

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.
BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO
THE LIBRARY OF
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division


G

Section

17

D6593

✓✓
DOCUMENTS



RELATING TO THE

SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY THE

ACT OF UNIFORMITY

OF

1662.

With an Historical Introduction.

LONDÔN:

W. KENT AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE,
10, BROAD STREET BUILDINGS, E C.

1862.

ENGLISH PURITANISM :

Its Character and History.

AN INTRODUCTION TO

DOCUMENTS

RELATING TO THE SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
BY THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY OF 1662.

BY

PETER BAYNE, Esq., A.M.

In the paper explanatory of the objects and plans of the United Saint Bartholomew Committee, issued many months ago, occur the following sentences:—

“ The Committee are unanimous in their resolution that
“ in their collection of historical facts bearing upon the
“ Ejection of the Two Thousand, and in their presentation
“ of them, in whatever form, to public notice, the most
“ rigid impartiality shall be observed. Implicit deference
“ to truth they recognise as the most important moral of
“ the event to be commemorated, and they would look upon
“ the indulgence of any predisposition, should it exist, to
“ dress up a case for the purpose of establishing foregone
“ conclusions, as a desecration of the opportunity which
“ God’s providence has brought round to them. They are
“ fully aware of the danger they will incur of unconsciously
“ imparting to narrative a bias which the events themselves
“ might fail to justify, and of controversially pressing them

“ to a service foreign to their real significance; and they
“ purpose conscientiously to exercise their utmost vigilance
“ against it.”

It was on the distinct understanding that these were the views of the Committee that I complied with the request which they did me the honour to address to me, to prepare an Historical Introduction to the Documents contained in this volume. The Committee have fulfilled their pledge by scrupulously respecting my independence in the composition of the introductory essay: the public will judge whether I have been upright and impartial in the treatment of the subject.

P. B.

ENGLISH PURITANISM :

ITS CHARACTER AND HISTORY.

THE Nonconformity of the Restoration was properly the last phase of old English Puritanism ; and with it as our special theme, we are in an advantageous position for reviewing, in its characteristic features and main historical developments, the entire phenomenon of Puritanism.

There is a general feeling that the hundred years during which the Puritan agitation was at its height are the most memorable in the history of England. The part played by England in modern civilization was then determined. The benefits, political, social, religious, which she has enjoyed, were then secured. The seeds of blessing and of bane which still spring around us were then sown. The essential aspects of our national character, in the widest sweep of their diversity and the profoundest conditions of their agreement, were then displayed. All this, we say, is matter of general assent, and it is therefore no

wonder that the tumult of the Puritan times echoes in the ear of England, or that Englishmen still enquire with interest what Puritanism was and what mark it left on the history of our country.

For all earnest minds the past is sacred, and there is something of profanity in bringing into its silent chambers the disputes and the watchwords of the present. In the senate of the immortals, in the temple of the dead, the only voice worthy to break the stillness is the voice of truth. On the present occasion, we are peculiarly tempted to infringe this canon, yet would its infraction be more than ordinarily pernicious. The questions and interests of Puritanism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries bear precisely such a resemblance to questions and interests of our own time as is likely to mislead; but an imperative condition of our understanding the former is the frank acknowledgment that they are different from the latter. If the slightest benefit is to be derived from our discussion, it will be necessary for writer and reader alike to divest the mind of partisan feeling, to check modern prepossessions, and to suspend modern sympathies. He who writes a panegyric looks of set purpose to a single aspect of events and actions. He who enters the magazine of history in quest of weapons for the controversial warfare of to-day, is as one who, penetrating into the tomb of an ancient warrior and snatching the spear from the skeleton hand, should find it crumble on the instant into dust. He who expects in the most

illustrious heroes a stainless perfection, or in the worst of men the depravity of demons, may move us with the grandeurs of poetic passion, but will not ultimately satisfy our judgment. To realize that the men of the past were our brothers, to feel the force of their motives as presented to their own minds, and to attain any apprehension of those high intents of Providence, in which men are always, more or less, *unconscious* actors, we must pay homage to truth, and to truth alone.

What, in heart and essence, apart from every accident, every accompaniment, was English Puritanism? Its nature has been correctly indicated by its name. The popular instinct has fixed upon its central thought and meaning. It was a purification,—an effort, wise or unwise, to rid the Christianity of England from all adhesions foreign to its nature or obstructive of its power,—an endeavour to remove everything, in doctrine, discipline, ceremonial, which during the middle ages had been added to the gospel of Christ. It will be necessary for us clearly to apprehend this grand regulating fact in the character and history of Puritanism.

When, to use a Scriptural image, the angel of the Reformation filled his censer with fire from God's altar, and cast it unto the earth, there were "voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake." Principles which had long slumbered in the hearts of the European nations, or agitated them with inarticu-

late yearnings, were roused by sympathetic attraction, and started into gigantic manifestation.

In England, for hundreds of years, a powerful current of religious feeling had set in a direction opposite to Rome. The doctrines of Wickliffe had been widely adopted; the Lollards had clung to their faith in the agonies of death by fire; and devotion to a political leader, combined with reverence for a martyred saint, had hallowed to the popular imagination the name of Cobham. That stifled cry of appeal to God against the corruptions of Rome, which through the mediæval time was audible in every country of Europe, had long been heard in England.

Side by side with this strictly religious antagonism to the papacy, there had existed an opposition of a purely secular and political kind. The sovereigns of England had fretted against the authority of Rome. A weak monarch, a John, or an Edward the Second, had succumbed to the terrible power then in the hand of the pontiff; but when the king was firmly seated and of resolute will, the death of a Thomas a Becket, or the promulgation of some statute attaching grievous penalties to the recognition of papal supremacy within the realm, had taught the haughtiest occupants of the chair of St. Peter, that the vassalage in which they held the throne of England was partial and precarious.

When the Reformation, therefore, broke out, a two-fold response awaited it in England. The people had been educated by spiritual teachers to

receive the doctrine of the Reformers; the sovereign was encouraged by a long course of precedent to disown the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope. One Reformation was set on foot by the Court; another proceeded among the people. The former was in the main political; the latter was profoundly religious: the first result of the one was the State Church of Henry VIII; the working of the other, within and beyond the ecclesiastical pale, constituted for more than a hundred years the thing we name Puritanism. The Church of England, as constituted in our day, owes its ultimate form and character to both.

Of Henry VIII we shall not speak. The Church of England, thank God, does not retain the worst traces of that coarse and bloodstained hand. The Church of which Henry was Pope, held the dogma of transubstantiation, and sanctioned prayers to saints, and kneeling and burning incense to images. Its views on confession, on celibacy, on private masses, would have given no offence to Loyola. It was, in one word, a Romish Church with Henry for Pope. In his right hand, this energetic Pontiff held a faggot to burn those who denied the real presence; in his left, a halter to hang those who abjured his ecclesiastical supremacy. His personal contribution to the cause of the Reformation in England was a defiance hurled by the throne against the Pope, a defiance so proud and so comprehensive, that the reverence which lingered in the national mind for Rome must have been rudely shaken. It was one important part of this defiance

to sweep England clear of the monastic institutions by which, in large measure, the nation had been held in allegiance to the Roman See; it was another to sanction measures for the religious instruction of the people, which tended to eradicate belief in those Romish doctrines which Henry retained in his Church.

But the more favourable representative of the first stage of governmental reformation in England was Archbishop Cranmer. The extravagant denunciation of this prelate by Macaulay, is probably the estimate of his character best known to English readers; and many who are startled by the antithetic emphasis of the young essayist, will accept the judicially calm, but sternly unfavourable verdict of Hallam. A recent American writer adduces conclusive proof that Cranmer was not present at the Council Board when the writ was made out for the execution by fire of Joan of Kent, and he recurs to a strain of panegyric which had almost ceased to celebrate the politic divine. "Cranmer" says this writer, "was a princely Christian; his errors, like chance rents in a royal robe; his rare and sterling virtues, like a diadem on a royal brow." Very generous, very eloquent. But are not fortitude and consistency necessary to the ideal of a princely Christian? And, among the gems in Cranmer's diadem of virtues, must not those six pearls which stand for his six recantations, be allowed to be of paste? You cannot escape from that stern verdict of

* Professor Hopkins. *The Puritans and Queen Elizabeth.* Vol. i, cap. iii.

Hallam's: Cranmer's fame requires the lustre of the flames which consumed him. He was the genius of compromise. Under Henry, he accepted with satisfaction every instalment of reform which could be wrung from the grasping and self-centred tyrant; and he industriously promoted those efforts for the religious instruction of the people, the translation and diffusion of the Bible, and the promulgation of homilies and prayers in the vernacular, which had an effect little dreamed of by Henry, in stimulating the progress of that spiritual Reformation, which was all the time advancing in the nation. Under Edward, Cranmer ventured to assume more of the character of a religious reformer, and endeavoured to convey to the Church certain of those ecclesiastical powers which Henry had monopolised. Under Mary he would have lived as a Roman Catholic, if recantation could have propitiated the queen. But his treasonable support of Lady Jane Grey, and the Protestantism which was known to lurk in his heart, made Mary implacable. He died at the stake, a Protestant by choice, a martyr by compulsion. England owes him much; but the part he played in her Reformation was that of an instrument rather than that of an agent, and there is no character mentioned in history better fitted to adjust a plausible compromise between the old and the new.

There were, however, men in England of a different spirit from Cranmer's. Their religion was no courtly inspiration. They were not careful to keep terms

with Rome. They had hailed with earnest satisfaction, with passionate sympathy, the rise of the second school of the Reformation, the school at whose head stood the great French Reformer. John Calvin exerted a more potent and penetrating influence upon the mind of Europe, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, than any other man, Luther not excepted. The nature of his influence is not, in these days, generally understood. It seems paradoxical to say that the influence of Calvin is confounded with the influence of Calvinism; but this is in a sense true. We think of the effect produced by a certain creed, as it has been left in cold and crystalline clearness by the Synod of Dort; not of the impression made by the grand elements of that creed, vitalized and sublimed by intensity of religious fervour, and incarnated in a living man. We represent Calvinism to our minds as an intellectual system, complicated in ramification, and hard as iron. It is to ordinary conceptions a vast metal framework, which may once have been used in the illumination of a city, but is now black and bare. From that framework a thousand jets of living fire, of radiant light, once poured their effulgence over Europe. When we pass from the Confessions of the Calvinistic Churches to the Institutes of Calvin, we can understand this fact. The entire logical system of the book is irradiated by the spirituality of Calvin's conception of the Christian revelation. So completely are the formal

precepts and positive ordinances of the Hebrew economy absorbed and lost for him in the unity of life in Christ, that not only the Jewish seventh day, but the Christian first day disappears, and the Lord's day is for Calvin any day of the week. The grand principle, the all-determining method, of Calvin's thought, was contemplation of the universe in God. In all place, in all time, from eternity to eternity, he saw God. Such faith will be infinitely appalling, or infinitely consoling, according to our conception of the Divine character. If God be an iron fate, if God's will be aught else than infinite truth, justice, and love, blended in one indissoluble ray of light, then will it be fatalism. But the God of Calvin was the God revealed in Scripture, the God manifested in Christ, the God whose name is Love; and to think that the God-light enveloped the universe, touching the cloud which veiled its beam, touching the Sinai smoke beneath which Israel trembled, was to him a thought, not of terror, not of enslavement, but of awful and adoring joy. It is agreed, by all competent to judge, that the mind of Calvin was, in power and comprehensiveness, of the very highest order exhibited by the human race; and when we conceive that colossal intellect inspired through all its faculties by transcendent intensity of religious emotion, we may realize, to some extent, the might of the spiritual impulse which he communicated to the West of Europe. It was a theological impulse, but it was also and equally an emanation of moral fervour; it

found manifestation not only in reformed *faith* but in reformed *manners*.

It followed from that intense realization of the idea of God which governed the thinking of Calvin, that the authoritative declaration of God's will should be regarded by him, and all who learned of him, with corresponding reverence. Around the Word of God they drew a line of demarcation, setting it far apart from every human production. On this rock Calvin placed his foot, confronting Rome with tranquil and inflexible defiance. From the authority of the Church he appealed to the authority of One greater than the Church. It is important to bear in mind that this, and no other antagonism, was present to the mind of Calvin; the Word of God was by him opposed to the infallibility of the Pope; it seems scarcely to have dawned upon him that there could be antagonism between reason and conscience on the one hand, and Scripture on the other. And in considering that urgency of appeal to Scripture, and Scripture alone, which throughout its whole history was made by English Puritanism, an appeal which, with our modern prepossessions, may seem to us to be a wilful searing of the eyeballs of reason and conscience, it is essential to recollect that it was against the authority of Rome that Calvin and his followers asserted the supremacy of God's written Word.

This position of reference pure and simple to the Bible, gave Calvin and his followers a signal advantage in maintaining the conflict with Rome.

That veil of imaginative splendour and superstitious devoutness by which the ancient Church drew towards herself, by a thousand chords of association, the veneration of Europe, became, with all its gorgeousness, a mere mask, hiding a truth more majestic, a beauty more ethereal, a simplicity more divine. The Papacy, said Calvin, has decided. She is joined unto her idols. Let her alone. The Spirit of God is shrined in no earthly temple, though it has been building for a thousand years. The Spirit of God is here; in the temple of the soul; in the temple of the Word. This was an opposition more profound, more comprehensive, than Rome had yet encountered. The Reformed Church became constructive, ceasing to be only a force of destruction. Instead of seeming the rebel child of the Papacy, she beamed forth, serene and terrible, the daughter of God new-born. If no powers had been granted her by the decrees of Popes, she claimed a charter direct from heaven, she pointed to rights sealed to her by the hand of God. If her faith was not based upon the decisions of Councils and the opinions of Fathers, it was written for her in the Word of God. Thence she could take her doctrine, her ritual, her discipline; and taking them thence, she could attach to them an authority higher than any authority on earth.

Rome, now fairly roused from that stupor in which she had been sunk when overtaken by the Reformation, was quick to signalize Calvin as her mightiest

adversary. A new spirit passed through the flagging ranks of Protestantism, a spirit of independence, of intrepidity, of burning earnestness, of heroic zeal. The Reformed Church, as distinguished from the Lutheran, took the van in the onward march of Protestantism. From the middle of the sixteenth century, the conquests won from Rome were almost entirely made by the Reformed communion. The great English divines, who flourished in the reign of Edward VI, and perished at the stake in the reign of Mary,—Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, nay, with all his courtliness, Cranmer himself,—sympathised with the Calvinistic Reformation. The Presbyterian John Knox was chaplain to the king. The Marian exiles, during their residence on the Continent, were treated with kindness and cordiality by the Calvinists, with coldness by the Lutherans. When Elizabeth ascended the throne, the feeling among the English divines in favour of completing the reformation of the Church, so as to bring her ceremonies and ritual into closer accord with those of the Calvinistic Churches, was all but universal.

We crave particular attention to these facts. Unless they are distinctly apprehended, no correct idea can be formed of the ecclesiastical history of those times; and the part played by the Puritans will be wholly misconceived. “How did they get there?” asks the clerical dapperling of these days, who has an inconceivably slight smattering of acquaintance with the history of the Church of England, and fancies that

the Puritans were from first to last intruders within her pale. The Puritans were in the Church of England from the days of Bradwardine and of Wickliffe; and had not their spiritual ardour and unconquerable fortitude *in* the Church of England defied the arts of power, she would, humanly speaking, have been no living Church, imbued with sacred fire, a vessel and habitation of Christ, but a thing of clay, fit only for the uses of her royal potters. There is a *consensus* of testimony to the fact, that the English Reformers of the Tudor reigns were almost to a man of Puritan sentiments. Lord Macaulay informs us, not in his youthful essays, but in that history in which his early enthusiasm for the Puritans is so decidedly toned down, that the Reformers of England wished to go as far as their Continental brethren; that they unanimously condemned, as Antichristian, numerous dogmas and practices which Henry retained, and which Elizabeth approved; that Bishop Hooper had the strongest aversion to the episcopal vestments; that Bishop Ridley pulled down the altars of his diocese, "and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which the Papists irreverently termed oyster boards;" that Bishop Jewel pronounced the clerical garb "a stage dress, a fool's coat, a relique of the Amorites;" that Archbishop Grindal "long hesitated about accepting a mitre, from dislike of what he regarded as the mummery of consecration;" that Bishop

Parkhurst prayed that the Church of England might model herself on the Church of Zurich; and that Bishop Ponet thought the word "bishop" should be exchanged for "superintendent." "When it is considered," says Lord Macaulay, summing up, "that none of these prelates belonged to the extreme section of the Protestant party, it cannot be doubted that if the general sense of that party had been followed, the work of reform would have been carried on as unsparingly in England as in Scotland."

Hallam—the Lord Chief Justice of our historical literature—pointedly exposes the misrepresentation that Puritan scruples were confined to a few, and sets before us, in two well-packed and weighty sentences, the precise state of the case at the accession of Elizabeth. "Except Archbishop Parker, who had remained in England during the late reign, and Cox, Bishop of Ely, who had taken a strong part at Frankfort against innovation, all the most eminent Churchmen, such as Jewell, Grindal, Sandys, Nowell, were in favour of leaving off the surplice and what were called the Popish ceremonies. Whether their objections are to be deemed narrow and frivolous or otherwise, it is inconsistent with veracity to dissemble that the Queen alone was the cause of retaining those observances to which the great separation from the Anglican establishment is ascribed."

The important and admirable work recently published by Professor Hopkins, of America, on the Puritans of Elizabeth's reign, abounds with evidence

that these views are correct. Episcopacy was not in those days deemed essential to the constitution of a Christian Church, or to the due administration of the sacraments; and holy orders conferred by any regular Church were recognised in the Church of England. In doctrine the latter had been radically reformed.

Queen Elizabeth, though she had some scruples about assuming an authority so explicitly spiritual as that exercised by her father over the Church, was vehemently ambitious; and her imperious will, and magnificent self-reliance, prevailed with her to retain, with some slight modification, the ecclesiastical supremacy bequeathed her by Henry. By the statutes of Supremacy and Uniformity, enacted in the first year of her reign, she was declared head of the Church, and changes in discipline and ritual without approbation of parliament were prohibited. A general uniformity in worship was thus secured, and it became competent to any zealous bishop to proceed against clergymen who departed from the established model. But no unexcepting assent to the Book of Common Prayer was required, and the Puritans continued for the most part to regard themselves as having a place in the Church of England. The great parties in the kingdom were three: the State-Protestants, who regarded the settlement of Elizabeth as leaving nothing to be desired; the Puritans, who were of opinion that reformation should be carried further, and should be regulated exclusively by the Word of God; and the Roman Catholics, who

watched the controversy between the other two with a view to profiting by their dissensions.

The Puritans, we said, had hailed with ardent sympathy the rise of that school of Reformers who made the breach with Rome complete. They did not become Puritans at the bidding of Calvin, but they experienced the full might of that spiritual impulse which emanated from the French Reformer. The terrible and sublime idea of God's omnipotence, and of the immutability of His will, rested upon their souls. It impressed them with a gravity which deepened almost into gloom, and it lost somewhat of that spirituality by which it was transfigured for the mind of Calvin. The positive ordinance of the sabbath, which to Calvin had been lost in the spirituality of Christian life, was a distinctive tenet of Puritanism. The prevailing emotion, in the Puritan conception of the Almighty, was awe. If we would know how the Puritan felt, we must resolutely divest our minds of all ideas relating to the Divine Being, derived from the habit acquired by men in these last ages, of sitting in judgment on the character of God, and discussing the quality of Scriptural ethics. The Puritans had not risen or sunk to that tender French conception of the Almighty as "*le bon Dieu*." They did not think of God as a simple impersonation of the benevolent principle, an easy, placable Father of the universe, wearing a smile of eternal indifference to right and wrong. God was to them what He was to the Hebrew king, when he said, "The Lord

reigneth, let the people tremble;" what He was to the rapt prophet who declared all nations to be to God "as the small dust of the balance." For these men the unseen was the reality, the seen a fleeting shadow. They lived in the presence of the Eternal. "If we provoke the mediator," said Cromwell once to his parliament, "He may say, I will leave you to God, I will not intercede for you; let Him tear you in pieces!" Cromwell was not sensible of difficulties in atonement ethics. He would as soon have thought of discussing theories of electricity when the blinding flash was on his eyeballs. Men who in the wildest storm of battle were placidly dauntless, men whose adamant fortitude no danger could ruffle, no difficulty appal, trembled and grew pale at the thought of falling into the hand of the living God. To such men it was consolation unspeakable to know that the divine will was actually expressed in the Bible. In that fear of God which made them towards men courageous and inflexible, they abode rigidly by the letter of Scripture. "Who are ye that set yourselves in opposition to an ancient church, to a venerable hierarchy, to famed divines, to anointed kings? Who are ye that, with downcast eyes of humility, tower in presumption, and with self-abasement on the lip, swell in pride?" We, might the Puritans reply, are men to whom God hath spoken. Our humility is not feigned; our trembling hesitancy is not hypocritical; but our fear and reverence are for God only. On our knees be-

fore Him, with strong crying and tears, we learn what His word means. Knowing that, we deem it no pride to set our conclusions above human authority, no presumption to dare to adhere to them. Has not the Reformation startled Christendom from its mortal slumber on the breast of the Romish mother, and set each man of us face to face with his Maker? Will God accept the opinion of divines for us? Will He accept the voice of Councils for us? Has He not cast us back upon our personality, and laid upon us the issue of life eternal or death eternal? The tumult of men, the conflict of authorities, this is to us but a faint murmur from the shores of finitude: we shall listen for the voice of the infinite God.

But did not their stubborn rejection of forms, their scrupulous avoidance of the sign of the cross and the use of the surplice, argue a pinched and morbid narrowness in the Puritans? Were not their hearts void of genial sympathy, of wholesome imaginative fire, of the larger charities which glowed in the hearts of apostles and in the bosom of the early Church? We shall meet these charges with no sweeping negative. The Puritans were men; the best of them imperfect saints, the worst of them stunted and intolerant bigots. But it is fair to contemplate this scrupulosity of theirs from one or two points of view, suggested by the circumstances of their position, and enabling us to judge them with candour, wisdom, and impartiality.

The principle of adherence to Scripture was, in the first place, acknowledged on all hands to be the prin-

ciple of the Reformation, and on doctrinal matters it had been boldly applied by the Fathers of the Church of England. Naturally and logically, in the absence of circumstances adequate to establish an exception, the application of the principle to worship would have followed its application to doctrine. Faith and form, creed and ceremonial, doctrine and devotion, have a reciprocal connection. They are associated by the law which assimilates the foliage to the trunk, the costume to the character, the expression of the features and the words of the lip, to the sentiments of the heart. Mediæval Romanism was not in its main character a religion of the moral faculty and of the reason. With an undefined doctrinal centre, the gorgeous draperies of its ceremonial floated appropriately round it, and it acted upon the popular imagination by form and rite, by solemn show and reverent circumstance. But Protestantism was essentially a spiritual, a moral, an intellectual religion. A rectification of the belief of Christians by the test of God's Word was its primary, its distinctive work; a rejection of those symbols, in which Romanism expressed its character, appeared to be the next step in advance. This, we saw, was felt by the first generation of English Reformers, even though they were prelates of the Church. This was recognized by the Reformed communions of Germany, of Switzerland, of Scotland. These had passed on from the rejection of Romish doctrine, to the rejection, equally complete, of Romish ritual. Surely it was not unreasonable that the

Puritans should call upon the Church of England to follow this example, and having emptied the cup of the Romish enchantress of its sorceries, to cast away the glittering chalice in which they had shewn their witching colours?

But the Puritan had other reasons besides the preservation of logical consistency in advocating a root and branch Reformation. He believed that dalliance with Rome was a wilful exposure to danger. He feared that delight in the symbol might lead to adoption of the substance. He spoke of the deadly malady of Romish error, of the moral atrophy and intellectual paralysis of Romish superstition, and he feared that a sweet and subtle poison might work through Romish ceremonies and forms. Arguments of admirable plausibility may be adduced to prove that this idea is erroneous. There are minds which seem constitutionally incapable of conceiving the peril apprehended. Following the stately argument of Hooker, one is apt to wonder how reasoning so plausible could have failed to satisfy the scruples of the Puritans. There is an amplitude in Hooker's mental vision, which commends him to all abstract thinkers, to all politicians of the library, and to all reformers of the closet. But the man who has to deal with definite, practical problems, who has to legislate for a world, not of judicious Hookers, but of injudicious and headstrong persons, will distrust the generality of his maxims. Hooper, Jewel, Hampden, Cromwell, all the thorough-going

Protestants of the time, all the practical thinkers who knew mankind, believed that retention of ceremonies would predispose the people to Romanism. And looking along the intervening centuries, listening to the unappealable verdict of time, do we find that those rugged practical men were in the wrong? To Hooker's challenge to shew how deadly infection could arise to the Church of England from similitude, in matters of indifference, to the Church of Rome, history has spoken their answer. Reminding her children constantly of the ancient church, leaving them to decide whether her affinity is greater for Rome or for the Reformation, the Church of England has entailed upon them a trial to which many in every generation have fallen victims. A long procession of illustrious deserters from her communion, a procession in which glitter two crowns and many coronets, a procession in which have gone some of the noblest hearts and proudest intellects of England, a procession from which a constant arrow-flight of venomed taunts has reached her own bosom, testifies whether or not the Puritans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries erred in pronouncing it dangerous for the Church of England to halt between the Romanists and the Reformers.

It is but just, also, to the Puritans to recollect that Popery had for them in those days an aspect of menace which few believe it now to wear. The historical drama of the Reformation was not concluded; the boundaries of Romanism and Pro-

testantism had not been fixed throughout Europe; Jesuitism was still in the ardour of its mighty youth, thrilling armies with a fire as of the crusades, hanging on the outskirts of retreating Protestantism, here wooing back to the embrace of Rome gray-haired men who in early years had been disciples of Calvin, there asking the Lutheran with bitter scorn as he and his children passed weeping into exile, whether his God was indeed a tower of strength, and with its Tillys and Wallensteins setting the battle in array against the Reformed throughout all the German countries. Puritanism was already a power in England when the Massacre of St. Bartholomew befel in Paris. Midnight murder,—such was the doom which, in that impressive manner, Rome announced that she reserved for every Protestant. Those shrieks breaking the night-silence, shrieks of men to whom faith had been pledged,—those gutters running with blood, blood of French citizens and patriots,—were likely to be remembered by Protestants. Puritanism had made its way into the corporations and manor houses of England, when the long conflict of the thirty years was proceeding, when the wail of Magdeburg went up to God, when Gustavus, who seemed the last hope of continental Protestantism, drooped his head in the moment of victory, and was led, in the sickness of death, from the field of Lützen. Circumstances like these were fitted to interfere with mental equanimity, to disturb the appreciation of Romish ceremonies

from the æsthetic and antiquarian point of view, to urge practical and impetuous minds to make the issue clear and simple—Rome or the Bible.

But to cast one glance into the depths of this subject,—was it, after all, a degradation of the worship of the Most High which was attempted by these Puritans? Were they altogether wrong in believing that there is a profound difference between the religion of taste and the religion of conscience; between the sense of elevation, the contemplative rapture, the glow of lofty emotion, which are worked by modulated music and solemn pageantry, by pictured wall and painted window, and the adoring humility and reverent awe which befit a man in the presence of his Creator? Is not the true sublimity of Christian worship its simplicity? Is not the radiancy of hallowed passion, the tear of penitent rapture, as man kneels before his God, the true beauty of holiness? It may be difficult for us to conceive this, but it was not difficult for the Puritan. The intensity of his religious feelings raised him above the ministry of sense and imagination. We are apt to think of Puritan devotion as similar to that which now most resembles it in externals, but wants its animating spirit, its transfiguring glow of religious emotion. There is, indeed, no dreariness like that witnessed when, in a bare, unsightly edifice, a listless congregation goes through the bald forms of Puritan worship. When the spirit of adoration is away, the absence of that mechanism, by which

sense and imagination are tenderly elevated or pleurably subdued, is felt. But the pure might of religious feeling supplied for the Puritan the place of all such aids; the intensity of his realization of God's presence made him commune with Him as spirit with Spirit. What to indifferent or to superficially affected minds would have been cold and barren, was to the Puritan the serenity of impassioned feeling. In the eloquent silence of God's presence, he required not the melting strains of music; in the piercing blaze of God's truth, he desired not the imagery of symbolic forms.

On the whole, let us recollect, as an important practical fact, that the forms which they scrupled to accept were not, to the Puritans, what they are to members of the Church of England in our time. The sacredness they had possessed for Romanists had been rudely swept away: the sacredness they possess for modern Churchmen, who, from infancy, may have seen them combined with pure preaching of the Word, who may know them as the garb of a solemn and stately but sincere Protestantism, had not yet shed its halo over them. The Puritans associated with them only the dread and aversion with which they regarded Rome. They viewed them as badges of an alien Church. Their ancient lustre seemed the pallor of a corpse; and the glory of a new life, infused into them by the Church adopting them, had not yet gifted them with solemn beauty or ancestral tenderness.

The seventeenth century opened upon England

with the transference of the sceptre of the Tudors to the Stuarts. At that time, both Puritanism, and the opposition to Puritanism, were comparatively mild. The large majority of Puritans disliked the ceremonies; but desired their abolition chiefly for the relief of tender consciences, and to promote the peace of the Church. With a considerable number, conformity was a painful alternative, a choice between two evils: to use the ceremonies might be an actual sin; but to commit schism, to infringe that unity of the Church which seemed to men in those days so august and awful, would be a greater transgression. They earnestly desired, therefore, that the Church would release them from a yoke which galled their consciences, and enable them to read their duty as ministers, in the clear bold characters of Scripture, instead of spelling it out from the tormenting oracles of casuistry. Still fewer, yet not without influence from their talent, intrepidity, learning, and piety, were those who composed, what in modern diction would be called, the Puritan left. These joined with Cartwright in demanding that spiritual authority should be vested, not in the Crown but in the Church; and held that Presbyters, in Synod assembled, had an authority the same in kind with that of Bishops. On the extreme edge of this section were the followers of Brown, who found the *ecclesia* only in the congregation, and denied authority both to Bishop and Synod. Presbyterians and Congregationalists of the more decided type were already beyond the ecclesiastical pale; but the great body of

the Puritans were still churchmen. These demanded not the imposition of their own model upon all, but permission for all who had conscientious scruples to exercise Christian liberty.

It seems difficult to believe that, for statesmen or churchmen of the liberal school of Hooker, it would have been impossible to make this concession. In the fourth book of his great work, Hooker quotes with approbation the large and generous sentiments on the subject of rites and ceremonies expressed by Gregory, Augustine, and Calvin. "Where the faith of the holy Church is one,"—such is the opinion he adopts from Gregory,—“a difference in customs of the Church doth no harm.” He agrees with Augustine that unity of belief is not infringed by “variety of certain ordinances.” Nay, he accepts from Calvin the sagacious and deeply Christian decision that, “sometime it profiteth and is expedient that there be difference, lest men should think that religion is tied to outward ceremonies.” The main intention of Hooker, it is true, was to argue that the Church of England, as a whole, had a right to adopt a different ceremonial from that of other Reformed Churches. But no theologian has denied the claim of the individual congregation to be in itself a Church, however justly the name may be applied to a multitude of congregations. In point of fact, if this is disputed, the first little company of believers, who met to worship Christ after His resurrection, did not constitute a Church. And if Calvin and Hooker admitted

that uniformity of rites throughout Christendom might lead to the idea that religion depends on ceremonies, with what plausibility could they have maintained that uniformity in every jot and tittle, throughout the ten thousand congregations of England, would not be attended with the same deadly peril?

It might have seemed that the accession of the royal line of Scotland to the English throne would inaugurate a period of tranquillity and reconciliation between the parties within the Church. James was a Calvinist; Scotland was Presbyterian. But Calvinism in James was not that vision of all things in God which it was to Calvin, nor that habitual interpretation of every event as the syllable of a Divine decree, which it was to Cromwell, but the logical conclusion of a coward's heart and a pedant's intellect. And if James was theologically a Calvinist, he had learned to fear and detest that haughty spirit of Presbyterianism which his despotic fussiness had irritated but could not quell. When, therefore, nearly a thousand of the Puritan Church ministers met him with their millenary petition, and implored on bended knee, "neither as factious men desiring a popular party in the Church, nor as schismatics aiming at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical," that tithes snatched by greedy laymen might be appropriated to maintaining ministers in dark places, that non-residence and incapacity among the clergy might be

checked, that ministers might be permitted occasionally to meet for conference and deliberation, and that zealous and able pastors, fearful of offending God by adoption of the forms and ceremonies, might not be cast out of the Church, they found his mean petulance as intolerant as the imperial ambition of Elizabeth. Four Puritan Doctors were permitted to argue against nearly a score of violent High Churchmen, backed by the King, with what result may be supposed. The Conference, known as that of Hampton Court, was followed by a proclamation enjoining a strict enforcement of uniformity. It is a notable fact, and admirably illustrative of the way in which temperate, wise, and large-minded men then looked upon the demands of the Puritans, that Lord Bacon published, about the time of this Conference, a pamphlet advocating their principal opinions. "He excepts," says Hallam, "to several matters of ceremony; the cap and surplice, the ring in marriage, the use of organs, the form of absolution, lay-baptism, &c." Let those who deem the Puritans narrow-minded bigots weigh that fact. There must have attached to the points on which they insisted a significance hard for us to conceive, or they could never have enlisted the sympathy of a mind so capacious, discreet, clear-sighted, and vigilant as the mind of Bacon.

During the reign of James, the Puritans experienced no relief, and the inarticulate discontent and displeasure of the nation grew steadily in intensity.

James was in truth an irritating sovereign. As his religion was a pedant's syllogism, so his despotism was an argumentative hair-splitting egotism. It fretted the proud English people, who had bent impatiently to the princely rule of the Tudors, to be lectured on divine right and infallible kingship by the incarnation of a logical formula. The bite of James was not much, but the venom of the creature stung shrewdly. He had an occasional glimpse of insight. He perceived at a glance that Laud would make nothing of Scotland—"Ye ken not the spirit of that folk." But what on the whole strikes the modern mind with amazement is that such a man should so long have ruled such a nation; that reverence for kingly descent should have so filled the atmosphere that not mere court favourites, but statesmen, divines, poets, and philosophers, should have rejoiced in the light of James's countenance. The English of that time believed themselves a free people. They valued their fundamental laws, and unviolated parliaments. But when we reflect on what they bore, not only from the Tudors, but from the first Stuarts, and recall the accents of slavish adoration in which they addressed their kings, the thought is borne irresistibly upon our minds, that constitutional monarchy, as we understand it, could never have flourished in England, unless the nation had been taught, in some transcendently impressive manner, to believe that kings are mortal.

The historical effect of this reign was to em-

bitter the dispute between Puritans and High Churchmen, and to identify the former more completely with the cause of England's civil freedom.

The seventeenth century was entering its second quarter, when King Charles the First ascended the throne. He was the greatest monarch, and the most remarkable man, sent by the Stuart race to the throne of England. He willed that the state of England, political and ecclesiastical, should be one thing; the Puritans willed that it should be another. If we would know, therefore, whether the Puritans deserved well of their country, or whether their memory is righteously loaded by High Churchmen with contempt and execration, we must place distinctly before the mind's eye a picture of England as it was when the Long Parliament rose against the King.

Charles himself was a man whom his bitterest opponents allow to have possessed many high and admirable qualities. In domestic relations irreproachable, a good husband, a good father, a friendly and indulgent master, chaste, grave, and temperate, with the demeanour of a gentleman, and the majesty of a king, he startled from his court, by the mere awe of his presence, that brood of foul and grovelling vices which nestled in the court of his father, and which rushed back to revel in the court of his son. His passions did not belong to the animal part of our nature, but to the spirit and the soul. He was a patron of learning; he was not only a patron but a

judge of art; and his intellectual activity took a higher elevation, his sensibility to the beautiful derived a hallowing lustre, from his reverent apprehension of divine and eternal realities. That belief in the divine right of kings, which was with his father a pedant's formula, was with him an article of religious faith, of mystic veneration. That favour for episcopacy, which was with James a maxim of despotic policy, was with Charles a conscientious enthusiasm for the Anglican Church. This must, we think, be conceded, if we will conceive the elements of that strength which made Charles so much more formidable to the Puritans than James had ever been; and if we will form any correct idea of the better portion of that cavalier party, as the representative and ideal of which he stands before history. Charles was a man of purpose, of religion, of conviction. We see it in those melancholy eyes which appeal to us from the canvas of Vandyke; we find it in the princely dignity and martyr fortitude with which he bore himself, one awful day, before his palace of Whitehall. But if we maintain Charles's conscientiousness against the general voice of Puritan writers, we must still more decisively allege, in contradiction to his blinded admirers, that his character had certain subtle but essential defects. His intellect was fine rather than strong; the centre of his moral nature was a delicate sense of propriety, rather than a transcendent sense of truth. Hence in all things he lacked simplicity. His virtues had not the ruddy hue of health, but a sickly and cloistral air. His

sincerity was enervated by vacillation, and entangled with craft; it was a wish, an aspiration, a longing, not a clear and unalterable fact. His religion was perplexed with casuistry, and tainted by dissimulation. He was, we say, not simple. He could be known and trusted by no man—not even by Strafford. His ambition—for he was ambitious—was not the yearning of mighty faculties for the tasks of empire, as was the ambition of Cæsar and of Cromwell; it was alloyed with the petulance of self-assertion, it was enfeebled by morbid notions of duty. In all things he was specious, plausible, imposing, never direct and true. To what extent he was influenced by the powerful minds which came in contact with him, it would be difficult to determine. We believe that he was profoundly affected by Laud and Strafford. But natures like his have an inborn antipathy to free institutions, and his hatred to Parliaments was more intense even than Wentworth's. That was an age when all free constitutions were in danger. The continental sovereigns were one by one securing the command of standing armies, and changing the parliamentary mace into the sword-sceptre. With more or less consciousness it was the grand aim of Charles to follow their example. His policy was not fully developed until it was in the hands of his two great ministers, the one for ecclesiastical, the other for civil affairs, Laud and Strafford: but from the commencement of his reign its spirit was unmistakable.

The first Parliament summoned by Charles met

in 1625. It showed a disposition to enquire into grievances, and to express disapprobation of the king's proceedings against the Huguenots. It was dissolved within the year. A second was called in the spring of 1626. The Commons were willing to grant supplies, but were still intent upon grievances, and dared to impeach Buckingham. Charles imprisoned the managers of the impeachment, dissolved the Parliament, and arrested the chiefs of the opposition. In 1628 a third Parliament was convoked. Before its dissolution in 1629, it had extorted from Charles, by a bribe of five subsidies, the ratification of the Petition of Right. The provisions of that celebrated instrument were what not the most abject worshipper of prerogative could deem revolutionary. The exaction of money by forced loans was condemned; the right of habeas corpus, a right of Englishmen as old as Magna Charta, was vindicated; the billeting of soldiers on private persons was restrained; and the substitution of martial for civil law was forbidden. But Charles had no sooner got his money than he hurried the Parliament away from Westminster, and sent Hollis, Valentine, Eliot, and other members of the opposition to languish in prison.

Were these arbitrary proceedings justified by the conduct of the Parliaments? Let Clarendon be witness; Clarendon, whose reverence for Charles approached adoration, and whose hatred for the Puritans thrilled his cold nature almost to passion.

He says that there occurred in those Parliaments several distempered passages and speeches "not fit for the dignity and honour of those places, and unsuitable to the reverence due to his Majesty and his councils." But for such passages the historian of the Cavaliers assigns the just excuse: "Whoever considers the acts of power and injustice of some of the ministers in those intervals of Parliament, will not be much scandalized at the warmth and vivacity of those meetings." And as for their general character, he declares that in no formal act of either House was there aught which was not "agreeable to the wisdom and justice of great courts on those extraordinary occasions." Charles not only dismissed them ignominiously, but clenched his teeth in implacable resentment, and determined in his heart to call no more Parliaments.

He had now occupied the throne for four years. Buckingham was dead. The transformation of the court of James into the court of Charles, which never could have been complete while the favourite lived, was accomplished. Laud had supplanted all others as ecclesiastical adviser; and Wentworth, the eloquent, daring, chivalrous patriot, had become a peer and an apostate.

