent to ac­quaint the commons by their speaker, that it was her plea­sure, that no bills concerning religion should henceforth be received, unless the same should be first considered and ap­proved by the bishops or clergy in convocation; and far­ther, her majesty commanded them to deliver up the two bills last read in the house, touching rites and ceremonies.[[46]](#footnote-46) This was a high strain of the prerogative, and a blow at the very root of the freedom of parliament. But the commons sent her majesty the bills, with a servile request, that she would not conceive an ill opinion of the house if she should not approve them.[[47]](#footnote-47) Her majesty sent them word, within a day or two, that she utterly disliked the bills, and never re­turned them. This awakened a brave spirit of liberty among some of the members; many free speeches were made upon this occasion, and among others, Peter Wentworth, esq. stood up and said,[[48]](#footnote-48) “that it grieved him to see, how many ways the liberty of free speech in parliament had been in­fringed. Two things (says he) do great hurt among us, one is a rumour that ran about the house, when the bill about the rites of the church was depending; ‘Take heed what you do, the queen liketh not such a matter, she will be offended with them that prosecute it.’ The other is, that sometime a message was brought to the house, either commanding or inhibiting our proceedings.” He added, “that it was dan­gerous always to follow a prince’s mind, because the prince might favour a cause prejudicial to the honour of God, and the good of the state. Her majesty has forbid us to deal in any matter of religion, unless we first receive it from the bishops. This was a doleful message; there is then little hope of reformation. I have heard from old parliament men, that the banishment of the pope, and the reforming true re­ligion, had its beginning from this house, but not from the bishops; few laws for religion had their foundation from them; and I do surely think (before God I speak it) that the bishops were the cause of that doleful message.” But for this speech and another of a like nature, Wentworth was sent to the Tower.

In the meantime the late act of the thirteenth of Elizabeth for subscribing the articles, was put in execution all over England, together with the queen’s injunctions; and accord­ing to Mr. Strype’s computation, one hundred clergymen were deprived this year for refusing to subscribe.[[49]](#footnote-49) The university of Cambridge was a nest of Puritans; many of the graduates were disaffected to the discipline of the church, as particularly, Mr. Browning, Mr. Brown of Trinity-college, Mr. Millain of Christ’s, Mr. Charke of Peter- house, Mr. Deering of Christ’s college, and several in St. John’s college, who being men of learning, had a great number of followers; but Dr. Whitgift the vice-chancellor watched them narrowly, and kept them under. The reve­rend Mr. Charke, in one of his sermons at St. Mary’s, had said, that “there ought to be a parity among the ministers in the church; and that the hierarchical orders of arch­bishops, patriarchs, metropolitans, &c. was introduced into the church by Satan.” For which he was summoned be­fore the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges, and, refusing to recant, was expelled the university. Charke wrote a handsome Latin apology to lord Burleigh their present chancellor, in which he confesses that it was his opinion, that the church of England might be brought nearer to the apostolic character or likeness; but that this must not be said either in the pulpit or desk, under the severest penalties. The chancellor, knowing him to be a good scholar, and in consideration that he had been hardly dealt with, interceded for him, but to no purpose. Mr. Browning, Mr. Deering, and others, met with the like usage. Deer­ing was a man of good learning, and made a chief figure in the university; he was also reader at St. Paul’s, London, and a most popular preacher; but being an enemy to the superior order of bishops, he fell into the hands of the com­missioners and was silenced.

The Puritans, finding it in vain to hope for a reformation from the queen or bishops, resolved for the future to apply to parliament, and stand by the constitution; for this pur­pose they made interest among the members, and compiled a treatise, setting forth their chief grievances in one view; it was drawn up by the reverend Mr. Field, minister of Aldermary, London, assisted by Mr. Wilcox, and was re­vised by several of the brethren. It was entitled, An Ad­monition to the Parliament; with Beza’s letter to the earl of Leicester, and Gualter’s to bishop Parkhurst for Refor­mation of church-discipline, annexed. It contains the plat­form of a church; the manner of electing ministers; their several duties, and their equality in government. It then exposes the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the proceed­ings of the bishops, with some severity of language. When Mr. Pearson, the archbishop's chaplain, taxed the authors with this in prison, Mr. Field replied, “This concerns me; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament use such vehemency; we have used gentle words too long, which have done no good; the wound grows desperate, and wants a corrosive; it is no time to blanch or sew pillars under men’s elbows, but God knoweth we meant to touch no man’s person, but their places and abuses.” The admoni­tion concludes with a petition to the houses, that a disci­pline more consonant to the word of God, and agreeing with the foreign reformed churches, may be established by law. The authors themselves, viz. the reverend Mr. Field and Wilcox, presented it to the house, for which they were sent for into custody, and by the influence of the bishops committed to Newgate, October 2, 1572.[[50]](#footnote-50) Upon this the book already printed was suffered to go abroad, and had three or four editions within the compass of two years, not withstanding all the endeavours of the bishops to find out the press.[[51]](#footnote-51)

The imprisonment of the two ministers occasioned the drawing up a Second Admonition, by Mr. Cartwright,[[52]](#footnote-52) lately returned from beyond sea, with an humble petition to the two houses, for relief against the subscription required by the ecclesiastical commissioners, which they represent had no foundation in law, but was an act of sovereignty in the crown, and was against the peace of their consciences; many having lost their places and livings for not comply­ing; they therefore beseech their honours to take a view of the causes of their nonsubscribing, that it might appear they were not disobedient to the church of God, or to their sovereign; and they most humbly entreat for the removal and abolishing of such corruption and abuses in the church as withheld their compliance. “The matters (say they) con­tained in the Admonition, how true soever they be, have found small favour; the persons that are thought to have made it are laid up in no worse prison than Newgate; the men that set upon them are no worse than bishops; the name that goeth of them is no better than rebels; and great words there are, that their danger will yet prove greater. Well, whatsoever is said or done against them, that is not the matter; but the equity of the cause, that is the matter; and yet this we will say, that the state showeth not itself upright, if it suffers them to be molested for that which was spoken only by way of admonition to the parliament, which was to consider of it, and receive or reject it, without farther mat­ter to the authors, except it contained some wilful mainte­nance of treason or rebellion, which it cannot be proved to do.”[[53]](#footnote-53) Two other pamphlets were published on this occasion, one entitled, “An exhortation to the bishops to deal brotherly with their brethren “The other, “An exhortation to the bi­shops and clergy to answer a little book that was published last parliament; and an exhortation to other brethren to judge of it by God’s word, till they saw it answered.”

The prisoners themselves drew up an elegant Latin apo­logy to the lord-treasurer Burleigh, in which they confess their writing the Admonition, but that they attempted not to correct or change anything in the hierarchy of themselves, but referred all to the parliament, hoping by this means that all differences might be composed in a legal way, and the corruptions which the most learned foreign divines com­plained of might be removed, to the preventing any schism or separation in the church.[[54]](#footnote-54) However, the treasurer had not courage to intermeddle with an affair which might em­broil him with the queen, or at least with her ecclesiastical commissioners, though it was well enough known he had a good will to the cause. But the commissioners, not content with the severity of the law, sported themselves in an arbi­trary manner with the miseries of their fellow creatures; detained them in prison beyond the time limited by the sta­tute, as appears by their humble supplication to the earl of Leicester, representing “that they had been condemned ac­cording to the act of uniformity, to a year’s imprisonment, which they had now suffered patiently in the common goal of Newgate, besides four months’ close imprisonment before their conviction, which they apprehended to be contrary to law: that by this means they and their poor wives and chil­dren were utterly impoverished; their health very much impaired, by the unwholesome savour of the place, and the cold weather; and that they were like to suffer yet greater extremities: they therefore humbly beseech his lordship, for the tender mercies of God, and in consideration of their poor wives and children, to be a means to the most honour­able privy council, that they may be enlarged; or, if that could not be obtained, that they might be confined in a more wholesome prison.” They preferred another petition of the same nature to the lords of the council; and a third was sent in the names of their wives and children. They also wrote a confession of their faith, dated from Newgate, December 4, 1572, with a preface, in which they complain of the re­proaches and calumnies of their adversaries: because (say they) we would have bishops unlorded, according to God’s word, therefore it is said, we seek the overthrow of civil ma­gistrates: because we say, all bishops and ministers are equal, and therefore may not exercise their sovereignty over one another; therefore they say, when they have brought this in among the bishops, we shall be for levelling the nobility of the land. Because we find fault with the regimen of the church as drawn from the pope, therefore they say, redesign the ruin of the state. Because we say, the minis­try must not be a bare reading ministry, but that every minis­ter must be learned, able to preach, to refute gainsayers, to comfort, to rebuke, and to do all the duties of a shepherd, a watchman, and a steward; therefore they bear the world in hand, that we condemn the reading of the Holy Scrip­tures in churches. Because we are afraid of joining with the church in all her rites and ceremonies, therefore we are branded with the odious names of, Donatists, Anabaptists, Arians, Arians, Hinckfeldians, Puritans,” &c.[[55]](#footnote-55)

The confession itself is orthodox, according to the doc­trinal articles of the church of England, and must give a general satisfaction to them who read it; it is written by the authors of the first admonition to the parliament, to testify their persuasion in the faith, against the uncharitable surmises of Dr. Whitgift, uttered in his answer to their Admonition, in defence both of themselves and their fautors; and is subscribed Johannes Fieldus.[[56]](#footnote-56)

The authors of this confession lay in prison a considerable time; for though the inhabitants of Aldermary, London, presented two supplications for the enlargement of their valuable pastor, and learned and faithful preacher, as they called Mr. Field; and though some great friends interceded for them, they could not obtain their release. The arch­bishop sent his chaplain, to confer with them in prison, after they had been there three months, for which they were thankful. The conference began with a suitable prayer which Mr. Field made, and was carried on with such de­cency as moved the chaplain’s compassion; but nothing would prevail with the inexorable commissioners to release them, till they had suffered the extremity of the law, and paid their fees, though the keeper gave it under his hand, that they were so poor as not to have money to pay for their lodgings or victuals.

To return to the Admonition, which consisted of twenty-three chapters, under the following titles:

Chap. I. Whether Christ forbiddeth rule or superiority to ministers.

II. Of the authority of the church in things indifferent.

III. Of the election of ministers.

IV. Of ministers having no pastoral charge; and of ceremonies used in ordering ministers.

V. Of the residence of the pastors.

VI. Of ministers that cannot preach, and of licences to preach.

VII. Of the apparel of ministers.

VIII. Of archbishops, metropolitans, bishops, arch­deacons, &c.

IX. Of the communion-book,

X. Of holidays.

XI. What kind of preaching is most effectual.

XII. Of preaching before the administration of the sacraments.

XIII. Of reading the Scriptures.

XIV. Of ministering and preaching by deacons.

XV. Of matters touching the communion.

XVI. Of matters touching baptism.

XVII. Of seniors, or government by elders.

XVIII. Of certain matters concerning discipline of the church.

XIX. Of deacons and widows.

XX. Of the authority of the civil magistrate in eccle­siastical matters.

XXI. Of subscribing the communion-book.

XXII. Of cathedral churches.

XXIII. Of civil offices in ecclesiastical persons.

These were the chief heads of complaint; which, the Puritans having laid before the world, the bishops thought themselves obliged to answer. Dr. John Whitgift, master of Trinity-college, and vice-chancellor of Cambridge, was ap­pointed to this work, which he performed with great labour and study, and dedicated it to the church of England. His method was unexceptionable; the whole text of the Admo­nition being set down in paragraphs, and under each para­graph the doctor’s answer.[[57]](#footnote-57) Before it was printed it was revised and corrected by archbishop Parker, Dr. Cooper bishop of Lincoln, and Pern bishop of Ely; so that in this book, says Mr. Strype, may be seen all the arguments for and against the hierarchy, drawn to the best advantage.

Dr. Whitgift's book was answered by Mr. Cartwright, whose performance called a masterpiece in its kind, and had the approbation of great numbers in the university of Cambridge, as well as foreign divines. Whitgift replied again to Cartwright, and had the thanks of the bishops and the queen; who, as a reward for his excellent and learned pains, made him dean of Lincoln, while Cartwright, to avoid the rigour of the commissioners, was forced to abscond in friends’ houses, and at length retire into banishment.

But it was impossible for these divines to settle the contro­versy, because they were not agreed upon one and the same standard, or rule of judgment. Mr. Cartwright maintained, that “the Holy Scriptures were not only a standard of doc­trine, but of discipline and government; and that the church of Christ in all ages was to be regulated by them.’' He was therefore for consulting his Bible only, and for re­ducing all things as near as possible to the apostolical standard. Dr. Whitgift went upon a different principle, and maintained, “that though the Holy Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, they were not designed as a standard of church discipline or government; but that this was changeable, and might be accommodated to the civil go­vernment we live under; that the apostolical government was adapted to the church in its infancy, and under perse­cution, but was to be enlarged and altered as the church grew to maturity, and had the civil magistrate on its side.” The doctor therefore, instead of reducing the external policy of the church to Scripture, takes into his standard the four first centuries after Christ; and those customs that he can trace up thither, he thinks proper to be retained, be­cause the church was then in its mature state, and not yet under the power of antichrist.