Laud, the father of Anglicanism strictly so-called, the martyr, saint, and apostle of the holy Tractarian Church, has been severely treated by authors. Macaulay spurns him with intemperate disdain. "The mean forehead," says his lordship, "the

pinched features, the peering eyes, of the prelate, suit admirably with his disposition. They mark him out as a lower kind of Saint Dominic, differing from the fierce and gloomy enthusiast who founded the inquisition, as we might imagine the familiar imp of a spiteful witch to differ from an archangel of darkness." Carlyle handles him, as he always does those whom he regards as too weak for great goodness or great badness, with a playful, pitiful contempt,—“*Little Dr. Laud!*” Hallam, speaking as usual from the bench, is not contemptuous; he says all he can for the Primate; and all is not much. Theological learning, generosity in patronising letters, warmth in friendship, and a slight tincture of religion, are imputed to him by Hallam. But his talents were poor; his ambition was servile: his religion was alloyed with worldly interest and temporal pride; and his temper was choleric, vindictive, harsh, and cruel. He was “the evil genius” of Charles. Will no one speak a good word for Laud? We turn hopefully to Clarendon. He sets out well. We hear at last that Laud was “a man of great parts, and very exemplary virtues;” but the next moment our enthusiasm is damped by learning that these were “alloyed and discredited by some unpopular natural infirmities.” The Laud of Clarendon is an impracticable, choleric pedant, with raspy voice and irritating, impatient ways; without natural humour, incapable of seeing or taking a joke; one of those incurably disagreeable persons whom Hazlit would have advised

to give up the attempt to make themselves tolerable to humanity. Professor Masson thinks, even, that the secret of Laud's ascent may have lain in his personal repulsiveness. "To have hold of the surrounding sensations of men, even by pain and irritation, is a kind of power; and Laud had that kind of power from the first." He had. Enthusiasm for Laud among his contemporaries, there seems to have been absolutely none, unless the soul of Peter Haylin was capable of enthusiasm.

Yet is it not difficult to explain Laud's influence with his contemporaries; nor is it impossible, though less easy, to account for that reverent enthusiasm for his memory, which constitutes, in modern times, one of the best proofs of an exalted frame of Oxonian piety. He had a sincere faith in the externals of religion; he attached infinite importance to making clean the outside of the cup and platter. He died with this affirmation on his lip, and, beyond question, it was true. "Ever since I came in place," he said before his judges, "I laboured nothing more than that the external public worship of God, too much slighted in most parts of the kingdom, might be preserved." Neglect of externals had, he averred, "almost cast a damp upon the true and inward worship of God; which, while we live in the body, needs external helps, and all little enough to keep it in any vigour." This was Laud's idea of the beauty of holiness. He conceived that, in seemly and imposing externals of worship, there lay a mystic power

to win the heart to religion. It was an idea which possessed an obvious attraction for the stately, ceremonious Charles, and Laud went all lengths with the king in affirming the right divine of monarchs and of bishops. For the rest, Laud was intense, vehement, energetic; he made his soul like unto a wedge. He was troubled with no doubts or scruples, turned neither to the right hand nor to the left, paused for no recreation, and was never caught slumbering. Like Robespierre, between whom and Laud there was in several things a close resemblance, he believed every word he spoke. It is this character, in which temperament plays as important a part as mental capacity, that commands success. Bishop Williams—a man of incomparably nobler faculty than Laud, brilliant, genial, eloquent, versatile; who, when he brought Laud to James, had probably never conceived the possibility of his becoming a rival—was soon thrust aside by the wiry, sleepless zealot, all iron, and dull-burning, unquenchable fire.

Let no one imagine that Laud was gifted with sensibility to grace and solemn loveliness. He is ever, when we look at him closely, the raspy-voiced, bustling, peevish little doctor, whose beauty of holiness is only the apotheosis of formalism. In that famous consecration of the Church of St. Catherine, in London, by the archbishop, we find, with some amazement, that the ceremonial consisted mainly in regulated antics—bowings, steppings, jumpings backward and forward, according to number and measure,

without any discernible principle of beauty or impressiveness. "As he approached the communion table," thus proceeded the consecration at its most solemn part, "he made several low bowings; and coming up to the side of the table, where the bread and wine were covered, he bowed seven times; and then, after the reading of many prayers, he came near the bread, and gently lifted up a corner of the napkin wherein the bread was laid; and, when he beheld the bread, he laid it down again, flew back a step or two, bowed three several times towards it; then he drew near again, and, lifting the cover of the cup, looked into it, and, seeing the wine, let fall the cover again, retired back, and bowed as before." We calculate that Laud, the little, red-faced, mean-looking man, bowed here some two dozen times, with interspersed skippings and pacings. Can anything be conceived more grotesque than the whole affair?

How then is it that Laud is to many devout Anglicans of modern times a poet-priest, whose adoration clothed itself naturally in beauty, who trimmed the lamp of sacrifice that its golden light might stream more radiantly towards heaven, and fill with hallowed effulgence the temple upon earth? Laud stands for more in history than he was in fact. He originated what it seems impossible that he can have deeply sympathised with. For George Herbert there was real poetry in the choral chaunt, in the coloured window, in the marble altar, in the solemn aisle. In Herbert's church of Layton, which was "for the

workmanship a costly mosaic, and for the form an exact cross," there ministered a true poet-priest. The man who at Bemerton prayed and mused until "The Temple" gradually rose in melody to his enraptured imagination, meant more than Laud by the beauty of holiness. Nor is it quite with the Puritan shudder that we think of that "Protestant nunnery," which Nicholas Ferrar established in those times at Little Gidding, on the borders of Northamptonshire. There, night and day, did the sound of prayer and praise ascend from virgin-choirs, while candles, white and green, shed around a dim, religious light, and the deep organ filled the place with moving sound. These are for us the more tender lights of the Laudian picture, and when we fix our gaze upon them, and reflect on all that has been done by genuine sensibility since the days of Laud, to invest the worship of the Church of England with lofty imagery and melting grace, we cease to be astonished at the veneration entertained in some quarters for Laud's memory.

These were, we say, the high lights of the Laudian picture. It is well to make the most of them. The shadows they have to relieve are dark. For the Puritans there was one fatal circumstance in all this cultivation of the beauty, or at lowest of the upholstery, of holiness. It was not optional, but compulsory. We know what songs are to a heavy heart. Perhaps it might be equally tormenting for a Puritan, trembling in the eye of the awful God, asking, as with the reeling earthquake under his feet, what he

should do to be saved, to be compelled to interpret the divine command to worship in spirit and in truth after the Laudian fashion. For there was no tolerance in the Archbishop. The large spirit of the old Romish Church, in respect of form and rite, was alien to the contracted soul of Rome's pedantic imitator. The generous breadth of the first Reformers and their immediate successors, the philosophic liberality of Hooker and Bacon, were unknown to the iron formalist. The word of the law, enjoining uniformity of worship, had since Elizabeth's time been strict enough, but it had been indulgently applied. Practically the result had been a general uniformity, with a pleasing and salutary variety. But Laud could allow no free sprouting of the forest boughs; every tree must be cut in exactly the same form. This was new in England, and if the Puritans, in the day of their ascendancy, enforced a uniformity of a different kind, it must be remembered that it was Laud who taught them the lesson of intolerance. The just and temperate prayer of the old Puritans, that, while they interfered not with others in worshipping as seemed to them best, and while they held the unity of the faith, and were loyal subjects of his Majesty, they might be permitted a certain latitude in the manner of celebrating divine worship, was for the first time, in practice as well as in theory, rejected by Laud. Uniformity had been previously enforced with an occasional touch of whips; he enforced it constantly and universally with scorpions.

And Laud's education of the clergy in the principles of æsthetic piety did not cease with ceremonial. An act had been passed in James's reign ordering the Book of Sports to be read after sermon in churches. While James lived, neglect to obey the statute had been overlooked, but an instrument so exquisitely adapted to torture the Puritans could not escape the new inquisitor. The clergy of the Church were rigorously compelled to proclaim from the pulpit, as a decency and duty, what every Puritan who believed in the binding nature of the fourth commandment regarded as a heinous sin. The moral *dilettante* of these enlightened days, who has so much to find fault with in the Puritans, is specially incensed at their Sabbatarian narrowness. But was it, after all, so unreasonable in clergymen to wince under a command to *enjoin* Sabbath-breaking? Even the Sunday league do not, we believe, expect ministers to recommend their hearers to erect Maypoles in the parks on Sabbath afternoons, and dance round them. And in estimating that habit of discountenancing amusements, of which so much has been made against the Puritans, it is fair to reflect upon the galling bondage of which Maypoles were to Puritans the type.

Laud's surveillance over doctrine was as keen as over ceremonial. He proscribed Calvinistic preaching throughout the Church. To his other honours is to be added that of having reformed the Church, for the fourth or fifth time, in an Arminian sense. For

daring to preach against Popery and Arminianism, Mr. Nathaniel Barnard “was excommunicated, suspended from the ministry, fined a thousand pounds, condemned in costs of suit, and committed to prison.” Preferment ran in full flood towards the Arminian preachers. Papists, on the other hand, were treated with ostentatious tolerance; and Rome began to gather in the first of those harvests of Laudian converts from the English Church, of which the sheaves have been so rich and abundant in the nineteenth century.

But it was when the Puritans fretted against the yoke, and one of those remonstrating books or pamphlets appeared, which were then the popular press of England, that the might of the Anglican Dominic was most imposingly displayed. In 1630, the father of Archbishop Leighton was prosecuted in the Star Chamber, for his *Zion's Plea against Prelacy*. He was deprived of holy orders, and committed to prison. He escaped, and was recaptured. His age was then between forty and fifty, his complexion fair, his forehead lofty. “I mean to come over,” he had written to his wife from Utrecht, “upon Jehovah's protection, under whose wings if we walk, nothing can hurt us.” He was first severely whipped. Next, he was set in the pillory, and had one of his ears cut off. His nose was then slit, and he was branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron. This was the first half of his punishment. He was taken back to the Fleet prison, kept there for a week, and then “his sores upon his

back, ears, nose, and face, being not cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside, and there had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of the nose, and branding the other cheek." Flung again into prison, he remained there ten years. William Prynne, for writing a book against the stage, in which he said that female players were notorious courtezans, had his ears cropped, and his forehead branded in 1633. He was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Unconquerable as an old Norseman, he wrote in his dungeon another attack against Laud and his suffragans. In June, 1637, he was brought out, with Dr. John Bastwick, a physician, and the Rev. Henry Burton, a parish clergyman, guilty also of anti-Laudism, to undergo another punishment. They were set in pillories in Palace yard, the people flocking round them, not to pelt and hoot malefactors, but to look with wonder and passionate tears on brave Englishmen, true to the people and to God. Prynne was regarded with peculiar spite by the authorities, and private directions were in those days sometimes given to executioners; his ears were sawed off with a ragged knife. "Cut me, tear me," he cried, as with the snarl of a baited lion, "I fear thee not; I fear the fire of hell, not thee!" What a reality the fear of hell was in those days! Prynne addressed the people, told them that he could prove against Lambeth and Rome that these things were contrary to the law of England. "If I fail to prove

it," he said, "let them hang my body at the door of that prison there." The crowd had the utmost confidence in Prynne's logic, and expressed the same by a great English shout. Burton made the pillory a pulpit, and preached the gospel to an audience probably more attentive than usual; but the hot June sun and the agony of his mangling nearly overcame him, and as they carried him away, he almost fainted. "Bastwick's wife, on the scaffold, received his ears in her lap, and kissed him."

Such things rather impeded the popular appreciation of Laud's upholstery of holiness. And be it remembered the Puritans had to content themselves with Laud's religion or none. An Association had been formed in the last year of James's reign by a number of pious men, for the purpose of buying up tithes which had been snatched by laymen, and applying them to the support of preachers who agreed with Laud neither in his Arminian theology nor his ceremonial worship. It was the first grand exhibition of the voluntary principle in England; its head quarters were London, a city then eminent for its godliness and patriotism, and one of its supporters was Oliver Cromwell, an energetic farmer of Huntingdon, whose spiritual experience was in those days very comforting to his pious friends. A letter of Oliver's, referring to one of the lecturers to whom the Association had lent assistance, is extant. "Building of hospitals," he writes, "provides for men's bodies; to build material temples is judged a work of piety; but

they that procure spiritual food, they that build up spiritual temples, they are the men truly charitable, truly pious." Oliver Cromwell, we may remark in passing, seems to have thought that the highest kind of Church extension is the procuring of men who are living spiritual temples. It is an opinion not in the least antiquated, worthy of the greatest practical genius that ever lived in England, and deserving careful consideration at this day. But the Association and its lecturers were beyond the regulation bounds; Laud, therefore, brought the leaders into the Star Chamber, had them condemned to pay a severe penalty, and broke up the whole scheme.

And constantly, as we said, the throng of proselytes was pressing on from the Church of England to the Church of Rome. In doctrine, as well as in ceremonial, the Laudians were drawing nearer and nearer to that Church at which the Puritans shuddered as the great apostacy. The Archbishop plainly declared that in disposing of benefices he would prefer single to married priests. Montague, Bishop of Chichester, favoured the invocation of saints. Some argued for prayers for the dead, thus making way for a belief in purgatory. The clergy in many quarters cast wistful glances on that powerful Romish weapon of auricular confession. The doctrine of transubstantiation was not explicitly avowed, but its essence, wrapped up in vague phraseology, was generally accepted; and the keystone of the Lutheran reformation, justification by faith, not by works, was obscured and unsettled. "It

must be confessed," says Hallam, "that these English theologians were less favourable to the papal supremacy than to most other distinguishing tenets of the Catholic Church. Yet even this they were inclined to admit in a considerable degree, as a matter of positive, though not Divine institution; content to make the doctrine and discipline of the fifth century the rule of their bastard reform." The King had opened secret negotiations with Rome.

Was it strange if rugged Prynnes, terribly afraid of hell, and with their sense of ecclesiastical æsthetics rather deadened in the pillory and the dungeon, and earnest prayerful Cromwells, for whom the clear shining of Gospel light was the sole beauty of holiness, should have viewed these things with infinite alarm and dismay? There is an organization so exquisitely strung, so delicately poised between extremes, that it can balance itself with angelic safety on the thin aerial line which the Laudian Church takes for its own between Rome and the Reformation. But ordinary mortals are not only unable to perform this feat; they are unable even to understand how others can achieve it. The Pope, who ought to have been a good judge whether Laudism is really different from Romanism, offered Laud a Cardinal's hat. Add a little higher elevation, a somewhat more ethereal sentiment, to a Laudian sister of mercy, and she becomes a Romish nun; add a little more learning, a keener intellectual fire-edge, to a Laudian doctor of divinity, and he becomes

a Romish Newman: it is a faith which can be held only by a peculiar people; a faith which he who runs cannot easily read. Prynne, with his ears twice sawed from his head, was excusable in not quite appreciating its music of the spheres.

Laud was now in the heyday of his glory, a glory like that of the sultry sun which ripens pestilence in the marsh; but he was still vexed by the contradiction of men with more bowels, and less faith, than himself. Even the Star Chamber, "where those who inflicted the punishment reaped the gain, and sat, like famished birds of prey, with keen eyes and bended talons," scowling ruin upon their victims, was not energetic according to the measure of Laud. In one man alone did he find sympathy vehement enough to cheer his dark soul, and stroke his raven plumage till it smiled. He sent croak after croak across St. George's Channel to a strong eagle, which answered with proud, exultant scream. All men have agreed to deny high talent to Laud; all men have agreed to impute supreme genius to Wentworth. He represents the civil arm, as Laud represents the ecclesiastical, of that comprehensive despotism which was being prepared for England under the auspices of Charles. He is one of those characters which fascinate and awe the historian, as he marks their forms sweeping in majestic gloom along the twilight galleries of the past. Alva, Wallenstein, Strafford, still lay a spell on the imagination of mankind. "Wentworth," exclaims Macaulay,

dashing in, with firm, quick strokes, the most vivid portrait he ever drew, "who ever names him without thinking of those harsh dark features, ennobled by their expression into more than the majesty of an antique Jupiter; of that brow, that eye, that cheek, that lip, wherein, as in a chronicle, are written the events of many stormy and disastrous years, high enterprise accomplished, frightful dangers braved, power unsparingly exercised, suffering unshrinkingly borne; of that fixed look, so full of severity, of mournful anxiety, of deep thought, of dauntless resolution, which seems at once to forbode and defy a terrible fate, as it lowers on us from the living canvas of Vandyke?" But no material portraiture is necessary in order to convey an impression of the colossal powers of Strafford. That scheme of Thorough was a masterpiece of practical genius. Wentworth, alone perhaps in his generation, saw precisely whither things were tending. He knew the historical import of the great events of his day; he saw to what hour of destiny the hands pointed on the clock of time. The grand issue between despotism and constitutionalism was to be decided in England. Strafford did not wish unmasked despotism to be established in that country of which he was once an illustrious patriot. His desire was that the supremacy of the will of the sovereign, which had existed in the Tudor reigns, should be perpetuated. Under Henry and Elizabeth Parliaments had hardly become vocal, and reverence for

the prerogative was so profound that, except in rare cases, they were quelled by a strong exertion of the monarch's will. But the intelligence and eloquence of Parliament had risen to an extraordinary height in the early years of Charles, and sympathy had been perfectly established between Parliament and the nation. Nor was the majesty which doth hedge a king quite so overpowering to that generation of Englishmen as it had been to their fathers. If the prerogative was to continue supreme, some reinforcement of its power was indispensable. Such reinforcement could consist only in a standing army; and it was this fact on which Wentworth laid his giant grasp. The king was to raise money without reference to Parliament; an army was to be embodied; and Charles was then to treat the Houses with that amount of respect which to his gracious condescension should seem fit. Such was the project which Wentworth named *Thorough*; and for which the raven of Canterbury croaked that he went in "thorough and thorough." It was well named: had it succeeded, the ancient Parliament of England would have become part of the pageantry of the throne.

Side by side with the reformation of the Church on the model of Laud, went on the reformation of the State on the model of *Strafford*. Year after year passed without a parliament. The exchequer was replenished by ruinous fines, by the sale of monopolies, by royal proclamations. At length the audacious step

of levying ship-money in the inland counties was resolved upon. Elizabeth, when the Armada, like a terrible bird of prey, was flitting along the white cliffs of England, had raised money in the sea-ports for the equipment of vessels of war; but not even "the imperial lioness" had demanded ship-money in the interior of the country; and, as it was never a regular method of raising supplies, never intended to supersede the legal method of parliamentary vote, Charles had bound himself by the Petition of Right to abandon it. Among the other inland shires, Buckingham was now assessed, and as a landholder of Buckingham, John Hampden was called upon to pay, for one parish thirty-one shillings, for another, twenty shillings. He refused to pay a farthing, and defied the whole power of Government. England gazed with proud admiration on this country gentleman, who attached importance so transcendent to a principle, and who believed that, in the tribunals of his country, the subject had as firm a footing as the king. The memorable ship-money case was tried in 1637, a few months after the triumph of Laud over Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, in Palace Yard. The judges in the Exchequer Chamber, pronounced, by seven against five, that Hampden was bound to pay. The provision of the Petition of Right, that no "gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such-like charge" should be levied without consent of parliament, was thus swept away. Englishmen were placed at the mercy of the crown, to an extent unknown since the concession of Magna Charta.

The great work was almost complete. The Parliament of England had not sat for eight years. The Courts of Law were subservient to the Crown. The Church was ruled with a rod of iron. A little more sleep, a little more slumber, and the eyes of England had been sealed in eternal despotism. The bosom of the nation heaved as in the stifled agony of nightmare, but "pacific England, the most solid pacific country in the world," as Carlyle well calls it, gave no sign of insurrectionary fury. The American wild was becoming peopled with English exiles. Lord Say, "the wise and cautious;" Lord Brooks, "the brave, open, and enthusiastic;" Hampden, the magnanimous, thoughtful, and dauntless, were beginning to despair of England. Suddenly a streamer shot from the northern sky; all eyes were turned upon the portent of storm; and a thrill of fierce joy struck to the hearts of the patriot Puritans of England, as the trumpets of gathering war sang clear from the Scottish border.

Laud, vehement and intense, with no statesman-like breadth of view, and none of that human sympathy which enables the practical statesman to know how nations feel, appears to have thought that, as Scotland was a little kingdom, he could deal with it more summarily and easily than with England. He set to work with emphasis. Episcopacy was forced upon the Scotch; and, in 1637, the final step of introducing a liturgy was attempted. The result is known to all. Jenny Geddes flung her stool at the head of

the officiating Dean of Edinburgh, and an uproar ascended in the old Greyfriars Church, loud enough to waken the dead that slept around. Clarendon thinks that this riot in Greyfriars was a kind of accident, and that men of craft and influence, acting with and upon it by various artificial methods, produced the world-historical movement of which the centre was the Solemn League and Covenant. The theory is interesting. It serves at least to show the historical capacity of that stately senatorial author—his power of appreciating the feelings which produce national revolutions. The tumult in Greyfriars was a jet from fire-fountains that had long swelled in the heart of the Scottish people. That stool of Jenny's, flying aloft so conspicuously, was a cinder from the deeps of a true burning mountain. The Scotch had long been enthusiastically Presbyterian. The preachers were the popular leaders of the nation; the General Assembly of the Church, with its extensive lay representation, was the real Parliament of the country. The cause of liberty and the cause of religion were allied in England; in Scotland they were one. The Scots, having once risen against the impositions of Laud, glowed speedily into a universal passion of excitement; the Solemn League and Covenant, for the establishment of Presbyterian uniformity throughout the three kingdoms, was signed by all classes with tears of rapture, often in the blood of the subscribers; and an army in hodden grey and blue bonnets, ranged beneath a banner inscribed in golden

letters, with the blazon, *For Christ's Crown and Covenant*, announced to Strafford, Laud, and Charles, that the time had not yet come to bring out with shouting the topstone of Thorough.

The whole body of the English Puritans were from the first in sympathy with the Scots, and disaffection had spread so generally throughout the nation, that it was impossible for Charles to raise an army inspired with any right enthusiasm for his cause. He went north in 1639, and looked upon the army of the Covenant, garnishing the hill of Dunse, above Berwick, with its brave new colours, its white tents, and crown of mounted cannon. He may have gone near enough to hear the drums, which acted as church bells and called the ruddy-faced young soldiers to "good sermons and prayers morning and even, under the roof of heaven," or he may have heard, at dawn or sun-down, the singing of psalms and the voice of prayer borne mellow from the far hill-side. Laud had found "no religion" in Scotland, not the slightest talent for, or appreciation of, the upholstery of holiness. It might have widened his ideas a little, or at least struck him into dumb amazement, to have seen that worshipping army, in its azure temple with the floor of green.

The expedition to Scotland exhausted the royal exchequer, and, as no lasting peace came of the truce which was cobbled up, a supply of money became indispensable. After eleven years' intermission, and with profound reluctance, Charles called the Par-

liament, which met in the spring of 1640. The English nation, with that infinite tolerance for monarchs which was in those days its characteristic, rejoiced to see once more the face of parliament; and the Houses were sober, dispassionate, and disposed to please the king. But they had a manful sense of the abuses under which the nation groaned, and quietly, but resolutely, set about their redress. They had sat some three weeks when the king turned them adrift. His friends were filled with mournful astonishment; his enemies with bitter joy. This was the short Parliament.

All the old illegal methods of raising money were now resorted to by Charles, and in August he marched again to meet the Scots, who this time had advanced into England. The king had got an army, but it would not fight. Posted on a hill to receive an enemy which had to ford a deep river in its front, it waited not to give or take a blow, but broke at once into what Clarendon calls "the most shameful and confounding flight that was ever heard of." This was at Newburn on the Tyne. The Scots established themselves in the northern counties, and the embarrassments of Charles became desperate.

It is impossible not to be struck with the shining part played by the Scottish people in this the first period of their intermeddling in the English Puritan business. Clarendon, who hated Scots with a perfect hatred, cannot veil the brilliancy and success of their proceedings. There is a stirring poetry, akin to that

which thrilled the Hebrew nation of old at the thought that Mount Zion was to become the crown of the whole earth, in the aspiration of the little kingdom to make its Covenant a bond of union, a fount of blessing, for the three nations. Away among their misty hills, the Scots could not be left alone. Laud must torment them with his genuflexions, his surplises, his services, his bishops. So they towered suddenly up in a passion of sacred wrath and enthusiasm, and vowed that the brethren whose groans they heard from England should also be free of Laud and his inventions. Their carriage in England was discreet and sagacious, as well as brave. Their leaders, the Earl of Rothes, Lord Louden, Alexander Henderson, men of tact, energy, and ability, appreciated the danger of wounding the pride of the English people by seeming either to conquer or to lay them under too great a debt of gratitude. They earnestly declared that the Scottish people "remembered the infinite obligations they had from time to time received from this nation; especially the assistance they had from it in their reformation of religion, and their attaining the light of the gospel; and therefore, as it could never fall into their hearts to be ungrateful to it, so they hoped that the good people of England would not entertain any ill opinion of their coming into this kingdom in a hostile manner." Clarendon expresses astonishment at the skill, harmony, self-command, and "confidence in each other," with which the numerous Scotch nobility

and their clergy acted; and laments that "this united strength, and humble and active temper, was not encountered by an equal providence and circumspection in the king's councils." These judicious Scots secured a splendid maintenance for their army in Durham and Northumberland, and the chiefs, lay and clerical, found their way to London. They were lodged in the heart of the city, near London stone, in a house adjoining St. Antholin's church, which was assigned them for their devotions. There Alexander Henderson and his brethren preached, and, to the great disgust of Clarendon, the Londoners flocked in crowds to hear them, so that "from the first appearance of day in the morning on every Sunday, to the shutting in of the light, the church was never empty." Readers of sensibility will imagine the horror of Doctor Laud!

But we have anticipated. An event or two not unknown to history had occurred before Presbyterian preachers could become popularities in the city of London. As the best of many bad alternatives, Charles had resolved, in the autumn of 1640, to call another Parliament. It met in November. It has been named the Long Parliament; and is regarded by judges as the most remarkable representative body that ever sat in this world.

The English nation had been hard to rouse, but the day of their wrath was come. The pent up indignation of eleven years rushed on with the might of an Atlantic tide; and Thorough went down before

it like a house built by children in the sand of the shore. Yet is it not so much the fervour of righteous vengeance in the statesmen of the Long Parliament which strikes upon the imagination, as the wisdom and calm intrepidity with which they directed it against its objects. They had formidable enemies to deal with. In reading of the French Revolution, we are constantly impressed with the feebleness of the opposition with which the chiefs of the popular party had to contend. Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, Calonne, Maurepas, Lomenie de Brienne, were poor creatures, and the triumph of the revolutionists over them shows like a massacre of the innocents. But our fathers fought with men. Laud, Charles, above all Wentworth, were no despicable adversaries. It was a perilous task to cope with these. Can anything be more terribly magnificent than that arrest of Strafford? As we recall the day when Pym made his accusing speech, and the Commons sat hour after hour until the dread business was accomplished, we seem to see a royal eagle poised high in the heavens, and mark an eagle-slayer, planting his foot on a dizzy crag, bending his bow with giant force, taking calm and steady aim, and sending the shaft hurtling through the sky. The arrow mounts, strikes, and in a moment the poised wings flutter, and Wentworth sinks like a stone into the abyss. What was the thought which struck along Strafford's brain when his "proud glooming countenance" darkened at the tidings that he was impeached for high treason?

Was it not the thought that, great as he was, the men against whom he had measured himself, Pym, Hampden, and their compatriots, were *abler* men than he?

The mighty tide swept on. Strafford died on the scaffold; Laud was committed to the Tower; the Star Chamber, the High Commission, the Council of York, were abolished; every agent by whom Charles had for eleven years striven to decree injustice by a law either saved himself by flight, or was called to account; and the Parliament passed a Bill to which Charles dared not refuse his sanction, ordaining that it should not be dissolved without its own consent. Clarendon may well call the statesmen of the Long Parliament "terrible reformers." They were terrible, but they were also great, and they originated all that has been greatest in the history of nations since the day they met.

When we pause to ask what was the pre-eminent glory of that Parliament which, in its earliest years, set the constitution of England on an immovable basis, we find that it was the harmonious combination of two elements, which have been separately appreciated and admired, but never clearly apprehended in their symmetry and their unity. The entire school of political speculation represented by Bentham, by the Mills, and by Buckle, a school imbued with the secular spirit of the French Revolution, has extolled the respect for law, the reverence for justice, the affection for constitutional form, which animated the

Puritan legislators of England. But to these modern speculators the religious fervour of the Puritans is an offence which they shun to contemplate, a scandal which they seek to hide, or an accident to which they attach no importance. Mr. Carlyle, on the other hand, pours fierce contempt on all that which these men deem worthiest of praise in the statesmen of the Long Parliament. He passes lightly over the ship-money case. Hampden is for him a man of close thin lips, vigilant eyes, and clear official understanding, very brave but formidably thick-quilted in constitutional theory. It is with the religious fervour of the Puritans, and that alone, that Mr. Carlyle has any ardent sympathy. He paints in colours of vivid poetry the sublime passion of their spiritual enthusiasm. "Our ancient Puritan Reformers," he exclaims, "were, as all Reformers that will much benefit this earth are, always inspired by a heavenly purpose. To see God's own law, then universally acknowledged for complete as it stood in the holy written Book, made good in this world; to see this, or the true unwearied aim and struggle towards this, it was a thing worth living for and dying for! Eternal justice; that God's will *be* done on earth as it is in heaven." True words; true as they are beautiful: but not the whole truth. The special glory of the Puritans is that they combined all that is seen in them by Bentham with all that is seen in them by Carlyle. They had the thoughtfulness, the sagacity, the wholesome conservative sympathy, the

veneration for law and precedent, which mark consummate practical legislators; but they had also a spiritual ardour, a pure moral enthusiasm, a perpetual sense of responsibility to the Most High God, which raised those qualities to a more ethereal temper, and shone through them like sacred fire dwelling in tabernacles of clay. England then had statesmen who were godly; and godly men who were statesmen. Never was a political revolution so hallowed and elevated by religion as that of the seventeenth century; never was a religious revolution so moderated and guided by political wisdom. It was by no base material desire that those Conscript Fathers of the state were moved. They were no raging anarchists, maddened by famine, and deliriously wailing and gnashing round their king for bread. Clarendon expatiates on the material prosperity of England during the ascendancy of Laud and Strafford, and reflects, with a dignity worthy of some high magnate in an oriental empire, on the unreasonableness of men who were roused to such indignation by mere infraction of law, nay of one law, namely, that supplies should be raised by Act of Parliament. What a little matter! It was only that the king should be nourished by an opulent realm without humiliating appeals to his people. It was only that a rich Hampden here and there should be illegally sentenced to pay a few shillings. It was only that, in the background, unseen by the common eye, like two dark enchanters in their Cyclopean cave, Laud and Strafford should forge the

one a chain for the Church, the other a sword for the State, chain and sword the emblems of that abstract danger, that unfelt and ideal woe, the system of Thorough. It was only, in one word, that England should be lulled gradually into the sleep of despotism, to await, with the other European monarchies, like those sceptered forms that slumbered in the hall of Eblis, the awakening of anarchic revolution. Our fathers discerned the peril; no semblance of external prosperity could veil it from their eyes. They felt that a subtle poison was stealing through that balmy air. They knew that the heaven, for all its azure and sunshine, would become brass, and the earth, for all its smiling plenty, would become iron, if once those guardian angels, law and freedom, forsook their ancient trust in England. Not by the will of one, but by the wisdom of many, was this England to be governed. *That* these Puritan legislators had resolved. They felt by sure instinct that it is an unnatural state of things; a state of things which never was, and never will be, permanently combined with true national greatness; a state of things which was conceded to the Hebrews as a self-sought doom; a state of things which is inhuman, pernicious, infinitely and incurably wrong, that the destinies of millions should hang upon the will of one erring man. There are, indeed, exceptional periods in the lives of nations, periods when the passions, furious and unchained, can be curbed only by a single gigantic hand. At such times, the heaven-born leader, the solitary towering genius, the dictator sent

from God, is indispensable. But the perpetuation of despotic authority in a line of hereditary descent is the most fearful disaster that can overtake a nation, and entails stupendous calamities on mankind. Only in the "multitude of councillors" is there durable safety for kingdoms. This truth the Puritan statesmen knew; and, with their lives in their hands, they stood in the gap, beneath the banner of law and Parliament, and withstood the entering procession of civil and religious despotism.

We shall not deny that there were weak and narrow-minded men among the Puritans, men whose earnestness froze their small natures into a wiry intensity, who were as much formalists as Laud, and of a still meaner type. There were Puritans for whom the beauty of holiness consisted in hair cropped "close round their heads, with many little peaks," in looks perpetually demure, in phrases affectedly precise. Who can have forgotten the disdain, so proud, so womanly, so delicious, with which Lucy Hutchinson relates that the magnificent locks which flowed over the shoulders of her prince of men, her adored Colonel, prejudiced his religious reputation with "the godly of those days?" And was there ever a great religious party to which did not adhere a certain number of hypocrites, whose profession, fair as it looked, gilded "not a temple of living grace, but a tomb," holding only "the carcase of religion"? There are stains on the memory of the Puritans; but they are grains of dust on an imperial garment. The

spirit which animated Puritanism, the spirit which throbbed in its heart of hearts, the spirit which made it irresistible in its own time, and lends it still an awful grandeur, was an inspiration of heroism from Almighty God. Both Lord Macaulay and Mr. Carlyle suggest too forcibly the idea that the Puritan religion was a mere spasmodic excitement, a burst of hysterical passion. It was not such. As we see it in Cromwell while he was yet a quiet farmer, before that liquid gleam in his eye, expressive of all tender, true, and profound emotions, had kindled into the lightning glance of the warrior, it was as placid as it was strong. "The Lord," he wrote to a lady, "accept me in His Son, and give me to walk in the light, as He is the light! He it is that enlighteneth our blackness, our darkness. I dare not say, He hideth His face from me. He giveth me to see light in His light. One beam in a dark place hath exceeding much refreshment in it:—blessed be His name for shining upon so dark a heart as mine!" That is religion for a peaceful, sober man, wending quietly to the grave; a beam from the heart of heaven, falling tenderly among the household charities, among the duties of every day. And was it not the *same* religion, was it not the religion of a healthy, clear-seeing, practical man, which accompanied Cromwell to the field? Was it extravagant in a Christian hero to believe that God was as near to him as to the Hebrew David? Cromwell's God was a living presence, uttering His wrath in the victorious battle charge, smiling His approval in the

broad light of returning peace. Religion of this kind is sublime; but surely, unless with our theories we have shut out the Most High from His universe, it is not absurd, it is not extravagant. And can anything be more wise and beautiful, more excellently removed from godlessness on the one hand, and morbid introspection, self-worshipping pietism, or fanatical frenzy, on the other, than the religion which pervades Mrs Hutchinson's memoir of her husband? Grant that the Colonel, as she portrays him, is an ideal Puritan, a saint crowned with the halo of glorious feminine love: must it not, on any showing, have been a noble party to which either Hutchinson or his wife belonged? "In the head of all his virtues," writes the high Puritan dame, "I shall set that which was the head and spring of them all, his Christianity—for this alone is the true royal blood that runs through the whole body of virtue, and every pretender to that glorious family, who hath no tincture of it, is an imposter and a spurious brat. This is that sacred fountain which baptiseth all the Gentile virtues, that so immortalize the names of Cicero, Plutarch, Seneca, and all the old philosophers; herein they are regenerated and take a new name and nature; digged up in the wilderness of nature, and dipped in this living spring, they are planted and flourish in the paradise of God. By Christianity I intend that universal habit of grace which is wrought in a soul by the regenerating Spirit of God, whereby the whole creature is resigned up into the Divine will

and love, and all its actions designed to the obedience and glory of its Maker." Such was the Christianity of the Puritans. Ever in the great Taskmaster's eye. We see them in the manor-houses of that old time, a stately, polite, religious people; not austere, yet not frivolous. Their theory of life was that man's chief end is not to amuse or to be amused, not to create or experience sensation, but to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever.

They loved England with a glowing, a haughty affection. Herein lay another notable difference between the Puritans of England and the revolutionists of France. To these last old France had become horrible; their soul's wish was to raze it to its foundations. But the Puritans stood up against Laud and Strafford, because they were binding new chains round the form of their beloved England. "Whoever," says the Puritan Mrs. Hutchinson, "considers England, will find it no small favour of God to have been made one of its natives, both upon spiritual and outward accounts. The happiness of the soil and air contribute all things that are necessary to the use or delight of man's life. The celebrated glory of this isle's inhabitants ever since they received a mention in history, confers some honour upon every one of her children, with an obligation to continue in that magnanimity and virtue, which hath famed this island, and raised her head in glory higher than the great kingdoms of the neighbouring continent..... Better laws and a happier constitution of government no nation ever enjoyed, it

being a mixture of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, with sufficient fences against the pest of every one of these forms, tyranny, faction, and confusion; yet,"—here the brave lady explains how even in such a state a patriot might have to draw sword,—“yet is it not possible for man to devise such just and excellent bounds as will keep in wild ambition, when princes' flatterers encourage that beast to break his fence, which it hath often done, with miserable consequences both to the prince and people; but could never in any age so tread down popular liberty, but that it rose again with renewed vigour, till at length it trod on those that trampled it before.”

Such were the sentiments of the Puritan patriots of England at the commencement of the Long Parliament. A large proportion of the party were persons of high breeding, of noble culture, of refined intelligence; in morals pure, in faith earnest, in devotion sincere. Many of them were of the aristocracy; the body of the party consisted of country gentlemen and the most substantial portion of the middle class. They dreamed not of overturning the monarchy or destroying the Church, but were resolute to maintain the freedom of their country, to rescue the Church from the thralldom of Laud, and to carry on that work of further reformation within her pale which had been contemplated by the first English Reformers.

Conjecture as to what might have occurred, if the circumstances which combine with men's dispositions to work out the results of history had been different, is

generally futile ; but it seems as probable as any event which did not take place can be said to be, that, but for a few untoward circumstances, the Long Parliament might, in its earliest sessions, have reformed the Church more satisfactorily either than Cromwell or than Charles II. The Commonwealth swept away the whole framework of Episcopacy, and ordained the discontinuance of the Book of Common Prayer ; the Act of Nonconformity not only re-established Episcopacy, but laid clergymen under more searching tests of Conformity than those of Laud himself: the dispositions of Churchmen, when the sittings of the Long Parliament commenced, were favourable to a mean between these extremes. The proscription of Calvinism might have ceased ; the adoption of certain ceremonies might have been left to the will of pastors and congregations ; liberty of prayer beyond the letter of the liturgy might have been conceded ; and presbyters might have been associated with bishops in the exercise of Church discipline. These reforms, with perhaps the addition of the exclusion of bishops from the Upper House, would have met with no serious opposition from Episcopalians of the school of Usher, and would have satisfied almost the entire Puritan party. In point of fact, the Puritans *in* the Church of England, the Puritans who loved the Church, clung to the Church, and desired no more than that the Church would reconcile them to herself, by granting them such liberty as might enable them to dwell in her courts, had only in solitary

instances demanded more than this. There were thorough-going Presbyterians in England, who objected on conscientious grounds to even a modified Episcopacy; there were thorough-going Independents who maintained the Divine right of congregations only: but those who could not conscientiously conform to a Church, retaining an Episcopalian framework, and tolerating, though not enjoining, the ceremonies, were in 1641 in a minority in England.

The self-will, however, and unmanly vehemence of Charles, urging him to that fatal "arrest of the five members," and the horror, alarm, and suspicion created by the Irish rebellion, hurried a resolute but constitutional opposition into revolution. Hampden, and other leaders of the Puritans, who had made common cause with the Scots on their first advance into England, knew that the triumph of Charles would be their destruction. The Puritans of the middle and lower classes were agitated with fears of massacre. The breach, therefore, which, in 1640 or 1641, might have been closed, had in 1642 become irreparable; and the quarrel was referred to the arbitrament of the sword. A beneficent and harmonious settlement became thus, for that century, impossible; and the Puritans gained only the melancholy assurance that spiritual reformation could not be effected in the battle-field. "We have spiritual weapons," said a Puritan who saw the conflict from beginning to end, "given us for spiritual combats, and

those who go about to conquer subjects for Christ with swords of steel, shall find the base metal break to shivers when it is used, and hurtfully fly in their own faces."

We saw how discreetly the Scots comported themselves when, in 1640, they ruined the king's affairs in the north of England, and compelled him to call the Long Parliament. From the end of 1640 their Commissioners had been in London, and their popularity with the Puritans never flagged. An order was entered by the House of Commons, "that upon all occasions the appellation should be used of *our brethren of Scotland.*" Those were the days when Milton hailed the two kingdoms as united in invincible might, in virtue, and in the brotherhood of godlike deeds. "Go on both hand in hand, O nations, never to be disunited; be the praise and the heroic song of all posterity!" But in fact the union could not be perfect; it contained elements of disruption from the first; and what seemed to the exultant Scots to cement it indissolubly, was the cause of its being finally rent asunder.