The reader will judge of these principles for himself.—One is ready to think, that the nearer we can come to the apostolical practice the better; and the less our religion is encumbered with rites and ceremonies of later invention, the more it must resemble the simplicity that is in Christ. If our blessed Saviour had designed that his worship should be set off with pomp and grandeur, and a multitude of cere­monies, he would have told us so; and, it may be, have settled them, as was done for the church of the Jews; but nothing of this appearing, his followers should be cautious of inserting human commandments or traditions into the religion of Christ, lest they cast a reflection upon his kingly office.

The dispute between Whitgift and Cartwright was ma­naged with some sharpness; the latter thought he had rea­son to complain of the hardships himself and his brethren suffered; and Whitgift having the government on his side, thought he stood upon higher ground, and might assume a superior air; when Cartwright and his friends pleaded for indulgence because they were brethren, the doctor replies, “What signifies their being brethren; Anabaptists, Arians, and other heretics, would be accounted brethren; their haughty spirits will not suffer them to see their error; they deserve as great punishment as Papists, because both con­spire against the church. If they are shut up in Newgate, it is a meet reward for their disorderly doings: for igno­rance may not excuse libels against a private man, much less when they slander the whole church.”—How would the doctor have liked this language in the mouth of a Pa­pist sixteen years before? But this has been the method of warm and zealous disputants; the knots they cannot untie with their fingers, they would fain cut asunder with the sword.

Thus Dr. Whitgift routed his adversary; he had already deprived him of his professor’s chair, and of his degree of D.D. and being now vice-chancellor of Cambridge, he got him expelled the university upon the following pretence: Mr. Cartwright, being senior fellow of his college, was only in deacon’s orders; the doctor being informed of this, and that the statute requiring such to take upon them the order of priesthood, might be interpreted to priests’ orders, concluded he was perjured;[[58]](#footnote-58) upon which he summoned the heads of the colleges together, and declared, that Mr. Cartwright had broken his oath, and, without any farther admonition, pushed his interest among the masters, to rid, the college of a man whose popularity was two great for his ambit ion, insomuch that he declared he would not establish order in the university while a person of his principles was among them; after this he wrote to the archbishop, September 21st, 1572, and begged his grace to watch at court, that Cartwright might get no advantage against him, for (says he) he is flatly perjured, and it is God’s just judgment that he should be so punished, for not being a full minister. A very mean and pitiful triumph!

The queen also, and her commissioners, brandished their swords against Cartwright and his followers. Her majesty by proclamation called in the Admonition, commanding all her subjects, who had any in their possession, to bring them to the bishop of the diocese, and not to sell them, upon pain of imprisonment; upon which Mr. Stroud the publisher brought in thirty-four, and his wife burnt the rest that were unsold: this Mr. Stroud was the suspended minister of Cranbrook, an excellent preacher, and universally beloved; but being reduced to poverty, he was forced to condescend to the low offices of correcting the press, and of publishing books for a livelihood;[[59]](#footnote-59) when he appeared before the bishop of London upon this occasion, his lordship re­proached him for laying down the ministry, though Parker had actually deprived him, and forbid him to preach six years before.

The bishops were no less careful to crush the favourers of the Admonition; for when Mr. Wake of Christ-church had declared in favour of it, in a sermon at St. Paul’s cross, the bishop of London sent for him next morning into cus­tody; but he made his escape. Mr. Crick, chaplain to the bishop of Norwich, having also commended the book in a sermon at the same place, the archbishop sent a special messenger to apprehend him; and though he escaped for the present, he afterward fell into the hands of the com­missioners, and was deprived;[[60]](#footnote-60) the like misfortune befell Dr. Aldrich, an eminent divine and dignitary of the church, with many others; notwithstanding which Dr. Sandys bishop of London, in his letter to the treasurer, calls for farther help: “The city (says he) will never be quiet, till these authors of sedition, who are now esteemed as gods, as, Field, Wilcox, Cartwright, and others, be far removed from the city; the people resort to them, as in Popery they were wont to run on pilgrimages; if these idols, who are honoured as saints, were removed from henee, their honour would fall into the dust, and they would be taken for blocks as they are. A sharp letter from her majesty would cut the courage of these men. Good my lords, for the love you bear to the church of Christ, resist the tumultuous en­terprises of these new-fangled fellows.” These were the weapons with which the doctor’s answer to the Admonition were enforced; so that we may fairly conclude with Fuller the historian, “that if Cartwright had the better of his ad­versary in learning. Whitgift had more power to back his arguments; and by this he not only kept the field, but gained the victory.”

On the other hand it is certain, vast numbers of the clergy, both in London and the two universities, had a high opinion of Cartwright’s writings; he had many admirers; and if we may believe his adversaries, wanted not for pre­sents and gratuities: many hands were procured in appro­bation and commendation of his reply to Whitgift; and some said, they would defend it to death.[[61]](#footnote-61) In short, though Whitgift’s writings might be of use to confirm those who had already conformed, they made no converts among the Puritans, but rather confirmed them in their former sen­timents.

To pursue this controversy to the end: in the year 1573, Dr. Whitgift published his defence against Cartwright’s reply;[[62]](#footnote-62) in which he states the difference between them thus: “The question is not, whether many things mentioned in your platform of discipline were fitly used in the apostles’ time, or may now be well used in sundry reformed churches; this is not denied; but whether, when there is a settled or­der in doctrine and government established by law, it may stand with godly and Christian wisdom to attempt so great alteration as this platform must needs bring in, with dis­obedience to the prince and laws, and unquietness of the church, and offence of many consciences.” If this were the whole question, surely it might stand with the wisdom of the legislature in settled times, to make some concessions in favour of pious and devout men; nor can it be inconsistent with godly and Christian wisdom, for subjects to attempt it by lawful and peaceable methods.

Two years after [1575] Mr. Cartwright published a second reply to Whitgift’s defence; it consisted of two parts; the first was entitled, “The second reply of T. C. against Dr. Whitgift’s second answer touching the church-discipline with these two sentences of Scripture in the title-page, “For Zion’s sake I will not hold my tongue; for Jerusalem’s sake I will not rest, till the righteousness thereof break forth as the light,” &c.—“Ye are the Lord’s remembrancers: keep not silence.” Isa. lxii. 6, 7. It is dedicated to the church of England, and all that love the truth in it. In his pre­face he answers divers personal matters between the doctor and himself: he remembers him of his illegal depriving him of his fellowship, and pronouncing him perjured. He says, he never opened his lips for the divinity-chair, as he had falsely charged him: that he had never desired the degree of a doctor, but by the advice of more than a dozen learned ministers, who, considering his office of divinity-reader, thought he ought to assume the title. He added, that he never refused a private conference with him [Whitgift], but that he offered it, and the other refused it, saying, he was incorrigible; indeed, he did refuse private conference by writing, having had experience of his adversary’s un­faithfulness; and because he thought that the doctrine he had taught openly should be defended openly. Whitgift charged him, that after he was expelled the college, he went up and down doing no good, but living at other men’s tables.[[63]](#footnote-63) How ungenerous was this, after the doctor had taken away his adversary’s bread, and stopped his mouth that he might not preach, to reproach him with doing no good, and being beholden to his friends for a dinner! Cartwright owned, that he was poor; that he had no wife, nor house of his own; and that it was with small delight that he lived upon his friends, but that he still did what little good he could, in instructing their children. Whitgift charged his adversary farther, with want of learning, though he had filled the divinity-chair with vast reputation, and had been styled by Beza, Sol, the very sun of England; he taxed him with making extracts of other men’s notes, and that he had scarce read one of the ancient authors he had quoted. To which Cartwright modestly replied, that as to great reading he would let it pass; for if Whitgift had read all the fathers, and he scarce one, it would easily appear to the learned world by their writings; but that it was suf­ficiently known that he had hunted him with more hounds than one.

The strength of his reply lies in reducing the policy of the church as near as possible to the standard of Scripture; for when Dr. Whitgift alleged some of the fathers of the fourth and fifth century on his side, Cartwright replied, “that forasmuch as the fathers have erred, and that cor­ruptions crept early into the church, therefore they ought to have no farther credit than their authority is warranted by the word of God and good reason; to press their bare authority without relation to this, is to bring an intolerable tyranny into the church of God?’

The second part of Cartwright's reply was not published till two years forward, when he was fled out of the king­dom;[[64]](#footnote-64) it is entitled, “The rest of the second reply of Thomas Cartwright against Master Doctor Whitgift’s answer, touch­ing the church-discipline, imprinted 1577:” in which he shows, that church-government by an eldership is by divine appointment, and of perpetual obligation. He then consi­ders the defects of the church of England, and treats of the power of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical matters; of ecclesiastical persons bearing civil offices; and of the Habits. He apologizes for going through with the controversy at such a distance of time, but he thought it of importance, and that it need not be ashamed of the light. Speaking of his own poverty, disgrace, and banishment, for appearing in this cause, he says, “it were an intolerable delicacy, if he could not give up a little ease and commodity, for that whereunto his life was due, if it had been asked; or that he would grudge to dwell in another corner of the world, for that cause for which he ought to be ready altogether to depart out of it.” But he was sensible he strove against the stream, and that his work might be thought unseasonable, his adversary being now advanced so much above him; for this year Whitgift was made a bishop, when poor Cartwright was little better than a wandering beggar.[[65]](#footnote-65)

Thus ended the controversy between these two champi­ons; so that Fuller, Heylin, and Collyer, must be mistaken, when they say, Whitgift kept the field, and carried off a complete victory, when Cartwright had certainly the last word. But whoever had the better of the argument. Whitgift got the most by it; and when he was advanced to the pinnacle of church-preferment, acted an ungenerous part towards his adversary, for many years prosecuting him with continual vexations and imprisonments, and pointing all his church-artillery against him, not suffering him so much as to defend the common cause of Christianity against the Papists, when he was called to it; however, at length being wearied out with the importunities of great men, or grow­ing more temperate in his old age, he suffered him to govern a small hospital in Warwick, given him by the earl of Lei­cester, where this great and good man’s hairs came down with sorrow to the grave.

To return: Notwithstanding all this opposition from the queen and her commissioners, the Puritans gained ground; and though the press was restrained, they galled their ad­versaries with pamphlets, which were privately dispersed both in city and country. Parker employed all his emis­saries to discover their printing-presses, but to no purpose; whereupon he complained to the treasurer in these words, “1 understand throughout all the realm (says he) how the matter is taken; the Puritans are justified, and we judged to be extreme persecutors; I have observed this for seven years; if the sincerity of the gospel should end in such judgments, I fear the council will be overcome. The Puritans slander us with books and libels, lying they care not how deep, and yet the more they write the more they are applauded and comforted.”[[66]](#footnote-66) The scholars of Cambridge were generally with the Puritans, but the masters and heads of colleges were against them; so that many who ventured to preach for the discipline were deprived of their fellow­ships, and expelled the university, or obliged to a public retractation.

There being no farther prospect of a public reformation by the legislature, some of the leading Puritans agreed to attempt it in a more private way; for this purpose they erected a presbytery at Wandsworth, a village five miles from the city, conveniently situated for the London brethren, as standing on the banks of the river Thames. The heads of the association were, Mr. Field, lecturer of Wandsworth, Mr. Smith of Mitcham, Mr. Crane of Roehampton, Messrs. Wilcox, Standen, Jackson, Bonham, Saintloe, and Edmonds, to whom afterward were joined, Messrs. Travers, Chake, Barber, Gardiner, Crook, Egerton, and a number of very considerable laymen. On the 20th of November eleven elders were chosen, and their offices described in a register, entitled, “The orders of Wandsworth.” This was the first presbyterian church in England. All imaginable care was taken to keep their proceedings secret, but the bishop’s eye was upon them, who gave immediate intelligence to the high commission, upon which the queen issued out a pro­clamation for putting the act of uniformity in execution; but though the commissioners knew of the presbytery, they could not discover the members of it, nor prevent others being erected in neighbouring counties.

While the queen and bishops were defending the out­works of the church against the Puritans, and bracing up the building with articles, canons, injunctions, and penal laws, enforced by the sword of the civil magistrate, the Pa­pists were sapping the very foundation; for upon publish­ing the pope’s bull of excommunication against the queen, great numbers deserted the public worship, and resorted to private conventicles to hear mass, while others, who kept their stations in the church, were secretly undermining it. “There were at this time (says a learned writer[[67]](#footnote-67)) certain ministers of the church that were Papists, who subscribed and observed the orders of the church, wore a side-gown, a square cap, a cope, and surplice. They would run into cor­ners, and say to the people, Believe not this new doctrine, it is naught, it will not long endure; although I use order among them outwardly, my heart is not with them, but with the mother church of Rome. No, no, we do not preach, nor yet teach openly; though we read their new-devised homilies for a colour to satisfy the time for a season.” In Yorkshire they went openly to mass, and were so numerous, that the Protestants stood in awe of them. In London there was a great resort to the Portugal ambassador’s chapel; and when the sheriff, by order of the bishop of London, sent his officers to take some of them into custody, the queen was displeased, and ordered them immediately to be released.

Sad was the state of religion (says Mr. Strype) at this time; “the substantial being lost in contending for externals; the churchmen heaped up many benefices upon them­selves, and resided upon none; neglecting their cures.[[68]](#footnote-68) Many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases, and waste of woods, and granted reversions and advowsons to their wives and children.—“Among the laity there was little devotion; the Lord’s day greatly profaned, and little observed; the common prayers not frequented; some lived without any service of God at all; many were mere Heathens and Atheists; the queen’s own court a har­bour for Epicures and Atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish; which things make good men fear some sad judgments impending over the nation.” The governors of the church expressed no concern for suppress­ing of vice, and encouraging virtue; there were no citations into the commons for immoralities: but the bishops were every day shutting the mouths of the most pious, useful, and industrious preachers in the nation, at a time when the queen was sick of the small-pox, and troubled with fainting fits, and the whole Reformation depended upon the single thread of her life.

This precarious state of religion was the more terrible, because of the Parisian massacre, which happened this very summer [572] on the 24th of August, being Bartholomew-day, when great numbers of Protestants having been invited to Paris, on pretence of doing honour to the king of Na­varre’s marriage to the king’s sister, ten thousand were mas­sacred in one night, and twenty thousand more in other parts of the kingdom, within the compass of a few weeks, by his majesty’s commission; no distinction being made between lords, gentlemen, justices, lawyers, scholars, physicians, and the meanest of the people;[[69]](#footnote-69) they spared neither women, maids, children in the cradle, nor infants in their mother’s womb. Many who escaped fled to Geneva and Switzerland, and great numbers into England, to save their lives. The Protestant princes of Germany were awakened with this butchery; and the queen put the coasts into a posture of defence, but made no concessions for uniting her Protestant subjects among themselves.

This year died the reverend and learned Mr. John Knox, the apostle and chief reformer of the kirk of Scotland.—This divine came into England in the reign of king Edward VI. and was appointed one of the itinerant preachers for the year 1552; he was afterward offered a parochial living in London, but refused it; upon king Edward’s death he retired beyond sea, and became preacher to the English exiles at Frankfort, till he was artfully spirited away by the contrivance of Mr. Cox, now bishop of Ely, for not reading the English service. He afterward preached to the English at Geneva; and upon the breaking up of that congregation in the year 1559, he returned to Scotland, and was a great instrument in the hand of Providence for the reformation of that kirk. He was a son of thunder, and feared not the face of any man in the cause of religion, which betrayed him sometimes into too coarse treatment of his superiors.[[70]](#footnote-70) How­ever, he had the respect of all the Protestant nobility and gentry of his country; and after a life of great service and labour, he died comfortably in the midst of his friends, in the sixty-seventh year of his age,[[71]](#footnote-71) being greatly supported in his last hours from the seventeenth chapter of St. John, and 1 Cor. xv.; both which he ordered to be frequently read to him: his body was attended to the grave with great solemnity and honour.

The queen being incensed against the Puritans for their late applications to parliament, reprimanded the bishops for not suppressing them, resolving to bend all the powers of the crown that way. Accordingly commissioners were ap­pointed under the great seal,[[72]](#footnote-72) in every shire, to put in exe­cution the penal laws by way of oyer and terminer, and the queen published a proclamation in the month of Octo­ber, declaring her royal pleasure, that all offenders against the act of uniformity should be severely punished. Letters were also sent from the lords of the council to the bishops, dated November 7th, 1573, to enforce her majesty’s procla­mation;[[73]](#footnote-73) in which, after having reproached them with holding their courts only to get money, or for such-like pur­poses, they now require them in her majesty’s name, either by themselves, which is most fit, or by their archdeacons, personally to visit and see that the habits, with all the queen’s injunctions, be exactly and uniformly observed in every church of their diocese; and to punish all refusers according to the ecclesiastical laws. The lord-treasurer also made a long speech before the commissioners in the star-chamber,[[74]](#footnote-74) in which, by the queen's order, “he charged the bishops with neglect, in not enforcing her majesty’s pro­clamation; he said, the queen could not satisfy her con­science without crushing the Puritans; for she thought none of her subjects worthy of her protection that favoured innovations, or that directly or indirectly countenanced the alteration of anything established in the church: that by too much lenity some might be apt to think the exceptions of these novelists against the ceremonies were reasonable and well-founded, or but trifling matters of disputation; but the queen was resolved that her orders and injunctions should not be contemned; that the public rule should be inviolably observed; and that there should be an absolute obedience, because the safety of her government depended upon it.” The treasurer, therefore, or some other member, proposed in council, that all ministers throughout the king­dom should be bound in a bond of 200£ to conform in all things to the act of uniformity, and in case of default their names to be returned into the exchequer by the bishop, and the bond to be sued.[[75]](#footnote-75) If this project had taken place, it would have ruined half the clergy of the kingdom.

Another occasion of these extraordinary proceedings of the court, is said to arise from the accidental madness of one Peter Birchet, of the Middle Temple, who had the name of a Puritan, but was disordered in his senses; this man came out of the Temple in his gown, October 14, 1573, about eleven in the morning, and seeing Mr. Fitzgerard, lieutenant of the pensioners, sir William Winter, and Mr. Hawkins, officers of the queen’s navy, riding through the Strand, with their servants on foot, came up to them, and sud­denly struck Hawkins with a dagger through the right arm into the body about the arm-hole, and immediately ran into the Bell-inn, where he was taken, and upon examination being asked, whether he knew Mr. Hawkins, he answered, he took him for Mr. Hatton, captain of the guards, and one of the privy chamber, whom he was moved to kill by the spirit of God, by which he should do God and his country acceptable service, because he was an enemy of God’s word, and a maintainer of Papistry. In which opinion he perse­vered, without any signs of repentance, till, for fear of being burnt for heresy, he recanted before Dr. Sandys bishop of London, and the rest of the commissioners. The queen asked her two chief justices, and attorney-general, what cor­poral punishment the villain might undergo for his offence; it was proposed to put him to death as a felon, because a premeditated attempt with an intention of killing had been so punished by king Edward II. though the party wounded did not die; but the judges did not apprehend this to be law. It was then moved, that the queen, by virtue of her prero­gative, should put him to death by martial law; and ac­cordingly a warrant was made out under the great seal for his execution, though the fact was committed in time of peace. This made some of the council hesitate, apprehend­ing it might prove a very bad precedent. At length the poor creature put an end to the dispute himself, for on the 10th of November, in the afternoon, he killed his keeper Longworth with one blow, striking him with a billet on the hinder part of the head, as he was looking upon a book in the pri­son-window of the Tower; for this crime he was next day indicted and arraigned at the King’s-bench, where he con­fessed the fact, saying, that Longworth in his imagination was Hatton: there, he received judgment for murder, and the next day, November 12, had his right hand first cut off at the place in the Strand where he struck Hawkins, and was then immediately hanged on a gibbet erected purposely between eight and nine of the clock in the morning, and continued hanging there for three days. The poor man talked very wildly, and was by fits downright mad, so that if he had been shut up in Bedlam after his first attempt, as he ought to have been, all farther mischief had been prevent­ed.[[76]](#footnote-76) However, it was very unreasonable to lay this to the charge of the Puritans, and to take occasion from hence to spread a general persecution over the whole kingdom: but the queen was for laying hold of all opportunities to sup­press a number of conscientious men, whom she would often say, she hated more than the Papists [[77]](#footnote-77)

The commissioners, being thus pushed forwards from above, sent letters to the bishops, exhorting them to com­mand their archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, to give it in charge to their clergy and quest-men, to present the names and surnames of all Nonconformists in their seve­ral parishes, before the first week in Lent.[[78]](#footnote-78) A letter of this sort was sent, among others, by the old bishop of Norwich to his chancellor, dated from Ludham, January 30, 1573. This was very unacceptable work to a man who was drop­ping into his grave;[[79]](#footnote-79) but he gave orders as he was com­manded; and many ministers of his diocese being returned unconformable, were suspended from reading common prayer and administering the sacraments, but allowed still to catechise youth;[[80]](#footnote-80) several of whom offered to preach to some congregations as the bishops should appoint, of which his lordship wrote to the archbishop, but his grace refused to set them on work, and continue their parts in the public exercises or prophesyings, for which the bishop was severely reprimanded, and threatened by the commissioners with the queen’s high displeasure; whereupon he allowed his chan­cellor to silence them totally, though it was against his judgment; for in his letter to a gentleman on this occasion, he writes, “—I was obliged to restrain them, unless I would willingly procure my own danger.—Therefore let not this matter seem strange to you, for the matter was of import­ance, and touched me so near, that I could do no less if I would avoid extreme danger.”[[81]](#footnote-81) But after all, his lordship being suspected of remissness, Parker directed a special commission to commissaries of his own appointing, to visit his diocese parochially; which they did, and reported, that some ministers were absent, and so could not be examined; other churches had no surplices, but the ministers said they would wear them when provided; but that there were about three hundred Nonconformists whom they had suspended; one of whom, as the good old bishop wrote, was godly and learned, and had done much good.[[82]](#footnote-82)

The heads of the Puritans, being debarred the liberty of preaching and printing, challenged their adversaries to a public disputation: this had been allowed the Protestants in queen Mary’s reign, and the Papists at the accession of queen Elizabeth; but the queen and council would not now admit, that what was established by law should be exposed to question, and referred to the hazard of a dispute. In­stead therefore of a conference, they took a shorter way, by summoning the disputants before the ecclesiastical com­mission, to answer to sundry articles exhibited against them, and among others to this, Whether the Common Prayer­book is every part of it grounded upon Holy Scripture?—an honour hardly to be allowed to any human composure: and for not answering to the satisfaction of the commission­ers, Mr. Wyburn, Johnson, Brown, Field, Wilcox, Spar­row, and Kings were deprived, and the four last committed to Newgate,[[83]](#footnote-83) from whence two of them had been but lately released,.—They were told farther, that if they did not com­ply in a short time they should be banished; though there was no law for inflicting such punishment.

Mr. Cartwright was summoned among the rest, but wisely got out of the way, upon which the commissioners issued out the following order: “To all mayors, bailiffs, sheriffs, con­stables, headboroughs, and all others the queen’s officers, to be aiding and assisting to the bearer [their messenger] with the best means they can devise to apprehend one Tho­mas Cartwright, student in divinity, wheresoever he be within the realm, and to bring him up to London with a sufficient guard, to appear before us her majesty’s com­missioners in causes ecclesiastical, for his misdemeanours in matters of religion;[[84]](#footnote-84) December 15th, 1573, Signed by John Rivers, mayor; Edwin, bishop of London; Alex. Nowell, dean of St. Paul’s; Gabriel Goodman, dean of Westminster; together with the attorney-general, solicitor-general, recorder, master of the rolls, and master of the requests.” But Mr. Cartwright lay concealed among his friends till an opportunity offered of leaving the kingdom.

The reverend Mr. Deering, reader of St. Paul’s, was also suspended for some trifling words spoken against the hierarchy in conversation; and in order to his restoration was obliged to subscribe four articles, viz. to the supre­macy; to the thirty-nine articles; to the Book of Common Prayer; and that the word and sacraments are rightly ad­ministered in the church of England; which he did, with some few exceptions. The commissioners then examined him upon fifteen or twenty articles more, of which these were some:—

“Whether we be tied by God’s word to the order and use of the apostles, and of the primitive church, in all things? Whether nothing may be in the church concerning ceremonies or regimen, but only that which Christ himself has commanded in his word? Whether every particular parish-church, of necessity and by the order of God’s word, ought to have their pastors, elders, and deacons, chosen by the people, and they only to have the whole government of the church in ecclesiastical matters? Whether there should be an equality among the ministers of this realm, as well concerning government and discipline, as the ministration of the word and sacraments? Whether the patrimony of the church, as glebe-lands and tithes, &c. ought to be taken from them? Whether the present ministers of the church of England are true ministers, and their administrations effectual? Whether it be more agreeable to God’s word, and more for the profit of the church, to use a form of com­mon prayer; or that every minister pray publicly, as his own spirit shall direct him? Whether the children of Pa­pists ought to be rebaptized? Whether an ecclesiastical person may have more livings than one? Whether a minis­ter of Christ may exercise a civil function?”[[85]](#footnote-85)

The rest of the articles, making in all above twenty, were about the obligation of the judicial laws of Moses, and the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. To all which Mr. Deering gave wise and modest answers, yield­ing as much as his principles and the nature of things would admit; but being called, as it were, before an inquisition, as he thought himself not bound to be his own accuser, so he prayed their honours, that what he had said might not be interpreted to his prejudice; yet the commissioners un­generously took advantage of his answers, and deprived him of his lecture.