The Scots were all aglow with enthusiasm for their Presbyterian faith. Presbyterianism was to their apprehensions so benign, so beautiful, so divinely good and great, that to persuade all men that it was the one thing needful, for time and eternity, for State and Church, seemed an easy, off-hand process. Before starting from Newcastle for London, in November, 1640, their Commissioners had been careful

to take along with them four Presbyterian luminaries, calculated, it was thought, to irradiate the four corners of England. Mr. Robert Baillie of Kilwinning, who had left his quiet manse in Ayrshire, with sword on thigh, and two Dutch pistols at saddle-bow, and come into England with the army of the Covenant, tells us how the matter was arranged. "Our noblemen and ministers," writes Mr. Baillie, "in one voice thought meet that not only Mr. Alexander Henderson, but also Mr. Robert Blair, Mr. George Gillespie, and I, should all three, for divers ends, go to London; Mr. Robert Blair to satisfy the minds of many in England who love the way of New England (*Independency*) better than that of Presbyteries in our Church; I for the convincing of that prevalent faction (*Arminian Episcopal*s) against which I have written; Mr. Gillespie for the crying-down of the English ceremonies, on which he has written; and all four of us to preach, by turns, to our Commissioners in their house." If this does not bring the English up to the mark, what will? Beautiful and wonderful the simplicity of those "noblemen and ministers!" As we think of the strife of opinion from that day to this—of the weltering war of words, never-ending, still-beginning, like the old battle between the winds and waves—is there not something pathetic in the thought of the four Presbyterian magicians, who were to reduce the ocean of English opinion to sublime and everlasting silence?

Unaccountable as it must have seemed to the Rev.

Mr. Baillie, the work of convincing England of the infinite superiority and Divine and exclusive right of Presbyterianism proved difficult. The Scots had no doubt that it was a duty to *impose* the heavenly truth upon all; to establish Presbyterianism, and to forbid everything else. A considerable party in England took their view of the question, but at no period were the English Presbyterians so numerous and decided that strict enforcement of Presbyterian uniformity throughout the country would not have been felt to be oppressive. Mighty, no doubt, as were the spells of our four magicians, the most powerful advocate of Presbyterian uniformity in England proved to be David Leslie, the crooked little soldier, who had once put Wallenstein to his mettle, and who was at the head of the Scotch army of the Covenant. When the prospects of the Parliament were at their darkest in 1643,—when Bristol, Exeter, and all the West had submitted to Charles,—the presence of Leslie and his Scots became extremely desirable. The Presbyterian influence in the House of Commons grew strong. Subscription of the Covenant by all classes was ordained. Oliver Cromwell set his hand to that famed document, pledging himself to put down Popery, Prelacy, and Superstition, and to promote uniformity in religion and worship throughout the three kingdoms. It turned out that Oliver's conception of uniformity meant chiefly a uniform absence of compulsion; and that he interpreted the Covenant in

a sense different from that of the Presbyterians. Meanwhile, however, twenty-one thousand Scots came trooping across the border, and proved highly serviceable to the Parliament in the summer of 1644. They held the King's forces in the north in check, took forts and towns, and astonished the English by their capacities of martial toil and "patient sufferance of the ill weather." On Marston Moor, "the Scots delivered their fire with such constancy and swiftness, it was as if the whole air had become an element of fire." What with Mr. Baillie's convincing syllogisms, and old Leslie's rolling fire, Presbyterianism seemed in a fair way in England. But Presbyterians of the Scottish school would tolerate neither Episcopalians nor Independents; and these last found a defender in Oliver Cromwell.

The Houses, in offering resistance to the King, had proclaimed that they did not fight against him but against his evil Councillors. The Scots, and those English Puritans who hailed them with the most forward sympathy, were consistent and emphatic in the disclaimer of any wish to overturn the monarchy. This has been commonly regarded as a pretence. Mr. Carlyle sneers at it as a piece of mere constitutional verbiage, treated with just scorn by Cromwell. We believe that it was sincere: nay more, that, unless we understand its sincerity, we shall attain no clear conception of the chain of historical cause and effect in those dubious years. The distinction between the Monarch and his Ministers was from of old familiar

to the mind of England. It was an ancient principle of the law, firmly grasped by the national mind, that a minister might be led to death for infringing the rights of the subject, though he could plead the express command of his sovereign. This principle being generally recognised, the Puritans saw no absurdity, no hypocrisy, in the profession that armies were levied and war declared, in order to bring a monarch, safe on account of the inviolability of his person, into amity with Parliament and alliance with law.

The early proceedings of Parliament, and the conduct of the Presbyterian party, from first to last, corresponded with this theory. The Covenant, while making no terms with the Episcopalian Church, was an oath of allegiance to the Stuart dynasty. "We kept," said an English Presbyterian divine, who saw the fall and the restoration of the monarchy, "to our old principles, and thought all others had done so too, except a very few inconsiderable persons. We were unfeignedly for King and Parliament. We believed that the war was only to save the Parliament and kingdom from the Papists and delinquents, and to remove the dividers, that the King might again return to his Parliament, and that no changes might be made in religion, but by the laws that had his free consent. We took the true happiness of King and people, Church and State, to be our end, and so we understood the Covenant, engaging both against Papists and schismatics." Hence the unwillingness

of the Parliamentary generals to annihilate the military power of Charles. They and all the Presbyterians desired to force a treaty upon him, but not to put him out of the way and proceed to an independent arrangement. In their programme two things were essential: the establishment of the Presbyterian Church; and the maintenance of the ancient throne. It is beyond dispute that, under the influence of the Scots, they dealt more sternly with Episcopacy than the old English Puritans required or would have approved. But they stood with equal persistence by their other essential point. If they refused to league themselves with Charles unless he abandoned Episcopacy, they refused to ally themselves with Cromwell when he struck at Charles and declared for the expulsion of the Stuarts. The Presbyterians defended the King to the last. For his sake, when it became evident that the Ironsides were going to trample him down, they rose in arms in Wales, in Scotland, and, in smaller numbers, throughout England. For his sake, they were beaten down by the victorious soldiers of Naseby. For his sake, they were ignominiously thrust from the House of Commons by Colonel Pride. No sooner had Charles I. laid his head on the block, than Charles II. was proclaimed by Presbyterians. Once more Cromwell joined in death-wrestle with these determined supporters of the throne. The fire of their loyalty was quenched in the blood of Dunbar and Worcester. Then, and not till then,

did the standard of the old dynasty sink in England. In one word, Presbyterian Royalists fought for the Stuarts with resolution as fixed, with valour as dauntless, as the Episcopalian Royalists. After the death of Charles I., Presbyterian Ministers were, as Cromwell acknowledges, "imprisoned, deprived of their benefices, sequestered, forced to fly from their dwellings, and bitterly threatened," for calling those who had condemned and executed the King, "murderers and the like."

If the Presbyterians thought it desirable to form a league with Charles after his troops were driven from the field, it is not surprising that Charles himself should have conceived the monarchy to be an inexpugnable tower of strength, and trusted to win back by intrigue what he had lost in battle. His theory on the subject will seem the wildest hallucination, unless we justly estimate that reverence for his person and prerogative, which made men fight against his armies, while shuddering at the thought of dethroning himself. He thought he could play off the Presbyterians and Independents against each other; "being" —we quote his own words,— "not without hope that I shall be able to draw either the Presbyterians or the Independents to side with me for extirpating one another, that I shall be really King again." The project was not absurd. Under certain circumstances, it might have succeeded. The prerogative was a potent engine of destruction in the hand of Charles, a detonating ball which, if put in the proper place,

might, at the proper time, have shattered asunder either the Presbyterian or the Independent coach. But to place the combustible, with the eye of an Oliver Cromwell looking fixedly upon the performer, was a matter of difficulty. Alliance with either party became a delicate business, when each knew that the object aimed at was the extirpation of both. The Ironsides felt that, while Charles lived, the danger of a league between him and the Presbyterians, based on a rigid Presbyterian uniformity, would continue to menace the Independents. This was historically the cause of Charles's death. Any Church which could be established in England during the Commonwealth, had to make room both for Presbyterians and Independents.

Oliver Cromwell was one of those old Puritans who groaned under the yoke of Laud. He had witnessed with indignation the extinction of the Society for supplying localities, which had no ministers, with lecturers. He had trembled at those 'Popish innovations' which, for his Calvinistic eyes, had none of the beauty of holiness. He had told the Parliament, with flashing countenance, and harsh untunable voice, that Dr. Alabaster had "preached flat Popery at Paul's Cross." As governor of Ely, under the Parliament, he had enforced the ordinance of the Houses against ceremonies, standing up in Ely Cathedral, and crying out to the Rev. Mr. Hitch, who ventured to appear in a surplice, "leave off your fooling and come down, sir." We believe, nevertheless, that

Cromwell would have been content with that measure of freedom in the Church which the majority of the early Puritans demanded. His principles, as stated by himself to one of his Parliaments, pledged him to respect the King's conscience, if it dictated the duty of establishing Episcopacy. "So long," said Cromwell, "as there is liberty of conscience for the Supreme magistrate to exercise his conscience in erecting what form of Church government he is satisfied he should set up, why should he not give the like liberty to others?" Might Cromwell, then, have arrived at an understanding with Charles, restored the monarchy, and anticipated Monk? We believe that, at one period, this was not impossible. But Cromwell soon perceived that Charles could not be trusted, and that his triumph would inevitably bring destruction upon all who had fought against him. Nor could concessions on the subject of Episcopacy be wrung from the king; and as Oliver was a Covenanter, though reading the Covenant rather in the spirit than the letter, it is probable that he felt himself, even if he regretted the fact, under a sacred obligation to oppose the establishment of prelacy. The result, at all events, was that he left Charles to his fate, and became the uncompromising enemy of the family of Stuart. The Lord, he said, had rejected this house from ruling over England.

To Presbytery, as a form of Church government, Cromwell had still fewer objections than to Episcopacy. But he had no sympathy with a party

whose sole conception of the "glorious Reformation" symbolised by the Covenant, was the substitution of a domineering Presbyterianism for a domineering Episcopacy. His Puritanism had been from the first, what the best of English Puritanism was, not a preference of one form of Church government to another, but a life of spiritual, personal religion, an intense realization of the presence of God, a devotion of the entire being to Him. The Cavaliers were dreaded and disliked by Cromwell not as Episcopalian, but as godless; and as he believed that both the Presbyterians and Independents were bent upon serving God in spirit and in truth, he was ardently desirous of effecting reconciliation between them. "Presbyterians, Independents," thus he wrote from Bristol in 1645, "all have here the same spirit of faith and prayer; the same presence and answer; they agree here, have no names of difference: pity it is it should be otherwise anywhere! All that believe have the real unity, which is most glorious; because inward and spiritual, in the Body, and to the Head. For being united in forms, commonly called Uniformity, every Christian will for peace-sake study and do, as far as conscience will permit. And for brethren, in things of the mind we look for no compulsion but that of light and reason." But this ideal was not easily attainable, even after the downfall of Laud. Only a few men scattered over England were capable of responding to the broad sense and the profound Christianity of those words of Oliver's.

His expressions constitute abundant proof that he was a hundred years in advance of the general intelligence of his age. He deplored, a few years before his death, that his aspiration had been vain. "Every sect saith," these were his words, "Oh, give me liberty! But give it him, and to his power he will not yield it to anybody else."

Cromwell did as much for liberty of conscience as his position rendered possible. The Presbyterians were his implacable foes. He dared not permit them to assemble in synod, nor would he allow them to exclude Independents from Church preferment. But Presbytery remained during the Protectorate the established religion of England, and Cromwell's Triers appointed a good man to a benefice whether he called himself Independent, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian. The "frequent use" of the Prayer Book was forbidden, but the fact that frequency of use was permitted to no man, demonstrates that occasional use was conceded to all. Observe also: first, that the Episcopalian Royalists would not let Cromwell alone, but annoyed him incessantly with their conspiracies; secondly, that the Puritans regarded the gift of prayer as of high importance in a minister, and deemed frequent use of the Prayer Book, however good it might be in itself, an evidence of intellectual poverty, spiritual apathy, or of indolence. The Protector was beyond comparison the most tolerant statesman of his age. Standing between the cramped episcopacy of Laud, and the stern genius

of Scottish Presbytery, he secured for the British islands as much religious liberty as could be maintained against both. It is a pathetic, a sublime spectacle, this of Cromwell struggling, inarticulately, half-consciously, to force his way to the practical realization of a great truth then only dawning on the foremost intellects of the race. He did what he could. With that marvellous power of going direct to the heart of every matter which distinguished him, he made it the grand aim of his ecclesiastical policy to appoint able and godly ministers in the parishes of England; and it is proved by overwhelming evidence that in this he was eminently successful.

It is a doctrine still current in the clubs of England, still published in Saturday Reviews, that the Puritan reformation of the Church of England came to this:—"the ordained clergy were superseded by carpenters and cobblers, who were conscious only of an outpouring of the Spirit." Is not this a curious view of English Church history in the seventeenth century? Does it not suggest with painful impressiveness, the reflection, "With how little knowledge, with how little sense, in this time of superlative enlightenment, is that public opinion formed, which governs the world!" The Puritans, as Hallam testifies, were in the earlier period of their history the most learned theologians of the Church; and if, during the Laudian ascendancy, they were discouraged at the Universities, they continued, beyond question,

an erudite and cultivated party. Against Laud's "bastard fifth century reform," they appealed not only to Scripture, but to the records of an earlier Christian antiquity. "Carpenters and cobblers!" The Church of Baxter, of Poole, of Goodwin, of Howe, of Owen, of Milton! The University of Oxford was doubtless extinct when Cromwell, its Chancellor, declared that he knew the value of learning to all right Commonwealths. The court of Cromwell was hopelessly illiterate when the Latin Secretary penned the Protector's despatches to Mazarin. It was to young street preachers, innocent of the arts of reading and writing, that Oliver referred when he boasted to his Parliament of the "very great seed" for the ministry which God had at the Universities.

It is surely unnecessary to pour contempt on England, in order to insult Nonconformity. Our ancestors never stooped so low as to endure, for fourteen years, a Church of vapouring mechanics. They were, indeed, not satisfied with the ecclesiastical organization established by Cromwell; some of them longed for exclusive Episcopacy, some of them for exclusive Presbytery, a few for exclusive Independency. But they knew that the Presbyterian Church had throughout its whole history honoured learning; that the Puritans had numbered in their ranks a goodly proportion of learned bishops and divines; that the Universities still performed the function of educating youth for the ministry; and that, doctrinally, the Church of the Commonwealth

agreed with the Church of the Thirty-Nine Articles. They knew that Cromwell's Triers had, on the whole, confined themselves to ejecting scandalous ministers, and that the comprehensive practical energy, which had trained Ironsides to fight, made itself known in the quickened zeal and heedful morals of ten thousand preachers.

The Presbyterian Directory of worship, in general use in the Churches, was no outpouring of uneducated extravagance; it was a reverent, thoughtful, temperate, and judicious document. It contained not one scornful word against the Book of Common Prayer, and declared the first English reformers worthy to be "had in everlasting remembrance, with thankfulness and honour." It affirmed only that the time had come for further reformation; that the Prayer Book "disquieted the consciences of many godly ministers and people;" that "others of hopeful parts" were by it "diverted from all thoughts of the ministry to other studies;" that the Papists boasted of it as a compliance, and the reformed Churches felt it as an offence; and that, therefore, it was well to lay it aside. The assertion is constantly made, that in the Church of the Commonwealth, and in the Presbyterian Churches of the present day, prayer was and is left entirely to the individual minister. It is an entire mistake. In the Presbyterian order of worship, directions are afforded on the subject, brief, but singularly comprehensive. The preacher, for example, is instructed "to pray for all in authority,

especially for the king's majesty; that God would make him rich in blessings, both in his person and government; establish his throne in religion and righteousness, save him from evil counsel, and make him a blessed and glorious instrument for the conservation and propagation of the gospel, for the encouragement and protection of them that do well, the terror of all that do evil, and the great good of the whole Church, and of all his kingdoms." This seems as dignified, as honourable, as worthy of a Church and as reverent towards God, as to supplicate blessings on a "most religious and gracious" lover of Mrs. Barlow, Mrs. Palmer, Lucy Waters, and Nell Gwynn.

Nor are the directions for preaching such as could have been framed by illiterate bigots, or capable of application in an illiterate Church. The minister is "pre-supposed" to have "skill in the original languages, and in such arts and sciences as are handmaids unto divinity," and to be gifted with knowledge "in the whole body of theology; but most of all, in the holy scriptures." The composition of the sermon is thus pertinently touched upon:—"The arguments or reasons are to be solid, and, as much as may be, convincing. The illustrations, of what kind soever, ought to be full of light, and such as may convey the truth into the hearer's heart with spiritual delight." It might be profitable for preachers, even in our own day, to take a hint from the old Presbyterian Directory.

“Whatever,” says Sir James Stephen, “may have been the faults, or whatever the motives of the Protector, there can be no doubt that under his sway England witnessed a diffusion, till then unknown, of the purest influence of genuine religious principles.” Such has been the concession of all candid, large-minded Anglicans; and yet, in the tractarian coterie, in the fashionable club, it continues to be believed that the Church in which Oliver Cromwell and John Milton worshipped, was a den of shrieking fanatics, and ranting fools.

For not a few clergymen, conscientiously attached to the ritual of the Church of England, Puritan ascendancy was the advent of persecution. Cromwell’s Triers, while turning out many incumbents for vice and incompetency, turned out some for “frequent use of the Book of Common Prayer.” Of all such what have we to say? We have to express for them unfeigned admiration; to extol their fortitude and virtue; to appeal to their example against the gold-worship and the respectability-worship of the present time; and to reflect, in pride and mournfulness, of a time when what we believe to have been the less great and the less noble of the contending parties consisted of men so great and so noble as the Churchmen and the Cavaliers of the seventeenth century. There is a sunshine so intense, a light so vivid, that its *shadow* is scarlet; there are times so illustrious that the leaders on all sides have the gait of heroes.

For the rest, we can only remark, that the man

who believes that there was a sweeping ejection of Episcopalian ministers from the Commonwealth Church, who talks of 7000 or half that number of sufferers, has argued himself into an hallucination contradicting the very laws of arithmetic. Cromwell's Court of Triers did not come into existence until about six years before the restoration; and how lax had been the enforcement of Presbyterianism since its approval by Parliament some ten years earlier, must be known to every student of those times. At the restoration, the average number of years during which the ejected Episcopalians had been out of their benefices cannot have been above ten; and it is obvious that every incompetent or tipping parson, who had been turned out by the Triers, would present himself as a martyr to the most religious and gracious King. Yet the claimants, at the restoration, of benefices previously held in the Church, did not number, at the utmost, above two or three hundred. In the next place, it is just to remember that the Puritans made a provision for the expelled ministers, sufficient to keep them from starvation. In the third place—and this is important—the ejected clergy were not forbidden to engage in that labour which would come most aptly to their hand, and by which they could, in many, if not in most instances, procure a livelihood, the labour of tuition. It was one of the bitterest cruelties inflicted by the rancour of the restoration to forbid Nonconformists to become schoolmasters or private tutors. Jeremy Taylor,

teaching his school in Wales, could refer to "the gentleness and mercy of a noble enemy." How beautiful are those words! How melancholy that after two hundred years so few Englishmen, on either side, can feel and emulate the nobleness of their spirit! God forbid that we should breathe an imputation on such a Churchman as Jeremy Taylor. There, in his Welsh solitude, tranquil as a star above the storm, did this saint of God utter those strains of practical piety, so tenderly beautiful, so richly melodious, which, to latest times, will bring all high virtues, all pure feelings, to dwell like angels in human breasts; which will cast a gentle, irresistible spell over the raging passions; which will convince men how reasonable is faith, how manly is humility, how divine is charity, how holy may be the life, how holy and how happy the death, of the Christian.

But there was now breaking dimly upon several minds a conception, which, after two hundred years, still waits for general acceptance. Cromwell, looking out upon England with the eye of a practical leader and king, seeing that the root of godliness was in many who strove and persecuted for the sake of forms, caught a glimpse of it. "Men," he said, the piercing beam of his genius struggling through the cloud of his words, "Men who believe the remission of sins through the blood of Christ, and free justification by the blood of Christ; who live upon the grace of God: those men, who are certain they

are so, are members of Jesus Christ, and are to Him the apple of His eye. Whoever hath this faith, let his form be what it will; he walking peaceably, without prejudice to others under other forms; it is a debt due to God and Christ, and He will require it, if that Christian may not enjoy his liberty." As for his own practice, Cromwell declares it to have been, "To let all this nation see that whatever pretensions to religion would continue quiet, peaceable, they should enjoy conscience and liberty to themselves." Many a Presbyterian shook his head at the mention of tolerance of sectaries; but Oliver had that penetrating glance of his on the heart of the matter, and he kept it there. In such a state of religious opinion as had come to exist in England, there could be justice and comfort only in agreement to differ.

Thinkers were beginning to penetrate to a truth which had been pressed on Cromwell by facts. John Milton had long proclaimed, in words which sounded like the Protector's battle charges, that conscience must be free. Chillingworth had used a word in reference to communion with the Church of Rome, which derived a new significance in the turn men's minds were taking. "The true reason," said Chillingworth, in explaining to Romanists the cause why Protestants separated from them, "is not so much because you maintain errors and corruptions as because you *impose* them." Jeremy Taylor had bid men consider, "whether of the two

is the schismatic, he that makes unnecessary and (supposing the state of things) inconvenient *impositions*, or he that disobeys them, because he cannot, without doing violence to his conscience, believe them: he that parts communion, because without sin he could not entertain it, or they that have made it necessary for him to separate, by requiring such conditions, which to no man are simply necessary, and to him in particular are either sinful or impossible.”

The idea, then, had already touched the intellectual mountain tops of England that *uniformity*, which had been yearned for first by Laud and then by the Covenanters, might not be more desirable, and was a thousand-fold less practicable, than *comprehension*. Unity in essentials; diversity in forms: such was the plan of Church communion which was now agitating, or composing, many minds in England.

Why could not Oliver attempt comprehension on even a broader scale than that of the Commonwealth Church, and with his strong arm helm it to success? For several reasons. Cromwell, while wielding a sceptre at which Europe trembled, was not himself free. He lay under dread of the army. The lion crouched at his feet, licked his hand, defended him from any power on earth that could come against him. But he had fed it with victory until the very emotion of fear had left its heart, and he knew with sure instinct that there were one or two things which would bring it in sudden irresistible spring upon him-

self. He dared not take the name of King; the Ironsides would not allow it: probably, also, he dared not offend them by proclaiming that all ministers who chose might use the Prayer Book. In the second place, Cromwell was never accepted with any cordiality by the subjects over whom he ruled. Clarendon says that the three nations "perfectly hated him." This is an exaggeration, but it is true that he was looked upon by the vast majority of Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen as a conqueror and usurper. The national pride had been wounded by the success of a company of soldiers, chosen for particular reasons by their commander, and having few affinities with the body of their countrymen. That indomitable instinct of liberty, which in the history of England has so often been identical with the instinct of law, was offended in Oliver. The public mind could not balance the difficulties of his position, or consider whether, at any time, he might have acted differently without sacrificing both his own life and the cause for which he fought. The facts patent to all were that, by sheer military force, he had turned out of doors a large number of the representatives of England, and that he had used the Parliamentary instrument, thus adapted to his purposes, to take the life of the King. The English people never forgave him. In vain did he moderate between their factions, earnestly bent upon winning the goodwill of all. In vain did he offer the glittering toys of foreign influence and martial glory to a nation wishing only

for domestic freedom. In vain did he implore the Presbyterians, his breast heaving with transcendent passion, his eye radiant with tears, to mark how God had owned him; how often he had been answered from the whirlwind; how certain it was that, if they rejected him, the liberty to worship God, which he preserved to them, would be exchanged for remorseless persecution. The nation would not be conciliated. That unconquerable spirit which had wrested Magna Charta from John, which, when thoroughly roused had daunted Elizabeth, which had stood with Hampden in the Exchequer Chamber and had blasted as with lightning the proud front of Strafford, rose up against Cromwell and put the question, "By what right dost thou rule in England?" He wished to govern by means of Parliaments; he held the arrangement of the electoral system in his own hands, and had major-generals to countenance loyal electors: but he could neither coax nor compel England to send him a sycophant House of Commons, and he was under the necessity of turning from the door nearly a hundred members of the last he called. It was a Parliament from which the vital essence had been extracted that offered Oliver the crown, a Parliament which had no claim to represent this island. What hope was there that the Protector, unable to obtain recognition from the kingdom as its lawful ruler, should introduce any scheme of ecclesiastical comprehension granting conscientious Episcopalians that access to the Church which he would, we believe,

have personally accorded them? David, the man of blood, could not rear the temple of Jerusalem; Cromwell, the victor of Naseby and Dunbar, could not build up the walls of the Church.

As the years of the Protectorate rolled slowly towards their close, preparation for a grand attempt to substitute comprehension for uniformity in the ecclesiastical establishment of England, was gradually proceeding.

Richard Baxter was the son of a farmer, who cultivated his fields on the banks of the Severn, at the time when Oliver Cromwell pursued a similar occupation on the banks of the Ouse. Richard had been born in 1615, and was an observing lad of eighteen or twenty, when the beauty of holiness was becoming rather dazzling under the manipulation of Laud. The Baxters were disposed, however, to judge favourably of everything which obtained the sanction of ecclesiastical authority. "There was," says Richard, "no savour of Nonconformity in our family." But Dr. Laud contrived to throw a shade of plausibility on Nonconformity even in the eyes of this unexceptionable household. The "conformable godly teacher," who had edified the village in Richard's boyhood, had ceased to be conformable when required to "read publicly the Book of Sports and Dancing on the Lord's Day;" and the pious rustics, whose conformity came up to the mark, headed by a piper who was adequately versed in the principles of the Laudian Church, chose their place of Sunday dancing

“not an hundred yards from our door.” “We could not,” adds Baxter, “on the Lord’s Day, either read a chapter, or pray, or sing a psalm, or catechise, or instruct a servant, but with the noise of the pipe and tabor, and the shoutings of the street, continually in our ears.” Rather trying, that, for a family with no savour of Nonconformity. The Baxters preferred reading the Scripture on the Lord’s Day, to dancing round the piper, so they were called “Puritans, precisians, and hypocrites,” and were the common scorn of the enlightened Laudian rabble. Nay more: “when the people by the book were allowed to play and dance out of public service time, they could so hardly break off their sports, that many a time the reader was fain to stay till the piper and players would give over. Sometimes the morris-dancers would come into the Church in all their linen, and scarfs, and antic-dresses, with morris-bells jingling at their heels; and”—so admirably did they apprehend Laud’s exaltation of the Prayer Book above the sermon,—“as soon as the Common Prayer was read, did haste out presently to their play again.” One could dance with some satisfaction after having honoured Church, king, and conscience to that extent. “It was a shame,” Oliver Cromwell once declared, referring to exhibitions like these, “to be a Christian, within these fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen years, in this nation.” Young Baxter began to admit that there was something after all to be said for Nonconformity; but the reverence for Church and throne,

which he acquired in his father's house, never left him.

He was in the prime of his opening manhood when the wars broke out. A pure, high, intellectual nature, in speculation intrepid, in simplicity child-like: with a brain of marvellous capacity and exquisite subtlety, and a heart thrilling with hope, with ardour, with spiritual enthusiasm. He had read fathers and schoolmen, until the scholastic faith that logic is omnipotent stole over his mind. From his deep, dark, eloquent eye, glowing with genius and purity, from his well-rounded ample forehead, from his sensitive yet resolute lip, there looked forth radiant trust in the good, the true, the beautiful, in God, freedom, immortality, and in the power of strong argument and clear word to woo all men to a like faith and love. It is an enviable frame of mind if we think only of the anthems with which it fills the young bosom, and the touches of morning crimson with which it brightens the cloud-curtains of the future: it is not so enviable if we reflect on the obstructions it throws in the way of success, and on its power to embitter the pang of disappointment, when the smiling future becomes the haggard present, and the soft hues of azure and vermilion dissolve in lashing sleet or pelting hail. Richard Baxter felt all the woe of this disappointment, but that blessed music of faith in God, and love to man, never went silent in the temple of his soul.

He became a Presbyterian, but not through the influence of Mr. Robert Baillie's book against the

Episcopals, or exactly after the fashion of that reverend gentleman's countrymen. Baxter is the historical representative of English, as distinguished from Scottish, Presbyterianism. The keen and impetuous intellect of Scotland, intense rather than comprehensive, found satisfaction in a determinate system of Church government, consistent in principle, dogma, and framework, and marked off by sharp logical edges from Episcopacy on the one hand, and Independency on the other. The Presbyterianism of that country had indeed passed through a transition stage. There had been superintendents, a sort of apology for bishops, in the days of Knox. But the recognition of the presbyter as equal, in all essential powers and functions, to the superintendent, had from the first been distinct, and at length every vestige of Episcopal form was swept away. The Presbyterians who crossed the border from Scotland in the Puritan period, had a strong antipathy to the very name of bishop. The English Puritans were not prepared to sympathise with this feeling. They were familiar as a party with the fundamental ideas of Presbyterianism. Like all the early English Reformers, they acknowledged the validity of Presbyterian ordination, and the identity, in kind, of the authority and duties of all Christian pastors. But they had no objection to an episcopacy of order, to the appointment of certain clergymen, called bishops, to be overseers of their brethren in particular districts. Again, while they agreed with the Presbyterians of Scotland,

in attaching importance to the gift of prayer, exercised by the individual pastor, they saw no reason why the habit of extemporary prayer should not be combined with a limited use of liturgical forms. Nor, in the last place, did they exhibit that sensitive jealousy of the interference of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical matters, which was so characteristic a feature of Scottish Presbytery. Such were the views of the large party in the Church of England which obtained the name of Presbyterian; and no man had embraced them with clearer apprehension, or in a more liberal spirit, than Richard Baxter.

It might be thought that this would dispose him to alliance with Cromwell. The Protector was bent upon securing as much tolerance as possible for all the Protestant parties. But Baxter had a keen, perhaps a scrupulous, sense of order: he was offended, therefore, with Oliver's encouragement of sectaries. Along with the whole Presbyterian party, also, whether in England or in Scotland, he had a fervent affection for the old monarchy and the royal house: he could not pardon Cromwell, therefore, for upsetting the throne. He was the sort of man whom Cromwell in every instance vehemently sought to win. For devoutness of intention, for spiritual religion, for high ability, Oliver had a simple and reverent affection; and he was astonished that Presbyterians and Independents could not be brought to a cordial agreement under his rule. The formal reasonings of the Presbyterians, who would not

accept his logic of the battle-field, who would not allow that victory was always the sign manual of God, perplexed and distressed him. He had once joined in close grapple of argument, on this subject, with the Presbyterian ministers of Edinburgh. Those judicious persons told him that they did not hang their faith on events. They could believe that not even the conqueror of Dunbar was necessarily in the right. There is a startling directness in Oliver's reply. "Did not you," he said, "solemnly appeal and pray? Did not we do so too? And ought not you and we to think, with fear and trembling, of the hand of the great God in this mighty and strange appearance of His" in the morning watches at Dunbar? The Scottish preachers were not convinced, but Oliver never fairly embraced the idea that his argument could be disregarded by good men. He resolved to try its force on Baxter. He sent for him, and addressed to him a speech of an hour's length, explaining how Providence had manifestly directed the change of government, how God had owned it, how Spain and Holland had been defeated. "He spoke tediously and slowly," says Baxter, "wearying his hearers." If the speech was wearisome, it was very different from those of Oliver's which remain to us, and one could wish that Baxter had inflicted its tediousness upon posterity. In point of fact, there was no sympathy between speaker and hearer; and while Cromwell pointed to the cloud of witnessing events by which God testified in his

favour, Baxter surveyed him with a look of waning interest and immutable dissent. At length Cromwell stopped, and then "I told him," says Baxter, "it was too great condescension to acquaint me so fully with all these matters which were above me; but I told him that we took our ancient monarchy to be a blessing and not an evil to the land, and honestly craved his patience that I might ask him how England had ever forfeited that blessing, and unto whom that forfeiture was made?" Consider that reply, after an hour's speech from the foremost man in Europe! Cromwell's patience was exhausted. He started as a gladiator who felt the net thrown over him, and passionately answered that "it was no forfeiture, but God had changed it as pleased Him." For four hours did Cromwell and Baxter argue, the calm, elaborate reasoning of the divine not being listened to with sufficient closeness of attention by the general. "I saw," says Baxter, giving us one of the most vivid glimpses into Oliver which we have from any of his contemporaries, "that *what he learned must be from himself.*" His eager eye, his impetuous gestures, his voice, harsh and untunable as the quick rattle of thunder, grated on the sensibilities of the refined logician. Baxter returned to quiet Kidderminster to sigh and pray for the restoration of the old monarchy. He had his wish; he saw the regular Defender of the faith placed upon the throne; and year after year, as he hearkened to the groans of Presbyterian pastors rising from the dun-

geons of England, he thought with more tender recollection of the magnanimous and princely usurper, who had been as a lion to his arguments, but as a lamb to himself.

At Kidderminster, Baxter realized his ideal of a Reformed pastor, both in usefulness and happiness. Sir James Stephens glows into eloquence, as he turns from the pageantries and the gloom of the world to look upon the alliance between Baxter and his flock. "He, a poor man, rich in mental resources, consecrating alike his poverty and his wealth to their service; ever present to guide, to soothe, to encourage, and, when necessary, to rebuke; shrinking from no aspect of misery, however repulsive, nor from the most loathsome forms of guilt which he might hope to reclaim; the instructor, at once, and the physician, the almoner and the friend, of his congregation. They, repaying his labour of love with untutored reverence; awed by his reproofs, and rejoicing in his smile; taught by him to discharge the most abject duties, and to endure the most pressing evils of life, as a daily tribute to their Divine benefactor." This was the Sabbath of Baxter's life.

Though not co-operating with Oliver in the furtherance of toleration, Baxter had already originated a scheme of comprehension. He declared himself for "Catholicism against parties," and set on foot an Association, in which this idea was carried into effect. "As we hindered no man," he says, in describing what would now be called the platform of this Association, "from

following his own judgment in his own congregation, so we evinced, beyond denial, that it would be but a partial, dividing agreement to agree on the terms of Presbyterian, Episcopal, or any one party, because it would unavoidably shut out the other parties; which was the principal thing which we endeavoured to avoid; it being not with Presbyterians only; but with all orthodox, faithful pastors and people, that we are bound to hold communion, and to live in Christian concord, so far as we have attained. Hereupon, many counties began to associate, as Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, Hampshire, Essex, and others; and some of them printed the articles of their agreement. In a word, a great desire of concord began to possess all good people in the land, and our breaches seemed ready to heal. And though some thought that so many associations and forms of agreement did but tend to more division, by showing our diversity of apprehensions, the contrary proved true by experience; for we all agreed on the same course, even to unite in the practice of so much discipline as the Episcopal, Presbyterians, and Independents are agreed in, and as crosseth none of their principles." This comprehension of Baxter's was being carried into execution during the Protectorate; readers will find it important to recollect that fact.

Cromwell died; the most magnanimous, generous, religious of despots; but rejected to the last by the English people. General confusion ensued, the heart of the nation yearning inarticulately towards the

king. But no revolution in public feeling is sudden in England, and nearly two years elapsed before the tumultuous elements had worked towards such a state of composure, that what had long been radically the wish of the nation, could be clearly expressed, and an invitation sent to Charles II. to return to the land and the throne of his fathers. The whole of that party vaguely styled Presbyterian, a party embracing all who did not hold Episcopacy to be the only divinely sanctioned form of Church government, and who could conscientiously engage in public worship without use of the Prayer Book, hailed with exultation the prospect of the restoration, and exerted themselves to the utmost in the interest of the king. This party had become predominant after the death of Cromwell, and, conscious of its power, was confident also of its ability to form such a settlement as should prove satisfactory to the majority of its members.

In the Parliament which met in April, 1660, the Parliament which recalled the king, the Presbyterian influence reigned supreme. The Independents, who, though their most important men, Owen and Milton for example, had been steady supporters of Cromwell, had retained their reverence for the old English constitution, assumed an attitude of dignified reserve. They did not expect, they did not desire, comprehension within the Church; but they hoped for honourable toleration as loyal subjects of the king. "I have credibly heard," says Baxter, "that Dr.

Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, and Dr. Owen, the leaders of the Independents, did tell the king, that as the pope allowed orders of religious parties in mere dependence on himself, without subjection to the bishops, all that they desired was (not to be the masters of others,) but to hold their own liberty of worship and discipline, in sole dependence on the king, as the Dutch and French Churches do, so they may be saved from the bishops and ecclesiastical courts."

It would have been the best policy for the Presbyterians,—so we now see from the event,—to league themselves firmly with the Independents and demand simple toleration outside the Church. But it was not in human nature that a party, situated as the Presbyterians were, should have contented themselves with this clear, modest, and intelligible programme. They looked confidently for comprehension. Baxter hurried to London, glowing with the ardour of one who proceeds upon the chief enterprise of his life. His intellectual faculties were in their meridian power, and though his logic had failed in that grand attempt to argue Cromwell into the fit mood for throwing himself, with a halter round his neck, at the feet of Charles II., he had found it successful in organising associations for comprehension, and in reducing to silence the casuists of Kidderminster. He retained a passionate faith in its efficacy. He came up in logical mail of proof, brandishing the sword of argument, a combatant for peace, a gladiator

for charity. He was at first full of hope. Had he not ethereal arms? Was not truth irresistibly convincing? Alas, the cynic may sneer, but the spectacle, so often presented in our world, in Roman revolutions, in English revolutions, in French revolutions, of virtue trusting in its own celestial arms, and finding them insufficient,—of reason, moderation, brotherly kindness, confident in the right, and vanquished by force or fraud,—is one of the most sublime, and certainly one of the most melancholy, presented in our world. Young Harry Vane, wondering that men would not open their eyes and become angels in a millennial kingdom, dying on the scaffold,—fair Madame Roland, hailing with rapture the doctrine of universal brotherhood, and falling, a headless corse, at the foot of the statue of liberty,—Richard Baxter inspired with the idea of a national Church, holding firm the central verities, but permitting its congregations to worship God as each interpreted conscience and Scripture, outwitted and thrust into the dungeon by scheming statesmen,—these are the most mournful scenes in the tragic drama of human history. Baxter soon perceived that his eloquent logic would have a stern task to perform.

At first all promised well. Several Presbyterian Ministers had proceeded to Holland and conferred with Charles. They were satisfied with the dispositions of the king, and the king was pleased with the ardour of their loyalty. "We found them," said

Charles, "persons full of affection to us, of zeal for the peace of the Church and State, and neither enemies, as they have been given out to be, to Episcopacy or Liturgy, but modestly to desire such alterations in either, as without shaking foundations, might best allay the present distempers, which the indisposition of the time and the tenderness of some men's consciences had contracted." In his Declaration from Breda, he promised that this tenderness of conscience should be respected. When he arrived in London, "above ten or twelve" of the Presbyterian Ministers were named among his Chaplains in ordinary. Baxter, Calamy, Reynolds, Bates, and Manton were among the number. The hopes of the party rose high, and Presbyterian tears and sobs mingled largely in the irrepressible weeping with which, in the merry month of May, 1660, a contrite and enraptured nation welcomed back its covenanted king.

Shortly after the return of Charles—it was still June—Baxter and some others were presented to the king by the Earl of Manchester.* The irrefragable logician, fixing upon Charles that deep, pure eye, which had not quailed before Cromwell, addressed to him an exhortation and advice. He "presumed to tell" the king, that the Protector's government had found the way of doing good the most effectual to promote their interests; that they had encouraged faithful ministers; that the people had been sensible of the benefits they conferred; and that, if liberty of

* Document, No. III.

worship were taken away, and godly ministers expelled from their benefices, the nation might fall into the vulgar error of supposing that fallen Oliver, seeing he had done much good, was a good governor. He entreated his majesty to believe that the religious part of his subjects, for whom, and not for the Presbyterians alone he spoke, were resolved enemies of sedition, rebellion, disobedience, and divisions. He urged the advantage of union to his majesty, to the people, and to the bishops themselves. From exhibiting the advantages of union, he passed on to show how easily it might be procured. The king would require only, first, to make things necessary the terms of union; secondly, to enforce discipline against sin; thirdly, to abstain from casting out faithful ministers, and obtruding unworthy men upon the people.