Mr. Deering appealed from the commissioners to the council, who were pleased to restore him, which galled the archbishop, as appears by his letter to one of the commissioners, dated July 6th, 1573*,* in which are those words; “We have sent you certain articles taken out of Cart­wright’s book, by the council propounded to Mr. Deering, with his answers to the same; and also a copy of the coun­cil’s letter to Mr. Deering, to restore him to his former reading and preaching, notwithstanding our advices never required thereunto. These proceedings puff them up with pride, make the people hate us, and magnify them with great triumphing, that her majesty and her privy council have good liking of this new building:—but we are persuaded, her majesty has no liking thereof, howsoever the matter be fa­voured by others.”

Mr. Deering was a learned, pious, and peaceable Non­conformist; his printed sermons are polite and nervous. In his letter to the lord-treasurer Burleigh on this occasion, he offered to show, before any body of learned men, the differ­ence between bishops of the primitive church, and those of the present church of England, in the following particu­lars:—Bishops and ministers then were in one degree, now they are divers. There were then many bishops in one town, now there is but one in a whole country. No bishop’s authority was more than in one city, but now it is in many shires.—Bishops then used no bodily punishments, now they imprison, fine, &c. The primitive bishops could not ex­communicate, or absolve, merely by their own authority, now they may. Then, without consent of presbyters, they could make no ministers, now they do. They could confirm no children in other parishes, they do now in many shires. They had then but one living, now they have divers. They had neither officials, commissaries, nor chancellors. They dealt in no civil government by any established authority.[[86]](#footnote-86) They had no right to alienate any parsonage, or let it in lease. Then they had a church where they served the cure, as those we call parish-priests, though they were metropoli­tans or archbishops; so that Ambrose, St. Austin, and others, who lived as late as the fourth or fifth century, and were called bishops, had very little agreement with ours. But for this our archbishop never left him till he was silenced again and deprived.

On the 29th of January 1573, the reverend Mr. Arthur Wake, parson of Great-Willing, value 100£. a year; Eusebius Paget, parson of Owld, 100£. a year; Thurston Mosely, parson of Hardingston, 40£. a year; George Gilderd, par­son of Collingtrowge, and William Dawson, parson of Weston-Favel, one hundred marks (all in the diocese of Peterborough, of which Dr. Scambier was bishop, and James Ellis, LL.D, chancellor), were first suspended for three weeks, and then deprived of their livings. They were all preachers; four of them were licensed by the university as learned and religious divines, and three of them had been moderators in the exercises. The reasons of their depri­vation were not for errors in doctrine, or depravity of life, but for not subscribing two forms of the commissioners’ devising, one called *forma promissionis,* the other *forma objurationis.* In *the forma promissionis* they swear and sub­scribe, “to use the service and Common Prayer-book, and the public form of administration of sacraments, and no other; that they will serve in their cures according to the rites, or­ders, forms, and ceremonies, prescribed; and that they will not hereafter preach or speak anything tending to the deroga­tion of the said book, or any part thereof, remaining au­thorized by the laws and statutes of this realm.” In the *forma objurationis* they subscribe and protest upon oath, “that the book of consecration of archbishops and bishops, and of the ordering of deacons, set forth in the time of king Edward VI. and confirmed by authority of parliament, doth contain in it all things necessary for such consecration and ordering, having in it nothing that is either superstitious or ungodly, according to their judgment; and therefore that they which be consecrated and ordered according to the same book, be duly, orderly, and lawfully, ordained and consecrated, and that they do acknowledge their duty and obedience to their ordinary and diocesan as to a lawful ma­gistrate under the queen’s majesty, so set forth as the laws and statutes do require; which obedience they do promise, according as the laws shall bind them to perform. In testimony whereof they do hereunto subscribe their names.”[[87]](#footnote-87)

The ministers offered to use the Book of Common Prayer and no other; and not to preach against the same before the meeting of the next parliament; but apprehending the oath and subscription to be contrary to the laws of God and the realm, they appealed to the archbishop of Canterbury; who denied their appeal.[[88]](#footnote-88) Hereupon they presented a supplication to the queen, and another to the parliament, but could not be heard, though their case was most com­passionate, for they had wives and large families of chil­dren, which were now reduced to poverty and want, so that (us they say in their supplication) if God in his providence does not help they must beg.

In the room of the deprived ministers certain outlandish men succeeded, who could hardly read so as to be under­stood; the people were left untaught; instead of having two sermons every Lord’s day, there was now but one in a quarter of a year, and for the most part not that. The pa­rishioners signed petitions to the bishop for their former preachers, but to no purpose; they must swear and sub­scribe, or be buried in silence.

On the 20th of September 1573, the reverend Mr. Robert Johnson, already mentioned, sometime domestic chaplain to the lord-keeper Bacon, now parson of St. Cle­ments near Temple-bar, was tried at Westminster-hall for nonconformity;[[89]](#footnote-89) it was alleged against him, that he had married without the ring; and that he had baptized with­out the cross. Mr. Pierce[[90]](#footnote-90) says, he was also accused of a misdemeanour, because when once he was administering the sacrament, the wine falling short, he sent for more, but did not consecrate it afresh, accounting the former consecration sufficient for what was to be applied to the same use; but nothing of this kind appears in his two indictments which are now before me, with the names of all the witnesses; but for the other offences, viz. for omitting these words in the office of baptism, “I receive this child into the congregation of Christ’s flock, and do sign him with the sign of the cross, in token,” &c. And for omitting these words in the marry­ing of Leonard Morris and Agnes Miles, “With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow, in the name of the Father,” &c. and for refusing to subscribe, he was shut up in close prison for seven weeks, till he died in great poverty and want.

The forms of subscription varied in the several dioceses, though the usual subscription and protestation for such clergymen as were cited before the commissioners for non-conformity,[[91]](#footnote-91) was this; “I promise unfeignedly by these presents, and subscribe with my hand, that I will teach the word of God soberly, sincerely, and truly, according to the doctrine established by law, without moving unnecessary contentions; and that I will never suffer any person to use my licence of preaching, by rasing out the name, or abus­ing the seal; and that I will deliver up my licence, being so required by that authority from whence I had it.”

“I acknowledge the book of articles agreed on in the synod of 1503, and confirmed by the queen, to be sound and agreeable to the word of God. That the queen’s majesty is supreme governor of the church of England next under Christ, as well in ecclesiastical as in civil causes. That in the Book of Common Prayer there is nothing evil, or re­pugnant to the word of God, and that it may be well used in this our Christian church of England. That as the pub­lic preaching of the word in the church of England is sound and sincere, so the public order of administration of sacra­ments is consonant to the word of God. And whereas I have in public prayer, and administration of sacraments, neglected and omitted the order by public authority set down, following my own fancy in altering, adding, or omit­ting, of the same, not using such rites as by law and order are appointed; I acknowledge my fault therein, and am sorry for it, and humbly pray pardon for that disorder. And here I do submit myself to the order and rites set down • and I do promise that I will from henceforth, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments, use and ob­serve the same. The which I do presently and willingly testify with the subscription of mine own hand.”

But this not reaching the laity, many of whom deserted their own parish-churches, and went to hear the Noncon­formists, the commissioners framed the following subscrip­tion for such of them as should be presented as defaulters:

“I acknowledge the queen’s majesty to be chief governor of the church of England under Christ. That in the Book of Common Prayer there is nothing repugnant to the word of God. That as the public preaching in this church of Eng­land is sound, so the public administration of the sacraments is consonant to the word of God. And whereas I have absented myself from my parish-church, and have refused to join with the congregation in public prayer, and in receiv­ing the sacrament, according to the public order set down, and my duty in that behalf, I am right sorry for it, and pray that this my fault may be pardoned; and do promise, that from henceforth I will frequent my parish-church, and join with the congregation there, as well in prayer as in the ad­ministration of the sacraments, according to such order as by public authority is set down and established; and to wit­ness this my promise I do hereunto willingly subscribe my name.”[[92]](#footnote-92)

The officers of the spiritual courts planted their spies in all suspected parishes, to make observation of those who came not to church, and cause them to be summoned into the commons, where they were punished at pleasure.—The keepers were charged to take notice of such as came to visit the prisoners, or bring them relief; and upon notice given, spies were set upon them to bring them into trouble. Com­plaints have been made of their rude language to the bishops and the rest of the commissioners; and it is possible that their lordly behaviour, and arbitrary proceedings, might sometimes make their passions overflow. “Oppression will make a wise man mad.” But I have the examinations of se­veral before me, in which nothing of this kind appears. On the other hand, it is certain the conduct of the commissioners was high and imperious; their under officers were ravenous, and greedy of gain; the fees of the court were exorbitant,[[93]](#footnote-93) so that if an honest Puritan fell into their hands he was sure to be half ruined before he got out, though he was cleared of the accusation.[[94]](#footnote-94)

Notwithstanding the dangers already mentioned, “people resorted to the suffering Puritans in prison, as in Popery they were wont to run on pilgrimage (they are the bishop of London’s words). Some aldermen and several wealthy citizens, gave them great and stout countenances, and per­suaded others to do the like.”

Separate communions were established, where the sacra­ment of the Lord’s supper was administered privately, after the manner of the foreign reformed churches; and those who joined with them, according to archbishop Parker, signed the following protestation:—

“Being thoroughly persuaded in my conscience, by the working and by the word of the Almighty, that these relics of antichrist are abominable before the Lord our God; and also, for that by the power, mercy, strength, and goodness, of the Lord our God only, I am escaped from the filthiness and pollution of these detestable traditions, through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: and last of all, inasmuch as by the working also of the Lord Jesus his Holy Spirit, I have joined in prayer and hearing God’s word, with those that have not yielded to this idolatrous trash, notwithstanding the danger for not coming to my pa­rish-church, &c. Therefore I come not back again to the preaching of them that have received the marks of the Ro­mish beast.

“Because of God’s commandment to go forward to per­fection. Heb. vi. 1. 2 Cor. vii. 1. Psalm lxxxiv.' 1. Ephes, iv. 15. Also to avoid them. Rom. xvi. 17. Ephes, v. 11. I Thess. v. 22.

“Because they are an abomination before the Lord our God. Deut. xxvii. 25, 26. and xiii. 17. Ezek. xiv. 6.

“I will not beautify with my presence those filthy rags, which bring the heavenly word of the Eternal our Lord God into bondage, subjection, and slavery.

“Because I would not communicate with other men’s sins. John ii. 9-11. 1 Cor. vi. 17. Touch no unclean thing, &c. Sirach xiii. 1.

“They give offence both to preacher and hearers. Rom. xvi. 17. Luke xvii. 1.

“They glad and strengthen the Papists in their errors and grieve the godly. Ezek. xiii. 21, 22. [Note this 21st verse.]

“They do persecute our Saviour Jesus Christ in his mem­bers. Acts ix. 4,5. 2 Cor. i. 5. Also they reject and despise our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Luke x. 16. Moreover those labourers, who at the prayer of the faithful, the Lord hath sent forth into his harvest, they refuse and also reject. Matt. ix. 38.

“These Popish garments are now become very idols in­deed, because they are exalted above the word of the Al­mighty.

“I come not to them because they should be ashamed, and so leave their idolatrous garments, &c. 2 Thess. iii. 14. If any man obey not our sayings, note him.

“Moreover, I have now joined myself to the church of Christ, wherein I have yielded myself subject to the disci­pline of God’s word, as I promised at my baptism, which if I should now again forsake, and join myself with their tra­ditions, I should forsake the union wherein I am knit to the body of Christ, and join myself to the discipline of an­tichrist; for in the church of the traditionaries there is no other discipline than that which has been maintained by the antichristian pope of Rome, whereby the church of God has always been afflicted, and is until this day, for the which cause I refuse them.

“God give us grace still to strive in suffering under the cross, that the blessed word of our God may only rule and have the highest place, to cast down strongholds, to destroy or overthrow policy, or imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and to bring into captivity or subjection, every thought to the obedience of Christ. 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. That the name and word of the Eternal our Lord God may be exalted, and magnified above all things. Psalm, viii. 2. Finis.”[[95]](#footnote-95)

To this protestation the congregation did severally swear, and then received the communion for the ratification of their assent; if we may believe the relation of archbishop Par­ker, who wrote this last paragraph with his own hand; though his grace had not always the best information, nor was sufficiently careful to distinguish between subscribing and swearing.

Sundry Nonconformists, who were willing to be at ease, and avoid the hazard of persecution, took shelter in the French and Dutch churches, and joined themselves to their communion: there were not many of this sort, because they understood not their language. But the queen and council had their eye upon them, and resolved to drive them from this shelter; for this purpose a letter was written from the council-board, to the ministers and elders of the Dutch church in London, bearing date April 1573, in which they say, “that they were not ignorant, that from the beginning of the Christian religion various churches had various and di­vers rites and ceremonies; that in their service and devo­tions, some stood, some kneeled, and others lay prostrate, and yet the piety and religion was the same, if they directed their prayers to the true God, without impiety and superstition. They added farther, that they contemned not their rites; nay, that they approved their ceremonies as fit and convenient for them, and that state whence they sprang. They expected therefore, that their congregation should not despise the customs of the English church, nor do any thing that might create a suspicion of disturbing its peace; and in particular, that they should not receive into their communion any of this realm that offered to join with them, and leave the customs and practice of their native country, lest the queen should be moved to banish them out of the kingdom.”[[96]](#footnote-96)

Endeavours had been used to bring these churches under the jurisdiction or superintendency of the bishop of the diocese for the time being; but they pleaded their charter, and that Grindal, while bishop of London, was their su­perintendent only by their own consent; however, a quar­rel happening sometime after in the Dutch church at Nor­wich, the queen’s commissioners interposed; and because the elders refused to own their jurisdiction, they banished all their three ministers; which struck such a terror into those of London, that when they received the council’s let­ter they were perfectly submissive, and after returning thanks for their own liberties, they promised to expel all such out of their church; and for the future not to receive any English, who from such principles should separate them­selves from the customs of their own country.[[97]](#footnote-97)

Gualter, Bullinger, and other foreign divines, again this year addressed the bishops their correspondents for mode­ration, but nothing could be obtained; only Parkhurst, bishop of Norwich, lamented the case, and wished to God, that all the English people would follow the church of Zurich, as the most absolute pattern. “The Papists (says he) lift up their crests, while Protestants walk about the streets dejected and sorrowful; for at this time there are not a few preachers that have laid down their cures of souls, and left them to fools and idiots, and that for this reason, because they would not use the linen garment called a surplice. New and severe edicts are lately published here against such as refuse to observe our ceremonies: pray God give a good issue, and have mercy upon all the churches of Christ.”

The prophesyings of the clergy, begun in the year 1571, had by this time [1574] spread into the dioceses of York, Chester, Durham, and Ely; the bishop of London set them up in several parts of his diocese; as did most of the other bishops. The clergy were divided into classes, or associa­tions, under a moderator appointed by the bishop; their meetings were once a fortnight; the people were present at the sermon; and after they were dismissed, the members of the association, whose names were subscribed in a book, Censured the performance. These exercises were of great service to expose the errors of Popery, and spread the knowledge of the Scriptures among the people.

But the queen was told by the archbishop, that they were no better than seminaries of Puritanism;[[98]](#footnote-98) that the more averse the people were to Popery, the more they were in danger of nonconformity: that these exercises tended to popularity, and made the people so inquisitive, that they would not submit to the orders of their superiors, as they ought. It was said farther, that some of the ministers dis­used the habits, and discoursed on church-discipline; and that others were too forward to show their abilities, to the discouragement of honest men of lower capacities; and that all this was notorious in the diocese of Norwich. Hereupon the queen gave the archbishop private orders to put them down everywhere, and to begin with Norwich; his grace accordingly wrote to Matchet, one of the chaplains in that diocese, requiring him to repair to his ordinary, and show him, how the queen had willed him to suppress those vain prophesyings; and that thereupon he should require the said ordinary, in her majesty’s name, immediately to dis­charge them from any farther such doings.

This was very unacceptable news to the good old bishop, who taking hold of the word *vain,* wrote to the archbishop, desiring to be resolved, whether he meant thereby the abuse, or some vain speeches used in some of these conferences; or in general, the whole order of those exercises; of which he freely declared his own approbation, saying, “that they had, and still did bring, singular benefit to the church of God, as well in the clergy as in the laity, and were right necessary exercises to be continued, so the same were not abused, as indeed they had not been, unless in one or two places at the most; whereof after he had knowledge he wrote an earnest letter to his chancellor, that such persons as were over-busy speakers should be put to silence, unless they would subscribe to the articles of conformity in reli­gion, or else promise not to intermeddle with any matter established and commanded by her majesty; which was per­formed accordingly, since which time he had not heard, but all things had succeeded quietly without offence to any.”

The archbishop was vexed at this letter, and wrote back to his chaplain, “that it was one of his old griefs, that this bishop had shewn his letter to his friends, who had eluded its true meaning, by standing upon the word *vain.* It is pity, says he, that we should show any vanity in our obedi­ence?’ In the meantime the bishop of Norwich applied to the privy council, who knew nothing of this affair; but were surprised at the archbishop’s order, and gave his lord­ship instructions to uphold the prophesyings. Their letter was as follows:

“*Salutem in Christo.* Whereas we understand that there are certain good exercises of prophesyings and expounding of Scriptures in Norfolk, as namely, at Holt-town, and other places, whereby both speakers and hearers do profit much, in the knowledge of the word of God. And whereas some not well minded towards true religion, and the knowledge of God, speak evil and slanderously of these exercises, as commonly they used to do against the sincere preaching of God’s holy word; these are to require your lordship, that so long as the truth is godly and reverently uttered in their prophesyings, and that no seditious, heretical, or schisma­tical doctrine, tending to the disturbance of the peace of the church, can be proved to be taught or maintained in the same; that so good a help and means to further true reli­gion may not be hindered and stayed, but may proceed and go forward to God’s glory, and the edifying of the people. Thus not doubting of your forwardness herein, your office and calling dutifully requiring the same at your hands, we bid your lordship right heartily farewell.[[99]](#footnote-99)

“Your lordship’s loving friends,

“T. Smith, Edwin, bp. London,

“Wa. Mildmay, Fran. Knollys.

“From London, this 6th

of May, 1574.”

The archbishop was surprised to see his orders countermanded by the privy council; but his grace took no notice of it to them, only acquainting the queen with it; by whose direction he wrote again to the bishop; that whereas he understood he had received letters from the council to con­tinue the prophesyings, contrary to the queen’s express command, he desired to know, what warrant they had given him for their proceedings; upon this the bishop of Norwich wrote back to the bishop of London, who was one of those that had signed the letter, for advice: but his lordship and the council were afraid to meddle any farther.

Parker, being thus supported by the queen, wrote again to Norwich, commanding the bishop peremptorily to obey the queen’s orders, upon pain of her majesty’s high displea­sure; and advised him not to be led by fantastical folk, nor take such young men into his counsels, who, when they had brought him into danger, could not bring him out of it. Of my care I have for you and the diocese (says the archbishop) I write thus much.[[100]](#footnote-100)

Upon this the good old bishop submitted, and wrote to his chancellor from Ludham, June the 7th, “――Whereas, by the receipt of my lord of Canterbury’s letter, I am com­manded by him, in the queen her majesty’s name, that the prophesyings throughout my diocese should be suppressed, these are therefore to will you, that as conveniently as you may, you give notice to every of my commissaries, that they in their several circuits may suppress the same. And so I leave you to God.” Thus were these religious exercises suppressed in one diocese, which was but the prologue to their downfall over the whole kingdom.

But his lordship did not long survive this distinguishing mark of the archbishop’s displeasure, for towards the latter end of the year he departed this life, to the great loss of his diocese, and of the whole church of England.

John Parkhurst, bishop of Norwich, was born at Guild­ford in Surrey, 1511, and educated in Merton-college, Oxon. He had been domestic chaplain to queen Katharine Parr, tutor to bishop Jewel, and rector of the rich parsonage of Clive; all which he forsook in the reign of queen Mary, and was an exile at Zurich in Switzerland, where he was so delighted with the order and discipline of that church, that he would often wish the church of England were model­led according to it. He was an open favourer of the Puri­tans, and never entered willingly into any methods of sever­ity against them. “I find (says he, in one of his letters to archbishop Parker) that rough and severe methods do the least good, and that the contrary has won over divers; and therefore I choose to go in this way, rather than with others to overrule by rigour and extremity.”[[101]](#footnote-101) He would willing­ly have allowed a liberty of officiating in the church, to such as could not conform to the ceremonies; but by com­mand from above, he was forced sometimes to obey his su­periors, contrary to his judgment. The bishop was a zeal­ous Protestant, and a great enemy to Popery; a learned divine, a faithful pastor, a diligent and constant preacher, and an example to his flock in righteousness, in faith, in love, in peace, in word, and in purity. He was exceeding hospitable, and kept a table for the poor; and was univer­sally beloved, honoured, and esteemed, by his whole diocese. This character is given him, says Mr. Strype, by one that knew him well, Thomas Becon, a native of Norfolk, and of known eminence in those days. He was made bishop of Norwich 1560, and died of the stone this year [1574], in the sixty-third year of his age.

Sundry well-disposed people in the parishes of Balsham in Cambridgeshire, and of Strethall in Essex, met together on holidays, and at other times, after they had done work, to read the Scriptures, and to confirm one another in the Christian faith and practice; but as soon as the commis­sioners were informed of these assemblies, the parsons of the parishes were sent for, and ordered to suppress them; though the honest people declared themselves conformable to the orders of the church, and that they met together after dinner, or after supper, upon holidays only, for their own and their families’ instruction; for the reformation of vice, and for a farther acquaintance with the word of God: the occasion of their assemblies we have in their own words: “for that heretofore (say they) we have at divers times spent and consumed our holidays vainly, in drinking at the alehouse, and playing at cards, tables, dice, and other vain pastimes, not meet for us and such of our calling and degree, for the which we have been often blamed of our parson; we thought it better to bestow the time in soberly and god­ly reading the Scriptures, only for the purposes aforesaid, and no other. We do not favour or maintain any of the opinions of the Anabaptists, Puritans, Papists, or Libertines, but would be glad to learn our duty towards God, our prince, and magistrates, towards our neighbours and our families, in such sort as becomes good, and faithful, and obedient subjects, and it is our greatest and only desire to live, follow, and perform, the same accordingly, as God shall give us grace.” But our archbishop had rather these poor people should be drinking and gaming at an alehouse, then engaged in a religious assembly not appointed by pub­lic authority.[[102]](#footnote-102)

The reverend Mr. Sampson, late dean of Christ-church, Oxon, was this year struck with the dead palsy on one side, which made him resign his lecture in the church at Whit­tington-college, which he had held to this time, and for which he had 10£. a year: it was in the gift of the cloth­workers’ company, to whom he recommended Mr. Deering for his successor; but Deering being silenced for nonconformity, the archbishop utterly refused him, which Sampson complained of in a letter to the treasurer, saying, “that though my lord of Canterbury liked not to take pains in the congregation himself, yet should he not forbid others who were both able and willing; that he could find no fault with Mr. Deering’s doctrine or manner of life; and that this was no great promotion.”[[103]](#footnote-103) He therefore humbly de­sired, that if the cloth-workers chose him, that his lordship would use his interest with the archbishop not to refuse him, but his grace was inflexible, and so the business miscarried.

This Mr. Sampson was a most exact man in his princi­ples and morals; and having suffered the loss of all things for a good conscience, he took the liberty to write freely to his superiors upon proper occasions; and among others to Grindal, archbishop of York, who had been his compa­nion in exile, though now advanced to the dignity of a lord­-archbishop. Sampson in one of his letters put him in mind of his former low condition, and cautioned him against being too much exalted with his high title. Grindal told him, he did not value the title of a lord, but that his great care was, to discharge his function faithfully until the great day of the Lord. Sampson replied, “that if he, whom worldly policy had made a lord, kept the humility of a humble brother and minister of the gospel, he was a phoenix; but his port, his train of waiting-men in the streets, his gentlemen-ushers going before him with bare heads, and his family full of idle serving-men, looked very lordly.” He adds, “that his own and his brethren’s revenues should not be laid out in maintaining a parcel of lazy idle servants, but rather upon these who were labourers in the harvest of the Lord Jesus. That whereas the archbishop had called them Puritans, it was a name unjustly imposed on brethren with whose doctrine and life none could find fault: if by Puri­tans such were meant as, following Novatus, dissembled themselves to be teachers, and wished the ceremonies might be observed, while they hated the customs of the ancient church, then might a number of churchmen be called Pu­ritans; and he prayed God to purge them and make them more pure—.” And whereas the archbishop in his letter had pitied his complaints of poverty and lameness, he said, “he complained of nothing; if he should complain of the former it would be before he had need; but when he had need he would complain to those to whom he might com­plain. Concerning his lameness, he was so far from com­plaining of that, that he humbly thanked God for it; and these chains he would choose to carry before the clogs and cares of a bishopric.”[[104]](#footnote-104) Such was the plain dealing of this confessor to one of the highest dignitaries in the church.