Cromwell had met Baxter's logic, thrust for thrust, glaring on him with fiery eye, and paying little regard to the courtesies of debate. Charles was all graciousness and condescension. He professed his gladness at learning Baxter's sentiments, and his resolution to bring all parties together. Old Mr. Ash burst into tears of joy, and Baxter thought that his logic had for once vanquished a king. But when the eloquent reasoner pressed Charles to permit the Presbyterian leaders to acquaint their brethren in the country with these proceedings, so that the whole party might be represented in the negotiation, his majesty was not to be caught. He was for no

assembly either on one side or other, but would bring a few of the Presbyterians and Episcopalians together, to advise him in the matter of concord. Baxter went from the presence of the rugged, overbearing Cromwell to his peaceful activity in Kidderminster; he may have had some misgivings as he withdrew from this interview with the gracious, soft-spoken Charles. But he was not the man to be seduced to so vulgar and illogical an opinion as that "he is the best governor who doth most good."

Baxter, then, and the few Presbyterians who happened to be in and about London, were to stand alone. They knew, however, that a large proportion of the people of England were on their side, and they could not, in a few weeks, cast off the feeling that they were pastors in what had been for fourteen years the Established Church of the country. They knew that their influence had been powerful in bringing back the king, and that their interest was strong in Parliament. Naturally, therefore, their first proposals,* made to the king in 1660, had the tone rather of concession than of demand, and embodied not what would induce them to remain in the Church, but what might, they thought, satisfy all moderate Episcopalians.

They set out with declaring that they believed a firm agreement to subsist between them and their brethren in the doctrinal truths of the Reformed religion, and in the substantial parts of divine wor-

* Documents, No. IV, V, VI, VII, VIII.

ship, the differences being only in conceptions of Church government, and in some particulars relating to liturgy and ceremonies.

In Church government they offered to accept the scheme of Archbishop Usher. That scheme may be defined as Presbyterian Episcopacy, or Episcopalian Presbytery; or, more correctly, as Presbytery with an Episcopal organization. It retains the fundamental principle of Presbyterianism, that all presbyters are equal, and that there is no Church ruler superior in kind to the presbyter. The bishop is to be president of the Synod of presbyters, but to have no powers belonging to him distinctively as bishop. Not the bishop alone, but the bishop and presbyters, are to confer holy orders; and the right to administer discipline and to dispense the sacraments belongs as much to every presbyter as to the bishop. An arrangement similar to this had been adopted in Scotland by the Presbyterian Knox, and it is difficult to see how any Presbyterian could have conscientious objections to its institution. It might seem inexpedient; it might appear to lead to an ascription to the perpetual presidents, called bishops, of powers essentially superior to those of presbyters; but no mere president, no one who is only *primus inter pares*, be he called bishop or moderator, infringes what are deemed the scriptural ordinances of presbytery. In point of fact, Archbishop Usher's Episcopacy is neither more nor less than a happy adaptation of Presbyterianism to an aristocratic condition of society.

In reference to the liturgy, the Presbyterians declared themselves satisfied of the lawfulness of liturgical forms of worship, provided they were agreeable to the Word of God, convenient to the worshipper, consonant with the liturgies of other Reformed Churches, not too rigorously imposed, and did not exclude extemporary prayer. A certain number of "learned, godly, and moderate divines" might, they believed, revise the Book of Common Prayer so as to bring it into harmony with these conditions.

As for ceremonies, they repeated those objections which had been brought against them by the Puritans for a hundred years. The worship of God, they said, is in itself perfect without addition of ceremonies; "God is a jealous God," and His worship "is certainly then most pure, and most agreeable to the simplicity of the gospel, and to His holy and jealous eyes," when it is strictly conformable to the perfect rule of faith and worship contained in the Word of God. The ceremonies had, along with popery, been rejected "by many of the Reformed Churches abroad;" had occasioned endless contention and dispute; had caused separation from the Church, prejudicing rather than promoting her unity. They next expressed that opinion on the subject which we found Hooker quoting with approbation from Calvin, namely, that ceremonies, being at best but indifferent, ought sometimes to be changed, "lest they should, by perpetual permanency and con-

stant use, be judged by the people as necessary as the substantials of worship themselves." Above all, they besought his majesty not to render unnecessary things by human command "necessary and penal," nor to "impose" kneeling at the sacrament and the observance of holidays of human institution. The use of the surplice, and of the cross in baptism, and the practice of bowing at the name of Christ, they proposed to abolish, "these things being, in the judgment of the imposers themselves, but indifferent and mutable; in the judgment of others a rock of offence; and, in the judgment of all, not to be valued with the peace of the Church."

They acknowledged the king "to be supreme governor over all persons, and in all things and causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil." In this point alone did these Presbyterian Ministers depart from the orthodox Presbyterian doctrine, as professed by the Church of Calvin and of Knox. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland never owned the ecclesiastical supremacy of the sovereign, and at the union between England and Scotland, it was expressly stipulated by the Scotch, that the old Kirk should retain her spiritual independence.

Such was the project of reconciliation which Baxter and his brethren submitted, in the first instance, to Charles. It was properly a scheme of comprehension, embracing the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians of England within one ecclesiastical

pale. It did not recognise the divine and exclusive right of bishops, and in so far it differed from strict Episcopacy; it did not assert the spiritual independence of the Church, and in this fell short of the catholic doctrine of Presbytery: but a large number of the most eminent bishops and divines of the Church of England had held that there is no Christian Minister exalted by divine right, exalted except for purposes of order, above the presbyter; and English Presbyterians had always been more or less "tainted with Erastianism." The scheme of Baxter and his brethren appears to us, therefore, a consummately wise and ingenious plan for blending the two Churches, as they had existed in England, in harmonious and permanent union; and we have no doubt that, if it had been adopted, the result would have been a vigorous and useful Church, singularly adapted to the conditions of English society, and more robustly Protestant than the Church of England has shown herself to be. And it is highly important to consider that these Presbyterian Ministers, conscientious men as they were, had to propose an arrangement which could be accepted by nine or ten thousand pastors who had been members of the Commonwealth Church. All those had, to say the least, conformed to a Church recognising the equality of presbyters, and placing them under no Episcopal superiors. Not one of all those thousands could have left the new Church on account of its Presbyterianism, though a considerable number of sturdy Pres-

byterians and Independents might have left it on account of its Episcopacy. The *added* elements were all in the direction of Episcopacy.

But the bishops, who took up and answered these proposals, rejected them with speed and emphasis. They would have nothing to say to Archbishop Usher's scheme, and expressed their doubts whether it had been really approved by the Archbishop. The Prayer Book was to them perfect in all those respects in which the Presbyterians had required a liturgy to excel, and had in their eyes none of those blemishes which had been said to adhere to it. The ceremonies of the Church of England were faultless, and the Protestant Churches abroad had not, they said, rejected them. In one word, the bishops denied all that the Presbyterians asserted; asserted all that the Presbyterians denied; refused all that the Presbyterians offered; and offered the Presbyterians nothing to refuse.

Such is human nature; such, in particular, has always been ecclesiastical nature. Nor can we wonder that the bishops should have adopted this course. A few Episcopalians,—four or five bishops, and two or three hundred ministers,—had remained true to their first love and first faith, through all the troubles and temptations of the Commonwealth. To them Episcopacy was a matter of conscience. They had proved the fact in an honourable and convincing manner. They had taken no quarter from the Presbyterians; they had now obtained ascendancy, and they

would make no compromise. Few as they were, they had become irresistibly powerful at this juncture. The Episcopalians who had conformed, were naturally tongue-tied: they had bent to the Presbyterian stream; with somewhat more satisfaction they would bend to the returning current of Episcopacy: they were like those long weeds in an estuary, which show which way the tide is setting, but have no influence either to impede or to impel it. The men who had suffered were now the men who triumphed, and in their triumph they would yield nothing. They were resolved, by one resolute effort, to bring the long controversy to a close, and thrust the Puritans from the Church of England. So far their conduct admits of justification; but considering that they had triumphed by the magnanimous patriotism of the Presbyterian restorers of Charles, it was not justifiable in them to exact a mean and ferocious revenge.

The bishops had now shown their hand. Baxter and his coadjutors might be surprised and distressed, but the circumstance, had they known how to avail themselves of it, was in their favour. There was still time. The year 1660 had not closed. The Parliament which had recalled Charles, the Parliament which had been elected while Presbyterian influence was supreme in England, still sat. It was now clear that the bishops would concede nothing. With the king and with the Parliament lay the sole chance of the Presbyterians. A statesman's eye would have perceived in a moment that the weapons of

logic would prove useless, and would have searched the horizon for every element of Presbyterian *strength*. Sheldon and Morley could not be persuaded; Clarendon and the courtiers would back the bishops; the Roman Catholics, dreading the comprehension of Protestant Nonconformists, were intriguing in the background; and the tide of High Church and Royalist feeling, swollen by the hatred of clergymen burning to mete out to the Puritans double of all they had endured, lashed into fury by the invectives of returning Cavaliers, and foul with the spite, turbid with the scorn, of every debauchee whom the Covenant had made a hypocrite, was coming in like a flood. To plead with the bishops was to plead with men who rode on the crest of that impetuous torrent. But the Presbyterians had the promise of Charles; their party still balanced the Cavaliers in the House: the vital question for them was not how to debate, but what to do.

Of the king they seemed sure. On the twenty-fifth of October, 1660, was issued his majesty's famous Declaration* concerning ecclesiastical affairs. It acknowledged the loyalty of the Presbyterians, and their zeal for peace in Church and State. It recited the promise given at Breda, that liberty should be granted to tender consciences, and no man disquieted or called in question for differences in matters of religion. It declared that Presbyterians and Episcopalians approved Episcopacy and a set form of liturgy,

* Document, No. IX.

disliked sacrilege and alienation of Church revenues, and were anxious to advance piety and true godliness. A Defender of the faith, Charles thought, might make something of these materials. "If," said the religious and covenanted king, "upon these excellent foundations, in submission to which there is such a harmony of affections, any superstructures should be raised, to the shaking those foundations, and to the contracting and lessening the blessed gift of charity, which is a vital part of Christian religion, we shall think ourself very unfortunate, and even suspect that we are defective in that administration of government with which God hath intrusted us." What an appalling suspicion to cross the brain of Charles the Second! The ceremonies,—we proceed with the Declaration,—would not be peremptorily insisted on. Episcopacy would be maintained, but moderated. Care would be taken that the Lord's day should be applied to holy exercises "without unnecessary diversions," and that insufficient, negligent, and scandalous ministers should not be permitted in the Church. The restored bishops were pronounced men of "great and exemplary piety," whose recent sufferings had given them the last touch of perfection; and only men of virtue, learning, and piety should, for the future, be preferred to the Episcopal office. Bishops were to be frequent preachers. The size of dioceses having been thought too large, an adequate number of suffragan bishops would be appointed in every diocese. Ordination and all exercises of

discipline would take place “with the advice and assistance of the Presbyters,” and no act of spiritual jurisdiction, such as excommunication or absolution, was to be performed exclusively by lay officials. The most learned, pious, and discreet of the Presbyters, would be chosen for deans and chapters, and a number of Presbyters, equal to that of the chapter, “annually chosen by the major vote of all the Presbyters of that diocese,” would advise and assist with the chapters in ordinations, excommunications, and so on. Confirmation was to be rightly and solemnly performed, by information and with consent of the minister of the place; none were to be admitted to the Lord’s supper till they had made a credible profession of their faith; and all possible diligence was to be used for the instruction and reformation of scandalous offenders. Every rural dean was to meet monthly with three or four ministers of his deanery, chosen by the Presbyters, to receive complaints from ministers or churchwardens, to compose differences referred to them for arbitration, to convince offenders, to reform things amiss by pastoral reproofs and admonitions, and to prepare and present to the bishop those matters which could not, in this pastoral and persuasive way, be composed and reformed. The dean and his assistants were to see that the children and younger sort were carefully instructed by the respective ministers of every parish, in the grounds of Christian religion. No bishop was to exercise arbitrary power, or impose anything

beyond the law of the land. The Book of Common Prayer was to be preserved; but "an equal number of learned divines, of both persuasions," were to review the same, making such alterations as should be thought necessary, and adding certain forms, couched, as much as might be, in scriptural phrase, which ministers, who preferred them to the others, might use. As for the ceremonies, they were not to be abolished: but those who found them galling to conscience, were to be indulged in their omission. Kneeling at the sacrament, the use of the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, wearing the surplice, were left, for the time, open questions, to be decided and determined upon by a National Synod. The oath of canonical obedience, and the subscription required by the canon, were to be dispensed with in the "ordination, institution, and induction" of clergymen, and in the taking of university degrees. Lastly, and to sum up the whole matter, no minister was to forfeit his benefice in virtue of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, who "read and declared his assent to all the Articles of religion, which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments comprised in the Book of Articles."

Such was the Declaration to which Charles II. put his hand "at our court at Whitehall, this twenty-fifth day of October, 1660." It is not pleasant to think of the whole thing as a trick, a piece of elaborate hypocrisy, with which Clarendon and the bishops per-

mitted Charles to amuse the Presbyterians. This view has been taken by men whose authority is imposing, by Hallam, Macaulay, and others, and can probably never be disproved. But we lean rather to the belief that Charles was sincere, and that he really meant to give the Presbyterians the benefit of his Declaration. What man so bad that he has not some visitings of virtue? What heart so dead that it has absolutely no sense of the pleasure of generosity and beneficence? If a glow of manly ambition did not thrill the bosom of Charles, if he felt no aspiration to bear himself as a king, no consciousness of royal duties, responsibilities, and rewards, with the eyes of a nation flashing blessings on him through its tears, he must have been indeed the basest of mortals. We believe that he would have sincerely rejoiced to see the Declaration become law.

And in truth it was worthy of his ambition. If he had obtained for it the sanction of the Houses, he would have taken an honourable place beside Henry, Elizabeth, and the other diademed Reformers of England. The Church might, since his day, have been less pliant to the hand of statesmen; less exclusive and aristocratic; less adapted to supply the name and form of religion to those decent, respectable multitudes who lack its power; less studiously courteous and deferential to Rome: but she would have been the most truly National Church in Christendom, loved, revered, all but adored by peer and peasant; and the Reformed Churches of

Europe would have hailed her with acclamations of joy and pride as the first and noblest daughter of the Reformation.

Now, Presbyterians, now, if ever, is your moment of destiny! Let your representatives in the metropolis hail the Declaration with shouts of welcome; let its clauses be regarded as the authoritative basis of union; and let every man of you in England petition Parliament to set it among the statutes of the realm!

Alas, the Presbyterians wanted the statesman's eye. They were, indeed, elated. Reynolds accepted a bishopric off hand. Baxter and Calamy signified their willingness to become bishops when the Declaration was law. The Presbyterian ministers of London composed a "humble and grateful acknowledgement," glowing with ardent satisfaction, accepting the Declaration as adequate to the requirements of peace; and laid it, with their signatures attached, at the foot of the throne. But that passion for absolute logical perfection, which is the distemper of noble minds, would not let Baxter leave well alone. With an infatuation truly marvellous, he drew up a petition to his majesty, expressing indeed the comfort and great joy with which he and his brethren regarded the Declaration, but criticising many of its provisions, and suggesting a few additions and alterations.* Oh for one hour of those canny, clear-eyed Scots, who put the English Presbyterians in the way of winning so much in 1640, one hour of the Earl of Rothes, or precious

* Document, No. XII. Documents, No. X. and XI.

Mr. Henderson, or even of the solid Mr. Baillie of Kilwinning, with his irresistible book against "Arminian Episcopals"! These would have shaken Baxter out of his trance of security, his dream of perfection; would have torn up his schedule of alterations and improvements; would have bidden him haunt the lobby of the House, besiege every nobleman who had the ear of Clarendon or the King, and send out emissaries to ride, as Hampden rode from county to county before the Long Parliament, through the length and breadth of England, calling on the people to send to Westminster a unanimous, urgent prayer that the King's Declaration might become law.

For, if Baxter did not find the Declaration absolute perfection, there were others to whom it was infinitely more displeasing. Sheldon, Morley, and the whole company of Episcopalian martyrs, would have considered it a miserable and humiliating surrender to the Roundheads. While Baxter polished and polished with a view to abstract perfection, they thought only of throwing the Declaration out of the House of Commons. They worked upon Clarendon. They rallied the courtiers as one man round the banner of High Church. They spirited away Sir Matthew Hale from the Lower House by having him appointed Chief Baron of the Exchequer. At length their efforts were crowned with success. On the twenty-eighth of November, 1660, they saw the Declaration rejected by a majority of twenty-six. Bishop Sheldon may now breathe freely; Bishop

Morley may give the rein to his rustic wit; Mr. Baxter may wake from his trance exactly when he pleases: *alea jacta est.*

In the month of December, 1660, the Convention Parliament was dissolved. In the spring of 1661, the new elections proceeded. The nation was in one of those convulsions of loyalty which have recurred at intervals in our history, and in which the great English people has always looked singularly foolish. We do not find that there was any elaborate packing of the Parliament; in fact, when this nation has felt strongly on any subject, the packing of Parliament has proved a hopeless business. The Houses met on the 8th of May. Meanwhile the negotiation between the Presbyterians and the bishops went on, and that meeting of an equal number of learned divines of both persuasions, which had been promised in the Declaration of October, took place. There were twelve bishops and twelve Presbyterians, each party being supported by nine assistant divines. They met in a palace in the Strand, built by Peter, Duke of Savoy, more than a hundred years before. The discussion which took place has hence been named the Savoy Conference.*

Bishop Sheldon, Bishop Morley, Dr. Gunning, and their party, desired no comprehension. To deny this is gratuitously absurd; they never thought of denying it themselves; and any rational defence of their proceedings must be based upon the hypothesis that,

* Documents, from No. XIV. to No. XXIII. inclusive.

as shrewd ecclesiastical statesmen, they deemed it best for the Church of England to expel the Puritans from her communion. Such was the policy of High Churchmen at the restoration; such was the policy of High Churchmen at the revolution; and such, in fact, is the policy of High Churchmen at the present day.

Sheldon, the ruling mind on the Episcopalian side, was an admirable representative of the school of high and dry Churchmen, which flourished during the reign of Charles II., and is in full vigour in modern times. He had none of the intensity, sincerity, narrow gloom, or fanatical enthusiasm, of Laud. Princely in his liberalities, eminent in the discharge of those hospitable duties which belong to a bishop's function, with neither the reality nor the affectation of saintliness, but with the courtesy, urbanity, and manner of one who shone in society, his feeling in reference to the Puritans appears essentially to have been that their earnestness, their zeal, their insistence upon personal piety, were disturbing elements in a great social and political institution like the Church of the throne and the aristocracy. He was, what a frank reviewer of our day has pronounced to be ideal perfection in a bishop,—a thorough man of the world. He judged, and he no doubt judged correctly, that a Church having within her borders the old Puritan life and fire, would not be the quiet, manageable, inoffensive Church which courtiers flatter and which statesmen love. He preferred stately stepping in the old paths to impas-

sioned efforts to cause the face of England to glow with spiritual Christianity. The Church was now to adapt herself to a society presided over by Charles II.; and Sheldon instinctively and justly felt that peace could not exist within her borders, if the Puritans, from her pulpits, flashed the mirror of Christian purity upon the vices and follies of the age. He was deliberately resolved, therefore, that they should be thrust out, and the more who went the better.

Sheldon took his measures as an able general who knew what he had to do, and never turned his eye from the mark. At the first meeting, April 15th, 1661, he made it plain that the Puritans were to enter on a campaign rather than engage in a conference. Along with his Episcopal brethren, he assumed a defensive position. The Prayer Book was in their eyes perfect; what did the Presbyterians wish to add or to alter? The assumption of this attitude was equivalent to a refusal to entertain the question of compromise. The revision which his majesty had promised in the October Declaration was not to be executed as a common work, in which all were presumed to have sympathy, in other words, was not to be revision at all. The Presbyterians had liberty to object, and the Bishops on hearing what was asked, would state what they were prepared to concede. It was vain for the Presbyterians to remonstrate. The Bishops had the sympathy of the court, and popular feeling became every day stronger against the Puritans. Delay was

victory for the prelates; silence or withdrawal would have been interpreted as obstinacy on the part of the Presbyterians. They drew up, therefore, their paper of Exceptions* to the Book of Common Prayer, and, on the 4th of May, 1661, presented it to the Bishops.

The leaders on the side of the Presbyterians were Baxter, Reynolds, Calamy, Clarke, and one or two others. Reynolds, Calamy, and about half of the Presbyterian twelve, had sat in the Westminster Assembly. Their first paper of Exceptions, though approved of by Baxter, was not from his pen. It lacks the fervour and copiousness which mark his composition. It is, throughout, cautious, cool, and judicious. This will, we think, be assented to if its terms are fairly considered, and if we grant that the Presbyterians were bound, in honour and in charity, to proceed on the supposition that all parties desired comprehension.

The principles on which they proposed to effect union are distinctly stated at the commencement. The first sentence in the document is an indirect but emphatic disclaimer of all wish to substitute a uniformity of their own for the uniformity of the Prayer Book. It is the expression of a hope that the bishops, "in imitation of his majesty's most prudent and Christian moderation and clemency," will "bear with the infirmities of the weak," and not "measure the consciences of other men by the light and latitude of their own," but consider of expedients fitted to

* Document, No. XV.

unite in a single communion "those that differ." The method of comprehension which they suggest is, in one word, the exercise of charity on the part of the Church towards her individual members. "The limiting of Church communion," they declare, "to things of *doubtful disputation*, hath been in all ages the ground of schism and separation."

Justice requires us to view the particular emendations proposed by the Puritans on the Prayer Book in the light of these general principles. If some of their exceptions appear to us trivial, we must recollect that the proposers seek not to bind even a trivial burden upon others, but crave that in trivial matters there may be no compulsion exercised upon themselves. If some of their scruples have become obsolete, let us acknowledge that the fact only confirms their main position, namely, that forms of worship devised in one age, and having, it may be, for that age, a noble and natural symbolism, should not be petrified into an unvarying type, and imposed on men in all ages, in all circumstances, under all variations of habit and of feeling. They frankly state that some of their exceptions are "of inferior consideration, verbal rather than material," others "dubious and disputable," while some appear to them to touch on serious corruptions repugnant to the rule of the gospel. They pray that the most important blemishes may be removed, and that there may be no "rigorous imposition" of the rites and ceremonies in general; they do not hint

that, if their own liberty is respected, they desire to push their model of uniformity upon others.

The particular exceptions were those which had been brought forward by the Puritans from the first, and which are taken to the Prayer Book at this day by the Evangelical party in the Church.

The Bishops received the paper from the Puritans, and their Reply * was brief and peremptory. "For preserving of the Church's peace, we know no better nor more efficacious way than our set liturgy"—such was their frank and scornful avowal. As for tender consciences, let persons troubled with these pray for humility to think their guides "wiser and fitter to order" than themselves. If the ceremonies were not imposed, where was innovation to end? "If pretence of conscience did exempt from obedience, laws were useless; whosoever had not list to obey might pretend tenderness of conscience, and be thereby set at liberty." Just so. It is the argument of selfish, timorous, and stupid Conservatism in all ages; lay a finger on Tenterden steeple, and the ocean will be upon us. For the rest, the things to which the Puritans took exception were, the Bishops allowed, "neither expressly commanded nor forbidden by God;" but the Church had a right to impose them on tender consciences because she was commanded by the apostle to take care that all things should be done decently and in order. A good deal of argument, in the manner

* Document, No. XVI.

though not exactly in the tone of Hooker, was added, with a view to show how unreasonable it was for tender consciences not to fall quietly asleep in the lap of mother Church. A list of "concessions" was appended to the Reply. It is when we examine this list that we see what a farce the whole Conference was, so far as the Bishops were concerned. The yoke of the ceremonies is not relaxed by a jot or a tittle. The alteration of the word "Sunday" into "Lord's day" is refused. Not a sentence of the Apocrypha is removed. The most important in the seventeen "concessions" is the omission of the words "sure and certain" before "hope of the resurrection to eternal life," as expressed over the body of every man committed to the grave. And these words, we all know, are in the Prayer Book to this day. Among those who have recently objected to them were the sons of Richard Carlile, the notorious atheist, who did not wish to purchase from the Church a compliment to their father.

Charles had promised at Breda, and again in his October Declaration, that liberty should be granted to tender consciences. The Bishops had now finally attached their interpretation to the phrase. The Puritans were to have liberty to submit their consciences implicitly to the Church.

In presenting the Exceptions to the Prayer Book, along with a reformed liturgy, which Baxter had unwisely drawn up, but which was never meant by the Presbyterians to be insisted on as a condition of their remaining in the Church, the Puritan

Commissioners addressed to the Bishops a Petition* for peace and concord. In this petition, and in the Rejoinder † to the reply of the Bishops to the exceptions, it is that we chiefly discern the part played by Baxter in this controversy. There is a profound and noble pathos in the earnestness with which he implores the bishops not to deprive Christians, by the ordinances of the Church, of that liberty which Christ confers upon His people. There is a more plaintive sadness, also very touching, in the accents in which he prays that, in a day of common joy, when old enmities seem gone for ever, when the turf is growing green on the battle-field, the religious and loyal subjects of his majesty may not experience the heart-breaking sorrow of beholding their pastors driven from the Church, and ignominiously silenced. There is a very tender wisdom, a wisdom which can never grow old, a wisdom as deserving of consideration to-day as it was two hundred years ago, in his pleading on the subject of conscientious scruples. Was all this suffering to be put upon brother Christians for refusing conformity to things, in the Bishops' own account, indifferent? Were they to be forced to adopt forms and ceremonies which seemed to them to pass beyond the directions of Scripture, thus reflecting on the Word as insufficient, and trenching on the kingly power of Christ? Suppose they were mistaken: was theirs not a mistake to be gently dealt with, a malady of noble souls? Was it so dire an offence to be fearful of displeasing God, even

* Document, No. XVII.

† Document, No. XVIII.

with the alternative of pleasing the Church? Was it not pardonable to be careful to obey Him, even at the risk of disobeying His ministers? Did not the love of Christ instruct Church rulers to be tender of those who were tender of His honour, to take heed how they punished men for taking heed of sin? Nay, did not the love, common to all human bosoms, still more the special love which binds Christian to Christian, commend reluctance in driving men by penalties on that which, as they believed, tended to their everlasting damnation, and which in truth, not being matter of faith, was, to them at least, sin? The Bishops did not allege difference in faith; they knew that the ministers whom they threatened to exclude, were godly and energetic pastors; would they refuse liberty and communion on earth, to those with whom Christ would hold communion in grace and glory? Baxter dwells upon this love of Christ for His people, which it seemed so strange to him that the bishops would not imitate. He recalls those scriptural passages in which the varied imagery of prophets and evangelists is employed to depict the tenderness, care, and loving consideration of Christ, for those who faithfully, however feebly, serve Him. He reminds the prelates that Christ is a merciful high priest, a gracious Saviour, a tender Governor, despising not the day of small things, feeding His flock like a shepherd, gathering His lambs with His arm, and carrying them in His bosom, not breaking the bruised reed, not quenching the smoking flax. "Bear with

us," he exclaims, "while we add this terrible passage:—'whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me: but whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.'"

Beyond prudential considerations, the Bishops had in reality but one argument by which to defend their impositions. St. Paul, they said, had directed that all things should be done "*ἐὺσχημόνως* in a fit scheme, habit, or fashion, decently," and that there should be a "*τάξις*, rule or canon for that purpose." The context of the passage in Paul's letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv, 40,) to which the Bishops referred, renders its meaning indubitable. Paul had given many particular directions as to praying, prophesying, the conduct of women in church, and so on. In the end, manifestly to obviate the idea that each particular direction was to continue binding under every change of circumstances, he laid down the general principle, to be applied as circumstances required, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.' That this command should enjoin expulsion from a Christian Church of thousands of devout persons, whose worship could on no pretence be said to be indecent or disorderly, on account of variation in the use of a few arbitrarily appointed signs or vestments, is as monstrous a conception as ever darkened counsel. And if the Church had a right absolutely to impose certain rites unmentioned in

Scripture, what shadow of argument could be urged against any of the impositions of Rome? In point of fact, the Church of Rome had always pursued a large and generous course in those matters, and the Presbyterians appealed to the diversity of liturgical manuals used in the early mediæval period. The Church of the Caroline Act of Uniformity is the only Church in Christendom which exacts, as a test of communion, a rigid identity in the observance of certain positive ordinances, not derived from Scripture. The Church of Rome is indulgent to her children so long as they are firm in their affection; the Presbyterian and Congregationalist Churches impose no rite or ceremony¹ for which they can plead no Scriptural warrant: the Church of England alone requires of her ministers, on pain of expulsion, to believe the surplice, the sign of the cross, kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and bowing at the name of Jesus, to constitute the identical and unchangeable model of Christian worship enjoined by Paul upon the Corinthians. "Grant us," said Baxter, "but the freedom that Christ and His apostles left unto the churches." The Bishops granted him their "concessions." A pang of inexpressible sorrow struck to his heart, sorrow for the distress of England and the sin of the prelates, rather than for the cruel sufferings which he knew to be in store for himself. "If these," he cried, "be all the abatements and amendments you will admit, you sell your innocency, and the Church's peace for nothing."

These may be considered as Baxter's last words of solemn protest and appeal. The discussion which followed was a mockery on the part of the Bishops, which had become painful from its grossness. If we carefully examine the report, however, we shall find the reasoning of the prelates as sophistical, and that of the Puritans as triumphant, as in the earlier parts of the controversy.

It has been maintained that Baxter and his brethren were insincere in their professions, and that they sought not comprehension but supremacy. The assertion proves either a great ignorance of the character of Baxter and his party, or a singularly uncandid state of mind. We saw that Baxter advocated comprehension before the death of Cromwell, nay, that he organised a general Association embracing all, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, who held the unity of the faith, but had varying opinions touching form. In subsequent years, he retained, amid the utmost severities of persecution, a reverence which may be deemed superstitious for the Established Church. "We are so far," he said, in a book published in 1683, "from desiring to draw people from the parish churches into conventicles, that we would keep up the honour of them to the utmost of our power, as knowing how greatly the countenance and maintenance of rulers conduceth to the furtherance of religion." He did not object to the *sanction* and *recommendation*, by a Church, of particular rites and ceremonies. The type might be

there, inducing harmony if not identity, with the authority of custom, of public approval, of general adoption; only he would not have it absolutely imposed. He objected to a National Church only when it became a prison. It must, we think, be allowed that the views entertained by himself and his party of the function of the magistrate in religious affairs set them for the next twenty-five years in an attitude towards the Church of England inferior in dignity to that assumed by John Owen and the Independents. These had no offer of compromise to make to the Church; every company of Christians was, they believed, as much a Church of Christ as the proudest hierarchy in the world. But that Baxter was sincere in craving, not supremacy, but liberty, for his party, not a surrender of her old ritual by the Church, but permission to deviate from it within certain limits, is as certain as any fact in history.

Thus has the Conference of an equal number of divines of both persuasions ended. The Bishops hand over the Presbyterians to the tender mercies of the civil power.

Parliament had met on the 8th of May, 1661. The House of Commons had shown itself blindly, foolishly, furiously loyal, and rushed at once with headlong impetuosity upon Puritanism and the Puritans. The Covenant was burnt by the hangman, —a fit homage, by the basest House of Commons England has ever seen, to the loftiest and purest in

spiration ever embodied in a political manifesto! The Bishops were recalled to the House of Lords; the Puritans were turned out of municipal corporations; the Episcopalian form of Church government was fully restored. Still the fury did not abate; the pace did not slacken. The bull had its head down, its eyes shut, its mane erect, its tail in the air, and went straight forward. At last, concentrating all its energy in one tremendous toss, it flung the Puritans clear over the battlements of the Church of England. This crowning triumph was achieved when the Act of Uniformity became law, 19th May, 1662.

The Act was deliberately intended, and ingeniously framed, to exclude the Puritans from the Church. If there was the slightest relaxation of the ceremonies, some of them might prevail with their consciences to let them remain; therefore, the ceremonies were bound more closely than ever upon the back of the Church. It was possible that a few of them might overcome their scruples in reference to the passages from the Apocrypha; so Convocation brought *Bel and the Dragon*, and *Susannah and the Elders*, to reinforce that important point in the Anti-Puritan position. It was not unlikely that many of them might conform so far as to use the Prayer Book, though not approving of everything it contained; accordingly, assent and consent to all and everything within its boards were exacted. And lest all this should not be enough, the Presbyterians were required to abjure their ordination, to submit to be

again admitted to holy orders by imposition of the hands of the Bishop, to declare the Covenant an unlawful oath, and to swear that taking arms against the King, for any cause whatever, was unlawful. If it was in the power of legislation to convert the Church, as Baxter said, into a prison, this was the measure to effect the transformation. No Puritan who had not a soul for the dungeon could remain within the Church on those conditions.

It is undeniable that the disgrace of this Act lies chiefly on the House of Commons. The Lords tried to moderate their madness. The King expostulated. But the Commons were determined to wreak their vengeance on the Puritans, and no remonstrance was of any avail. We believe that the enactment of the Bill annoyed Charles. The contempt which it ostentatiously exhibited for his Declarations of Breda and of October, must have seemed to him insulting. But firm interposition in any cause of public interest and personal honour, was not to be expected from Charles. His best quality was that easy humour, that indolent facility, that capricious and fickle generosity, which is apt, as Mr. Thackeray remarks, to distinguish ladies and gentlemen, whose views of life correspond, generally, with those of Nell Gwynn. Had he been a man of character and principle, he would have told the Commons that he would rather go again upon his travels than have his name and reign branded with such a stigma as the Act of Uniformity.

On the 24th of August, 1662, the anniversary of

the great St. Bartholomew massacre, the measure of exclusion came into operation. Every incumbent who did not on that day pronounce from the pulpit all the oaths, professions, and engagements which it prescribed, ceased, *ipso facto*, to be connected with the Church of England. There was on that day many a conscience trampled on in the presence of God. About seven thousand ministers who had taken the Covenant, and conformed to a Presbyterian Church, declared the Covenant an unlawful oath, and pronounced sentence of vehement condemnation on all they had been doing for a dozen years. But the Puritans stood firm. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists, numbering about two thousand, preferred the waste to the prison house. Not allowed a farthing of maintenance, not permitted to preach to their former parishioners, or to become tutors and schoolmasters in order to earn a livelihood, deprived even of a year's stipend which they had earned, they deliberately chose to obey God rather than man. It was hard, more hard than we can in these days easily imagine. The smile of power was, in the seventeenth century, necessary to the happiness of Presbyterians, to an extent which we can neither admire nor appreciate; and the Presbyterians of the Church had clung to the House of Stuart, longed for it, prayed for it, agitated for it. In the joy they had contributed so largely to create, they were denied a share; the peace which they had hailed with transport was to be for them, desolation.

Baxter, who had been a king's chaplain, who had been offered a bishopric, and who had looked for a joy infinitely greater than Charles could bestow in winning for England an august victory in the cause of truth, love, innocency, and peace, was not permitted even to resume his charge in Kidderminster. In suffering he became great. No high-wrought picture conveys to us so touching a conception of the distress of the Nonconformists as those few simple words in which Baxter, writing in 1683, describes what he and his brethren still endured. "The jails," he said, "are filled with Nonconformists: nine ministers are now in Newgate, and many more in other places. And almost all of them mulct and fined in far more than ever they were worth. Their goods and books taken by distress: they are fain to fly or abscond that are not in prison: their wives and children in distress and want: they are judged by the justices unworthy, so much as to be summoned to answer for themselves before they are judged, or to be heard plead their own cause, or to know and witness their accusers and witnesses; but as I myself was distrained of all my goods and books on five convictions before ever I heard of any accusation, or saw a judge, so is it with many others, and more. In a word, lords, knights, and clergymen, take us for insufferable persons in the land, unfit for human society, enemies to monarchy, obedience, and peace, and corporations promise to choose such Parliament men as are for our extirpation."

Never man was more loyal than Richard Baxter. He had a fastidious respect for authority. "We abhor schism," he said in 1683, "and have laboured to have healed the wounds of the Church with all our power, these twenty-two years and more." The old irrefragable faith in logic, and the calm conviction that, if men only fairly considered his arguments, they would be convinced and persuaded, remained with him to the last. "Have they," he asked, in placid invincibility, "answered my Treatise of Episcopacy, my first and second Plea for Peace, my Apology, my Treatise of the Terms of Church Concord?" No; and they never will. Jefferies or Parker might make an irreverent jest upon the subject. But answered or not, persecuted or in prosperity, no earthly power could deprive Richard Baxter of happiness. "My life," he said, "and labours have been long vowed to God. He hath preserved my life, and succeeded my labours above forty years, by a continual course of remarkable providence, beyond my own and other men's expectations. What He hath thus given me, is doubly due to His service; which hath been still so good to me, that it hath made even a painful life, a continual pleasure. He never failed or forsook me: I dare not ask any longer life of Him, but for more and longer service. And if my service be at an end, why not my life also?" It is beautiful; it is sublime. With that deep, steadfast, melancholy eye, Baxter looks out upon the world of men, amazed that truth, innocency,

love should not win universal homage, but knowing now with fixed certainty that men will turn a deaf ear to their pleading; and when the curtain of sadness seems about to fall over him in utter night, suddenly the God-light streams from beyond, like sunbeams flushing through the veil of evening, and the joy of a victory beyond death irradiates his countenance. Even as a thinker Baxter did not wholly fail. His own generation did not listen to him, but after two centuries, his ideas are still new, and many an one, who lingers over the vision of a Church of England embracing within her pale the whole religious life of the nation, will turn to his works to learn the true principles of comprehension. He sympathised with all the most pure, high, and poetical minds of his time, with Tillotson, with Hale, with Chillingworth, with Taylor, and his thoughts find responsive echoes in the nineteenth century in the writings of Coleridge and Arnold.

But the position of Baxter and his party was too indeterminate to be firm. A more resolute and thorough-going race of Nonconformists arose to carry on the Puritan descent in England. Owen, with less poetical feeling and glow of sympathy than Baxter, but of more compact intellectual structure, and stronger administrative judgment, saw that Nonconformists must turn from the Bacchanalian rout of the restoration, and learn to look with compassionate disdain on a Church which stooped in those years to abject degradation, which celebrated an infamous

Court in the drivel of Parker and the blasphemy of South. The Independents asked no comprehension; they wished only for toleration: and this was the most proper and dignified attitude to assume.

When James II. made it plain to all the world that he resolutely purposed to lead Church and kingdom back to Rome, Presbyterians and Independents, casting off all grudges, made common cause with the Church, and joined in hailing William. Once more the Church refused comprehension, but the promises of William were not the promises of Charles. The Toleration Act was passed.

From that day to this, the Nonconformists of England have ever been found in the van of their country's defenders; taunted and hated by Churchmen in time of peace, but ready as of old, in the hour of peril, to stand side by side with all who take rank in the phalanx which guards the Protestant religion and the Constitutional liberties of England.

Has not the day come when we may all join in admiring the valour, in acknowledging the wisdom, in celebrating the virtue, of those English Puritans of the seventeenth century? The contest of that age is past. The thoughts, the feelings, the interests, the aims, of men have changed. Why should we, like the phantom warriors after that fabled conflict of the middle age, baptise our hate with immortality, and, setting the battle in array in the clouds, above the field where the faces of the heroes are still and pale,

renew watchwords which have lost their meaning, and grasp weapons which are shadowy and strange? Did not the Puritans deserve well of their country? Was not the crisis of the seventeenth century necessary for England? What man is there who would now deliberately wish that they had not risen against Laud, and Strafford, and Charles? Did they not make it for ever impossible that England should fall back into feudal servitude? Is it not by their ordinance that the British monarchy has been the temple of freedom, and that British freedom is but graceful, spontaneous, melodious order? The tumult of those times may shock a feminine sensibility; but was it not that agitation which rendered possible the subsequent development? Dante mentions a belief of ancient sages, that the universe reached perfection through successive periods of chaos, and that the principle which ever in the chaos worked towards cosmos was *love*. There are chaotic periods in the life of nations, and the seventeenth century was one of these in the history of England; but a kindly principle, a principle of life and growth, a love for light, for truth, for liberty, worked in that chaos to produce the gardened England which we know.