Parker’s zeal against the Puritans betrayed him some­times into great inconveniences; like a true inquisitor, he listened to every idle story of his scouts, and sent it presently to the queen or council; and the older he grew, the more did his jealousies prevail. In the month of June one of his servants acquainted him, that there was a design of the Puritans against the life of the lord-treasurer and his own; and that the chief conspirator was one Undertree, encouraged by the great earl of Leicester: the old arch­bishop was almost frighted out of his wits at the news, as appears by the following passage in his letter to the trea­surer: “This horrible conspiracy (says he) has so astonished me, that my will and memory are quite gone; I would I were dead before I see with my corporal eyes that which is now brought to a full ripeness.” He then prays, that the detector of this conspiracy may be protected and honour­ably. considered, and the conspirators punished with the utmost severity, otherwise the end would be worse than the beginning. And that he might not seem to express all this concern for his own safety, he tells the treasurer, that it was for his sake and the queen's that he was so jealous, “for he feared that when rogues attempted to destroy those that were so near her majesty’s person, they would at last make the same attempt upon her too; and that even some that lay in her bosom [Leicester], when opportunity served, would sting her.” The archbishop sent out his scouts to apprehend the conspirators that his steward had named, who pretended a secret correspondence with Undertree; and among others who were taken into custody, were, the reverend Mr. Bonham, Brown, and Stonden, divines of great name among the Puritans: Stonden had been one of the preachers to the queen’s army, when the earl of Warwick was sent against the northern rebels. Many per­sons of honour were also accused, as, the earls of Bedford, Leicester, and others. But when Undertree came to be examined before the council, the whole appeared to be a sham, between Undertree and the archbishop’s steward, to disgrace the Puritans, and punish them as enemies to the state as well as the church. So early was the vile practice of fathering sham plots upon the Puritans begun, which was repeated so often in the next age! Undertree had forged letters in the names of Bonham, Stonden, and others; as appeared to a demonstration when they were produced before the council, for they were all written with one hand, When he was examined about his accomplices he would accuse nobody, but took the whole upon himself; so that their honours wrote immediately to the archbishop to dis­charge his prisoners.[[105]](#footnote-105) But, which is a little unaccountable, neither Undertree nor the archbishop’s steward received any punishment.

His grace’s reputation suffered by this plot; all impar­tial men cried out against him, for shutting up men of cha­racter and reputation in prison, upon such idle reports. The Puritans and their friends reflected upon his honour and honesty; and in particular the bishop of London, and Dr. Chatterton master of Queen’s college, Cambridge, whom in his wrath he called a chatterer; and in his letter to Grindal archbishop of York, said, “that he cared not three chips for aught that could be proved as to his alle­giance; he doing it so secretly, faithfully, and prudently, as he did; and would do the same again, if he knew no more than he did at that time.” The earl of Leicester could not but resent his ill-usage of him, which he had an oppor­tunity to repay had he been so minded; the archbishop having executed an act of justice [as he called it] upon a person in the late plot, after he had received a letter from court forbidding him to do it; which was not very consist­ent with his allegiance. But the archbishop braved out his conduct against everybody, after his own brethren the bishops, and all the world, had abandoned him. He told the lord-treasurer, “that he cared not for Leicester, though he was informed he took counsel with the Precisians to undo him: that though he had written to the earl, and to another Puritan courtier, it was not in way of submission, as some of the crew reported and took it.[[106]](#footnote-106) That the earl had peace­ably written again to him, dissembling his malice like a right courtier: but he notwithstanding understood what was purposed against him, and for religion’s sake he took it. This was the spirit and language of our archbishop!

One of the last public acts in which his grace was em­ployed, was visiting the diocese of Winchester, and in par­ticular the isle of Wight, in 1575; and here he made use of such methods of severity, says Mr. Strype, as made him talked against all over the country. This island was a place of resort for foreign Protestants, and seafaring men of all countries, which occasioned the habits and ceremonies not to be so strictly observed as in other places, their trade and commerce requiring a latitude: when the archbishop came thither with his retinue, he gave himself no trouble about the welfare of the island, but turned out all those ministers who refused the habits, and shut up their churches. This was so great a concern to the inhabitants, that they sent up their complaints to the earl of Leicester, who made such a report to the queen of the archbishop’s proceedings, that her majesty immediately gave order, that things should re­turn to their former channel;[[107]](#footnote-107) and when his grace came to court after his visitation, her majesty received him coldly, and declared her displeasure against his unseasonable se­verities.—The bishop of Winchester also complained, that the clergy of his diocese had been sifted in an unmerciful manner; all which, instead of softening this prelate, drew from him the following angry letter to the lord-treasurer, wherein he complains “of the strong interest the Puritans had at court; and of the inconstancy of some of the bishops; that several of that order lay by and did little, while others endeavoured to undermine him. That the queen was al­most the only person that stood firm to the church; but if the Precisians had the advantage, her majesty would be undone. That he was not so much concerned for the cap, tippet, surplice, wafer-bread, and such-like ceremonies, as for the authority of the laws that enjoined them. The queen indeed had told him, that he had the supreme go­vernment ecclesiastical, but upon experiment he found it very much hampered and embarrassed. Before God (says he) I fear that her highness’s authority is not regarded; and if public laws are once disregarded, the government must sink at once.”[[108]](#footnote-108)

There was but one corner of the British dominions that our archbishop’s arm could not reach, viz. the isles of Guernsey and Jersey; these had been a receptacle for the French refugees from the Parisian massacre; and lying upon the coasts of France, the inhabitants were chiefly of that nation, and were allowed the use of the Geneva or French discipline, by the lords of the council. An order of the states of France had been formerly obtained, to se­parate them from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Constance in Normandy, but no form of discipline having been settledby law since the Reformation, Mr. Cartwright and Snape were invited to assist the ministers in framing a proper dis­cipline for their churches: this fell out happily for Cart­wright, who being forced to abandon his native country, made this the place of his retreat. The two divines being arrived, one was made titular pastor of Mount Orgueil, in the isle of Jersey; and the other of Castle Cornet, in Guernsey. The representatives of the several churches being assembled at St. Peter’s Port in Guernsey, they communicated to them a draught of discipline, which was debated, and accommodated to the use of those islands, and finally settled the year following, as appears by the title of it, which is this; “The ecclesiastical discipline observed and practised by the churches of Jersey and Guernsey, after the reformation of the same, by the ministers, elders, and deacons, of the isles of Guernsey and Jersey, Sark and Al­derney, confirmed by the authority, and in the presence, of the governors of the same isles, in a synod holden in Guernsey, June 28, 1576; and afterward received by the said ministers and elders, and confirmed by the said go­vernors in a synod, holden in Jersey the 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 17th days of October, 1577.” The book consists of twenty chapters, and each chapter of several articles, which were constantly observed in these islands till the latter end of the reign of king James I. when the liturgy of the church of England supplanted it.**[[109]](#footnote-109)**

Though the Papists were the queen’s most dangerous enemies, her majesty had a peculiar tenderness for them;[[110]](#footnote-110) she frequently released them out of prison, and connived at their religious assemblies, of which there were above five hundred in England at this time: many of the queen’s sub­jects resorted to the Portugal ambassador’s house in Char­ter-house yard, where mass was publicly celebrated; and because the sheriffs and recorder of London disturbed them, they were committed to the Fleet by the queen’s ex­press command. At the same time they were practising against the queen’s life; and that their religion might not die with the present age, seminaries were erected and en­dowed, in several parts of Europe, for the education of English youth, and for providing a succession of missiona­ries to be sent into England for the propagation of their faith. The first of these was erected when the kingdom was ex­communicated; after which many others were founded, to the unspeakable prejudice of the Protestant religion. To set them before the reader in one view: colleges were erected at the following places:

The 1st at Douay, 1569, by Philip king of Spain.

2d at Rome, 1579, by pope Gregory XIII.

3d at Valladolid, 1589, by the king of Spain.

4th at Seville, 1593, by the same.

5th at St. Omer's, 1596, by the same.

6th at Madrid, 1606, by Joseph Creswel, Jesuit.

7th at Louvaine, 1606, by Philip III. of Spain.

8th at Liege, 1616, by the abp. of that country.

9th at Ghent, 1624, by Philip IV.

The Popish nobility and gentry sent over their children to these colleges for education;[[111]](#footnote-111) and it is incredible what a mass of money was collected in England for their mainte­nance, by their provincials, sub-provincials, assistants, agents, coadjutors, familiars, &c. out of the estates of such Catholics as were possessed of abbey-lands; the pope dis­pensing with their holding them on these considerations. The oath taken by every student at his admission was this;

“Having resolved to offer myself wholly up to divine service, as much as I may, to fulfil the end for which this our college was founded, I promise and swear, in the pre­sence of Almighty God, that I am prepared from mine heart, with the assistance of divine grace, in due time to receive holy orders, and to return into England, to convert the souls of my countrymen and kindred, when and as often as it shall seem good to the superior of this college.”

The number of students educated in these colleges may be collected from hence; that whereas according to Saun­ders, an eminent Popish writer,[[112]](#footnote-112) there were but thirty old priests remaining in England, this year [1575], the two colleges of Douay and Rome alone, in a very few years, sent over three hundred; and it is not to be doubted, but there was a like proportion from the rest.

About this time began to appear *the family of love,* which derived its pedigree from one Henry Nicholas, a Dutchman. By their confession of faith published this year, it appears that they were high enthusiasts; that they allegorized the doctrines of revelation, and, under a pretence of attaining to spiritual perfection, adopted some odd and whimsical opinions, while they grew too lax in their morals, being in their principles something akin to the Quietists of the church of Rome, and the Quakers among ourselves. They had their private assemblies for devotion, for which they tasted of the severities of the government.

But the weight of the penal laws fell heaviest upon some of the German Anabaptists, who refused to join with the Dutch or English churches. There were two sorts of Ana­baptists that sprung up with the reformation in Germany; one was of those who differed only about the subject and mode of baptism, whether it should be administered to in­fants, or in any other manner than by dipping the whole body under water. But others, who bore that name, were mere enthusiasts, men of fierce and barbarous tempers, who broke out into a general revolt, and raised the war called the Rustic war. They had an unintelligible way of talking of religion, which they usually turned into allegory; and these being joined in the common name of Anabaptists, brought the others under an ill-character. Twenty-seven of them were apprehended in a private house without Aldersgate-bars, on Easter-day, 1575, where they were as­sembled for worship: of these, four recanted the following errors, (1.) That Christ took not flesh of the substance of the Virgin. (2.) That infants born of faithful parents ought to be rebaptized. (3.) That no Christian man ought to be a magistrate. (4.) That it is not lawful for a Christian man to take an oath. But others refusing to abjure, eleven of them, all Dutchmen, were condemned in the consistory of St. Paul’s to be burnt, nine of whom were banished, and two suffered the extremity of the fire in Smithfield, July 22, 1575, viz. John Wielmacker and Hendrick Ter Woort. Thus the writ *de hæretico comburendo,* which, had hung up only *in terrorem* for seventeen years, was taken down and put in execution upon these unhappy men. The Dutch congregation interceded earnestly for their lives; as did Mr. Fox the martyrologist, in an elegant Latin letter to the queen, but she was immovable; so distant was her majesty from the tender spirit of her brother king Edward.[[113]](#footnote-113)

A little before the burning of these heretics Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, departed this life: he was born at Norwich, 1504, and educated in Bene’t-college, Cambridge. In the reign of king Edward VI.[[114]](#footnote-114) he married, and was therefore obliged to live privately under queen Mary. Upon queen Elizabeth’s accession he was advanced to the archbishopric of Canterbury; and how he managed in that high station, may be collected from the foregoing history. He wrote a book entitled, Antiquitates Britannicæ, which shows him to have had some skill in ecclesias­tical antiquity; but he was a severe churchman; of a rough and unchurtly temper, and of high and arbitrary principles both in church and state; a slave to the prerogative and the supremacy; and a bitter enemy to the Puritans, whom he persecuted to the length of his power, and beyond the limits of the law. His religion consisted in a servile obedi­ence to the queen’s injunctions, and in regulating the pub­lic service of the church: but his grace had too little regard for public virtue;[[115]](#footnote-115) his entertainments and feastings being chiefly on the Lord’s day: nor do we read, among his epis­copal qualities, of his diligent preaching or pious example. Fuller calls him a Parker indeed, careful to keep the fences, and shut the gates of discipline, against all such night- stealers as would invade the same; and indeed this was his chief excellence. He was a considerable benefactor to Bene’t-college, the place of his education, where he ordered his MS. papers to be deposited, which have been of considerable service to the writers of the English Reformation.[[116]](#footnote-116) He died of the stone on the 17th of May, 1575, in the seventy-se­cond year of his age, and was interred in Lambeth-chapel the 6th of June following; where his body rested till the end of the civil wars; when Col. Scot, having purchased that palace for a mansion-house, took down the monument, and buried the bones, says Mr. Strype,[[117]](#footnote-117) in a stinking dung- hill, where they remained till some years after the restora­tion, when they were decently reposed near the place where the monument had stood, which was now again erected to his memory.[[118]](#footnote-118)