If the Puritans had accepted from Charles the peace of despotism, would England in our own time have escaped the agonies of revolution? If the constitution had not been vindicated and established by

religious Hampdens, Elliots, Pyms, should we not have had our Marats and Robespierres? We have religious liberty: had those men not fought and suffered, might we not have had atheistic license? Our wildest political agitator demands now but admission within the pale of the constitution, the very demand a tribute of admiration and regard: our most timid Conservatives take their stand upon principles which the Puritans asserted at the risk of their lives, and which there were then none but they to assert. And if we value the purity of our domestic life, if as a nation we revere the household sanctities and loathe the grosser vices, may we not look with pride and gratitude on those later Puritans, who, when the foul debauch of the restoration ran its course, when adultery was a jest and indecency a fashion, retained their purity of manners and simplicity of conversation, and rebuked from the dungeon a Court of profligates and a Church of slaves? True, the Puritans had their faults, their follies, their failings. Religion loses its heavenly aspect when painted on banners, when the white raiment of saints is exchanged for martial scarlet, and the truth of God is flashed back from the stained and dented mirror of the sword-blade. Yet is there an influence as benign as it is stirring in those periods of human history in which the passions of the intellectual, moral, spiritual nature, convulse mighty peoples.

It is assuredly a truth, though Mr. Carlyle may have asserted it with something of exclusiveness, that certain generations of men have shown more than others of celestial purpose, of hallowed aspiration, of faith in the Unseen, the Eternal, the Divine. Physical achievement, material power, comfort and placid listlessness in domestic life,—these are the reigning ideas of our age. To rear pyramids of gold, to pave the land with iron highways, to send our words in the electric flash under the roar of oceans, to add ever new adornment to our houses of clay, to touch with richer embroidery of gold and crimson the couch of luxury—these are our aims. Such were not the ideas, such were not the aims, of the Puritan period. It may be well for us to realise, in intellect and imagination, a time when all minds were differently toned; when men looked upward to the heaven of God rather than downward to the little world with its dainties, its fashions, its social conventions; when high spiritual impulses were not deemed proofs of inferior culture; and when the most practical statesman waited reverently and fearfully on the providence of God. The Puritans did not succeed in making England, as Baxter said, the porch of heaven, with the hymn of praise, the accents of prayer, rising from her myriad families to greet the break of morn, and hail the evening star. In the close surveillance of the individual life which the Puritans demanded from the Church, there may have been something irremediably alien to the imperious instinct of personal and

domestic freedom which dwells in all Englishmen. Yet their conception of earth as a place of waiting and of worship, not of complete present satisfaction, is one we must retain if we retain our Christianity; and according as we embrace or as we scorn the main ideas by which they were animated, shall we rise into grandeur, or dwindle into insignificance.

THE END.

DOCUMENTS

RELATING TO THE SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
BY THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY OF 1662.

EDITED BY
THE REV. GEO. GOULD.

This volume has been published in illustration of the Act of Uniformity. The series of Documents, now for the first time issued in a connected form, exhibits the relations of the King, the Parliament, the Bishops, and the Presbyterian divines to each other in the discussions which preceded and resulted in that measure: and the various Acts, reprinted in this volume, which were intended to harass and destroy the Nonconformists, will enable every reader to judge of the relentless animosity with which those peaceable and conscientious citizens were persecuted.

Had it not been for increasing the bulk of the volume, some other Acts and papers would have been included in it; but it is hoped that the collection now made is complete for all practical purposes.

The example of such accomplished editors as Wilkins and Cardwell—in whose costly collections of documents relating to the Church of England many of the following papers have been formerly reprinted—has been followed in the preparation of this volume. The orthography has been modernized, and the punctuation has been corrected. In every other respect the Documents appear in their original form.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
I. Declaration of King Charles II from Breda	1
II. Interview of the Presbyterian Ministers with King Charles II at Breda	4
III. Discourse of the Ministers with King Charles II in London	6
IV. The first Address and Proposals of the Ministers	12
V. Archbishop Ussher's Model of Church Government	22
VI. Requests verbally presented to King Charles II in consequence of the Act for restoring the English Clergy	26
VII. The Bishops' Answer to the first Proposals of the London Ministers, who attempted the work of reconciliation	27
VIII. A Defence of our Proposals to His Majesty for Agreement in Matters of Religion	39
IX. His Majesty's Declaration to all his loving subjects of his kingdom of England and dominion of Wales concerning ecclesiastical affairs	63
X. The Petition of the Ministers to the King upon the first draft of his Declaration	79
XI. Alterations in the Declaration proposed by the Ministers	98
XII. Humble and grateful acknowledgment of some Ministers of London for the Declaration	101
XIII. A Proclamation prohibiting all unlawful and seditious meetings and conventicles under pretence of religious worship	104

	PAGE
XIV. The King's Warrant for the Conference at the Savoy	107
XV. The Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer	111
XVI. The Answer of the Bishops to the Exceptions of the Ministers	146
XVII. The Petition for peace and concord presented to the Bishops with the proposed Reformation of the Liturgy	176
XVIII. The Rejoinder of the Ministers to the Answer of the Bishops	201
XIX. Paper offered by Bishop Cosins, and Answer thereto	346
XX. The Discussion on Kneeling at the Lord's Supper .	351
XXI. The Discussion on the Sinfulness of the Liturgy .	359
XXII. The Reply to the Bishops' Disputants, which was not answered	364
XXIII. Petition to the King at the close of the Conference	379
XXIV. The Act of Uniformity. 14 Car. II, cap. iv. .	386
XXV. Efforts of Presbyterian Ministers to have the King's Declaration of October, 1660, enacted .	404
XXVI. Extracts from Journals of Parliament relating to the passing of the Act of Uniformity . . .	408
XXVII. The Six Hundred Alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer by Convocation, and adopted by Parliament	456
XXVIII. The Publication of the Book of Common Prayer .	458
XXIX. The King's Declaration of 27th December, 1662 .	460
XXX. Proceedings in Parliament upon the King's Dec- laration of 26th December, 1662	468
XXXI. The Conventicle Act, 1664. 16 Car. II, cap. iv.	477
XXXII. The Five Mile Act. 17 Car. II, cap. ii. . . .	488
XXXIII. The Conventicle Act, 1670. 22 Car. II, cap. i. .	491
XXXIV. The Test Act. 25 Car. II, cap. ii.	499
XXXV. The Toleration Act. 1 Guil. et Mar., cap. xviii. .	507

DOCUMENTS

RELATING TO THE

Settlement of the Church of England

BY THE

ACT OF UNIFORMITY OF 1662.

I.

Declaration of King Charles II from Breda.—Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, bk. xvi, §§ 193—7, Oxford, 1849, vol. vi, pp. 232—4.

Charles R.

CHARLES, by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. To all our loving subjects of what degree or quality soever, greeting. If the general distraction and confusion which is spread over the whole kingdom doth not awaken all men to a desire and longing that those wounds which have so many years together been kept bleeding may be bound up, all we can say will be to no purpose. However, after this long silence, we have thought it our duty to declare how much we desire to contribute thereunto; and that, as we can never give over the hope in good time to obtain the possession of that right which God and nature hath made our due, so we do make it our daily suit to the divine Providence, that he will, in compassion to us and our subjects, after so long misery and sufferings, remit, and put us into a quiet and peaceable possession of

that our right, with as little blood and damage to our people as is possible: nor do we desire more to enjoy what is ours, than that all our subjects may enjoy what by law is theirs, by a full and entire administration of justice throughout the land, and by extending our mercy where it is wanted and deserved.

And to the end that the fear of punishment may not engage any conscious to themselves of what is past to a perseverance in guilt for the future, by opposing the quiet and happiness of their country in the restoration both of king, peers, and people to their just, ancient, and fundamental rights, we do by these presents declare, that we do grant a free and general pardon, which we are ready upon demand, to pass under our great seal of England, to all our subjects, of what degree or quality soever, who within forty days after the publishing hereof shall lay hold upon this our grace and favour, and shall by any public act declare their doing so, and that they return to the loyalty and obedience of good subjects; excepting only such persons as shall hereafter be excepted by parliament. Those only excepted, let all our subjects, how faulty soever, rely upon the word of a king, solemnly given by this present Declaration, that no crime whatsoever committed against us or our royal father, before the publication of this, shall ever rise in judgment, or be brought in question, against any of them, to the least endamage-ment of them, either in their lives, liberties, or estates, or (as far forth as lies in our power) so much as to the prejudice of their reputations, by any reproach, or term of distinction from the rest of our best subjects; we desiring and ordaining, that henceforward all notes of discord, separation, and difference of parties, be utterly abolished among all our subjects; whom we invite and conjure to a perfect union among themselves, under our protection, for the resettlement of our just rights and theirs, in a free parliament; by which, upon the word of a king, we will be advised.

And because the passion and uncharitableness of the times

have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other; which, when they shall hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation, will be composed, or better understood; we do declare a liberty to tender consciences; and that no man shall be disquieted, or called in question, for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an act of parliament, as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence.

And because in the continued distractions of so many years, and so many and great revolutions, many grants and purchases of estates have been made to and by many officers, soldiers, and others, who are now possessed of the same, and who may be liable to actions at law, upon several titles; we are likewise willing that all such differences, and all things relating to such grants, sales, and purchases, shall be determined in parliament; which can best provide for the just satisfaction of all men who are concerned.

And we do farther declare, that we will be ready to consent to any act or acts of parliament to the purposes aforesaid, and for the full satisfaction of all arrears due to the officers and soldiers of the army under the command of General Monk; and that they shall be received into our service upon as good pay and conditions as they now enjoy.

Given under our sign manual, and privy signet, at our court at Breda, the $\frac{4}{14}$ th day of April, 1660, in the twelfth year of our reign.

II.

Interview of the Presbyterian Ministers with King Charles II at Breda.—Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, bk. xvi, §§ 242—4, Oxford, 1849, vol. vi, pp. 261—3.

WITH these committees from the parliament and from the city, there came a company of clergymen, to the number of eight or ten, who would not be looked upon as chaplains to the rest, but being the popular preachers of the city, (Reynolds, Calamy, Case, Manton, and others, were the most eminent of the Presbyterians, and) desired to be thought to represent that party. They [entreated] to be admitted all together to have a formal audience from his majesty, where they were tedious enough in presenting their duties, and magnifying the affections of themselves and their friends, who, they said, had always, according to the obligation of their covenant, wished his majesty very well, and had lately, upon the opportunity that God had put into their hands, informed the people of their duty; which they presumed his majesty had heard had proved effectual, and been of great use to him. They thanked God for his constancy to the protestant religion, and professed that they were no enemies to moderate episcopacy, only desired that such things might not be pressed upon them in God's worship which, in their judgment who used them, were acknowledged to be matters indifferent, and by others were held unlawful.

The king spake very kindly to them, and said [that] he had heard of their good behaviour towards him, and that he had no purpose to impose hard conditions upon them with reference to their conscience; they well knew that he had referred the settling all differences of that nature to the wisdom of the parliament, which best knew what indulgence and toleration was necessary for the peace and the quiet of the kingdom. But his majesty could not be so rid of them; but they desired several private audiences of him; which he never

denied; wherein they told him, that the Book of Common Prayer had been long discontinued in England, and the people having been disused to it, and many of them having never heard it in their lives, it would be much wondered at, if his majesty should, at his first landing in the kingdom, revive the use of it in his own chapel, whither all persons would resort; and therefore they besought him that he would not use it so entirely and formally, and have some parts only of it read, with mixture of other good prayers, which his chaplains might use.

The king told them with some warmth, that whilst he gave them liberty, he would not have his own taken from him; that he had always used that form of service, which he thought the best in the world, and [had never discontinued it] in places where it was more disliked than he hoped it was by them; that when he came into England, he would not much inquire how it was used in other churches, though he doubted not he should find it used in many; but he was sure he would have no other used in his own chapel. Then they besought him with more importunity, that the use of the surplice might be discontinued by his chaplains, because the sight of it would give great offence and scandal to the people. They found the king as inexorable in that point as in the other; [he] told them plainly, that he would not be restrained himself, when he gave others so much liberty; that it had been always held a decent habit in the church, constantly practised in England till these late ill times; that it had been still retained by him; and though he was bound for the present to tolerate much disorder and undecency in the exercise of God's worship, he would never in the least degree discountenance the good old order of the church in which he had been bred by his own practice. Though they were very much unsatisfied with him, whom they thought to have found more flexible, yet they ceased further troubling him, in hope and presumption that they should find their importunity in England more effectual.

III.

Discourse of the Ministers with King Charles II in London.—
Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 229—32.

For the gratifying and engaging some chief Presbyterians, that had brought in the king; by the Earl of Manchester's means, (who then being Lord Chamberlain, it belongeth to his place) above ten or twelve of them were designed to be the king's Chaplains in Ordinary. Mr. Calamy, and Dr. Reynolds were first put in; and then Mr. Ash was importuned to accept it, and then they put me in for one: (Mr. Nath. Newcomen refused it): and then Dr. Spurstow, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Bates, Dr. Manton, Mr. Case, &c., were admitted. But never any of them was called to preach at court, saving Mr. Calamy, Dr. Reynolds, myself, and Dr. Spurstow, each of us once: and I suppose never a man of them all ever received or expected a penny for the salary of their places.

When I was invited by the Lord Broghill, (afterwards Earl of Orrery) to meet him at the Lord Chamberlain's; they both persuaded me to accept the place, to be one of his majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary. I desired to know whether it were his majesty's desire, or only the effect of their favourable request to him. They told me that it was his majesty's own desire, and that he would take it as an acceptable furtherance of his service. Whereupon I took an oath from the Lord Chamberlain, as a household servant of his majesty's, to be true and faithful to him, and discover any conspiracy I should know of, &c. And I received this certificate from him:—

These are to certify, that Richard Baxter, Clerk, hath been sworn and admitted Chaplain to the king's majesty in Ordinary, to have and enjoy all rights, profits, and privileges

thereunto belonging. Given under my hand this 26th of June, 1660, in the twelfth year of the reign of our sovereign lord the king.

Ed. Manchester.

When I was with these two lords on this occasion, I told them what conferences I had with several episcopal men about the terms of an agreement or coalition, and how much it concerned the interest, both of the king and of religion, that we might be so united, and what unhappy consequences else would follow, and how easy I thought an agreement with moderate men would be, and on what terms Bishop Ussher and I had agreed in a little space. A little after the Lord Broghill was pleased to come to me; and he told me, that he had told the king of the business of a conference for an agreement, and that the king took it very well, and was resolved to further it. And about the same time the Earl of Manchester signified as much to Mr. Calamy: so that Mr. Calamy, Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Ash, and myself went about it to the Earl of Manchester, Lord Chamberlain, and after consultations of the business with him, he determined of a day to bring us to the king. Mr. Calamy (to whom both I, and I think all the rest, did leave the nomination of the persons to be employed) advised that all that were the king's chaplains of us might be called to the consultation, and that we four might not seem to take so much upon us without others: (if we did not go once without them to the king, which I well remember not, that was all): so Dr. Wallis, Dr. Manton, and Dr. Spurstow, &c., went with us to the king: who with the Lord Chancellor, and the Earl of St. Albans, &c., came to us in the Lord Chamberlain's lodgings. We exercised more boldness at first, than afterwards would have been borne: when some of the rest had congratulated his majesty's happy restoration, and declared the large hope which they had of a happy union among all Dissenters by his means, &c., I presumed to speak to him of the concernments of religion, and how far we were from desiring the continuance of any

factions or parties in the church, and how much a happy union would conduce to the good of the land, and to his majesty's satisfaction; and though there were turbulent fanatic persons in his dominions, yet that those ministers and godly people, whose peace we humbly craved of him, were no such persons, but such as longed after concord, and were truly loyal to him, and desired no more than to live under him *a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty*; and whereas there were differences between them and their brethren about some ceremonies or discipline of the Church, we humbly craved his majesty's favour for the ending of those differences, it being easy for him to interpose, that so the people might not be deprived of their faithful pastors, nor ignorant, scandalous, unworthy ones obtruded on them! I presumed to tell him, that the people that we spake for were such as were contented with an interest in heaven, and the liberty and advantages of the gospel to promote it; and if this were taken from them, and they were deprived of their faithful pastors, and liberty of worshipping God, they would take themselves as undone in this world, whatever plenty else they should enjoy: and the hearts of his most faithful subjects, who hoped for his help, would even be broken: and that we doubted not but his majesty desired to govern a people made happy by him, and not a broken hearted people, that took themselves to be undone, by the loss of that which is dearer to them than all the riches of the world! And I presumed to tell him that, the late usurpers that were over us so well understood their own interest, that to promote it, they had found the way of doing good to be the most effectual means, and had placed and encouraged many thousand faithful ministers in the Church, even such as detested their usurpation: and so far had they attained their ends hereby, that it was the principal means of their interest in the people, and the good opinion that any had conceived of them; and those of them that had taken the contrary course had thereby broken themselves to pieces. Wherefore I humbly craved his majesty's patience, that we might have

the freedom to request of him, that as he was our lawful king, in whom all his people (save a few inconsiderable persons) were prepared to centre, as weary of their divisions, and glad of the satisfactory means of union in him, so he would be pleased to undertake this blessed work of promoting their holiness and concord: (for it was not faction or disobedience which we desired him to indulge:) and that he would never suffer himself to be tempted to undo the good which Cromwell or any other had done, because they were usurpers that did it, or discountenance a faithful ministry because his enemies had set them up: but that he would rather outgo them in doing good, and opposing and rejecting the ignorant and ungodly of what opinion or party soever: for the people whose cause we recommend[ed] to him had their eyes on him as the officer of God, to defend them in the possession of the helps of their salvation, which, if he were pleased to vouchsafe them, their estates and lives would cheerfully be offered to his service. And I humbly besought him that he would never suffer his subjects to be tempted to have favourable thoughts of the late usurper, by seeing the vice indulged which they suppressed; or the godly ministers or people discountenanced whom they encouraged. For the common people are apt to judge of governors by the effects, even by the good or evil which they feel: and they will take him to be the best governor who doth them most good, and him to be the worst who doth them most hurt: and all his enemies cannot teach him a more effectual way to restore the reputation and honour of the usurpers, than to do worse than they, and destroy the good which they had done, that so he may go contrary to his enemies; and so to force the people to cry out, we are undone in loss of the means of our salvation: it being a hard matter ever to bring the people to love and honour him by whom they think they are undone, in comparison of those that they think made them happy, though the one have a just title to be their governor, which the other hath not.

And again I humbly craved, that no misrepresentations

might cause him to believe that, because some fanatics have been factious and disloyal, therefore the religious people in his dominions, who are most careful of their souls, are such, though some of them may be dissatisfied about some forms and ceremonies in God's worship which others use: and that none of them might go under so ill a character with him, by misreports behind their backs, till it were proved of them personally, or they had answered for themselves: for we that better knew them than those that were like to be their accusers, did confidently testify to his majesty on their behalf, that they are resolved enemies of sedition, rebellion, disobedience, and divisions; which the world shall see, and their adversaries be convinced of, if his majesty's wisdom and clemency do but remove those occasions of scruple, in some points of discipline and worship of God, which give advantage to others to call all dissenters factious and disobedient, how loyal and peaceable soever. And I humbly craved that the freedom and plainness of these expressions to his majesty might be pardoned, as being extracted by the present necessity, and encouraged by our revived hopes. I told him also, that it was not for Presbyterians, or any party, as such, that we were speaking, but for the religious part of his subjects, as such; than whom no prince on earth had better; and how considerable part of the kingdom he would find them to be; and of what great advantage their union would be to his majesty, to the people, and to the bishops themselves; and how easily it might be procured,—1. By making only things necessary to be the terms of union. 2. And by the true exercise of church discipline against sin. 3. And not casting out the faithful ministers that must exercise it, nor obtruding unworthy men upon the people. And how easy it was to avoid the violating of men's solemn vows and covenants, without any hurt to any others. And finally, I requested that we might but be heard speak for ourselves, when any accusations were brought against us.

These, with some other such things, I then spake, when some of my brethren had spoken first. Mr. Simeon Ash also

spake much to the same purpose, and of all our desires of his majesty's assistance in our desired union.

The king gave us not only a free audience, but as gracious an answer as we could expect: professing his gladness to hear our inclinations to agreement, and his resolution to do his part to bring us together; and that it must not be by bringing one party over to the other, but by abating somewhat on both sides, and meeting in the midway; and that if it were not accomplished, it should belong of ourselves, and not of him. Nay, that he was resolved to see it brought to pass, and that he would draw us together himself: with some more to this purpose. Insomuch that old Mr. Ash burst out into tears with joy, and could not forbear expressing what gladness this promise of his majesty had put into his heart.

Either at this time, or shortly after, the king required us to draw up, and offer him such proposals as we thought meet, in order to agreement about church government; for that was the main difference: if that were agreed there would be little danger of differing in the rest: and he desired us to set down the most that we could yield to.

We told him, 1. That we were but a few men, and had no commission from any of our brethren to express their minds: and therefore desired that his majesty would give us leave to acquaint our brethren in the country with it, and take them with us. The king answered, that that would be too long, and make too much noise, and therefore we should do what we would our selves only, with such of the city as we would take with us. And when we then professed that we presumed not to give the sense of others, nor oblige them; and that what we did must signify but the minds of so many men as were present; he answered, that it should signify no more; and that he did not intend to call an assembly of the other party, but would bring a few, such as he thought meet: and that if he thought good to advise with a few of each side, for his own satisfaction, none had cause to be offended at it.

[2.] Also we craved that at the same time when we offered

our concessions to the king, the brethren on the other side might bring in theirs, containing also the uttermost that they could abate and yield to us for concord, that seeing both together, we might see what probability of success we had. And the king promised that it should be so.

Hereupon we departed and appointed to meet from day to day at Sion College, and to consult there openly with any of our brethren that would please to join with us, that none might say they were excluded: some city ministers came among us, and some came not; and divers country ministers who were in the city came also to us; as Dr. Worth, since a bishop in Ireland, Mr. Fulwood, since Archdeacon of Totnes, &c. But Mr. Matthew Newcomen was most constant in assisting us.

IV.

*The first Address and Proposals of the Ministers.*¹—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, pp. 232—6; *Cardwell's History of Conferences*, pp. 277—86, Oxford, 1849.

May it please your most excellent majesty,
 WE your majesty's most loyal subjects cannot but acknowledge it as a very great mercy of God, that immediately after your so wonderful and peaceable restoration unto your throne and

¹Of the preparation of this paper, Baxter gives the following account:—
 “Mr. Calamy drew up most with Dr. Reynolds; Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Worth drew up that which is against the ceremonies; I only prevailed with them to premise the four first particulars, for the countenancing godliness, the ministry, personal profession, and the Lord's day: they were backward, because they were not the points in controversy; but yielded at last on the reasons offered them.....I also prevailed with our brethren to offer an abstract of our larger papers, lest the reading of the larger should seem tedious to the king; which abstract verbatim, as followeth, at their desire I drew up.”—*Life*, by Sylvester, p. 232.

government, (for which we bless his Name) he hath stirred up your royal heart as to a zealous testimony against all profaneness in the people, so to endeavour a happy composing of the differences, and healing of the sad breaches which are in the church. And we shall, according to our bounden duty, become humble suitors at the throne of grace, that the God of peace who hath put such a thing as this into your majesty's heart, will by his heavenly wisdom and holy Spirit so assist you therein, and bring your resolutions unto so perfect an effect and issue, that all the good people of these kingdoms may have abundant cause to rise up and bless you, and to bless God who hath delighted in you to make you his instrument in so happy a work. That as your glorious progenitor Henry VII was happy in uniting the houses of Lancaster and York, and your grandfather, King James of blessed memory, in uniting the kingdoms of England and Scotland, so this honour may be reserved for your majesty as a radiant jewel in your crown, that by your princely wisdom and Christian moderation, the hearts of all your people may be united, and the unhappy differences and mis-understandings amongst brethren in matters ecclesiastical so composed, that the Lord may be one, and his Name one in the midst of your dominions.

In an humble conformity to this your majesty's Christian design, we, taking it for granted that there is a firm agreement between our brethren and us in the doctrinal truths of the reformed religion, and in the substantial parts of divine worship, and that the differences are only in some various conceptions about the ancient form of church-government, and some particulars about liturgy and ceremonies, do in all humble obedience to your majesty represent,—that inasmuch as the ultimate end of church-government and ministry is, that holiness of life and salvation of souls may be effectually promoted, we humbly desire in the first place, that we may be secured of those things in practice, of which we seem to be agreed in principles.

1. That those of our flocks who are serious and diligent

about the matters of their salvation, may not by words of scorn, or any abusive usages, be suffered to be reproachfully handled; but have liberty and encouragement in those Christian duties of exhorting and provoking one another unto love and good works, of building up one another in their most holy faith, and by all religious and peaceful means of furthering one another in the ways of eternal life; they being not therein opposite to church-assemblies, nor refusing the guidance and due inspection of their pastors, and being responsible for what they do or say.

2. That each congregation may have a learned, orthodox, and godly pastor residing amongst them, to the end that the people may be publicly instructed and edified by preaching every Lord's day, by catechising, and frequent administration of the Lord's Supper, and of Baptism, and other ministerial acts as the occasions and necessities of the people may require both in health and sickness; and that effectual provision of law be made, that such as are insufficient, negligent, or scandalous, may not be admitted to, or permitted in so sacred a function and employment.

3. That none may be admitted to the Lord's Supper, till they competently understand the principles of Christian religion, and do personally and publicly own their baptismal covenant, by a credible profession of faith and obedience; not contradicting the same by a contrary profession, or by a scandalous life: and that unto such only confirmation (if continued in the church) may be administered: and that the approbation of the pastors to whom the catechising and instructing of those under their charge do appertain, may be produced before any person receive confirmation; which course we humbly conceive will much conduce to the quieting of those sad disputes and divisions which have greatly troubled the church of God amongst us, touching church-members and communicants.

4. That an effectual course be taken for the sanctification of the Lord's day, appropriating the same to holy exercises both in public and private without unnecessary divertisements; it being certain and by long experience

found, that the observation thereof is a special means of preserving and promoting the power of godliness, and obviating profaneness.

Then for matters in difference, viz., church-government, liturgy, and ceremonies, we most humbly represent unto your majesty :

1. First, for church-government ; that although upon just reasons we do dissent from that ecclesiastical hierarchy or prelacy disclaimed in the covenant, as it was stated and exercised in these kingdoms ; yet we do not, nor ever did renounce the true ancient primitive episcopacy or presidency as it was balanced and managed by a due commixtion of presbyters therewith, as a fit means to avoid corruptions, partiality, tyranny, and other evils which may be incident to the administration of one single person : which kind of attempered episcopacy or presidency, if it shall, by your majesty's grave wisdom and gracious moderation, be in such a manner constituted, as that the fore-mentioned, and other like evils may be certainly prevented, we shall humbly submit thereunto.

And in order to a happy accommodation in this weighty business, we desire humbly to offer unto your majesty some of the particulars, which we conceive were amiss in the episcopal government, as it was practised before the year 1640.

1. The great extent of the bishop's diocese, which was much too large for his own personal inspection, wherein he undertook a pastoral charge over the souls of all those within his bishopric, which must needs be granted to be too heavy a burthen for any one man's shoulders : the pastoral office being a work of personal ministration and trust, and that of the highest concernment to the souls of the people, for which they are to give an account to Christ.

2. That by reason of this disability to discharge their duty and trust personally, the bishops did depute the administration of much of their trust, even in matters of spiritual cognizance, to commissaries, chancellors, and officials, whereof some were secular persons, and could not

administer that power which originally appertaineth to the pastors of the church.

3. That those bishops who affirm the episcopal office to be a distinct order by divine right from that of the presbyter, did assume the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction to themselves.

4. That some of the bishops exercised an arbitrary power, as by sending forth their books of articles in their visitations, and therein unwarrantably inquiring into several things, and swearing the churchwardens to present accordingly. So also by many innovations and ceremonies imposed upon ministers and people not required by law²; and by suspending ministers at their pleasure.

For reforming of which evils, we humbly crave leave to offer unto your majesty,

1. The late most reverend primate of Ireland his "Reduction of episcopacy unto the form of synodical government, received in the ancient church;" as a ground-work towards an accommodation and fraternal agreement in this point of ecclesiastical government; which we the rather do, not only in regard of his eminent piety and singular ability, as in all other parts of learning, so in that especially of the antiquities of the church; but also, because therein expedients are offered to the healing of these grievances.

2. And in order to the same end, we further humbly desire, that the suffragans or chorepiscopi, mentioned in the primate's "Reduction," be chosen by the respective synods, and by that election may be sufficiently authorized to discharge their trust. That the associations may not be so large as to make the discipline impossible, or to take off the ministers from the rest of their necessary employment.

3. That no oaths, or promises of obedience to the bishops, nor any unnecessary subscriptions or engagements be made necessary to ordination, institution, induction, ministrations, communion, or immunities of ministers, they being responsible

² This last clause is wanting in the MS. copy preserved in the Tanner papers.—CARDWELL.

for any transgression of the law. And that no bishops, nor any ecclesiastical governors, may at any time exercise their government by their own private will or pleasure; but only by such rules, canons and constitutions, as shall be hereafter by act of parliament ratified and established: and that sufficient provision of law may be made to secure both ministers and people against the evils of arbitrary government in the church.

2. CONCERNING THE LITURGY.

1. We are satisfied in our judgments concerning the lawfulness of a liturgy, or form of public worship; provided that it be for the matter agreeable unto the word of God, and fitly suited to the nature of the several ordinances, and necessities of the church; neither too tedious in the whole, nor composed of too short prayers, unmeet repetitions or responsals: not to be dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed churches; nor too rigorously imposed; nor the minister so confined thereunto, but that he may also make use of those gifts for prayer and exhortation which Christ hath given him for the service and edification of the church.

2. That inasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer hath in it many things that are justly offensive and need amendment, hath been long discontinued, and very many, both ministers and people, persons of pious, loyal, and peaceable minds, are therein greatly dissatisfied; whereupon, if it be again imposed, will inevitably follow sad divisions, and widening of the breaches which your majesty is now endeavouring to heal; we do most humbly offer to your majesty's wisdom, that for preventing so great evil, and for settling the church in unity and peace, some learned, godly, and moderate divines of both persuasions, indifferently chosen, may be employed to compile such a form as is before described, as much as may be in Scripture words; or at least to revise and effectually reform the old, together with an addition or insertion of some other varying forms in Scripture phrase, to be used at the minister's choice; of which variety and liberty there be instances in the Book of Common Prayer.

3. CONCERNING CEREMONIES.

We humbly represent that we hold ourselves obliged, in every part of divine worship, to do all things decently, in order, and to edification, and are willing therein to be determined by authority in such things as being merely circumstantial, are common to human actions and societies, and are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.

And as to divers ceremonies formerly retained in the Church of England, we do in all humility offer unto your majesty these ensuing considerations :

That the worship of God is in itself perfect, without having such ceremonies affixed thereto.³

That the Lord hath declared himself in the matters that concern his worship to be “ a jealous God ;” and this worship of his is certainly then most pure, and most agreeable to the simplicity of the gospel, and to his holy and jealous eyes, when it hath least of human admixtures in things of themselves confessedly unnecessary adjoined and appropriated thereunto ; upon which account many faithful servants of the Lord, knowing his word to be the perfect rule of faith and worship, by which they must judge of his acceptance of their services, and must be themselves judged, have been exceeding fearful of varying from his will, and of the danger of displeasing him by additions or detractions in such duties wherein they must daily expect the communications of his grace and comfort, especially seeing that these ceremonies have been imposed and urged upon such considerations as draw too near to the significancy and moral efficacy of sacraments themselves.

That they have, together with popery, been rejected by

³ To this clause the Tanner MS. adds the following words : “ for did they contribute anything to that necessary decency which the apostle requires, we might expect to meet with them in the apostles’ time ; there being no reason to induce us to the use of them which might not have induced them.”—
CARDWELL.

many of the reformed churches abroad, amongst whom, notwithstanding, we doubt not but the Lord is worshipped decently, orderly, and in the beauty of holiness.

That ever since the reformation they have been matter of contention and endless disputes in this church, and have been a cause of depriving the church of the fruit and benefit which might have been reaped from the labours of many learned and godly ministers, some of whom judging them unlawful, others unexpedient, were in conscience unwilling to be brought under the power of them.

That they have occasioned, by the offence taken at them by many of the people heretofore, great separations from our church, and so have rather prejudiced than promoted the unity thereof; and at this time, by reason of their long disuse, may be more likely than ever heretofore to produce the same inconveniences.

That they are at best but indifferent, and in their nature mutable; and that it is, especially in various exigencies of the church, very needful and expedient that things in themselves mutable be sometimes actually changed, lest they should, by perpetual permanency and constant use, be judged by the people as necessary as the substantials of worship themselves.

And though we do most heartily acknowledge your majesty to be *custos utriusque tabulae*, and to be supreme governor over all persons, and in all things and causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, in these your majesty's dominions, yet we humbly crave leave to beseech your majesty to consider whether, as a Christian magistrate, you be not as well obliged by that doctrine of the apostle touching things indifferent, in not occasioning an offence to weak brethren, as the apostle himself (then one of the highest officers in the church of Christ) judged himself to be obliged by; and whether the great work wherewith the Lord hath intrusted your majesty be not rather to provide by your sacred authority that the things which are necessary, by virtue of divine command, in his worship should be duly performed, than that things un-

necessary should be made by human command necessary and penal. And how greatly pleasing it will be to the Lord that your majesty's heart is so tenderly and religiously compassionate to such of his poor servants differing in some small matters, who prefer the peace of their consciences in God's worship above all their civil concernments whatsoever.

May it therefore please your majesty out of your princely care of healing our sad breaches, graciously to grant, that kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and such holy days, as are but of human institution, may not be imposed upon such as do conscientiously scruple the observation of them; and that the use of the surplice, and cross in baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus rather than the name of Christ, or Emmanuel, or other names whereby that divine person, or either of the other divine persons is nominated, may be abolished; these things being, in the judgment of the imposers themselves, but indifferent and mutable; in the judgment of others, a rock of offence; and, in the judgment of all, not to be valued with the peace of the church.

We likewise humbly represent unto your most excellent majesty, that divers ceremonies which we conceive have no foundation in the law of the land, as erecting altars, bowing towards them, and such like, have been not only introduced, but in some places imposed: whereby an arbitrary power was usurped; divers ministers of the gospel, though conformable to the established ceremonies, troubled; some reverend and learned bishops offended; the Protestants grieved; and the Papists pleased, as hoping that those innovations might make way for greater changes.

May it therefore please your majesty, by such ways as your royal wisdom shall judge meet, effectually to prevent the imposing and using of such innovations for the future, that so, according to the pious intention of your royal grandfather king James of blessed memory, the public worship may be free, not only from blame, but from suspicion.

In obedience to your majesty's royal pleasure graciously signified to us, we have tendered to your most excellent majesty what we humbly conceive may most conduce to the glory of God, to the peace and reformation of the church, and to the taking away, not only of our differences, but the roots and causes of them. We humbly beg your majesty's favorable acceptance of these our loyal and conscientious endeavours to serve⁴ your majesty and the church of Christ, and your gracious pardon if in any thing or expression we answer not your majesty's expectation; professing before your majesty, and before the Lord, the searcher of hearts, that we have done nothing out of strife, vain glory, or emulation, but have sincerely offered what we apprehend most seasonable, as conducing to that happy end of unity and peace which your majesty doth so piously prosecute.

We humbly lay ourselves, and these our addresses, at your majesty's feet, professing our unfeigned resolution to live and die your majesty's faithful, loyal, and obedient subjects; and humbly implore your gracious majesty, according unto your princely wisdom and fatherly compassion, so to lay your hand upon the bleeding rents and divisions that are amongst us, that there may be a healing of them: so shall your throne be greater than the throne of your fathers; in your days the righteous shall flourish, peace shall run down like a river, and the generations to come shall call you blessed.

⁴ The words "your majesty and" are wanting in the Tanner MS.—
CARDWELL.

V.

*Archbishop Ussher's Model of Church Government.*¹—
Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Silvester, pp. 238—241.

By the order of the Church of England, all presbyters are charged to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this realm hath received the same. And that we might the better understand what the Lord had commanded therein, the exhortation of St. Paul to the elders of the church of Ephesus is appointed to be read unto them at the time of their ordination: “take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock, among whom the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to rule the congregation of God, which he hath purchased with his blood.”

Of the many elders, who in common thus ruled the church of Ephesus, there was one president, whom our Saviour, in his epistle to the church, in a peculiar manner stileth the angel of the church of Ephesus; and Ignatius, in another epistle, written about twelve years after, to the same church, calleth the bishop thereof: betwixt which bishop and the presbytery of the church, what an harmonious consent there was in the ordering of church government, the same Ignatius doth fully there declare; by the presbytery (with St. Paul) understanding the company of the rest of the presbytery or elders who then had a hand, not only in the delivery of the doctrine

¹ This reduction was published in 1658, after Archbishop Ussher's death, by Dr. Bernard. An unfinished MS. on the same subject, had been stolen out of his writing-desk, and printed early in 1641, with the following title, “The Directions of the Archbishop of Armagh concerning the Liturgy and “Episcopal Government,” which, upon complaint being made to the House of Commons by the Archbishop, that “it was most ingeniously fathered “upon him,” was suppressed by order of the House, dated 9th of February, 1640—1.—Life of . . . Ussher, by C. R. Elington, D.D., pp. 208—9.

and sacraments, but also in the administration of the discipline of Christ. For further proof whereof we have that known testimony of Tertullian in his general Apology for Christians. In the church are used exhortations, chastisements and divine censures; for judgment is given with great advice as among those who are certain they are in the sight of God, and it is the chiefest foreshewing of the judgment that is to come, if any man hath so offended that he be banished from the communion of prayer, and of the assembly, and of all holy fellowship.

The presidents that bear rule therein are certain approved elders who have obtained this honour, and not by reward, but by good report. Who were no other (as he himself elsewhere intimateth) but those from whose hands they used to receive the sacrament of the eucharist.

For with the bishop, who was the chief president, (and therefore styled by the same Tertullian in another place *Summus Sacerdos* for distinction sake,) the rest of the dispensers of the word and sacraments were joined in the common government of the church. And therefore in matters of ecclesiastical judicature, Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, used the received form of gathering together the presbytery.

Of what persons that did consist, Cyprian sufficiently declareth, when he wished him to read his letters to the flourishing clergy that there did preside or rule with him.

The presence of the clergy being thought to be so requisite in matters of episcopal audience that, in the fourth council of Carthage, it was concluded that the bishop might hear no man's cause without the presence of the clergy; which we find also to be inserted into the canons of Egbert, who was Archbishop of York in the Saxon times, and afterwards into the body of the canon law itself.

True it is, that in our church this kind of presbyterian government hath been long disused, yet, seeing it still professeth that every pastor hath a right to rule the church (from whence the name of rector also was given at first unto him) and to administer the discipline of Christ, as well as to

dispense the doctrine and sacraments :—and the restraint of the exercise of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in this realm :—no man can doubt but by another law of the land this hindrance may be well removed. And how easily this ancient form of government, by the united suffrages of the clergy, might be revived again, and with what little show of alteration the synodical conventions of the pastors of every parish might be accorded, with the presidency of the bishops of each diocese and province, the indifferent reader may quickly perceive by the perusal of the ensuing propositions.

1. In every parish the rector or the incumbent pastor, together with the churchwardens and sidemen, may every week take notice of such as live scandalously in that congregation, who are to receive such several admonitions and reproofs as the quality of their offence shall deserve; and if by this means they cannot be reclaimed, they may be presented unto the next monthly synod, and in the meantime be debarred by the pastor from access unto the Lord's table.

2. Whereas by a statute in the twenty-sixth of King Henry VIII, (revived in the first year of Queen Elizabeth,) suffragans are appointed to be erected in twenty-six several places of this kingdom, the number of them might very well be conformed unto the number of the several rural deaneries into which every diocese is subdivided, which being done, the suffragan (supplying the place of those who in the ancient church were called chorepiscopi) might every month assemble a synod of all the rectors, or incumbent pastors within the precinct, and according to the major part of their voices conclude all matters that should be brought into debate before them.

To this synod the rector and churchwardens might present such impenitent persons, as by admonition and suspension from the sacrament, would not be reformed; who, if they should still remain contumacious and incorrigible, the sentence of excommunication might be decreed against them by the synod, and accordingly be executed in the parish where they

lived. Hitherto also all things that concerned the parochial ministers might be referred, whether they did touch their doctrine or their conversation:—as also the censure of all new opinions, heresies, and schisms which did arise within that circuit, with liberty of appeal if need so require unto the diocesan synod.