1. This was, undoubtedly, true, with respect to the majority: but this history has furnished different instances of objections in point of doctrine. The established sentiments concerning the Trinity and the person of Christ, though they did not form the grounds of that separation, of which our author writes, were yet called in question, and as we have seen in the note p. 61, were by no means universally received. But it would not have been surprising, if in that early period of the Reformation, there had been a perfect acquiescence in every doctrinal principle, that did not appear to have been peculiar to the system of Popery: for the progress of the mind and of inquiry is necessarily gradual. The gross corruptions of Popery were at first sufficient to occupy and fill the thoughts of the generality.—A kind of sacred awe spread itself over questions connected with the character and nature of God and his Christ, which would deter many from a close and free examination of them. And ceremonies and habits, being more obvious to the senses, continually coming into use and practice, and being enforced with severity, the questions relative to them more easily engaged attention, were more level to the decision of common understandings, and became immediately interesting. In this state of things there was little room and less inclination to push inquiries on matters of speculation.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Bishop Warburton is displeased with Mr. Neal for speaking of the natural right every man has to judge for himself as one of the heads of controversy between the Puritans and Conformists: when, his lordship adds, “his whole history shows that this was a truth unknown to either party.” It is true, that neither party had clear, full, and extensive views on this point; or were disposed to grant the consequences arising from it. But each in a degree admitted it and acted upon it. And the Puritans, it appears, by p. 199, rested their vindication, in part, upon this principle.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Which, adds Dr. Warner, “plainly showed Elizabeth to be the true daughter of Henry.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Life of Grindal, p. 242. Life of Parker, p. 342. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Pierce, p. 42. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Life of Grindal, Records, no. 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This was done at the motion and council of bishop Grindal.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Grindal’s Life, p. 135. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The names of the men were, John Smith, John Roper, Robert Tod, Robert Hawkins, James Ireland, William Nickson, Walter Hyukesinan, Thomas Rowland, George Waddy, William Turner, John Nashe, James Adderton, William Wight, Thomas Lydford, Richard Langton, Alexander Lacy, John Leonard, Roger Hawksworth, Robert Sparrow, Richard King, Christopher Colman, John Benson, John Bolton, Robert Gates. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. MS. 42. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. MS. p. 22. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. MS. p. 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Strype’s Ann. vol. 1. p. 623, [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Strype’s Ann. p. 216. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Strype’s Ann. p. 541. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Giindal’s Life, p. 133. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Collyer, p. 523. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. 13 Eliz, cap. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Life of Parker, p. 324. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Wood’s Athen. Ox. vol. 1. p. 125, 126. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. I have an example of this now before me. The reverend Mr. Axton, minister of Morton-Corbet in Leicestershire, was cited into the bishop’s court three several times this year, and examined upon the reasons of his refusing the apparel, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the sacrament, which he debated with the bishop and his officers with a decent freedom and courage. At the close of the debate the bishop said,

    Bish. Now, Mr. Axton, 1 would know of you, what you think of the calling of the bishops of England?

    Axton. I may fall into danger by answering this question.

    Bish. I may compel you to answer upon your oath.

    Axt. But I may choose whether I will answer upon oath or not. I am not bound to bring myself into danger; but because I am persuaded it will redound to God’s glory, I will speak, be the consequence what it will; and I trust in the Holy Spirit that I shall be willing to die in defence of the truth.

    Bish. Well; what do you think of my calling?

    Axt. You are not lawfully called to be a bishop, according to the word of God.

    Bish. I thought so; but why?

    Axt. For three causes, 1. Because you were not ordained by the consent of the eldership.

    Bish. But I had the hands of three or four bishops.

    Axt. But that is not the eldership St. Paul speaks of, 1 Tim. iv. 14.

    Bish. By what eldership were you ordained? Was it not by a bishop?

    Axt. I had indeed the laying on of the hands of one of the bishops of England, but that was the least part of my calling.

    Bish. What calling had you more?

    Axt. I having exercised and expounded the word several times in an ordinary assembly of ten ministers; they joined in prayer, and, being required to speak their consciences in the presence of God, declared upon the trial they had of me, that they were persuaded I might become a profitable labourer in the house of God; after which I received the laying on of the hands of the bishop.

    Bish. But you had not the laying on of the hands of those preachers.

    Axt. No; I had the substance, but I wanted the accident, wherein I beseech the Lord to be merciful to me; for the laying on of hands, as it is the word, so it is agreeable with the mighty action of ordaining the ministers of God.

    Bish. Well, then your ordination is imperfect as well asinine. What is your second reason?

    Axt. Because you are not ordained bishop over any one flock; nay, you are not a pastor over any one congregation, contrary to 1. Pet. v. 2, “Feed the flock;” and to Acts xiv. 23.; from whence it is manifest that there should be bishops and elders through every congregation!

    Bish. What is a congregation?

    Axt. Not a whole diocese, but such a number of people as ordinarily assemble in one place to hear the word of God.

    Bish. What if you had a parish six or seven miles long, where many could not come to hear once in a quarter of a year?

    Axt. I would not be pastor over such a flock.

    Bish. What is your third reason?

    Axt. Because you are not chosen by the people; Acts xiv. 23. “And they ordained elders by election in every church,” “by the lifting up of hands.”

    B.’s Chanc. How come you to be parson of Morton-Corbet?

    Axt. 1 am no parson.

    Chanc. Are you then vicar?

    Axt. No; I am no vicar. I abhor those names as antichristian; I am pastor of the congregation there.

    Chanc. Are you neither parson nor vicar? How hold you your living?

    Axt. I receive these temporal things of the people, because I, being their pastor, do minister to them spiritual things.

    Chanc. If you are neither parson nor vicar you must reap no profit.

    Axt. Do you mean good faith in that you say?

    Chanc. Yea, if you will be neither parson nor vicar, there is good cause why another should.

    Bish. You must understand, that all livings in the church are given to ministers as parsons and vicars, and not as pastors and ministers. How were you chosen pastor?

    Axt. By the free election of the people and leave of the patron: after I had preached about six weeks by way of probation, I was chosen by one consent of them all, a sermon being preached by one of my brethren, setting forth the mutual duties of pastor and people.

    Bish. May the bishops of England ordain ministers?

    Axt. You ought not to do it in the manner ye do; that is, without the consent of the eldership, without sufficient proof of their qualifications, and without ordaining them to a particular congregation.

    Bish. Well, Mr. Axton, you must yield somewhat to me, and I will yield somewhat to you; I will not trouble you for the cross in baptism; and if you will wear the surplice but sometimes it shall suffice.

    Axt. 1 can’t consent to wear the surplice, it is against my conscience; I trust, by the help of God, I shall never put on that sleeve which is a mark of the beast.

    Bish. Will you leave your flock for the surplice?

    Axt. Nay, will you persecute me from my flock for a surplice? I love my flock in Jesus Christ, and had rather have my right arm cut off than be removed from them.

    Bish. Well, I will not deprive you this time.

    Axt. I beseech you consider what you do in removing me from my flock, seeing I am not come in at the window, or by simony, but according to the institution of Jesus Christ. .

    On the 22d of November following Mr. Axton appeared again, and was examined touching organs, music in churches, and obedience to the queen’s laws, &c.

    Bish. You in refusing the surplice are disloyal to the queen, and shewa contempt of her laws.

    Axt. You do me great injury in charging me with disloyalty; and especially when you call me and my brethren traitors, and say, that we are more troublesome subjects than the Papists.

    Bish. I say still, the Papists are afraid to stir, but you are presumptuous, and disquiet the state more than they.

    Axt. If I, or any that fear God, speak the truth, doth this disquiet the state? The Papists have for twelve years been plotting treason against the queen and the gospel, and yet this doth not grieve you. But I protest in the presence of God, and of you all, that I am a true and faithful subject to her majesty; also I do pray daily both publicly and privately, for her majesty’s safety, and for her long and prosperous reign, and for the overthrow of all her enemies, and especially the Papists. I do profess myself an enemy to her enemies, and a friend to her friends; therefore, if you have any conscience, cease to charge me with disloyalty to my prince.

    Bish. Inasmuch as you refuse to wear the surplice, which she has commanded, you do in eflect deny her to be supreme governess in all causes ecclesiastical and temporal.

    Axt. I admit her majesty’s supremacy so far, as, if there be any error in the go­vernors of the church, she has power to reform it; but I do not admit her to be an ecclesiastical elder, or church-governor.

    Bish. Yes; but she is, and hath full power and authority all manner of ways; in­deed she doth not administer the sacraments and preach, but leaveth those things to us. But if she were a man, as she is a woman, why might she not preach the word of God as well as we?

    Axt. May she, if she were a man, preach the word of God? Then she may also ad­minister the sacraments.

    Bish. This does not follow, for you know Paul preached, and yet did not baptize.

    Axt. Paul confesses that he did baptize, though he was sent especially to preach.

    Bish. Did not Moses teach the people? and yet he was their civil governor.

    Ax’. Moses’s calling was extraordinary. Remember the king of Judah, how he would have sacrificed in the temple of God. Take heed how you confound those offices which God has distinguished.

    Bish. You see how he runneth.

    Bickley. You speak very confidently and rashly.

    Bish. This is his arrogant spirit.-—MS. p. 55, 56.

    Thus the dispute broke off, and the good man, notwithstanding all his supplica­tions, was deprived of his living, and driven to seek his bread in another country, though the bishop owned he was a divine of good learning, a ready memory, and well qualified for the pulpit.

    One sees here the difficulties the Puritans laboured under in their ordinations; they apprehended the election of the people, and the examination of presbyters, with the imposition of their hands, necessary to the call of a minister; but this, if it were done in England without a bishop, would hardly entitle them to preach in the church, or give them a legal title to the profits of their livings: therefore, after they had passed the former trials, they applied to the bishop for the imposition of his hands; but others being dissatisfied with the ordination of a single person not rightly called, as they thought, to the office of a bishop, went beyond sea, and were ordained by the presbyteries of foreign churches: for though the English Puritans had their synods and presbyteries, yet it is remarkable that they never ordained a single person to the ministry. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Strype’s Ann. vol. 1. p. 628, 629. Life of Parker, p. 312. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Strype’s Ann. vol. 2. p. 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Pierce’s Vindication, p. 77. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Clarke’s Life of Cartwright, p. 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Skype’s Annals, vol. 2. p. 29. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. 13 Eliz. cap. 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Strype’s Ann. vol. 2. p. 72. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Ibid. p. 71. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Art. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Art. 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. MS. p. 92. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. MS. p. 92. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Sparrow, p. 223. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Strype’s Ann. vol. 2. p. 97. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. This book was originally written in Latin; but for the use of the generality of the people, it was translated into English, with remarkable accuracy, by Anne, lady Bacon, the second of the four learned daughters of sir Anthony Coke. Such was the esteem in which it was held, that there was a design of its being joined to the thirty-nine articles, and of causing it to be deposited not only in all cathedrals and collegiate churches, but also to private houses. It promoted the Reformation from Popery more than any other publication of that period. The New Annual Register for 1789, History of Knowledge, p. 19.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Ath. Ox. vol. 1. p. 135, 136. Pierce's Vindic, p. 45, 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Life of Grindal, p. 166, [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. MS. p. 117. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Life of Parker, p. 326, 327. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. An. Ref. vol. 2. p. 95. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Life of Parker, p. 344. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Strype’s Annals, vol. 2. p. 125. D’Ew’s Journal, p. 207. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Life of Parker, p. 394. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. In the face of this full and positive evidence of the temper and measures of the queen, bishop Maddox talks of the great favour and indulgence shown to the Puritans in the year 1572; and refers us to Strype, in his Life of Whitgift, saying, “that they were as gently treated as might be; no kind of brotherly persuasion omitted towards them; and most of them as yet kept their livings, though one or two were displaced.” In this connexion he quotes also a letter of Fox the martyrologist to her majesty, “exalting her in his praises for her regard and gracious answer to a petition of certain divines concerning the habits.” Vindication, p. 173. This letter, Mr. Neal observes, was written in 1564, several years before that part of her reign, wherein she thought fit to inflict severe punishments upon the dissenters. Besides, whatever weight is due to Mr. Fox’s praises, or to Mr. Strype’s representation; though the Puritans had some intervals of ease, some tokens of royal indulgence and favour; her reign, and their situation under it, are not surely to be characterized by a few intervals of ease, and by partial indulgences; but by the spirit of the laws framed against them; and by the great leading measures and the general tenor of her government. The first Christians are, generally, understood to have suffered ten severe persecutions under the Roman emperors: “but it is not to be supposed, that persecution was always violent and uninterrupted; there might be some abatements of those troubles, and some seasons of rest and peace. In the reigns of Adrian and Titus Antoninus, there were some edicts, or rescripts, which were favourable to them: though during those very reigns many Christians still suffered in almost every part of the empire.” Lardner’s Works, vol. 8. p. 341, 342. 8vo. So as to the period before us, the question is. Did the Puritans enjoy liberty and security under the reign of queen Elizabeth; or was their situation the reverse of enjoying these blessings? If it were the latter (and the particulars of this long detail will show what was the case), then the leading features of her government were intolerance and persecution.—ED, [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Strype’s Annals, vol. 3. p. 127, 128. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. lb. p. 126. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Strype’s Annals, p. 187. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. MS. p. 119. 135. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Life of Parker, p. 347. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. He was at the head (observes Mr. Neal in his Review) of a new generation of Puritans, of warmer spirits; who opened the controversy with the church into other branches, and struck at some of the main principles of the hierarchy.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Pierce’s Vindication, p. 85. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Strype’s Ann. vol. 2, p. 186. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. MS. p. 120. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. I have the whole before me, but shall only transcribe a few passages relating to the present controversy.