3. The diocesan synod might be held once or twice in the year as it should be thought most convenient; therein all the suffragans and the rest of the rectors or incumbent pastors (or a certain select number out of every deanery within that diocese) might meet: with whose consent, or the major part of them, all things might be concluded by the bishop or superintendent (call him whether you will) or in his absence by one of the suffragans, whom he should depute in his stead to be moderator of that assembly. Here all matters of greater moment might be taken into consideration, and the orders of the monthly synods revised and (if need be) reformed. And if here also any matter of difficulty could not receive a full determination, it might be referred to the next provincial or national synod.

4. The provincial synod might consist of all the bishops and suffragans, and such of the clergy as should be elected out of every diocese within the province. The primate of either province might be the moderator of this meeting, (or in his room some one of the bishops appointed by him) and all matters be ordered therein by common consent as in the former assemblies. This synod might be held every third year, and if the parliament do then sit, (according to the act for a triennial parliament) both the primates and provincial synods of the laud might join together, and make up a national council; wherein all appeals from inferior synods might be received, all their acts examined, and all ecclesiastical constitutions which concern the state of the church of the whole nation established.

May it please your grace,

I would desire you to consider whether presentments are fit to be made by the churchwardens alone, and not rather by

the rector and churchwardens. Then whether in the diocesan synod the members of it be not too many, being all to judge, and in their own cause, as it may fall out. Therefore, after this clause, “and the rest of the rectors or incumbent pastors,” whether it be not fit to interline, “or four or six out of every deanery.”

RI. HOLDSWORTH.

We are of judgment, that the form of government here proposed is not in any point repugnant to the Scripture, and that the suffragans mentioned in the second proposition may lawfully use the power both of jurisdiction and ordination, according to the word of God, and the practice of the ancient church.

VI.

*Requests verbally presented to King Charles II in consequence of the Act for restoring the English Clergy.*¹—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, p. 241.

1. That with all convenient speed we may see his majesty's conclusions upon the proposals of the mutual condescencions, before they pass into resolves, and if it be thought meet, our brethrens proposals also.

2. That his majesty will publicly declare his pleasure for the suspension of proceedings, upon the Act of Uniformity,

¹ By the Act 12, Car. II, cap. 17, intituled “An act for confirming and restoring of ministers,” it was enacted that every minister presented to a benefice since the year 1642, (such benefice being then void) and being in possession of the same on the 25th of December, 1659, shall be adjudged the lawful incumbent; and any minister, formerly ejected, not having declared for the king's trial and execution, nor against infant-baptism, shall be restored to his benefice before the 25th of December, 1660, upon taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy.—Gibson's Codex, pp. 1070—4.

against Nonconformists in case of liturgy and ceremonies, till our hoped for agreement.

3. That his majesty will be pleased to publish his pleasure, (at least to those that are concerned in the execution) that (till the said expected settlement) no oath of canonical obedience, nor subscription to the liturgy, discipline, ceremonies, &c., nor renunciation of their ordination by mere presbyters, or confessing it to be sinful, be imposed on, or required of any, as necessary to their ordination, institution, induction, or confirmation by the seals.

4. That his majesty will cause the revoking of the broad seal that is granted to all those persons that by it are put into places where others have possession, to which none before could claim a right; that is, such as they call dead places.

5. That his majesty will be pleased to provide some remedy against the return or settlement of notoriously insufficient or scandalous ministers, into the places from which they were cast out, or into any other.

VII.

The Bishops' Answer to the first proposals of the London Ministers, who attempted the work of reconciliation.—Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 242—7.

CONCERNING THE PREAMBLE.

§¹ 1. We first observe, that they take it for granted, that there is a firm agreement between them and us in the doctrinal

¹ The §§ are inserted, as the subsequent Defence of their proposals by the Presbyterian divines refers to them.

truths of the reformed religion, and in the substantial parts of divine worship; and that the differences are only in some various conceptions about the ancient forms of church government, and some particulars about liturgy and ceremonies; which maketh all that follows the less considerable and less reasonable to be stood upon, to the hazard of the disturbance and peace of the church.

§ 2. They seem to intimate as if we did discountenance the practice of those things which, in principles, we allow; which we utterly deny.

In sundry particulars therein proposed, we do not perceive what farther security can be given, than is already provided for by the established laws of this realm; whercunto such persons as shall at any time find themselves aggrieved may have recourse for remedy.

§ 3. 1. We heartily desire (as well as they) that all animosities be laid aside; words of scorn, reproach, and provocation might be mutually forborne; and that, to men of different persuasions, such a liberty may be left of performing Christian duties according to their own way, within their own private families, as that yet uniformity in the public worship may be preserved, and that a gap be not thereby opened to sectaries for private conventicles: for the evil consequences whereof none can be sufficiently responsible unto the state.

§ 4. 2. We likewise desire that every congregation may have an able and godly minister to preach, catechise, administer the sacraments, and perform other ministerial offices as need shall require. But what they mean by residing, and how far they will extend that word, and what effectual provision of law can be made, more than is already done, concerning the things here mentioned, we know not.

§ 5. 3. Confirmation (which for sundry ends we think necessary to be continued in the church) if rightly and solemnly performed, will alone be sufficient as to the point of instruction. And for notorious and scandalous offenders, provision is made in the rubric before the communion; which rules, had they been carefully observed, the troubles of the church

by the disputes and divisions here mentioned had been prevented.

§ 6. 4. There cannot be taken a more effectual course in this behalf than the execution of the laws already made for the due observation of the Lord's day: which, in this particular, are very much stricter than the laws of any foreign reformed churches whatsoever.

CONCERNING CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

§ 7. They do not suggest, nor did we ever hear, any just reasons given for their dissent from the ecclesiastical Hierarchy or Prelacy, as it was stated and established in this kingdom: which we believe to be, for the main, the true ancient primitive episcopacy, and that to be more than a mere presidency of order. Neither do we find that the same was in any time balanced or managed by authoritative commixtion of Presbyters therewith: though it hath been then, and in all times since, usually exercised with the assistance and counsel of Presbyters in subordination to the Bishops.

§ 8. And we cannot but wonder that the administration of government by one single person, should by them be affirmed to be so liable to corruption, partialities, tyrannies, and other evils, that for the avoiding thereof it should be needful to have others joined with him in the power of government; which, if applied to the civil state, is a most dangerous insinuation. And we verily believe, what experience and the constitutions of kingdoms, armies, and even private families, sufficiently confirmeth (in all which the government is administered by the authority of one single person, although the advice of others may be requisite also; but without any share in the government) that the government of many is not only most subject to all the aforesaid evils and inconveniences, but more likely also to breed and foment perpetual factions both in Church and State, than the government by one is, or can be. And since no government can certainly prevent all evils, that which is liable to the least and fewest is certainly to be preferred.

AS TO THE FOUR PARTICULAR INSTANCES OF THINGS
AMISS, &c.

§ 9. 1. We cannot grant that the extent of any diocese is so great, but that a Bishop may well perform that, wherein the proper office and duty of a bishop doth consist; which is not the personal inspection of every man's soul under his government, (which is the work of every parochial minister in his cure) but the pastoral charge of overseeing, directing, and taking care that the ministers and other ecclesiastical officers within his diocese, do their several respective duties in their several stations as they ought to do. And if some dioceses shall be thought of too large extent, the bishops may have suffragan bishops to assist them, as the laws allow. It being a great mistake, that the personal inspection of the bishop is, in all places of his diocese, at all times necessary. For by the same reason, neither princes, nor governors of provinces, nor generals of armies, nor mayors of great cities, nor ministers of great parishes, could ever be able to discharge their duties in their several places and charges.

§ 10. 2. We confess the bishops did (as by the law they were enabled) depute part of the administration of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction to chancellors, commissaries, and officials, as men better skilled in the civil and canon laws. But, as for matters of more spiritual concernment, viz., the sentences of excommunication, and absolution, with other censures of the Church, we conceive they belong properly to the bishop to decree and pronounce, either by himself, where for the present he resideth, or by some grave ecclesiastical person by him surrogated for that purpose, in such places where he cannot be personally present. Wherein, if many things have been done amiss for the time past, or shall be seasonably conceived inconvenient for the future, we shall be as willing to have the same reformed and remedied, as any other persons whatsoever.

§ 11. 3. Whether a Bishop be a distinct order from Presbyter or not, or whether they have power of sole ordination or no? is

not now the question. But we are firm that the bishops of this realm have constantly (for aught we know, or have heard to the contrary) ordained with the assistance of presbyters, and the imposition of their hands, together with the bishops. And we conceive it very fit, that in the exercise of that part of their jurisdiction which appertaineth to the censures of the Church, they should likewise have the advice and assistance of some presbyters. And, for this purpose, the colleges of deans and chapters are thought to have been instituted, that the bishops in their several dioceses might have their advice and assistance in the administration of their weighty pastoral charge.

§ 12. 4. This last dependeth upon matter of fact. Wherein if any bishops have [done], or shall do, otherwise than according to law, they were and are to be answerable for the same. And it is our desire (as well as theirs) that nothing may be done or imposed by the bishop, but according to the known laws.

FOR REFORMING OF WHICH EVILS, &c.

§ 13. 1. The primate's Reduction, though not published in his lifetime, was formed many years before his death, and shewed to some persons (ready to attest the same) in the year 1640: but it is not consistent with two other discourses of the same learned Primate, (viz., the one of the Original of Episcopacy, and the other of the Original of Metropolitans,) both printed in the year 1641, and written with great diligence, and much variety of ancient learning. In neither of which is to be found any mention of the Reduction aforesaid. Neither is there in either of them propounded any such model of church government as in the said Reduction is contained; which doubtless would have been done, had that platform been according to his settled judgment in those matters.

In which Reduction there are sundry things (as, namely, the conforming of suffragans to the number of rural deaneries) which are apparently private conceptions of his own, accommodated, at that time, for the taking off some present

animosities; but wholly destitute of any color of testimony or precedent from antiquity; nor is any such by him offered towards the proof thereof.

And it would be considered, whether the final resolution of all ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction into a national synod, where it seemeth to be placed in that Reduction without naming the king, or without any dependence upon him, or relation to him, be not destructive of the king's supremacy in causes ecclesiastical.

It is observable, nevertheless, that even in the Reduction Archi-Episcopacy is acknowledged.

AS TO THE SUPER-ADDED PARTICULARS.

§ 14. 1. The appointment and election of suffragans, is by the law already vested in the king, whose power therein is, by the course here proposed, taken way.

§ 15. 2. What they mean by association in this place, they explain not; but we conceive it dangerous that any association (whatsoever is understood thereby) should be made or entered into without the king's authority.

§ 16. 3. We do not take the oaths, promises, and subscriptions, by law required, of ministers at their ordination, institution, &c., to be unnecessary, although they be responsible to the laws if they do amiss; it being thought requisite, as well by such cautions to prevent offences, as to punish offenders afterwards. Upon all which consideration it is, that officers in the court, freemen in cities and corporate towns, masters and fellows of colleges in the universities, &c., are required, at their admission into their several respective places, to give oaths for well and truly performing their several respective duties, their liableness to punishment in case of non-performance accordingly notwithstanding. Neither doth it seem reasonable that such persons—as have themselves, with great severity, prescribed and exacted antecedent conditions of their communion not warranted by law—should be exempted from the tie of such oaths and subscriptions as the laws require.

§ 17. 4. We agree that the Bishops, and all ecclesiastical governors, ought to exercise their government, not arbitrarily, but according to law.

5. And for security against such arbitrary government and innovations, the laws are, and from time to time will be, sufficient provision.

CONCERNING LITURGY.

§ 18. A liturgy, or form of public worship, being not only by them acknowledged lawful, but by us also (for the preservation of unity and uniformity) deemed necessary, we esteem the liturgy of the Church of England, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and by law established, to be such an one as is by them desired; according to the qualifications here mentioned, viz. :—

1. For matter agreeable to the Word of God, which we and all other lawful ministers within the Church of England, have, or, by the laws ought to have attested by our personal subscription.

2. Fitly suited to the nature of the several ordinances, and the necessities of the church.

3. Nor too tedious in the whole. It's well known that some men's prayers before and after sermon, have been usually not much shorter, and sometimes much longer than the whole church service.

4. Nor the prayers too short. The wisdom of the church, both in ancient and modern times, hath thought it a fitter means for relieving the infirmities of the meaner sort of people (which are the major part of most congregations) to contrive several petitions into sundry shorter collects or prayers, than to comprehend them all together in a continued style, or without interruption.

5. Nor the repetitions unmeet. There are examples of the like repetition frequent in the Psalms, and other parts of Scripture: not to mention the unhandsome tautologies that oftentimes happen, and can scarce be avoided, in the

extemporary and undigested prayers that are made; especially by persons of meaner gifts.

6. Nor the responsals. Which, if impartially considered, are pious ejaculations fit to stir up devotion, and good symbols of conformity betwixt the minister and people, and have been of very ancient practice and continuance in the church.

7. Nor too dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed churches. The nearer both their forms and ours come to the liturgy of the ancient Greek and Latin churches, the less are they liable to the objections of the common enemy. To which liturgies, if the form used in our church be more agreeable than those of other reformed churches, and that it were at all needful to make a change in either, it seemeth to be much more reasonable that their form should be endeavoured to be brought to a nearer conformity with ours, than ours with theirs; especially the form of our liturgy having been so signally approved by sundry of the most learned divines of the reformed churches abroad, as by very many testimonies in their writings may appear. And some of the compilers thereof have sealed the Protestant religion with their blood, and have been by the most eminent persons of those churches esteemed as martyrs for the same.

§ 19. As for that which followeth: neither can we think that too rigorously imposed which is imposed by law, and that with no more rigour than is necessary to make the imposition effectual (otherwise it could be of no use but to beget and nourish factions); nor are ministers denied the use and exercise of their gifts in praying before and after sermon, although such praying be but the continuance of a custom of no great antiquity, and grown into common use by sufferance only, without any other foundation in the laws or canons, and ought therefore to be used by all sober and godly men with the greatest inoffensiveness and moderation possible.

§ 20. If anything in the established liturgy shall be made appear to be justly offensive to sober persons, we are not at all unwilling that the same should be changed.

The discontinuance thereof, we are sure was not our fault. But we find by experience that the use of it is very much desired, where it is not; and the people generally are very well satisfied with it where it is used; which we believe to be a great conservatory of the chief heads of Christian religion, and of piety, charity, and loyalty in the hearts of the people.

We believe that the disuse thereof for sundry late years, hath been one of the great causes of the sad divisions in the church; and that the restoring the same, will be (by God's blessing) a special means of making up the breach; there being (as we have great cause to believe) many thousands more in the nation that desire it than dislike it.

Nevertheless, we are not against revising of the liturgy by such discreet persons as his majesty shall think fit to employ therein.

OF CEREMONIES.

§ 21. We conceive there needs no more to be said for justifying the imposition of the ceremonies by law established, than what is contained in the beginning of this section: which giveth a full and satisfactory answer to all that is alleged or objected in the following discourse, which is for the most part rather rhetorical than argumentative; inasmuch as lawful authority hath already determined the ceremonies in question to be decent and orderly, and to serve to edification; and consequently to be agreeable to the general rules of the word.

We acknowledge the worship of God to be in itself perfect in regard of essentials, which hindereth not but that it may be capable of being improved to us by addition of circumstantialia in order to decency and edification.

As the Lord hath declared himself jealous in matters concerning the substance of his worship, so hath he left the church at liberty for circumstantialia to determine concerning particulars according to prudence as occasion shall require, so as the foresaid general rules be still observed: and, therefore,

the imposing and using indifferent ceremonies is not varying from the will of God, nor is there made thereby any addition to, or detraction from, the holy duties of God's worship. Nor doth the same any way hinder the communication of God's grace or comfort in the performance of such duties.

§ 22. The ceremonies were never esteemed sacraments, or imposed as such; nor was ever any moral efficacy ascribed to them, nor doth the significancy (without which they could not serve to edification) import or infer any such thing.

§ 23. Ceremonies have been retained by most of the protestant churches abroad, which have rejected popery, and have been approved by the judgment of the most learned, even of those churches that have not retained them. Every national church being supposed to be the best and most proper judge what is fittest for themselves to appoint in order to decency and edification, without prescribing to other churches.

§ 24. That the ceremonies have been matter of contention in this or any other church was not either from the nature of the thing enjoined, or the enjoining of the same by lawful authority: but partly from the weakness of some men's judgments unable to search into the reason of things: and partly from the unsubduedness of some men's spirits, more apt to contend than willing to submit their private opinions, to the public judgment of the church.

§ 25. Of those who were obnoxious to the law, very few (in comparison) have been deprived, and none of them (for aught we know) but such as after admonition and long forbearance finally refused to do, what not only the laws required to be done, but themselves also formerly had solemnly, and (as they professed) willingly promised to do.

§ 26. We do not see with what conscience any man could leave the exercise of his ministry in his peculiar charge, for not submitting to lawful authority in the using of such things as were in his own judgment no more than inexpedient only. And it is certainly a great mistake, at the least, to call the submitting to authority in such things, a bringing the conscience under the power of them.

§ 27. The separation that hath been made from the church, was from the taking a scandal where none was given;—the church having fully declared her sense touching the ceremonies imposed, as things not in their nature necessary, but indifferent;—but was chiefly occasioned by the practice, and descended from the principles of those that refused conformity to the law, the just rule and measure of the churches unity.

§ 28. The nature of things being declared to be mutable, sheweth that they may therefore be changed, as they that are in authority shall see it expedient; but it is no proof at all that it is therefore expedient that it should be actually changed. Yet it is a sufficient caution against the opinion (or objection rather) of their being held by the imposers either necessary, or substantial of worship. Besides, this argument, if it were of any force, would infer an expediency of the often changing even of good laws, whereas the change of laws, although liable to some inconveniences, without great and evident necessity, hath been by wise men ever accounted a thing not only imprudent, but of evil, and sometimes pernicious consequence.

§ 29. We fully agree with them in the acknowledgment of the king's supremacy, but we leave it to his majesty's prudence and goodness to consider, whether for the avoiding of the offence of some of his weak subjects, he be any way obliged to repeal the established laws; the repealing whereof would be probably dissatisfactory to many more, and those (so far as we are able to judge) no less considerable a part of his subjects. Nor do we conceive his majesty by the apostle's either doctrine or example obliged to any farther condescension to particular persons, than may be subservient to the general and main ends of public government.

The Lord hath entrusted governors to provide, not only that things necessary in God's worship be duly performed, but also that things advisedly enjoined, though not otherwise necessary, should be orderly and duly observed. The too great neglect whereof would so cut the sinews of authority, that it would become first infirm, and then contemptible.

As we are no way against such tender and religious compassion in things of this nature, as his majesty's piety and wisdom shall think fit to extend ; so we cannot think that the satisfaction of some private persons is to be laid in the balance against the public peace and uniformity of the church.

CONCERNING PARTICULAR CEREMONIES.

§ 30. It being most convenient that in the act of receiving the Lord's supper one and the same gesture should be uniformly used by all the members of this church ; and kneeling having been formerly enjoined and used therein, as a gesture of greatest reverence and devotion, and so most agreeable to that holy service ; and holy-days of human institution having been observed by the people of God in the Old Testament, and by our blessed Saviour himself in the Gospel, and by all the churches of Christ in primitive and following times, as apt means to preserve the memorials of the chief mysteries of the Christian religion ; and such holy-days being also fit times for the honest recreation of servants, labourers, and the meaner sort of people :—

For these reasons, and the great satisfaction of far the greatest part of the people, we humbly desire (as a thing in our judgment very expedient) that they may both be still continued in the church.

§ 31. As for the other three ceremonies, viz., the surplice, cross after baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus ; although we find not here any sufficient reason alleged why they should be utterly abolished : nevertheless, how far forth in regard of tender consciences a liberty may be thought fit to be indulged to any, his majesty, according to his great wisdom and goodness, is best able to judge.

§ 32. But why they that confess that, in the judgment of all, the things here mentioned are not to be valued with the peace of the church, should yet, after they are established by law, disturb the peace of the church about them, we understand not.

§ 33. We heartily desire that no innovations should be brought into the church, or ceremonies which have no foundation in the laws of the land imposed, to the disturbance of the peace thereof: but that all men would use that liberty that is allowed them in things indifferent, according to the rules of Christian prudence, charity, and moderation.

§ 34. We are so far from believing that his majesty's condescending to these demands will take away not only differences, but the roots and causes of them, that we are confident it will prove the seminary of new differences, both by giving dissatisfaction to those that are well pleased with what is already established; who are much the greater part of his majesty's subjects; and by encouraging unquiet spirits when these things shall be granted, to make further demands. There being no assurance by them given, what will content all Dissenters: than which nothing is more necessary for the settling of a firm peace in the church.

VIII.

*A Defence of our Proposals to His Majesty for Agreement in Matters of Religion.*¹ — *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, pp. 248—58.

CONCERNING THE PREAMBLE.

1. We are not insensible of the great danger of the church, through the doctrinal errors of many of those with whom we

¹ When the presbyterian divines had received from the bishops the foregoing answer to their proposals, instead of a statement of concessions which they were expecting, "the brethren," says Baxter, "at first desired me to write an answer to it. But afterwards they considered that this would but provoke them, and turn a treaty for concord into a sharp disputation, which would increase the discord; and so what I had written was never seen by any man: lest it should hinder peace."—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, pp. 241—2.

are at difference, also, about the points of government and worship now before us. But yet we choose to say of the *party*, that we are agreed in doctrinals, because they subscribe the same Holy Scriptures, and Articles of Religion, and Books of Homilies as we do. And the contradictions to their own confessions, which too many are guilty of, we thought not just to charge upon the party; because it is but personal guilt. As to the differences (which in charity and for peace, we had rather extenuate than aggravate;) it is of objective conceptions that we speak, there being a difference in the things, as well as in our apprehensions. And we conceive that *the ancient form of church-government, and the soundness of the liturgy, and freedom from corrupting unlawful ceremonies*, are matters that are worthy a conscionable regard: and no such little inconsiderable things as to be received without sufficient trial, or used against the dissuasions of our consciences. No sin should seem so small as to be wilfully committed; especially to divines. He that will sin for little or nothing, is not to be trusted when he hath great temptations. “Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do, and teach them the same, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven:” Matt. v, 19. And whether the imposer or the forbearers do hazard and disturb the church, the nature of the thing declareth. To you it is indifferent before your imposition; and therefore you may, without any regret of your own consciences, forbear the imposition, or persuade the law-makers to forbear it. But to many of those that dissent from you, they are sinful; and therefore cannot be yielded to by them without the wilful violation of their duty to the absolute Sovereign of the world. If, in the church of Rome, the conscience of a subject forbid the use of crucifixes, and images, and chrism, and holy water, &c., is it therefore they, or is it the pastors, that needlessly impose these things that are the disturbers of the church? The princes might have forborne to make a law restraining Daniel three days from prayer; but

Daniel could not forbear praying three days, though the law commanded it: and which of them then was the disturber of the peace? If you say that we are wilful, and our consciences are peevish and misinformed; charity and modesty requireth you not to overvalue your own, or groundlessly vilify the judgments and consciences of your brethren. We study as hard as you; and are ready to join with you in the solemnest protestations, as before the Lord, that we are earnestly desirous to know the truth; and we suppose we stand on the calmer side the hedge, in point of temptation: for if we err it is to our cost and loss, and have little but reproach and suffering to entice us willingly to mistake. And we are always ready to try by argument which side it is that is mistaken.

2. May not we crave that necessary things may be secured to us, without being interpreted to seem to insinuate accusations against you? As it is not the authors of this Answer personally considered, that we could be imagined to accuse, because we know them not; so there are others, besides the party with whom we are seeking a reconciliation, that may be averse to the practice of those things about which divines are doctrinally agreed in, especially that part of the vulgar who are, practically, of no religion. And it is very displeasing to us to be called out to an accusation of others; as being a course that will tend more to exasperate than reconcile. Fain we would have had leave to petition for our liberty and for the security of religion, without accusing any of being injurious to it. But it is the unhappy advantage of those that are uppermost, that they can cut out at pleasure such work for those that they would use as adversaries, that shall either make them seem their adversaries, or appear to be really the adversaries or betrayers of the truth, and cast them upon inconveniences and odium which way soever they go. But to be plain with you, if you would but agree with us in the practising, and promoting the practice of, those things about which you profess to be agreed in principles, our differences in all other things would quickly be at an end. The great con-

troversy between the hypocrite and the true Christian,—whether we should be serious in the practice of the religion which we commonly profess?—hath troubled England more than any other: none being more hated and derided as Puritans, than those that will make religion their business, and make it predominant in their hearts and lives; while others that hate them, take it up in custom, for fashion, or in jest, and use it only in subserviency to the will of man and their worldly ends, and honour it with compliments, and paint the skin while they stab the heart. Reconcile this difference, and most others will be reconciled.

3. Whether this signify any repentance for the voluminous reproaches which many of you have written against those you call Puritans, your amendment will interpret. That you will give us liberty in our family duties alone is a courtesy that you cannot well deny a Papist or Mahometan, because you have there no witnesses of what they do; and yet we shall take ourselves beholden for it, so low are our expectations. But is there no duty that private Christians owe to one another, for the furthering their salvation, but only for their several families? Why may not those that, on the Lord's day, repeat a sermon in their families, admit a neighbour family to be present, which is not able to help themselves? A great part of the families among the poor are composed of such as can neither write nor read, and therefore know not how to spend the Lord's day when they are out of the congregation: and a sermon forgotten will hardly be so well practised as if it were remembered; and the ignorant will hardly remember it if they never hear it but once. At least, methinks, it should be an encouragement to you, when you have studied what to say to the people (rather than matter of offence) to see them so far value it, as to desire to fasten it in their memories. And if several families join also in the singing of psalms of praise to God, and calling on him for a blessing on the minister and themselves, is this a crime: when perhaps most of those families either cannot pray at all, or not with such cheerful advantage, by themselves? If you are against such

mutual helps as these, you are against the benefit of the people's souls: the Lord pity the flocks that have such pastors! If you are not against them, why are you against our desires of encouragement in them? Have the laws of the land secured any of these to us against your canons? If they have, why have so many families formerly been undone, for such exercises as these, and for fasting and praying together for the pardon of their sins? To deal freely with you, we are constrained so well to know with whom we have to do, that our business is to request you of the clergy, not to provoke the law-givers to make any law against this: that it may not become a crime to men, to pray together, and provoke one another to love, and to good works; when it is no crime to talk, and play, and drink, and feast together. And that it may be no crime to repeat a sermon together, unless you resolve that they shall hear none which is worth their repeating and remembering. And whereas you speak of opening a gap to sectaries for private conventicles, and the evil consequences to the state, we only desire you to avoid also the cherishing of ignorance and profaneness, and suppress all sectaries, and spare not, in a way that will not suppress the means of knowledge and godliness. As you will not forbid all praying or preaching, lest we should have sectarian prayers or sermons, so let not all the people of the land be prohibited such assistance to each other's souls, as nature and scripture oblige them to, and all for fear of the meetings of sectaries. We thought the cautions in our petition were sufficient, when we confined it *subjectively to those of our flocks, and objectively to their duties of exhorting and provoking one another to love and to good works, and of building up one another in their most holy faith, and, only by religious peaceable means, of furthering each other in the ways of eternal life: and for the order, they being not opposite to church assemblies (but subordinate,) nor refusing the guidance and inspection of their pastors (who may be sometime with them and prescribe them their work and way, and direct their actions,) and being responsible for what they do or say (their doors being open)*

there will not want witnesses against them, if they do amiss. And is not all this enough to secure you against the fear of sectaries, unless all such helps and mutual comforts be forbidden to all that are no sectaries? This is but as the papists do in another case, when they deny people liberty to read the Scriptures lest they make men heretics or sectaries. And for the *danger of the state*, cannot men plot against it in ale-houses, or taverns, or fields, or under pretence of horse races, hunting, bowls, or other occasions, but only under pretence of worshipping God? If they may, why are not all men forbidden to feast, or bowl, or hunt, &c., lest sectaries make advantage of such meetings, as well as to fast and pray? God and wise men know that there is something more in all such jealousies of religious duties.

§ 4. Do you really desire that every congregation may have an able, godly minister? Then cast not out those many hundreds or thousands that are approved such, for want of re-ordination, or for doubting whether diocesans, with their chancellors, &c., may be subscribed to; and set not up ignorant ungodly ones in their places. Otherwise the poor undone churches of Christ will no more believe you in such professions, than we believed that those men intended the king's just power and greatness, who took away his life.

But you *know not what we mean by residence, nor how far we will extend that word*. The word is so plain, that it is easily understood by those that are willing: but he that would not know, cannot understand, as King Charles told Mr. Henderson. I doubt the people will quickly find that you did not understand us. And yet I more fear lest many a parish will be glad of non-residence, even if priest and curate and all were far enough from them, through whose fault I say not.

§ 5. Two remedies you give us instead of what we desired for the reformation of church-communion:

1. You say, *confirmation if rightfully and solemnly performed will alone be sufficient as to the point of instruction*. Answer; but what we desired was necessary to the right and solemn

performance of it. Doth not any man that knoweth what hath been done in England, and what people dwell there, know that there are not more ignorant people in this land than such as have had, and such as desire episcopal confirmation? Is it *sufficient in point of instruction*, for a bishop to come among a company of little children and other people, whom he never saw before, and of whom he never heard a word, and of whom he never asketh a question which may inform him of their knowledge or life: and presently to lay his hands on them in order, and hastily say over a few lines of prayer, and so dismiss them? I was confirmed by honest Bishop Morton, with a multitude more, who all went to it as a May-game, and kneeled down, and he dispatched us with that short prayer so fast, that I scarce understood one word he said; much less did he receive any certificate concerning us, or ask us any thing which might tell him whether we were Christians; and I never saw nor heard of much more done by any English bishop in his course of confirmation. If you say that more is required in the rubric, I say then it is no crime for us to desire it.

2. And for your provision in the other rubric against scandalous communicants, it enableth not the minister to put away any one of them all, save only the malicious that will not just then be reconciled. Be not angry with us, if in sorrow of heart, we pray to God that his churches may have *experienced pastors*, who have spent much time in serious dealing with every one of their parishes personally, and know what they are and what they need, instead of men that have conversed only with books, and the houses of great men; or, when they do sometimes stoop to speak to the ignorant, do but talk to them of the market or the weather, or ask them, what is their name.

§ 6. To your Answer we reply—those laws may be well made stricter. They hindered not the imposition of a book, to be read by all ministers in the churches, for the people's liberty for dancing, and other such sports, on the Lord's day; and this in the king's name; to the ejecting or suspending of those

ministers that durst not read it. And those laws which we have may be more carefully executed. If you are ignorant how commonly the Lord's day is profaned in England by sporting, drinking, revelling, and idleness, you are sad pastors that no better know the flock: if you know it, and desire not the reformation of it, you are yet worse. Religion never prospered anywhere so much, as where the Lord's days have been most carefully spent in holy exercises.

CONCERNING CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

§ 7. Had you well read but Gersom, Bucer, Didoclavius, Parker, Baynes, Salmasius, Blondell, &c., yea, of the few lines in Bishop Ussher's Reduction which we have offered you, or what I have written of it in Disp. 1. of Church Government; you would have seen *just reason given for our dissent from the ecclesiastical hierarchy as stated in England*; and have known that it is unlike the primitive episcopacy. But if that which must convince you, must be brought nearer your eyes, by God's help we undertake to do that fully whenever we are called to it.

§ 8. The words which you here except against, with admiration, of *the corruptions, partialities, tyranny*, which Church Government by a single person is liable to, was taken by us out of the book commonly ascribed to King Charles himself, called *Icon. Basil.*, but we purposely suppress his name to try whether you would not be as bitter against his words, as against ours; and did not esteem *fidem per personas, non personas per fidem*.

And further we reply, it is one thing for a bishop to rule alone when there are no presbyters, or to rule the presbyters themselves alone; and another thing when he hath presbyters yet to rule all the flock alone; for by this means, he *quoad exercitium* at least degradeth all the rest, or changeth their office, which is to guide as well as to teach; as, if the general of an army, or the colonel of a regiment should rule all the soldiers alone, doth he not then depose all his captains,

lieutenants, cornets, corporals, sergeants, &c.? But especially, it is one thing for Ignatius his bishop of one church that hath but *one altar*, to rule *it alone*, (though yet he commandeth the people to obey their presbyters,) and another thing for an *English diocesan* to rule *a thousand such churches* alone! And when all is done, do they rule alone indeed? Or doth not a *lay-chancellor* exercise the keys, so far as is necessary to suppress private meetings for fasting and prayer, &c., and to force all to the sacrament, and enforce the ceremonies, and some such things? And for the great discipline it is almost altogether left undone. We are sorry that you should be able to be ignorant of this : or, if you know it, that such camels stick not with you, but go down so easily.

INSTANCES OF THINGS AMISS.

§ 9. 1. That which you cannot grant (that the dioceses are so great) you would quickly grant if you had ever conscientiously tried the task which Dr. Hammond described as the bishop's work ; yea, but for one parish, or had ever believed Ignatius and other ancient descriptions of a bishop's church.

But is it faithful dealing with your brethren, or your consciences (pardon our freedom in so weighty a ease,) to dispute as though you made a bishop but an archbishop to see by a general inspection of the parish pastors that they do their office, and as if they only *ruled the rulers* of the particular flocks (which you know we never strove against,) when as no knowing Englishman can be ignorant that our bishops have the *sole government of pastors and people*, having taken all jurisdiction or proper government (or next all) from the particular pastors of the parishes, to themselves alone? Is not the question rather as whether the king can rule all the kingdom by the chancellor, or a few such officers, without all the justices and mayors ; or whether one schoolmaster shall only rule a thousand schools and all the other schoolmasters only teach them? You know that the *depriving of all the parish pastors of the keys of government* is the matter of our greatest

controversies: not as it is *any hurt to them*, but to the church, and *certain* exclusion of all true discipline. And whether the office of the bishops of particular churches *infimi ordinis, vel gradus*, be not for personal inspection and ministration, as well as the office of a schoolmaster or physician, you will better know when you come to try it faithfully, or answer fearfully for unfaithfulness. We know that the knowing Lord Bacon, in his Considerations, saith so as well as we.

And for what you say of *suffragans*, you know there are none such.

§ 10. 2. We are glad that in so great a matter as lay-chancellors' exercise of the keys in excommunications and absolutions, you are forced plainly, and without any excuse, to confess the errors of the way of government. And let this stand on record before the world to justify us when we shall be silenced, and reproached as schismatics, for the desiring of the reformation of such abuses, and for not swearing canonical obedience to such a government.

§ 11. 3. And you have almost as little to say in this case. Mark, reader, that we must all be silenced, and cast out of our offices, if we subscribe not to the book of ordination *ex animo*, as having nothing contrary to the word of God; and the very preface of that beginneth with the affirmation of this *distinction of orders, offices, functions*, from the apostles' days, and one of the prayers ascribeth it to the Spirit of God; and yet now it is here said that, *whether a bishop be a distinct order from a presbyter or not, is none of the questions*. That must be none of the question when the king calleth them to treat for a reconciliation or unity, which will be out of question against us when we are called to *subscribe*, or are to be forbidden to preach the gospel!

And let what is here confessed for presbyters' assistance in ordination, stand on record against them when it is neglected or made an insignificant ceremony.

§ 12. 4. In the last also you give up your cause, and yet it's well if you will amend it. Whether the canons be laws

let the lawyers judge: and whether all the bishops' Books of Articles (as against making Scripture our table talk, and many such others) be either laws, or according to law, let the world judge.

THE REMEDIES OFFERED FOR REFORMING THESE EVILS.

§ 13. 1. Whereas to avoid all exception, or frustrating contentions or delays, we offered only Bishop Ussher's Platform (subscribed also by Dr. Holdsworth) that the world might see that it is episcopacy itself that we plead for; you tell us that it *was formed many years before his death, and is not consistent with two other of his discourses*: in which either you would intimate that he contradicteth himself, and could not speak consistently, or that he afterward retracted this Reduction. For the first, we must believe that many men can reconcile their own writings, when some readers cannot, as better understanding themselves than others do; and that this reverend bishop was no such raw novice, as not to know when he contradicted himself in so public and practical a case, as a frame of church government; nor was he such a hypocrite as to play fast and loose in the things of God: but upon debate we undertake to vindicate his writings from this aspersion of inconsistency; only you must not take him to mean that all was well done, which, as an historian, he saith was done. And as to any retraction, one of us (myself) is ready to witness that he owned it not long before his death, as a collection of fit terms to reconcile the moderate in these points, and told him that he offered it the late king.

And whereas you tell us that the *conforming of suffragans to rural deaneries*, and other such, are *his private conceptions, destitute of any testimony of antiquity*, we answer—No marvel, when rural deaneries were unknown to true antiquity, and when in the ancientest church, every church had its proper bishop, and every bishop but one church, that had also but one altar. But surely the chorepiscopi were no strangers

to antiquity, as may appear (before the Council at Nice) in *Concil. Ancyran.* Can. 12, and in *Concil. Antiochin.* Can. 10, &c. It was unknown in the days of Ignatius and Justin Martyr, that a church should be as large as a rural deanery, containing a dozen churches with altars, that had none of them peculiar bishops: but it was not strange then that every church had a bishop; and if it were rural, a chorepiscopus. As also you may gather even from Clemens Romanus.

The quarrel which you pick with the archbishop's Reduction for not naming the king, as if he destroyed his supremacy, is such as a low degree of charity, with a little understanding, might easily have prevented. Either you know that it is the power of the keys, (called spiritual and proper ecclesiastical,) and not the coercive power *circa ecclesiastica*, which the archbishop speaketh of, and all our controversy is about, or you do not know it. If you do know it, either you think this power of the keys is resolved into the king, or not: if you do think so, you differ from the king, and from all yourselves that ever we talked with, and you contradict all protestant princes, that have openly disclaimed any such power, and published this to the world, to stop the mouths of calumniating papists: and we have heard the king, and some of you disclaim it: and how can you then fitly debate these controversies, that differ from all protestant kings, and from the church! But if you yourselves do not so think, had you a pen that would charge the archbishop for destroying the king's supremacy, for asserting nothing but what the king and you maintain? And if you knew not that this spiritual power of the keys, as distinct from magistratical coercive power, is the subject of our controversy, we dispute to good purpose indeed with men that know not what subject it is that we are to dispute about! So that which way soever it go, you see how it is like to fall; and how men that are out of the dust and noise will judge of our debates. And here we leave it to the notice and observation of posterity, upon the perusal of all your exceptions, how little the English bishops had to say against the form of primitive episcopacy contained in

Archbishop Ussher's Reduction, in the day when they rather choose the increase of our divisions, the silencing of many hundred faithful ministers, the scattering of the flocks, the afflicting of so many thousand godly Christians, than the accepting of this primitive episcopacy; which was the expedient which those called presbyterians offered, never once speaking for the cause of presbytery; and what kind of peacemakers and conciliators we met with, when both parties were to meet at one time and place with their several concessions for peace and concord ready drawn up, and the presbyterians in their concessions laid by all their cause, and proposed an archbishop's frame of episcopacy: and the other side brought not in any of their concessions at all, but only unpeaceably rejected all the moderation that was desired.

Lastly, they here desire it may be observed that in this Reduction, archiepiscopacy is acknowledged: and we shall also desire that it may be observed, that we never put in a word to them against archbishops, metropolitans or primates, and yet we are very far from attaining any peace with them.

And we desire that it may be observed also, that understanding with whom we had to do, we offered them not that which we approved ourselves as the best, but that which we would submit to, as having some consistency with the discipline and order of the church, which was our end.

OF THE SUPER-ADDED PARTICULARS.

§ 14. 1. This is scarce serious: the primate's suffragans or chorepiscopi are rural deans, or as many for number: the suffragans you talk of by law are other things, about sixteen in all the land. The king's power is about the choice of them as human officers; but, as pastors of the church or bishops, the churches had the choice for a thousand years after Christ, through most of the Christian world. And what if it be in the king's power: is it not the more reasonable that the king be petitioned to in the business? The king doth not choose every rural dean himself: and is it any

more destructive of his power to do it by the synods, than by the diocesan? This use the name and power of kings is made of by some kind of men, to make a noise against all that cross their domination, but all that is exercised by themselves is no whit derogatory to royalty. And yet how many men have been excommunicated for refusing to answer in the Chancellors' courts, till they profess to sit there by the king's authority?