    “We hold and believe, that we ought to keep inviolably that kind of government that is left us in the gospel.――That the office of a pastor is to preach the word, and administer the sacraments, and therefore that bare readers, or single sayers, are no more fit for pastors, than women or children that can read well; yet we deny not the reading of the Scriptures in all congregations, but this is not a part of the mi­nister’s office.

    “We think it unlawful to withdraw from the church, where the word is truly preached, the sacraments sincerely ministered, and true ecclesiastical discipline ex­ercised. We are not for an unspotted church on earth, and therefore, though the church of England has many faults, we would not willingly withdraw from it, and yet we believe that God’s children, when they are threatened with persecution, and the church-doors are shut against them, may draw themselves into private assemblies, separating from cursed idolatry and pestilent Popery, though the laws of princes are against it; and whosoever refuseth to be subject to these congregations separating themselves, resisteth the ordinances of God.

    “We affirm, that the church of God is a company or congregation of the faithful, called and gathered out of the world, by the preaching of the gospel, united in the true faith, and resolving to form their lives, government, order, and ceremonies, ac­cording to the word of God.

    “We hold, that there ought to be joined to the pastors of the church, elders and deacons, for the bridling of vices, and providing for the poor: that no pastor ought to usurp dominion over another; nor any church exercise lordship or rule over another.

    “We believe, that the pastor should be chosen by the congregation, and being chosen, should be continued in his vocation by the elders, with public prayer and imposition of hands.

    “Concerning ceremonies, we hold that they ought to be few, and such as have no show of evil, bill manifestly tend to decency and good order. We reject therefore all the Popish ceremonies and apparel.――We hold, that churches may differ in order and ceremonies, and yet keep the unity of the faith; and therefore we condemn not other churches that have ceremonies different from ours.――Concerning public worship; we hold, that there ought to be places appointed for this purpose, and that there may be a prescript form of prayer, and service in the known tongue, because all have not the gift of prayer, but we would not have it patched out of the pope’s portuises: but be the form of prayer never so good, we affirm that ministers may not think themselves discharged when they have said it over, for they are not sent to say service, but to preach deliverance through Christ: preaching, therefore must not be thrust out of doors for reading. Neither ought the minister so to be tied to a pre­script form, that at all times he must be bound of necessity to use it; for who can draw a form of prayer, necessary for all times, and fit for all congregations. We deny not, but it is well that there be various manners of prayers, but we must take heed that they be not long and tedious; wherefore preaching, as it is the chief part of a minister’s office, so all other things must give place to it.

    “Concerning singing of psalms, we allow of the people’s joining with one voice in a plain tune, but not of tossing the psalms from one side to the other, with the inter­mingling of organs.

    “Touching holidays, we say, that religion is tied to no time; nor is one day more holy than another, but because time must be had to hear the word of God, and to administer the holy sacraments, therefore we keep the Lord’s day as we are com­manded, but without all Jewish superstition.――We think, that those feast-days of Christ, as of his birth, circumcision, passover, resurrection, and ascension, &c. may by Christian liberty be kept, because they are only devoted to Christ, to whom all days and times belong. But days dedicated to saints, with fasts on their eves, we utterly dislike, though we approve of the reverend memory of the saints, as exam­ples to be propounded to the people in sermons; and of public and private fasts, as the circumstances of nations or private persons require.”
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    The letter from the lords of the council, and the speech of the lord-treasurer, are alleged by bishop Maddox, as convincing proofs of the mild conduct of the bishops. How far his conclusion is justly drawn; whether it prove any thing more than that the zeal and activity of the bishops did not keep pace with the wishes of the court, the reader will judge from the facts Mr. Neal’s History has exhibited. But, however this evidence may exculpate the bishops, it certainly impeaches the lenity of the queen, and is a direct proof of the severity, the unyielding severity, of her government.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
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94. The commissioners treated those that came before them neither like men nor Christians, as will appear, among many others, by the following examination of Mr. White, a substantial citizen of London, January 18,1573; who had been fined, and tossed from one prison to another, contrary to law and justice, only for not frequenting his parish-church. His examiners were, the lord-chief-justice, the master of the rolls, the master of the requests, Mr. Gerard, the dean of Westminster, the sheriff of London, and the clerk of the peace. After sundry others had been dispatched, Mr. White was brought before them, whom his lordship accosted after this manner:

    L. C. J. Who is this?

    White. White, an’t please your honour.

    L. C. J. White, as black as the devil.

    White. Not so, my lord; one of God’s children.

    L. C. J. Why will you not come to your parish-church?

    White. My lord, I did use to frequent my parish-church before my troubles, and procured several godly men to preach there, as well as in other places of preaching and prayer; and since my troubles I have not frequented any private assemblies but as I have had leave and liberty have gone to my parish-church; and therefore those that presented me, have done it out of malice; for if any of these things can be proved against me simply, or that I hold all things in common, your lordship may dismiss me from hence to the gallows,

    Mr. Ger. You have not usually frequented your own parish-church.

    White. I allow I have more used other places, where I was better edified.

    Mr. Ger. Then your presentment is in part true?

    White. Not, an’t please you, for I am presented for not coming at all to my parish-church.

    Mr. Ger. Will you then come to prayers when there is no sermon?

    White; I would avoid those things that are an offence to me and others, and disturb the peace of the church; however, I crave the liberty of a subject, and if I do not publicly frequent both preaching, prayer, and the sacraments, deal with me accordingly.

    Dean of West. What fault find you in the common prayer?

    White. Let them answer to whom it appertains? for being in prison almost a year about these matters, I was, upon a statute relating to that book, indicted, and before I came to liberty almost outlawed, as your worship, Mr. Gerard, knows.

    Mast. Req. What Scripture have you to ground your conscience against these garments?

    White. The whole Scriptures are for destroying idolatry, and every thing that belongs to it.

    Mast. Req. These things never served to idolatry.

    White. Shough; they are the same which heretofore were used to that purpose.

    Mast. Req. Where is the place where these are forbidden?

    White. In Deuteronomy, and other places, the Israelites are commanded, not only to destroy the altars, groves, and images, with all thereto belonging, but also to abolish the very names; and God by Isaiah commandeth not to pollute ourselves with the garments of the image, but to cast it away as a menstruous clout.

    Mast. Rolls. These are no part of idolatry, but are commanded by the prince for civil order, and if you will not be ordered you show yourself disobedient to the laws.

    White. I would not willingly disobey any law, only I would avoid those things that are not warranted by the word of God.

    Mast. Req. These things are commanded by act of parliament, and in disobeying the laws of your country you disobey God.

    White. I do it not of contempt but of conscience; in all other things I am an obedient subject.

    L. C. J. Thou art a contemptuous fellow, and wilt obey no laws.

    White. Not so, my lord, I do and will obey laws; and therefore refusing but a ceremony out of conscience, and not refusing the penalty for the same, I rest still, a true subject.

    L. C. J. The queen’s majesty was overseen not to make you of her council, to make laws and orders for religion.

    White. Not so, my lord; I am to obey laws warranted by God’s word,

    L. C. J. Do the queen’s laws command any thing against God’s word?

    White. I do not so say, my lord.

    L. C. J. Yes, marry do you, and there I will hold you.

    White. Only God and his laws are absolutely perfect: all men and their laws may err.

    L. C. J. This is one of Shaw’s darlings; I tell thee what, I will not say any thing of affection, for I know thee not, saving by this occasion; thou art the wickedest and most contemptuous person that has come before me, since I sat in this commission.

    White. Not so, my lord, my conscience witnesseth otherwise.

    Mast. Req. What if the queen should command to wear a gray frieze gown, would you come to church then?

    White. That were more tolerable, than that God’s ministers should wear the habit of his enemies.

    L. C. J. How, if she should command to wear a fool’s coat and a cocks’ comb?

    White. That were very unseemly, my lord, for God’s ministers.

    Dean West. You will not then be obedient to the queen’s commands?

    White. I would only avoid those things that have no warrant in the word of God, that are neither decent nor edifying, but flatly the contraband are condemned by the foreign reformed churches.

    L. C. J. You wouId have no laws.

    White. If there were no laws, 1 would live a Christian and do no wrong; if I received any, so it were.

    L. C. J. Thou art a rebel.

    White. Not so, my lord, a true subject.

    L. C, J. Yea, I swear by God, thou art a very rebel; for thou wouldst draw thy sword, and lift up thy hand against thy prince, if time served.

    White. My lord, 1 thank God, my heart standeth right towards God and my prince; and God will not condemn, though your honour hath so judged.

    L. C. J. Take him away.

    White. I would speak a word which I am sure will offend, and yet I must speak it; I heard the name of God taken in vain; if I had done it, it had been a greater offence than that which I stand here for.

    Mr. Ger. White, White, you don’t behave yourself well.

    White. I pray your worship, show me wherein, and I will beg pardon and amend it.

    L. C. J. I may swear in a matter of charity.

    White. There is no such occasion; but because it is bruited, that at my last being before you, I denied the supremacy of my prince, I desire your honours and worships, with all that be present, to bear witness, that I acknowledge her majesty the chief governor, next under Christ, over all persons and causes within her dominions, and to this I will subscribe. I acknowledge the book of articles, and the Book of Common Prayer, as far as they agree with the word of God. I acknowledge the substance of the doctrine and sacraments of the church to be sound and sincere; and so I do of rites and orders, as far as they agree with the word of God.

    Dean of West. You will not then allow, that all things in the Book of Common Prayer are taken out of the word of God?

    White. Though they should be so, yet being done by man, I cannot give them the same warrant as to the writings of the Holy Ghost.

    L. C. J. Take him away.

    White. I would to the Lord Jesus, that my two years’ imprisonment might be a means of having these matters fairly decided by the word of God, and the judgment of other reformed churches.

    L. C. J. You shall be committed, I warrant you.

    White. Pray, my lord, let me have justice; I am unjustly committed; I desire a copy of my presentment.

    L. C. J. You shall have your head from your shoulders; have him to the Gate¬house.

    White. I pray you to commit me to some prison in London, that I may be near my house.

    L. C. J. No, sir, you shall go thither.

    White. I have paid fines and fees in other prisons; send me not where I shall pay them over again.

    L. C. J. Yes, marry shall you: this is your glory.

    White. I desire no such glory.

    L. C. J. It will cost you twenty pounds, I warrant you, before you come out.

    White. God’s will be done.

    These severities against zealous Protestants, of pious and sober lives, raised the compassion of the common people, and brought them over to their interests. “It was a great grief to the archbishop (says Mr. Strype), and to other good bishops, to see persons going off from the first establishment of the Protestant religion among us, making as if the service-book was unlawful, and the ecclesiastical state anti-christian; and labouring to set up another government and discipline――.” But who drove them to these extremities? Why were not a few amendments in the liturgy yielded to at first, whereby conscientious men might have been made easy; or liberty given them to worship God in their own way? [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
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113. The remarks of that valuable historian, Gerard Brandt, on these cruel proceedings, are so just and liberal, that they deserve to be laid before the reader. “This severity (says he), which was not the first that had been practised in England since the Reformation, appeared to many Protestants, who were still under the cross in Flanders and Brabant, both strange and incredible. They lamented that those who not long before had been persecuted themselves, were now harassing others for the sake of their religion, and offering violence with fire and sword to the consciences of other men, though they had before taught, and that with great truth, ‘that it did not belong to any mortal man to lord it over the consciences of others. That faith was the gift of God, and not to be implanted in the minds of men by any external force, but by the word of God, and illumination of the Holy Spirit: that heresy was not a carnal but spiritual crime, and to be punished by God alone: that error and falsehood were not to be overcome with violence but truth: that the obligation which the children of God lie under, is not to put others to death for the faith, but to die themselves in bearing witness to the truth. Lastly, that the shedding of blood for the sake of religion is a mark of antichrist, who thereby sets himself in the judgment-seat of God, assuming to himself the dominion over conscience, which belongs to none but God only.’” See Brandt’s History of the Reformation in the Low Countries, quoted in Mr. Lindsey’s second address to the youth of the two universities, p. 230, &c. or La Roche’s Abridgment of Brandt, p. 163. It should be added, that one ground of the odium which fell on those who were called Anabaptists, was their deviation from the established creed, in their ideas concerning the person of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. Which shows in how very early a period of the Reformation Unitarian sentiments arose among the more thoughtful and inquisitive; but the hand of power was lifted up to suppress their growth and spread.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
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