§ 15. We much doubt whether you designed to read the archbishop's Reduction when you answered our papers. If you did not, why would you choose to be ignorant of what you answered, when so light a labour might have informed you? If you did, how could you be ignorant of what we meant by *Associations*, when you saw that such as our rural deaneries was the thing spoken of, and proposed by the Reduction? And 1. Are the rural deaneries, think you, without the king's authority? If not, what mean you by such intimations, unless you would make men believe that we breathe treason, as oft as we breathe, as the soldier charged the countryman for whistling treason, when he meant to plunder him? 2. And what though associations may not be entered into without the king's authority: do you mean that therefore we may not thus desire his authority for them? If you do not, to what sense or purpose is this answer? Sure we are, that for three hundred years, when magistrates were not Christian, there was preaching, prayers, and associating in particular churches hereunto without the king's authority, and also associating in synods: and after that, for many a hundred year, the Christian magistrates confirmed and overruled such associations, but never overthrew them, or forbad them.

§ 16. But the apostles of Christ, and all his churches for many hundred years, thought all these subscriptions and oaths unnecessary; and never prescribed, nor required either them or any such; so unhappy is the present church in the happy understandings of these men of yesterday, that are wiser than Christ, his apostles, and universal church, and

have at last found out these necessary oaths and subscriptions. And you are not quite mistaken: necessary they are, to set up those that shall rule by constraint as lords over God's heritage, and necessary engines for the dividing and persecuting of the church. But judge thou, O Lord, according to thy righteousness, in the day which is coming!

But the examples of corporations and colleges are brought in, who prevent offences by subscriptions and oaths. And even so hath Christ (whose spirit would impose nothing on the churches but things necessary) appointed a vow and solemn covenant to be the way of entrance into his church: and the apish spirit which followeth him (to counterwork him) by the addition of human churches, sacraments, and ordinances, doth also imitate him in making their oaths and promises necessary to engage men to their service and institutions, as Christ hath made baptism necessary to engage us to his service and institutions. And your arguments for diocesans are so weak, that we wonder not that you think both oaths, subscriptions, prisons, confiscations, and banishments, necessary to enforce them.

What you add of *such persons as have themselves enacted conditions of their communion not warranted by law*, we understand not: either the law warranteth men to own Christ for their Saviour, and to own their own membership in the particular church which they demand constant communion with, or it doth not. If it do not, we have reason to desire more than is warranted by that law. If it do, you should have done well to instance what persons and what exactions you mean. If you speak this of all the churches of the land that dislike your prelacy, it is too gross an untruth to have been uttered in the light. If you speak only of some persons or parties, that is no reason why others should be deprived of their liberty and ministry. Nor indeed is it good arguing that such oaths and subscriptions as the church of old did never know, may be imposed by the laws of men, because some brethren have lately required such conditions of their communion, as are imposed by the laws of God.

But let us prevail with you to drive this no further than the persons, whoever they be, did drive it whom you blame: their utmost penalty on the refusers of their conditions was non-communion with them; a thing which many of you voluntarily choose. Let this be all our penalty for refusing your oaths and subscriptions (if we can get no better from you:) but shall we be silenced, imprisoned, confiscated, banished, for refusing your oaths and subscriptions, because somebody imposed things which the law allowed not in order to their own communion? These are no fit proportions of justice.

§ 17. Out of your own mouths then is your government condemned. What act of parliament ratified your canons? What law imposed altars, rails, and the forcing of ministers to read the book for dancing on the Lord's days? Or what law did ratify many articles of your visitation books? And did the laws sufficiently provide for all those poor ministers that were silenced or suspended for not reading the dancing book, or any such things? What the better were all those for the laws that were silenced, or driven into foreign lands? But perhaps the laws will provide for us indeed as you desire.

CONCERNING THE LITURGY.

§ 18. 1. The doctrine is sound. But the apocryphal matter of your lessons in Tobith, Judith, Bell and the Dragon, &c., is scarce agreeable to the Word of God.²

2. Whether it be fitly suited, let our exceptions and other papers be heard before your judgment go for infallible.

3. What men's prayers you take your measure or encouragement from, we know not: but we are sure that if all the common prayers be twice a day read, the time for psalms and sermons will be short. And yet were they free from disorder and defectiveness in matter, we could the better bear with the length, though other prayers and sermons were partly excluded by them.

² This is spoken of the old Common Prayer Book, and not of the new, where the doctrine in point of infants' salvation is changed.

4. Though we live in the same country, we scarce differ any where more than in our very experiences. Our experience unresistably convinceth us, that a continued prayer doth more to help most of the people and carry on their desires, than turning almost every petition into a distinct prayer; and making prefaces and conclusions to be near half the prayers. And if the way of prayer recorded in Scripture (even in the Jews' church, where infirmity might be pleaded more than now) were such as yours, we shall say no more in that against it: but if it were not, be not wise then overmuch.

5. We are content that the liturgy have such repetitions as the scriptures have, so it may have no other! And we are content that all extemporate prayer be restrained which is guilty of as much tautology and vain repetition as the liturgy is: if this much will satisfy you we are agreed.

6. Nor are we against any such responsals as are fit to the ends you mention: if ours are all such (upon impartial examination) let them stand.

7. But the question is, 1. Whether the Greek and Latin Churches in the three first ages, or those of later ages, be more imitable? 2. And, whether the other reformed churches have not more imitated the ancientest of those churches, though we have more imitated the latter and more corrupt? 3. And, whether our first work be to stop the papists' mouths by pleasing them or coming too near them, when we know they that are likest them in all their corruptions please them best? Yet are we not for any unnecessary difference from them, or affectation of causeless singularity.

As to the reformed churches' testimony of our liturgy, shall their very charity become our snare? If they had liked our form of prayers best, they would some of them have imitated us. And our martyrs no doubt, they honoured as we do, not as suffering for the modes and ceremonies of that book, as opposite to the reformed churches' mode (for so they suffered not); but as suffering for the sound doctrine and true worship of the Protestants, as opposite to Popery and the mass.

§ 19. Your reasons to prove your impositions not too

rigorous, are 1. Because they are *by law*: if we tell you that so is the Spanish Inquisition, you'll say, we compare our law-givers to the Spaniards: if we say that your new mentioned martyrs were burnt by law in England, you'll say that we compare them to Papists. But all these are laws: and so are those in reformed countries which are against bishops and ceremonies: do you therefore think them not too rigorous? 2. Your other reason is that the *rigour is no more than is necessary to make the imposition effectual*. You never spake words more agreeable to your hearts, as far as by your practices we can judge of them. Either you mean effectual to change men's judgments, or effectual to make them go against their judgments, or effectual to rid them out of the land or world. The first you know they are unfit for; if you think otherwise, would you that your judgments should have such kind of helps to have set them right? The second way they will be effectual with none but wicked men and hypocrites, who dare sin against their consciences for fear of men: and is it worth so much ado to bring the children of the devil into your church? The third way of efficacy, is but to kill or banish all the children of God that are not of your opinion: for it is they that dare not sin against conscience whatever they suffer: and this is but such an efficacy as the Spanish Inquisition and Queen Mary's bonfires had, to send those to God whom the world is not worthy of. You know every man that is true to his God and his conscience, will never do that which he taketh to be sin, till his judgment is changed: and therefore, with such, it can be no lower than blood, or banishment, or imprisonment at least, that is the efficacy which you desire: and if no such rigour be too much, its pity the French, that murdered 30,000 or 40,000 at their Bartholomew days, or as Dr. Peter Moulin saith, 100,000 within a few weeks, and the Irish that murdered 200,000 had not a better cause: for they took the most effectual way of rigour.

But when God maketh inquisition for the blood of his servants, he will convince men that such rigour was too much,

and that their wrath did not fulfil his righteousness. You shew your kindness to men's praying in the pulpit without your book: make good what you say, that such praying is of no great antiquity and we will never contradict you more! Or if we prove it not the ancientest way of praying in the Christian church, we will give you leave to hang, or banish us, for not subscribing to the Common Prayer Book: which the apostles used, and which was imposed on the church for some hundred years. But it seems you think that we are beholden to mere sufferance without law or canon for conceived prayers. How long then it will be suffered we know not, if we must live by your patience.

§ 20. It seemeth that our converse and yours much differ: the most that we know or meet with had rather be without the liturgy: and you say, that the people are generally well satisfied with it. By this time they are of another mind. If it were so we take it for no great honour to it; considering what the greater number are in most places, and of what lives those persons are (of our parishes and acquaintance generally or for the most part) who are for it: or what those are that are against it, and whom for its sake you desire your effectual rigour may be exercised against. The Lord prepare them to undergo it innocently!

§ 21. Doth there *need no more to be said for the ceremonies?* How little will satisfy some men's consciences! Lawful authority hath in other countries cast out the same bishops and ceremonies which are here received. Doth it follow that they are good in one country, and disorderly and undecent in another? or that our authority only is infallible in judging of them?

Is not God's worship perfect without our ceremonies, in its integrals as well as its essentials?

As for circumstantials when you saw us allow of them, you need not plead for them as against us. But the question is, whether our additions be not more than circumstances.

§ 22. We suppose that you give all to the cross in baptism which is necessary to a human sacrament: and this we are ready to try by just dispute.

When you say that *never was moral efficacy ascribed to them*, you seem to give up all your cause: for by denying this ascribed efficacy, you seem to grant them unlawful if it be so: and if it be not so let us bear the blame of wronging them. The informing and exciting the dull mind of man in its duty to God, is a moral effect from moral efficacy. But the informing and exciting the dull mind of man, in its duty to God, is an effect ascribed to our ceremonies: *ergo.*, a moral effect from moral efficacy is ascribed to our ceremonies. The major cannot be denied by any man that knoweth what a moral effect and efficacy is: that which worketh not *per modum naturæ in genere causæ efficientis naturalis* only, but *per modum objecti, vel in genere causæ finalis*, upon the mind of man, doth work morally: but so do our ceremonies: *ergo*—sure the Arminians that deny all proper physical operations of God's Spirit, as well as his Word, and reduce all to moral efficacy, will not say that ceremonies have such a physical efficacy more than moral. And if not so, the good effects here mentioned can be from no lower efficacy than moral. And the minor which must be denied, is in the words of the preface to the Common Prayer Book, and therefore undeniable. The Word of God itself worketh but *moraliter proponendo objectum*, and so do our ceremonies.

§ 23. There is a great difference between sacramental ceremonies, and mere circumstances, which the reformed churches keep. These we confound not, and could have wished you would not. Our cross in baptism is *a dedicating sign*, (saith the canon) *or transient image, made in token that this child shall not be ashamed of Christ crucified, but manly fight under his banner against the flesh, the world, and the devil, and continue Christ's faithful servant and soldier to his life's end.* So that 1. It is a dedicating sign, performed by the minister, and not by the person himself, as a bare professing sign is. 2. It engageth the party in a relation to Christ *as his soldier and servant.* 3. And in the duties of this relation against all our enemies, as the *sacramentum militare* doth a soldier to his general; and that in plainer and fuller words

than are annexed to baptism. 4. And it is no other than the covenant of grace or of Christianity itself, which this sacrament of the cross doth enter us into, as baptism also doth. It is not made a part of baptism, nor called a sacrament, but as far as we can judge, made essentially a human sacrament adjoined to baptism. The reformed churches which use the cross, we mean the Lutherans, yet use it not in this manner.

§ 24. This is but your unproved assertion, that the fault was not in the ceremonies, but in the contenders: we are ready to prove the contrary: but if it had been true, how far are you from Paul's mind, expressed Rom. xiv and xv; and 1 Cor. viii. You will let your weak brother perish, and spare not, so you can but charge the fault on himself; and lay stumbling blocks before him, and then save him by your effectual rigour, by imprisonment or punishment.

§ 25. Those seem a few to you that seem many to us. Had it been but one hundred such as Cartwright, Amesius, Bradshaw, Parker, Hildersham, Dod, Nicolls, Langley, Paget, Hering, Baynes, Bates, Davenport, Hooker, Wilson, Cotton, Norton, Shephard, Cobbet, Ward, &c., they had been enough to have grieved the souls of many thousand godly Christians; and enough for any one of the reformed churches, had they possessed them, to have glorified in; and many far meaner are yet the glory of the ancient churches, and called, and revered as fathers. But we doubt this same spirit will make you think that many hundred more are but a few to be silenced ere long. And then your clemency will comfort the poor people that have ignorant or deoboist readers instead of ministers (for too many such we have known,) that it was their pastors' faults that obstinately refused to conform, when they had promised it; that is, that repented of the sin of their subscription when they discerned it: and had they never been ignorant enough to subscribe, they had never entered: and the many hundreds which you thus keep from the ministry, you make nothing of.

§ 26. Whether diocesans be a lawful authority as claiming spiritual government, and how far men may own them

even in lawful things, are controversies to be elsewhere managed. We justify no man's leaving his ministry upon the refusal of anything but what he judged unlawful, yea, and what was really so.

§ 27. Whether any offence were given (though not enough to warrant separation) let our argumentations on both sides declare. The said declaration of the church's sense is not the smallest part of the scandal. Calling a human sacrament *indifferent, or no sacrament*, proveth it not to be as it is called. That the Nonconformists were the cause of separation, who did most against it, is easily said, and as easily proved as the Arians proved that the Orthodox were the cause of the schism of the Luciferans who separated from the church for receiving the Arians too easily to communion.

§ 28. Church matters in this much differ from civil matters; and it is one thing to change a church custom when it dangerously prevaieth to corrupt men's understandings, and another thing when there is no such danger. So Hezekiah thought when he destroyed the brazen serpent, and Paul (who before circumcised Timothy) when he said, if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. Could men have foreseen that the primacy of the Bishop of Rome in the imperial churches, would have been sublimated to such a challenged supremacy over all the Christian world, we suppose the ancients would have held it their duty to have removed the primacy to some other seat.

§ 29. According to your councils will you be judged of God? The not-abating of the impositions is the casting off many hundreds of your brethren out of the ministry, and of many thousand Christians out of your communion. But the abating of the impositions, will so offend you, as to silence or excommunicate none of you at all. For *e.g.* we think it a sin to subscribe, or swear canonical obedience, or use the transient image of the cross in baptism, and therefore these must cast us out. But you think it no sin to forbear them, if the magistrate abate them, and therefore none of you will be cast out by the abatement. But it seemeth that your

charity judgeth the bare displeasing of your appetite to the ceremonies, is a greater evil than the silencing and excommunicating all us, your poor brethren, though our imprisonment follow. Nay, this is not all; for your displeasure will be only that another man subscribeth not, crosseth not, &c., while you may do it yourselves as much as you please.

Whether the casting out of so many ministers and Christians, for such things, do more subserve the said ends of public government, than the forbearance would do, if you know not, we leave you to God's conviction. As also whether these things be well imposed, and men's obedience to authority, and the peace of the church, and its uniformity or unity, be well and justly laid upon them. Such concessions indeed might bear you out far.

CONCERNING PARTICULAR CEREMONIES.

§ 30. Why then is it not as meet that one gesture be used by all in singing psalms or hearing sermons? Why doth the minister stand in prayer, even in the sacrament prayer, while the people kneel? We speak against none of your liberty in using either kneeling, or holy days, and perhaps some of us mean to use both ourselves; but only beseech you that they may be no more imposed than the ancient church imposed them, and we desire no more; and, if you reverence antiquity, why will you not imitate it in point of imposition, as well as in the thing itself. But yet that antiquity was against kneeling on the Lord's day at the sacrament, and that they had but few of our holy days for many hundred years, we suppose you are not ignorant.

§ 31. It's well you have no more to say against liberty to forbear the other three ceremonies. The more unexcusable will you be, when you silence and excommunicate those that use them not.

§ 32. And it's strange that meaner understandings than yours cannot see why men should forbear that *which is not to be valued with the church's peace*. A lie or a false sub-

scription, is not to be valued with the church's peace; and is it therefore a wonder to you that men should scruple them? It is fitter matter for the wonder of good men, that after so long experience, those that will needs be the lords and governors in spiritual matters, should so resolutely lay the church's peace upon such things as these, where they know beforehand, that men of no conscience will all be peaceable, and thousands of godly people are unsatisfied; and that they will needs take all for disturbers of the peace, who jump not with their humour in every ceremony, how willing soever to be ruled by the laws of God.

§ 33. We are glad that you justify not innovation and arbitrariness; and yet desire not such a cure as some do, by getting laws which may do their work.

§ 34. If your want of charity were not extraordinary, it could not work effectually to the afflicting of your brethren and the church; when we tell you what will end your differences, you know our minds so much better than ourselves, that you will not believe us; but you will be confident that we will come on with new demands. This is your way of conciliation! When you were to bring in your utmost concessions, in order to our unity, and it was promised by his majesty that you should meet us half way, you bring in nothing, and persuade his majesty also that he should not believe us in what we offer, that it would be satisfactory if it were granted! You say that it will give dissatisfaction to the greater part of his majesty's subjects! We are more charitable than to believe that a quarter of his majesty's subjects are so uncharitable as to be dissatisfied if their brethren be not silenced and excommunicated for not swearing, subscribing, or using a ceremony, while they may do it as much as they list themselves. And whereas you say, that there is no assurance given that it will content all dissenters; you know that there are many dissenters, as papists, quakers, etc., for whom we never meddled; and we think this an unjust answer to be given to them, who craved of his majesty that they might send to their brethren through the land, to have the testi-

mony of their common consent, and were denied it, and told that it should be our work alone, and imputed to no others.

In conclusion, we perceive that your counsels against peace are not likely to be frustrated; your desires concerning us are like to be accomplished; you are like to be gratified with our silence and ejection, and the excommunication and consequent sufferings of dissenters. And yet we will believe that blessed are the peacemakers; and, though deceit be in the heart of them that imagine evil, yet there is joy to the counsellors of peace: Prov. xii, 20. And though we are stopt by you in our following of peace, and are never like thus publicly to seek it more (because you think we must hold our tongues, that you may hold your peace), yet are we resolved, by the help of God, if it be possible, and as much as in us lieth, to live peaceably with all men: Rom xii, 18.

IX.

*His majesty's Declaration to all his loving subjects of his kingdom of England and dominion of Wales concerning ecclesiastical affairs.*¹—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, pp. 259—64; *Wilkin's Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ*, vol. iv, pp. 560—4; *Cardwell's History of Conferences, &c.*, Oxford, 1849, pp. 286—98.

Charles Rex.

How much the peace of the state is concerned in the peace of the church, and how difficult a thing it is to preserve order

¹ A copy of this Declaration was, according to promise, sent by the Lord Chancellor to the Presbyterian Divines—Reynolds, Calamy, and Baxter—on September the 4th, with “liberty to give notice of what [they] liked not.” Baxter drew up a lengthy “petition,” which was delivered to the chancellor, but was never presented to the king. The ministers were then desired “to make such alterations in the Declaration as were necessary to attain its ends;” and on the 22nd of October “the Declaration, as it was drawn up by the Lord Chancellor,” was read over in the presence of the king, who listened to a discussion of its various clauses, and finally determined its form. The following notes indicate the alterations which were made in the original draft.

and government in civil, whilst there is no order or government in ecclesiastical affairs, is evident to the world; and this little part of the world, our own dominions, hath had so late experience of it, that we may very well acquiesce in the conclusion, without enlarging ourself in discourse upon it, it being a subject we have had frequent occasion to contemplate upon, and to lament, abroad as well as at home.

In our letter to the speaker of the house of commons from Breda we declared how much we desired the advancement and propagation of the protestant religion; that "neither the unkindness of those of the same faith towards us, nor the civilities and obligations from those of a contrary profession (of both of which we have had abundant evidence) could in the least degree startle us, or make us swerve from it, and that nothing can be proposed to manifest our zeal and affection for it, to which we will not readily consent:" and we said then, "that we did hope in due time, ourself to propose somewhat for the propagation of it, that will satisfy the world, that we have always made it both our care and our study, and have enough observed what is most like to bring disadvantage to it." And the truth is, we do think ourself the more competent to propose, and with God's assistance to determine many things now in difference, from the time we have spent, and the experience we have had in most of the reformed churches abroad, in France, in the Low Countries, and in Germany, where we have had frequent conferences with the most learned men, who have unanimously lamented the great reproach the protestant religion undergoes from the distempers and too notorious schisms in matters of religion in England: and as the most learned amongst them have always with great submission and reverence acknowledged and magnified the established government of the Church of England, and the great countenance and shelter the protestant religion received from it, before these unhappy times; so many of them have with great ingenuity and sorrow confessed, that they were too easily misled by misinformation and prejudice into some disesteem of it, as if it had too much complied with the church of Rome; whereas they now acknowledge it to be the best

fence God has yet raised against popery in the world ; and we are persuaded they do with great zeal wish it restored to its old dignity and veneration.

When we were in Holland, we were attended by many grave and learned ministers from hence, who were looked upon as the most able and principal assertors of the Presbyterian opinions ; with whom we had as much conference, as the multitude of affairs which were then upon us would permit us to have, and to our great satisfaction and comfort found them persons full of affection to us, of zeal for the peace of the church and state, and neither enemies, as they have been given out to be, to episcopacy or liturgy, but modestly to desire such alterations in either, as without shaking foundations, might best allay the present distempers, which the indisposition of the time and the tenderness of some men's consciences had contracted. For the better doing whereof, we did intend, upon our first arrival in this kingdom, to call a synod of divines, as the most proper expedient to provide a proper remedy for all those differences and dissatisfactions which had or should arise in matters of religion ; and in the mean time, we published in our Declaration from Breda, "a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man should be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom ; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an act of parliament, as upon mature deliberation shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence."

Whilst we continued in this temper of mind and resolution, and have so far complied with the persuasion of particular persons, and the distemper of the time, as to be contented with the exercise of our religion in our own chapel, according to the constant practice and laws established, without enjoining that practice, and the observation of those laws in the churches of the kingdom ; in which we have undergone the censure of many, as if we were without that zeal for the church which we ought to have, and which, by God's grace, we shall always retain ; we have found ourself not so candidly

dealt with as we have deserved, and that there are unquiet and restless spirits, who, without abating any of their own distemper in recompense of the moderation they find in us, continue their bitterness against the church, and endeavour to raise jealousies of us, and to lessen our reputation by their reproaches, as if we were not true to the professions we have made: and in order thereunto, they have very unseasonably caused to be printed, published, and dispersed throughout the kingdom a Declaration heretofore printed in our name during the time of our being in Scotland, of which we shall say no more than that the circumstances, by which we were enforced to sign that Declaration, are enough known to the world;² and that the worthiest and greatest part of that nation did even then detest and abhor the ill usage of us in that particular, when the same tyranny was exercised there by the power of a few ill men, which at that time had spread itself over this kingdom; and therefore we had no reason to expect that we should at this season, when we are doing all we can to wipe out the memory of all that hath been done amiss by other men, and, we thank God, have wiped it out of our own remembrance, have been ourself assaulted with those reproaches, which we will likewise forget.

Since the printing this Declaration, several seditious pamphlets and queries have been published and scattered abroad to infuse dislike and jealousies into the hearts of the people, and of the army; and some who ought rather to have repented the former mischief they have wrought, than to have endeavoured to improve it, have had the hardiness to publish, that the doctrine of the church, against which no man, with whom we have conferred, hath excepted, ought to be reformed as well as the discipline.

* The draft added, "that we did, from the moment it passed our hand, ask God forgiveness for our part in it, which we hope he will never lay to our charge." These words were "omitted by desire of the king." The Declaration referred to, was issued in August 1650, at his coronation in Scotland. In it the king embraced the covenant, disclaimed his father's wars and actions, lamented his mother's idolatry, and abjured all popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, and profaneness.

This over passionate and turbulent way of proceeding, and the impatience we find in many for some speedy determination in these matters, whereby the minds of men may be composed, and the peace of the church established, hath prevailed with us to invert the method we had proposed to ourself, and even in order to the better calling and composing of a synod (which the present jealousies will hardly agree upon) by the assistance of God's blessed Spirit which we daily invoke and supplicate, to give some determination ourself to the matters in difference, until such a synod may be called as may without passion or prejudice give us such further assistance towards a perfect union of affections, as well as submission to authority, as is necessary: and we are the rather induced to take this upon us, by finding upon the full conference we have had, with the learned men of several persuasions, that the mischiefs, under which both the church and state do at present suffer, do not result from any formed doctrine or conclusion which either party maintains or avows, but from the passion and appetite and interest of particular persons, who contract greater prejudice to each other from those affections, than would naturally rise from their opinions; and those distempers must be in some degree allayed, before the meeting in a synod can be attended with better success than their meeting in other places, and their discourses in pulpits have hitherto been; and till all thoughts of victory are laid aside, the humble and necessary thoughts for the vindication of truth cannot be enough entertained.

We must for the honour of all those of either persuasion, with whom we have conferred, declare, that the professions and desires of all for the advancement of piety and true godliness are the same; their professions of zeal for the peace of the church the same; of affection and duty to us the same: they all approve episcopacy; they all approve a set form of liturgy; and they all disprove and dislike the sin of sacrilege, and the alienation of the revenue of the church; and if upon these excellent foundations, in submission to which there is such a harmony of affections, any

superstructures should be raised, to the shaking those foundations, and to the contracting and lessening the blessed gift of charity, which is a vital part of Christian religion, we shall think ourself very unfortunate, and even suspect that we are defective in that administration of government with which God hath intrusted us.

We need not profess the high affection and esteem we have for the Church of England as it is established by law; the reverence to which hath supported us with God's blessing against many temptations; nor do we think that reverence in the least degree diminished by our condescensions, not peremptorily to insist on some particulars of ceremony, which however introduced by the piety, and devotion, and order of former times, may not be so agreeable to the present, but may even lessen that piety and devotion, for the improvement whereof they might happily be first introduced, and consequently may well be dispensed with; and we hope this charitable compliance of ours will dispose the minds of all men to a cheerful submission to that authority, the preservation whereof is so necessary for the unity and peace of the church; and that they will acknowledge the support of the episcopal authority to be the best support of religion, by being the best means to contain the minds of men within the rules of government: and they who would restrain the exercise of that holy function within the rules which were observed in the primitive times, must remember and consider that the ecclesiastical power being in those blessed times always subordinate and subject to the civil, it was likewise proportioned to such an extent of jurisdiction, as was most agreeable to that; and as the sanctity, and simplicity, and resignation of that age did then refer many things to the bishops, which the policy of succeeding ages would not admit, at least did otherwise provide for, so it can be no reproach to primitive episcopacy, if where there have been great alterations in the civil government, from what was then, there have been likewise some difference and alteration in the ecclesiastical, the essence and foundation being still preserved. And

upon this ground, without taking upon us to censure the government of the church in other countries, where the government of the state is different from what it is here, or enlarging ourself upon the reason why, whilst there was an imagination of erecting a demoeratical government here in the state, they should be willing to continue an aristoeratical government in the church, it shall suffice to say, that since by the wonderful blessing of God the hearts of this whole nation are returned to an obedience to monarehic government in the state, it must be very reasonable to support that government in the church, which is established by law, and with which the monarchy hath flourished through so many ages, and which is in truth as ancient in this island as the Christian monarchy thereof, and which hath always in some respects or degrees been enlarged or restrained, as hath been thought most condueing to the peace and happiness of the kingdom; and therefore we have not the least doubt, but that the present bishops will think the present concessions now made by us to allay the present distempers, very just and reasonable, and will very cheerfully conform themselves thereunto.

I. We do in the first place declare³ our purpose and resolution is and shall be to promote the power of godliuiness, to eneourage the exereises of religion both public and private, and to take care that the Lord's day be applied to holy exereises, without unnecessary divertisements; and that insufficient, negligent, and scandalous ministers be not permitted in the church; and that as the present bishops are known to be men of great and exemplary piety in their lives, which they have manifested in their notorious and unexampled sufferings during these late distempers, and of great and known sufficiency of learning, so we shall take special care, by the assistance of God, to prefer no men to that office and charge, but men of learning, virtue, and piety, who may

³ "Our purpose church; and," not in the draft. Inserted at the request of the Presbyterians.

be themselves the best examples to those who are to be governed by them; and we shall expect and provide the best we can, that the bishops be frequent preachers, and that they do very often preach themselves in some church of their diocese, except they be hindered by sickness, or other bodily infirmities, or some other justifiable occasion, which shall not be thought justifiable if it be frequent.

II. Because the dioceses, especially some of them, are thought to be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragan bishops in every diocese,⁴ as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work.

III. No bishop shall ordain, or exercise any part of jurisdiction which appertains to the censures of the church, without the advice⁵ and assistance of the presbyters; and no chancellors,⁶ commissaries, or officials, as such, shall exercise any act of spiritual jurisdiction⁷ in these cases, viz. excommunication, absolution, or wherein any of the ministry are concerned, with reference to their pastoral charge. However our intent and meaning is to uphold and maintain the profession of the civil law so far and in such matters, as it hath been of use and practice within our kingdoms and dominions; albeit as to excommunication, our will and pleasure is, that no chancellor, commissary, or official shall decree any sentence of excommunication, or absolution, or be judges in those things wherein any of the ministry are concerned, as is aforesaid. Nor shall the archdeacon exercise any jurisdiction without the advice and assistance of six ministers of his archdeaconry, whercof three to be nominated by the bishop, and

⁴ In the draft this clause stood thus:—"If any diocese shall be thought of too large an extent, we will appoint suffragan bishops for their assistance." The present clause was proposed by the Presbyterians.

⁵ The Presbyterians had proposed, "and consent;" but "the king would by no means pass the word . . . because it gave the ministers a negative voice."

⁶ "Commissaries, or officials, as such," inserted at the request of the Presbyterians.

⁷ The following words "In these cases . . . archdeaconry," not in original draft.

three by the election of the major part of the presbyters within the archdeaconry.

IV. To the end that the deans and chapters may be the better fitted to afford counsel and assistance to the bishops, both in ordination and the other offices mentioned before, we will take care that those preferments be given to the most learned and pious presbyters of the diocese; and moreover, that an equal number (to those of the chapter) of the most learned, pious, and discreet presbyters of the same diocese, annually chosen by the major vote of all the presbyters of that diocese present at such elections, shall be always advising and assisting, together with those of the chapter, in all ordinations, and in every part of jurisdiction, which appertains to the censures of the church, and at all other solemn and important actions in the exercise of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, wherein any of the ministry are concerned: provided that at all such meetings the number of the ministers so elected, and those present of the chapter shall be equal, and not exceed one the other, and that to make the numbers equal, the juniors of the exceeding number be withdrawn, that the most ancient may take place; nor shall any suffragan bishop ordain, or exercise the forementioned offices and acts of spiritual jurisdiction, but with the advice and assistance of a sufficient number of the most judicious and pious presbyters annually chosen as aforesaid within his precincts: and our will is that the great work of ordination be constantly and solemnly performed by the bishop and his aforesaid presbytery, at the four set times and seasons appointed by the church for that purpose.³

³ The clause originally stood thus:—"As the dean and chapters are the most proper council and assistants of the Bishop, both in ordination and for the other offices mentioned before; so we shall take care that those preferments be given to the most learned and pious Presbyters of the diocese, that thereby they may be always at hand and ready to advise and assist the Bishop: and moreover, that some other of the most learned, pious, and discreet Presbyters of the same diocese (as namely the rural deans, or others, or so many of either as shall be thought fit, and are nearest) be called by the Bishop to be present and assistant together with

V. We will take care that confirmation be rightly and solemnly performed, by the information and with the consent⁹ of the minister of the place;¹⁰ who shall admit none to the Lord's Supper, till they have made a credible profession of their faith, and promised obedience to the will of God, according as is expressed in the considerations of the rubric before the Catechism; and that all possible diligence be used for the instruction and reformation of scandalous offenders, whom the minister shall not suffer to partake of the Lord's table, until they have openly declared themselves to have truly repented and amended their former naughty lives, as is partly expressed in the rubric, and more fully in the canons; provided there be place for due appeals to superior powers. But besides the suffragans and their presbytery, every rural dean (those deans, as heretofore, to be nominated by the bishop of the diocese) together with three or four ministers of that deanery, chosen by the major part of all the ministers within the same, shall meet once in every month, to receive such complaints as shall be presented to them by the ministers or churchwardens of the respective parishes; and also to compose all such differences betwixt party and party as shall be referred unto them by way of arbitration, and to convince offenders, and reform all such things as they find amiss, by their pastoral reproofs and admonitions, if they may be so

“those of the chapter, at all ordinations, and at all other solemn and important actions in the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, especially wherein any of the ministers are concerned. And our will is, that the great work of ordination be constantly and solemnly performed by the Bishop in the presence, and with the advice and assistance of his aforesaid Presbytery at the four set times and seasons appointed by the church for that purpose.” The paragraph, as adopted, was altered according to the suggestion of the Presbyterians.

⁹ “Advice” in the draft; altered to “consent” at the request of the Presbyterians.

¹⁰ The original draft ended with these words:—“and as great diligence used for the instruction and reformation of notorious and scandalous offenders as is possible; towards which the rubric before the communion hath prescribed very wholesome rules.” The clause—“who shall superior powers,” was inserted upon the proposal of the Presbyterians.

reformed; and such matters as they cannot by this pastoral and persuasive way compose and reform, are by them to be prepared for, and presented to the bishop; at which meeting any other ministers of that deanery may, if they please, be present and assist. Moreover, the rural dean and his assistants are in their respective divisions to see, that the children and younger sort be carefully instructed by the respective ministers of every parish, in the grounds of Christian religion, and be able to give a good account of their faith and knowledge, and also of their Christian conversation conformable thereunto, before they be confirmed by the bishop, or admitted to the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

VI. No bishop shall exercise any arbitrary power, or do or impose anything upon the clergy or the people, but what is according to the known law of the land.

VII. We are very glad to find, that all with whom we have conferred, do in their judgments approve a liturgy, or set form of public worship to be lawful; which in our judgment for the preservation of unity and uniformity we conceive to be very necessary: and though we do esteem the liturgy of the Church of England, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and by law established, to be the best we have seen; and we believe that we have seen all that are extant and used in this part of the world, and well know what reverence most of the reformed churches, or at least the most learned men in those churches have for it; yet since we find some exceptions made¹¹ against several things therein, we will appoint an equal number of learned divines of both persuasions, to review the

¹¹ The draft was, "to many obsolete words, and other expressions used therein, which upon the reformation and improvement of the English language, may well be altered. We will appoint some learned divines, of different persuasions, to review the same, and to make such alterations as shall be thought most necessary, and some such additional prayers as shall be thought fit for emergent occasions, and the improvement of devotion, the using of which may be left to the discretion of the ministers; in the mean time, and till this be done, we do heartily wish and desire to remove." The alterations in the clause as adopted:—"against several things at his discretion;" the insertion of "although" in the following sentence; and the addition of the important promise, "yet in compassion as aforesaid," were suggested by the Presbyterians.

same, and to make such alterations as shall be thought most necessary, and some additional forms (in the Scripture phrase as near as may be) suited unto the nature of the several parts of worship, and that it be left to the minister's choice to use one or other at his discretion. In the meantime, and till this be done, although we do heartily wish and desire, that the ministers in their several churches, because they dislike some clauses and expressions, would not totally lay aside the use of the Book of Common Prayer, but read those parts, against which there can be no exception; which would be the best instance of declining those marks of distinction, which we so much labour and desire to remove; yet in compassion to divers of our good subjects, who scruple the use of it as now it is, our will and pleasure is, that none be punished or troubled for not using it, until it be reviewed, and effectually reformed^l, as aforesaid.

VIII. Lastly, concerning ceremonies, which have administered so much matter of difference and contention, and which have been introduced by the wisdom and authority of the church, for edification, and the improvement of piety, we shall say no more, but that we have the more esteem of all, and reverence for many of them, by having been present in many of those churches, where they are most abolished, or discountenanced;¹² and it cannot be doubted, but that as the universal church cannot introduce one ceremony in the worship of God, that is contrary to God's word expressed in the Scripture, so every national church, with the approbation and

¹² The draft added, "and where we have observed so great and scandalous indecency, and to our understanding so much absence of devotion, that we heartily wish that those pious men, who think the Church of England overburthened with ceremonies, had some little experience, and made some observations in those churches abroad which are most without them. And we cannot but observe that those pious and learned men, with whom we have conferred upon this argument, and who are most solicitous for indulgence of this kind, are earnest for the same out of compassion to the weakness and tenderness of the conscience of their brethren, not that themselves, who are very zealous for order and decency, do, in their judgments, believe the practice of those particular ceremonies which they except against, to be in itself unlawful." These words were struck out by desire of the Presbyterians.

consent of the sovereign power, may, and hath always introduced such particular ceremonies, as in that conjuncture of time are thought most proper for edification and the necessary improvement of piety and devotion in the people, though the necessary practice thereof cannot be deduced from Scripture; and that which before was, and in itself is, indifferent, ceases to be indifferent, after it is once established by law: and therefore our present consideration and work is to gratify the private consciences of those, who are grieved with the use of some ceremonies, by indulging to and dispensing with their omitting those ceremonies, not utterly to abolish any which are established by law, (if any are practised contrary to law, the same shall cease,) which would be unjust, and of ill example; and to impose upon the conscience of some,¹³ for the satisfaction of the conscience of others, which is otherwise provided for. As it could not be reasonable that men should expect, that we should ourself decline, or enjoin others to do so, to receive the blessed sacrament upon our knees, which in our conscience is the most humble, most devout, and most agreeable posture for that holy duty, because some other men, upon reasons best, if not only, known to themselves, choose rather to do it sitting or standing; we shall leave all decisions and determinations of that kind, if they shall be thought necessary for a perfect and entire unity and uniformity throughout the nation, to the advice of a national synod, which shall be duly called after a little time, and a mutual conversation between persons of different persuasions hath mollified those distempers, abated those sharpnesses, and extinguished those jealousies, which make men unfit for those consultations; and upon such advice, we shall use our best endeavour that such laws may be established, as may best provide for the peace of the church and state.¹⁴ Provided that none shall be denied the sacrament of the Lord's supper, though they do not use the gesture of kneeling in the act of receiving.

¹³ The draft added, "and we believe much superior in number and quality."

¹⁴ "Provided receiving," not in the draft.

In the meantime, out of compassion and compliance towards those who would forbear the cross in baptism, we are content that no man shall be compelled to use the same, or suffer for not doing it; but if any parent desire to have his child christened according to the form used, and the minister will not use the sign, it shall be lawful for that parent to procure another minister to do it; and if the proper minister shall refuse to omit that ceremony of the cross, it shall be lawful for the parent, who would not have his child so baptized, to procure another minister to do it, who will do it according to his desire.

No man shall be compelled to bow at the name of Jesus, or suffer in any degree for not doing it, without reproaching those who out of their devotion continue that ancient ceremony of the church.

For the use of the surplice,¹⁵ we are contented that all men be left to their liberty to do as they shall think fit, without suffering in the least degree for wearing or not wearing it; provided that this liberty do not extend to our own chapel, cathedral, or collegiate churches, or to any college in either of our universities,¹⁶ but that the several statutes and customs for the use thereof in the said places be there observed as formerly.

And¹⁷ because some men, otherwise pious and learned, say

¹⁵ The draft added, "which hath for so many ages been thought a most decent ornament for the clergy in the administration of divine service, and is in truth of a different fashion in the Church of England from what is used in the Church of Rome, we are, etc."

¹⁶ In the draft it was, "where we would have the several statutes and customs observed which have been formerly."

¹⁷ The draft stood thus:—"And because some men (otherwise pious and learned) say they cannot conform to the subscription required by the canon at the time of their institution and admission into benefices, we are content (so they take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy) that they shall receive institution and induction, and shall be permitted to exercise their function, and to enjoy the profits of their livings, without any other subscription, until it shall be otherwise determined by a Synod called and confirmed by authority." It was adopted in its present form, "and because . . . degrees," at the request of the Presbyterians.

they cannot conform unto the subscription required by the canon, nor take the oath of canonical obedience; we are content, and it is our will and pleasure (so they take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy) that they shall receive ordination, institution, and induction, and shall be permitted to exercise their function, and to enjoy the profits of their livings, without the said subscription or oath of canonical obedience; and moreover, that no persons in the universities shall for the want of such subscription be hindered in the taking of their degrees. Lastly,¹⁸ that none be judged to forfeit his presentation or benefice, or be deprived of it, upon the statute of the thirteenth of queen Elizabeth, chapter the twelfth, so he read and declare his assent to all the articles of religion, which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments comprised in the Book of Articles in the said statute mentioned. In a word, we do again renew what we have formerly said in our Declaration from Breda, for the liberty of tender consciences, that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom: and if any have been disturbed in that kind since our arrival here, it hath not proceeded from any direction of ours.

To conclude, and in this place to explain what we mentioned before, and said in our letter to the house of commons from Breda, that “we hoped in due time, ourself to propose somewhat for the propagation of the protestant religion, that will satisfy the world, that we have always made it both our care and our study, and have enough observed what is most

¹⁸ In the original draft were these words, which were now omitted:—
 “Lastly, that such as have been ordained by Presbyters, be not required
 “to renounce their ordination, or to be re-ordained, or denied institution
 “and induction for want of ordination by bishops.

“And, moreover, that none be judged to forfeit their presentation or benefice, or be deprived of it, for not reading of those of the thirty-nine
 “articles that contain the controverted points of church government and
 “ceremonies.” The clause as it stands, “Lastly mentioned,” was adopted in compliance with the proposal of the Presbyterians.

like to bring disadvantage to it;" we do conjure all our loving subjects to acquiesce in and submit to this our Declaration concerning those differences, which have so much disquieted the nation at home, and given such offence to the protestant churches abroad, and brought such reproach upon the protestant religion in general, from the enemies thereof; as if upon obscure notions of faith and fancy, it did admit the practice of Christian duties and obedience to be discountenanced and suspended, and introduce a license in opinions and manners, to the prejudice of the Christian faith. And let us all endeavour, and emulate each other in those endeavours, to countenance and advance the protestant religion abroad, which will be best done by supporting the dignity and reverence due to the best reformed protestant church at home; and which being once freed from the calumnies¹⁹ and reproaches it hath undergone from these late ill times, will be the best shelter for those abroad, which will by that countenance both be the better protected against their enemies, and be the more easily induced to compose the differences amongst themselves, which give their enemies more advantage against them: and we hope and expect that all men will henceforward forbear to vent any such doctrine in the pulpit, or to endeavour to work in such manner upon the affections of the people, as may dispose them to an ill opinion of us and the government, and to disturb the peace of the kingdom; which if all men will in their several vocations endeavour to preserve with the same affection and zeal we ourself will do, all our good subjects will by God's blessing upon us enjoy as great a measure of felicity as this nation hath ever done, and which we shall constantly labour to procure for them, as the greatest blessing God can bestow upon us in this world. Given at our court at Whitehall this twenty-fifth day of October, MDCLX.

¹⁹ "Calamities," in the draft.

X.

*The Petition of the Ministers to the King upon the first draft of his Declaration.*¹—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, pp. 265—74.

May it please your Majesty,

So great was the comfort created in our minds by your majesty's oft-expressed resolution to become the effectual moderator in our differences, and yourself to bring us together by procuring such mutual condescensions as are necessary thereto, and also by your gracious acceptance of our Proposals, which your majesty heard and received not only without blame, but with acknowledgment of their moderation, and as such as would infer a reconciliation between the differing parties, that we must needs say, the least abatement of our hopes, is much the more unwelcome and grievous to us. And it is no small grief that surpriseth our hearts, from the complaints of the students ejected in the universities, and of faithful ministers removed from their beloved flocks, and denied institution, for want of subscription, re-ordination, or an oath of obedience to the bishop; but especially from many congregations in the land, that cry out they are undone by the loss of those means of their spiritual welfare which were dearer to them than all worldly riches, and by the grievous burden of ignorant, or scandalous, or dead, unprofitable ministers set over them, to whom they dare not commit the guidance and care of their immortal souls, and whose ministry they dare not own or countenance, lest they be guilty of their sin. And it addeth to our grief and fear in finding so much of the proposed necessary means of our agreement, especially in the point of government, here passed by in your majesty's Declaration, as if it were denied us. But yet remembering the gracious and encouraging promises of your majesty, and observing your majesty's clemency in what is here granted us, and your great condescension in

¹ This paper was drawn up by Baxter. The alterations, marked in the notes, were made by him, with much reluctance, at the instance of Mr. Calamy, Dr. Reynolds, the Earl of Manchester, the Earl of Anglesey, and Lord Hollis.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, p. 265.

vouchsafing not only so graciously to hear us in these our humble addresses and requests, but also to grant us the sight of your Declaration before it is resolved on, with liberty of returning our additional desires, and hope that they shall not be rejected; we re-assume our confidence, and comfortably expect, that what is not granted in this Declaration that is reasonable and necessary to our agreement, shall yet be granted upon fuller consideration of the equity of our requests.

As our designs and desires are not for any worldly advantages or dignities to ourselves, so have we not presumed to intermeddle with any civil interest of your majesty, or any of your officers; nor in the matters of mere convenience to cast our reason into the balance against your majesty's prudence; but merely to speak for the laws and worship and servants of the Lord, and for the peace of our consciences, and the safety of our own and brethren's souls. It lifts us up with joy to think what happy consequences will ensue, if your majesty shall entertain these healing motions: how happily our differences will be reconciled, and the exasperated minds of men composed; how temptations to contention and uncharitableness will be removed; how comfortably your majesty will reign in the dearest affections of your subjects; and how firmly they will adhere to your interest as their own; how cheerfully and zealously the united parts and interests of the nation will conspire to serve you; what a strength and honour a righteous magistraey, a learned, holy, loyal ministry, and a faithful, praying people will be to your throne; and how it will be your glory to be the king of the most religious nation in the world, that hath no considerable parties, but what are centred (under Christ) in you; what a comfort it will be for the bishops and pastors of the church, to be honoured and loved by all the most religious of their flocks; to see the success of their labours and the beauty of the church promoted by our common concord, and brethren to assemble and dwell together in unity, serving one God, according to one rule, with one heart and mouth.

[And on the contrary, it astonisheth us to foresee the doleful consequences that would follow, if (which God forbid) your majesty should refuse the most necessary, moderate ways of concord, and be engaged by a party to exalt them by the suppression of the rest! How woful a day would it prove to your majesty and your dominions, in which you should thus espouse a cause and interest injurious to the interest of Christ, and the cause of unity and love, and, contrary to your majesty's gracious inclinations, be engaged unawares in a seeming necessity to deal hardly with the ministers and servants of the Lord! How considerable a part of the three nations for number, wisdom, piety, and interest, you would be drawn to govern with a grievous hand; and to lay *them* under the greatest sorrow who restored and received your majesty with joy! How the dissent of ministers from the government and ceremonies of the church, were it expressed but by their groans and tears, and moderate complaints to God, or not praying for that church government which they dare not pray for, would be reckoned as discontent and sedition; and it would be judged a crime to *feel* when they are hurt! What occasion this would give to irreligious temporizers to arrogate the name of your majesty's best subjects, and to let out their malice against the upright, and make religion a reproach! And then what a hindrance that would be to the conversion and saving of the people's souls, and what a fruitful nursery of all vice! How grievously charity would be overthrown, while the people are engaged in the hardest thoughts and speeches of each other! What a temptation it would be to the afflicted part to abate their honour and due respect to those they suffer by, when they are deprived of that which is dearest to them in the world; and when the groans and cries of afflicted innocents arrive at heaven, and have awakened the justice of the King of kings, the greatest cannot stand before him. And what a snare and grief will it be to the bishops and pastors of the church to be esteemed wolves, and to be engaged to suppress them as their adversaries, that else might be the honour of their ministry, and

the comfort of their lives. And when divisions and separated assemblies are thus multiplied (the people being driven from the public congregations), either it will bring them under trouble, or let in papists and others that are intolerable into an equal toleration: and such discontents and distractions in the church, will not be without their influence on the state. And by all this how much will Satan and the enemies of our religion be gratified, and God dishonoured and displeased. And, seeing all this may safely and easily be now prevented, we humbly beseech the Lord, in mercy to vouchsafe to your majesty a heart to discern of time and judgment.]²

And as these are our general ends and motives, so we are induced to insist upon the *form of synodical government* conjunct with a fixed presidency or episcopacy, for these reasons:

1. We have reason to believe that no other terms will be so generally agreed on. And it is no way injurious to episcopal power; but most firmly establisheth all in it that can pretend to divine authority or true antiquity. It granteth them much more than Reverend Bishop Hall (in his *Peacemaker*) and many other of that judgment, do require; who would have accepted the fixing of the president for life, as sufficient for the reconciliation of the churches.

2. It being most agreeable to the Scripture and the primitive government, is likeliest to be the way of a more universal concord, if ever the churches arrive on earth at such a blessing. However, it will be most acceptable to God, and to well-informed consciences.

3. It will promote the practice of discipline and godliness

² "All this enclosed part was left out of the Petition as presented to his majesty, this only being inserted in the room of it.

"And on the contrary, should we lose the opportunity of our desired reconciliation and union, it astonisheth us to foresee what doleful effects our divisions would produce, which we will not so much as mention in particulars lest our words should be misunderstood. And, seeing all this may safely and easily now be prevented, we humbly beseech the Lord in mercy to vouchsafe to your majesty an heart to discern a right of time and judgment."

without disorder, and promote order without the hindering of discipline and godliness.

4. And it is not to be silenced (though in some respects we are loath to mention it) that it will save the nation from the violation of the Solemn Vow and Covenant, without wronging the church at all, or breaking any other oath. And, whether the Covenant were lawfully imposed or not, we are assured, from the nature of a vow to God, and from the cases of Saul, Zedekiah, and others, that it would be a terrible thing to us to violate it on that pretence. Though we are far from thinking that it obligeth us to any evil, or to go beyond our places and callings to do good, much less to resist authority; yet doth it undoubtedly bind us to forbear our *own consent* to those luxuriances of church government which we there renounced, and for which no divine institution can be pretended.

[*It is not only the Presbyterians, but multitudes of the episcopal party,*]³ and the nobility, gentry, and others that adhered to his late majesty, in the late unhappy wars, that (at their composition) took this Vow and Covenant. [[⁴And God forbid that ever the souls of so many thousands should be driven upon the sin of perjury, and upon the wrath of God, and the flames of hell: or, that under pretence of calling them to repent of what is evil, they should be urged to commit so great an evil. If once the consciences of the nation should be so debauched, what good can be expected from them? or what evil shall they ever after be thought to make conscience of? or what bonds can be supposed to oblige them? or how can your majesty place any confidence in them, notwithstanding the oaths of allegiance and supremacy which

³ “This was thus expressed in the Petition that was presented:—[Not presuming to meddle with the consciences of those many of the nobility, and gentry, &c.]

⁴ “What follows in this double enclosure, was omitted in the copy presented, this only being inserted in the room of it.

“We only crave your majesty’s clemency to ourselves and others, who believe themselves to be under its obligations. And God forbid that we that are ministers of the Word of truth, should do anything to encourage your majesty’s subjects to cast off the conscience of an oath.”

they take? or how can they be taken for competent witnesses in any cause, or persons meet for human converse? or how should those preachers be regarded by their auditors, that dare wilfully violate their solemn vows? and it would be no comfort nor honour to your majesty, to be the king of a perfidious nation. And, whatever palliation flattery might at hand procure, undoubtedly at distance of time and place (where flattery cannot silence truth) it would be the nation's perpetual infamy! And what matter of reconciliation would it be to the guilty papists, when we blame their impious doctrines that have such a tendency? How loose would it leave your majesty's subjects, that are once taught to break such sacred bonds.] Till the Covenant was decried as an almanack out of date, and its obligation taken to be null, that odious fact could never have been perpetrated against your royal father; nor your majesty have been so long expelled from your dominions. And the obligation of the Covenant upon the consciences of the nation, was not the weakest instrument of your return. We therefore humbly beseech your majesty (with greater importunity than we think we should do for our lives) that you will have mercy on the souls and consciences of your people, [and will not urge or tempt them to this grievous sin, nor drive them on the insupportable wrath of the Almighty, whose judgment is at hand, where princes and people must give that account, on which the irreversible sentence will depend. For the honour of our religion, and of your majesty's dominions and reign, we beseech you,] suffer us not to be tempted to the violating of such solemn vows, (and this for nothing!) when an expedient is before you, that will avoid it without any detriment to the church; nay to its honour and advantage.

The prelacy which we disclaimed is that of diocesans—upon the claim of a superior order to a presbyter—assuming the sole power of public admonition of particular offenders, enjoining penitence, excommunicating and absolving (besides confirmation) over so many churches, as necessitated the corruption or

⁵ “This enclosed part was quite left out of the copy that was presented.”

extirpation of discipline, and the using of human officers (as chancellors, surrogates, officials, commissaries, archdeacons) while the undoubted officers of Christ (the pastors of the particular churches) were hindered from the exercise of their office.

The restoration of discipline in the particular churches, and of the pastors to the exercise of their office therein, and of synods for necessary consultation and communion of churches, and of the primitive presidency or episcopacy, for the avoiding of all shew of innovation and disorder is that which we humbly offer as the remedy: beseeching your majesty, that if anything asserted seem unproved, an impartial conference in your majesty's hearing may be allowed us in order to a just determination.

CONCERNING THE PREAMBLE IN YOUR MAJESTY'S DECLARATION,
WE PRESUME ONLY TO TENDER THESE REQUESTS.

1. That as we are persuaded it is not in your majesty's thoughts to intimate that we are guilty of the offences which your majesty here reciteth, so we hope it will rather be a motive to the hastening of the nation's cure, that our unity may prevent men's temptations of that nature for the time to come.

2. Though we have professed our willingness to submit to the primitive episcopacy, and a reformed liturgy, hoping it may prove an expedient to a happy union, yet have we expressed our dislike of the prelacy and present liturgy, while unreformed. And though sacrilege and unjust alienation of church-lands is a sin that we detest, yet whether, in some cases of true superfluities of revenues, or true necessity of the church, there may not be an alienation which is no sacrilege, and whether the kings and parliaments have been guilty of that crime that have made some alienations, are points of high concernment, of which we never had a call to give our judgment: and therefore humbly beseech your

majesty, that concerning these matters, we may not, to our prejudice, be otherwise understood, than as we have before and here expressed.

3. That as your majesty hath here vouchsafed us your gracious acknowledgment of our moderation, it might never be said, that a ministry and people of such moderate principles, consenting to primitive episcopacy and liturgy, could not yet be received into the settlement and countenanced body of your people, nor possess their stations in the church, and liberty in the public worship of God.

4. And whereas it is expressed by your majesty, that [the essence and foundation of episcopacy might be preserved, though the extent of the jurisdiction might be altered], this is to us a ground of hope, that seeing the greatning or the lessening of episcopal power is in your majesty's judgment but a matter of convenience, the Lord will put it into your heart to make such an alteration in the alterable points, as the satisfaction of the consciences of sober men, and the healing and union of these nations, do require.

As to our plea for primitive episcopacy, the *offices* and *ordinances* of Christ must be still distinguished from the *alterable accidents*. Though we plead not for the primitive *poverty, persecution, or restraints*, yet must we adhere to the primitive *order and worship, and administrations*, in the substance; as believing that the *circumstantiating* of them is much committed unto man, but to institute the *ordinances* and *offices* is the high prerogative of Christ, the universal King and Lawgiver of the church.

CONCERNING THE MATTER OF YOUR MAJESTY'S CONCESSIONS,
AS RELATED TO OUR PROPOSALS.

1. We humbly renew our petition to your majesty, for the effectual security of those promised necessities, which are the matter of our chiefest care, and whereunto the controverted points subserve: viz.—1. That private exercises of piety

might be encouraged. 2. That an able, faithful ministry may be kept up, and the insufficient, negligent, scandalous, and non-resident, cast out. 3. That a credible profession of faith and obedience be pre-required of communicants. 4. That the Lord's day be appropriated to holy exercises without unnecessary diversions.

2. For church government. In this your majesty's Declaration, parish discipline is not sufficiently granted us. Inferior synods, with their presidents, are passed by; and the bishop which your majesty declareth for is not *episcopus præses*, but *episcopus princeps*, indued with *sole* power both of *ordination* and *jurisdiction*. For though it be said, that *the bishop shall do nothing without the advice of the presbyters*, yet their *consent* is not made necessary, but he might go *contrary* to the counsel of them all. And this advice is not to be given by the *diocesan synod*, or any *chosen representatives* of the clergy, but by the *dean and chapter*, and so many and such others as *he* please to call. In all which there being nothing yielded us, which is sufficient to the desired accommodation and union, we humbly prosecute our petition to your majesty, that the primitive presidency with the respective synods described by the late reverend Primate of Ireland, may be the form of church-government established among us: at least in these three needful points—

1. That the pastors of the respective parishes may be allowed, not only publicly to preach, but personally to catechise or otherwise instruct the several families, admitting none to the Lord's table that have not personally owned their baptismal covenant by a credible profession of faith and obedience; and to admonish and exhort the scandalous, in order to their repentance; to hear the witnesses and the accused party, and to appoint fit times and places for these things; and to deny such persons the communion of the church in the holy eucharist, that remain impenitent; or that wilfully refuse to come to their pastors to be instructed, or to answer such probable accusations; and to continue such exclusion of them till they have made a credible profession of

repentance, and then to receive them again to the communion of the church: provided there be place for due appeals to superior power.

All this we beseech your majesty to express under your fifth concession, because it is to us of very great weight, and the rubric is unsatisfactory to which we are referred.

2. That all the pastors of each rural deanery, having a stated president chosen by themselves, (if your majesty please to grant them that liberty,) may meet once a month, and may receive presentments of all such persons as, notwithstanding suspension from communion of the church, continue impenitent or unreformed; and, having further admonished them, may proceed to the sentence of solemn excommunication, if after due patience they cannot prevail: and may receive the appeals of those that conceive themselves injuriously suspended, and may decide the cause. Or if this cannot be attained, at least that the pastors of each rural deanery with their president, may have power to meet monthly, and receive all such presentments and appeals, and judge whether they be fit to be transmitted to the diocesan or not: and to call before them and admonish the offenders so presented.

Yet if presentments against magistrates and ministers be reserved only to the diocesan synod, and their appeals immediately there put in, we shall therein submit to your majesty's pleasure.

3. That a diocesan synod, consisting of the delegates of the several rural synods, be called as often as need requireth: and that without the consent of the major part of them, the diocesan may not ordain, or exercise any spiritual censures on any of the ministers: nor excommunicate any of the people but by consent of the synod, or of the pastors of the particular parishes where they had communion. And that not only chancellors, but also archdeacons, commissaries, and officials *as such*, may pass no censures, purely spiritual.

But for the exercise of *civil government coercively* by mulcts or corporal penalties by power derived from your majesty, as supreme over persons, and in things ecclesiastical,

we presume not at all to interpose: but shall submit to any that act by your majesty's commission.

OUR REASONS FOR THE FIRST PART OF DISCIPLINE, VIZ.,
IN PARTICULAR PARISHES, ARE THESE:

It is necessary to the honour of the Christian profession, to the integrity of worship, to the destruction of impiety and vice, to the preservation of the sound, the raising them that are fallen, the comforting of the penitent, the strengthening of the weak; the purity, order, strength, and beauty of our churches, the vanity of believers, and the pleasing of Christ who hath required it by his laws. And withal, it is agreeable to the ancient canons and practice of the churches, and is consented to by our reverend brethren, and so is no matter of controversy now between us.

Yet is not the rubric satisfactory which we are referred to.

1. Because it leaves the people at their liberty, whether they will let us know of their intention to communicate, till the night or morning before; and alloweth us *then only* to admonish them, when (in great parishes) it is impossible for want of time.

2. Because it doth allow us to deny the sacrament to those only that *maliciously refuse reconciliation with their neighbours*, and only *admonish other scandalous sinners* to forbear: though the canons forbid us to deliver *them* the sacrament.

THE REASONS WHY WE INSIST ON THE SECOND PROPOSAL,
ARE THESE:

It being agreed on between us, that the younger less discreet sort of ministers are unfit to pass the sentence of excommunication, without *advice* and *moderation* by others, and every church is not like to be provided with grave, discreet, judicious guides; the necessity of these frequent lesser synods for such *moderation*, and *advice*, and *guidance* will appear by these two general evidences.

1. It is the very nature and substance of the office of a presbyter, to have the power of the keys for binding and loosing, retaining or remitting sin; which therefore *together* or *apart*, as there is occasion, they are bound to exercise. And this being the institution of Jesus Christ, cannot be altered by man. In their ordination, according to the established order in England, it is said, *Whose sins thou dost remit, they are remitted: whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.* And they are commanded to *minister the doctrine, sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this realm hath received the same*, as expressly as the bishops are. And as the late Primate of Ireland observeth in his "Reduction," *That they may the better understand what the Lord hath commanded, the exhortation of St. Paul to the elders of the church of Ephesus is appointed to be read to them at the time of their ordination, Take heed to yourselves and to all the flocks, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to (feed or) rule the congregation of God which he hath purchased with his blood.* And it is apparent in this, (Acts xx, 17, 18, 28; and xv, 23, 25; and xvi, 4; 1 Thess. v, 12, 13; 1 Tim. iii, 4, 5; and v, 17; Heb. xiii, 7, 17, 24;) and other places, that it is the office of a presbyter to *oversee, rule, and guide* the flock (which [is] the ministerial rule which consisteth in the exercise of the keys, or management and personal application of God's Word to the consciences and cases of particular persons, for their salvation, and the order of the church;) the coercive power belonging to the magistrate. And this was the practice in the ancient church, as appeareth undeniably in Ignatius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hierom, Chrysostom, &c., Concil. Carthag., 4, Can. 22, 23, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, as is confessed by the chiefest defenders of episcopacy.

2. If all presentments and appeals be made to the *bishop* and his *consistory alone*, it will *take from us* the *parish discipline* which is granted us, and cast almost all discipline out of the church; as is most apparent to them that by experience are acquainted with the *quality* of our flocks, and with

the *true nature* of the *pastoral work*: considering 1. How many hundred churches are in a diocese: 2. How many thousand persons are in very many parishes; and of those what a number are obstinate in wilful gross ignorance or scandal, refusing to be instructed, or admonished by their pastors: 3. How long, and earnestly, and tenderly sinners must be dealt with, before they are cut off by solemn excommunication: 4. How unsatisfactory it must be to the conscience of a bishop or synod, to cut off a man as impenitent upon the bare report of a minister, before by full admonition they have proved him impenitent themselves; especially when too many ministers are (to say nothing of passion that might cause partial accusations) unable so to manage a reproof and exhortation, as is necessary to work on the consciences of the people, and to convict resisters of flat impenitency: 5. What abundance of work the bishop will have besides; constant preaching will require time for preparation; visiting the several churches; confirming all the souls in so many hundred parishes (which alone is more than any one man can do aright, if he had nothing else to do); ordaining, instituting, and examining the persons, so far as to satisfy a tender conscience that takes not all on trust from others, and is but an executor of their judgments; these, and much more, with the care of church-buildings, lands, and his own affairs and family, and sicknesses, and necessary absence sometimes, will make this great additional work, which must be constantly performed for so many hundred of parishes, to be impossible: 6. Reproofs and suspension would so exasperate the scandalous, that they would vex the pastors with numerous appeals: 7. The pastors will be undone by travelling, and waiting, and maintaining such a multitude of witnesses as is necessary for the prosecuting of presentments, and answering so many appeals: 8. The business will be so odious, chargeable, and troublesome, that witnesses will not come in: 9. The minister by these prosecutions and attendances, will be taken off the rest of his ministerial work: 10. Bishops (being but men) will be tempted by this intolerable burden to be weary of the work,

and slubber it over, and cast it upon others, and to discountenance the most conscionable ministers that most trouble them with presentments; which when the offenders perceive, they will the more insult and vex us with appeals.

So that the *discouragements of ministers* and the *utter incapacity of the bishops* to perform a quarter of this work, will nullify discipline, as leaving it impossible. Experience hath told us this too long.

And then when our communion is thus polluted with all that are most incapable through utter ignorance, scandal, and contempt of piety;—1. Ministers will be deterred from their administrations to subjects so incapable. 2. Bishops that are tender conscienced, will be deterred from undertaking so impossible a work, and of so ill success. 3. And men that have least tenderness of conscience, and care of souls, and fear of God's displeasure, will seek for and intrude into both places. 4. And the tender conscienced people will be tempted to speak hardly of such undisciplined churches, and of the officers; and to withdraw from them. 5. And hereby they will fall under the displeasure of superiors, and the scorn of the vulgar, that have no religion but what is subservient to their flesh. 6. And so while the most pious are brought under discountenance and reproach, and the most impious get the reputation of being most regular and obedient to their rulers, piety itself will grow into disesteem, and impiety escape its due disgrace. And this hath been the cause of our calamities.

3. As to the liturgy; it is matter of great joy and thankfulness to us, that we have heard your majesty more than once so resolutely promising, that *none shall suffer for not using the Common Prayer and ceremonies, but you would secure them from the penalties in the Act of Uniformity, as that which your Declaration at Breda intended*, and to find here so much of your majesty's clemency in your gracious concessions for a future emendation. But we humbly crave leave to acquaint your majesty, (1.) That it grieveth us after all to hear that, yet it is given in charge, by the judges at the

assizes, to indict men upon that Act for not using the Common Prayer. (2.) That it is not only *some obsolete words and other expressions* that are offensive. (3.) That many scruple using *some part* of the book as it is, lest they be guilty of countenancing the whole, who yet would use it when reformed.

Therefore we humbly crave that your majesty will here declare *that it is your majesty's pleasure that none be punished or troubled for not using the Book of Common Prayer, till it be effectually reformed by divines of both persuasions equally deputed thereunto.*

And that your majesty would procure that *moderation in the imposition hereafter* which we before desired.

4. Concerning ceremonies. Returning our humble thanks for your majesty's gracious concessions (of which we are assured you will never have cause to repent) we further crave,

1. That your majesty would leave out those words concerning us, that we *do not in our judgments believe the practice of those particular ceremonies which we except against to be in itself unlawful*; for we have not so declared our judgments. Indeed we have said, that treating in order to a happy uniting of our brethren through the land, our work is not to say what is *our own* opinion, or what will *satisfy us*; but what will satisfy so many as may procure the said union. And we have said, that some think *some of them unlawful in themselves*, and *others but inconvenient*. And while the *imposers* think them but *indifferent*, we conceived they might reasonably be entreated to let them go; for the saving of their brethren's consciences and the church's peace. We are sure that a Christian's conscience should be tender of adding to, or diminishing from, the *matter* of God's worship in the smallest point, the laws of God being herein the only perfect rule, Deut. xii, 32; and that a Synod infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, would "lay upon" the churches "no greater burden than necessary things," Acts xv, 28; and that for things indifferent, Christians should not *despise* or *judge* each other, Rom. xiv; much less, by silencing the able and faithful

ministers of the gospel, to *punish the flocks even in their souls*, for the tolerable differences and supposed mistakes of *ministers*. We doubt not but Peter and Paul went to heaven without the ceremonies in question.

And seeing your majesty well expresseth it, *that the universal church cannot introduce one ceremony in the worship of God that is contrary to God's Word expressed in the Scriptures*, and multitudes of Protestants at home and abroad, do think that *all mystical sacramental rites of human institution are contrary to the perfection of God's law, and to Deut. xii, 32, &c.*, (though the determination of *mere circumstances necessary in genere*, be not so,) and therefore dare not use them, for fear of the displeasure of God the universal sovereign; it must needs be a great expression of your majesty's wisdom and tenderness of God's honour and the safety of your peoples' souls, to refuse in things unnecessary to drive men upon (apprehended) sin, and upon the wrath of God, and the terrors of a condemning conscience.

2. We beseech your majesty to understand, that it is not our meaning by the word *abolishing* to crave a prohibition against *your own* or other men's liberty in the things in question; but it is a *full liberty* that we *desire*; such as should be in *unnecessary things*; and such as will tend to the concord of your people, *viz., that there be no law or canon for or against them, commanding, recommending, or prohibiting them*: as now there is none for any particular gesture in *singing of psalms*, where *liberty* preserveth an *uninterrupted unity*.

FOR THE PARTICULAR CEREMONIES.

1. We humbly crave as to *kneeling in the act of receiving*, that your majesty will declare our liberty therein, that none should be troubled for receiving it standing or sitting.

And your majesty's expressions *upon reasons best known*,

if not only, to themselves, command us to render some of our reasons.

1. *We are sure that Christ and his apostles sinned not, by not receiving it kneeling; and many are not sure that by kneeling they should not sin; and therefore for the better security, though not for absolute necessity, we crave leave to take the safer side.*

2. *We are sure that kneeling in any adoration at all, in any worship, on any Lord's day in the year, or any week-day between Easter and Pentecost, was not only disused, but forbidden by General Councils (as Concil. Nicæu., 1, Can. xx, and Concil. Trull., etc.) and disclaimed by ancient writers, and this as a general and uncontrolled tradition: and therefore that kneeling in the act of receiving is a novelty contrary to the decrees and practice of the church for many hundred years after the apostles. And if we part with the venerable examples of all antiquity where it agrees with Scripture, and that for nothing, we shall depart from the terms which most moderators think necessary for the reconciling of the churches. And novelty is a dishonour to any part of religion: and if antiquity be honourable, the most ancient, or nearest the legislation and fountain, must be most honourable. And it is not safe to intimate a charge of unreverence upon all the apostles and primitive Christians, and the universal church, for so many hundred years together of its purest time.*

3. *Though our meaning be good, it is not good to shew a needless countenance of the Papists' practice of adoring the bread as God, when it is used by them round about us. Saith Bishop Hall, in his life, p. 20:—I had a dangerous conflict with a Sorbonist, who took occasion by our kneeling at the receipt of the Eucharist, to persuade all the company of our acknowledgment of a transubstantiation.*

4. *Some of us that could rather kneel than be deprived of communion, should yet suffer much before we durst put all others from the communion that durst not take it kneeling; which therefore we crave we might not be put upon.*

2. We humbly crave also, *that the religious observation of holy-days of human institution may be declared to be left indifferent, that none be troubled for not observing them.*

3. We humbly tender your majesty our thanks for your gracious concession of *liberty* as to the *cross* and *surplice*, and *bowing at the name* Jesus, rather than Christ, or God. But we farther humbly beseech your majesty—
1. *That this liberty in forbearing the surplice, might extend to the colleges and cathedrals also; that it drive not thence all those that scruple it, and make not those places receptive only of a party; and that the youth of the nation may have just liberty as well as the elder. If they be engaged in the universities, and their liberties there cut off in their beginning, they cannot afterwards be free; many hopeful persons will be else diverted from the service of the church.* 2. *That your majesty will endeavour the repealing of all laws and canons by which these ceremonies are imposed, that they might be left at full liberty.*

4. We also humbly tender our thanks to your majesty for your gracious concession of the forbearance of the subscription required by that canon. But (1) we humbly acquaint your majesty, that *we* do not dissent from the doctrine of the Church of England, expressed in the Articles and Homilies: but it is the controverted passages about *government, liturgy, and ceremonies, and some by-passages and phrases in the doctrinal part*, which are scrupled by those whose liberty is desired. Not that we are against subscribing the proper rule of our religion, or any meet confession of faith. Nor do we scruple the oath of supremacy or allegiance. Nor would we have the door left open for Papists or heretics to come in.
2. We take the boldness to say that since we have had the promises of your gracious indulgence herein, and, upon divers addresses to your majesty and the Lord Chancellor, had comfortable encouragement to expect our liberty, yet cannot ministers procure institution without renouncing their ordination by presbyters, or being re-ordained; nor without subscription, and the oath of canonical obedience.

3. We must observe, with fear and grief, that your majesty's indulgence and concessions of liberty in this Declaration extendeth not either to the *abatement of re-ordination*, or of *subscriptional ordination*, or of the *oath of obedience to the bishops*. We therefore humbly and earnestly crave, that your majesty will declare your pleasure:—1. That ordination, and institution, and induction, may be conferred without the said subscription or oath; and 2. That none be urged to be re-ordained, or denied institution for want of ordination by prelates, that was ordained by presbyters; 3. And that none be judged to have forfeited his presentation or benefice, nor be deprived of it for not reading those Articles of the thirty-nine that contain the controverted points of government and ceremonies.

Lastly, We humbly crave that your majesty will not only grant us this liberty *till the next synod, but will endeavour that the synod be impartially chosen; and that your majesty will be pleased to endeavour the procurement of such laws as shall be necessary for our security till the synod, and for the ratification of moderate and healing conclusions afterwards; and that nothing by mere canon be imposed on us, without such statute laws of parliament.*

These favours (which will be injurious to none) if your people may obtain of your majesty, it will revive their hearts to daily and earnest prayer for your prosperity, and to rejoice in the thankful acknowledgment of that gracious Providence of heaven, that hath blessed us in your restoration, and put it into your heart to heal our breaches, and to have compassion on the faithful people in your dominions, who do not petition you for liberty to be schismatical, factious, seditious, or abusive to any, but only for leave to obey the Lord, who created and redeemed them, according to that law by which they must all be shortly judged to everlasting joy or misery. And it will excite them to, and unite them in, the cheerful service of your majesty, with their estates and lives, and to transmit your deserved praises to posterity.

XI.

*Alterations in the Declaration proposed by the Ministers.*¹—
Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 275-6.

1. We do in the first place declare that our purpose and resolution is, and shall be to promote the power of godliness, to encourage the exercises of religion, both public and private, and to take care that the Lord's day be appropriated to holy exercises, without unnecessary divertisements; and that insufficient, negligent, non-resident, and scandalous ministers be not permitted in the Church: and as the present bishops are known to be men of great and exemplary piety, &c.

2. Because the dioceses, especially some of them, are thought to be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragan bishops in every diocese, as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work.

3. No bishops shall ordain, or exercise any part of jurisdiction which appertains to the censures of the Church, without the advice and consent of the presbyters; and no chancellors, commissaries, archdeacons, or officials shall exercise any act of spiritual jurisdiction.

¹ "The Petition of the ministers being delivered to the Lord Chancellor, "was so ungrateful," says Baxter, "that we were never called to present it "to the king, but instead of that, it was offered us that we should make "such alterations in the Declaration as were necessary to attain its ends; "but with these cautions: 1. That we put in nothing but what we "judged of flat necessity; and 2. That we altered not the preface or "language of it, for it was to be the king's Declaration: and what he spake as "expressing his own sense, was nothing to us; but if we thought he imposed "anything intolerable upon us, we had leave to express our desires for the "altering of it. Whereupon we agreed to offer this following paper of alte- "rations, letting all the rest of the Declaration alone; but withal, by word "to tell those we offered it to (which was the Lord Chancellor) that this was "not the model of church-government which we at first offered, nor which "we thought most expedient for the healing of the church; but seeing that "cannot be obtained, we shall humbly submit, and thankfully acknowledge "his Majesty's condescension, if we may obtain what now we offer, and shall "faithfully endeavour to improve it to the church's peace, to the utmost of "our power. Having declared this (with more) we delivered in the fol- "lowing paper."—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 274.

4. To the end that the deans and chapters may be the better fitted to afford counsel and assistance to the bishops, both in ordination, and in the other ordinances mentioned before, we will take care that those preferments be given to the most learned and pious presbyters of the diocese.

And moreover, that at least an equal number of the most learned, pious, and discreet presbyters of the same diocese, (annually chosen by the major vote of all the presbyters of that diocese) shall be assistant and consenting together with those of the chapter at all ordinations, and all other acts of spiritual jurisdiction.

Nor shall any suffragan bishops ordain, or exercise any act of spiritual jurisdiction, but with the consent and assistance of a sufficient number of the most judicious and pious presbyters, annually chosen by the major vote of all the presbyters in his precincts.

And our will is, that the great work of ordination be constantly and solemnly performed at the four set times and seasons appointed by the Church for that purpose.

5. We will take care that confirmation be rightly and solemnly performed, by the information, and with the consent of the minister of that place, who shall admit none to the Lord's supper, till they have made a credible profession of their faith, and promised obedience to the will of God according as is expressed in the consideration of the rubric before the catechism; and that all possible diligence be used for the instruction and reformation of scandalous offenders, whom the ministers shall not suffer to partake of the Lord's table until they have openly declared themselves to have truly repented, and amended their former naughty lives, as is partly expressed in the rubric, and more fully in the canons. Provided there be place for due appeals to superior powers.

6. No bishops, &c.

7. We are very glad to find that all with whom we have conferred, do, in their judgments, approve a liturgy, or a set form of public worship to be lawful, which in our judgments, for the preservation of unity and uniformity, we conceive to

be very necessary. And although we do esteem the liturgy of the Church of England contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and by law established, to be the best that we have seen, (and we believe that we have seen all that are extant, and used in this part of the world) and we know what reverence most of the reformed Churches, or at least the most learned men in those Churches have for it; yet since we find some exceptions made against several things therein, *we will appoint an equal number of learned divines of both persuasions to review the same, and to make such alterations as shall be thought most necessary, and some additional forms (in Scripture phrase as near as may be) suited unto the nature of the several ordinances; and that it be left to the minister's choice to use one or the other at his discretion.* In the mean time, and till this be done, although we do heartily wish and desire that the ministers in their several churches because they dislike some clauses, and expressions, would not totally lay aside the use of the Book of Common Prayer, but read those parts against which there can be no exception, which would be the best instance of declining those marks of distinction, which we so much labour and desire to remove: yet in compassion to divers of our good subjects who scruple the use of it as now it is, our will and pleasure is that none be punished or troubled for not using it, until it be reviewed and effectually reformed as aforesaid.

In the Preface concerning ceremonies, we desire that at least these words be left out:—*not that themselves do in their judgments believe the practice of these particular ceremonies, which they except against, to be in itself unlawful.*

As concerning ceremonies, our will and pleasure is, 1, that none shall be required to kneel in the act of receiving the Lord's supper; but left at liberty therein.

2. That the religious observation of holy days of human institution be left indifferent, and that none be troubled for not observing of them.

3. That no man shall be compelled to use the cross in baptism, or suffer for not using it.

4. That no man shall be compelled to bow at the name of Jesus.

5. For the use of the surplice, we are contented that all men be left to their liberty to do as they shall think fit, without suffering in the least degree for wearing or not wearing it.

And because some men, otherwise pious and learned, say they cannot conform unto the subscription required by the canons, nor take the oath of canonical obedience, we are content, and it is our will and pleasure (so they take the oath of allegiance and supremaey) that they shall receive ordination, institution, and induction, and shall be permitted to exercise their function, and to enjoy the profits of their livings without the said subscription, or oath of canonical obedience. And moreover, that no persons in the universities shall, for the want of such subscription be hindered in taking their degrees. Lastly, that such as have been ordained by presbyters, be not required to renounce their ordination, or to be re-ordained, or denied institution and induction for want of ordination by bishops. And moreover, that none be judged to forfeit their presentation or benefice, or be deprived of it, for not reading of those of the XXXIX Articles that contain the controverted points of Church government and ceremonies.

XII.

Humble and grateful acknowledgment of some Ministers of London for the Declaration.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, pp. 284—5.

TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY :

The humble and grateful acknowledgment of many ministers of the gospel in and about the city of London, to his royal majesty for his gracious concessions in his majesty's late Declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs.

Most dread Sovereign,

WE your majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, ministers of the gospel in your city of London, having perused your majesty's late Declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs, and finding it, to the joy of our hearts, so full of indulgence and gracious condescension, we cannot but judge ourselves highly obliged, in the first place, to render our unfeigned thanks to our good God, who hath so mercifully inclined your majesty's royal heart to this moderation; and next, our most humble and hearty acknowledgments unto your sacred majesty, that we may testify to your royal self, and all the world, our just resentment of your majesty's great goodness and clemency therein expressed.

May it please your Majesty,

The liberty of our consciences, and the free exercise of our ministry in the work of our great Lord and Master, for the conversion of souls, ought to be, and are, more dear to us than all the profits and preferments of this world: and therefore your majesty's tenderness, manifested in these so high concernments, doth wonderfully affect us, and raise up our hearts to a high pitch of gratitude.

We cannot but adore divine goodness for your majesty's stedfast adherence to the protestant religion, notwithstanding all temptations and provocations to the contrary, and your professed zeal for the advancement and propagation thereof, declaring that nothing can be proposed to manifest your zeal and affection for it, to which you will not readily consent.

Your majesty has graciously declared, that your resolution is, and shall be, to promote the power of godliness, to encourage the exercises of religion, both public and private, to take care that the Lord's day be applied to holy exercises, without unnecessary divertisements; and that insufficient, negligent, and scandalous ministers, be not permitted in the church. Your majesty hath granted that no bishop shall ordain, or exercise any part of jurisdiction which appertains to the censures of the church, without the advice and assist-

ance of the presbyters, and neither do, nor impose anything, but what is according to the known laws of the land; excluded chancellors, commissaries, and officials, from acts of jurisdiction; so happily restored the power of the pastors, in their several congregations; and granted a liberty to all the ministers to assemble monthly for the exercise of the pastoral persuasive power, to the promoting of knowledge and godliness in their flocks. Your majesty hath graciously promised a review, and effectual reformation of the liturgy, with additional forms to be used at choice: and in the meantime, that none be punished or troubled for not using it. Your majesty hath graciously freed us from subscription required by the canon, and the oath of canonical obedience; and granted us to receive ordination, institution, and induction, and to exercise our function, and enjoy the profit of our livings, without the same. Your majesty hath gratified the consciences of many who are grieved with the use of some ceremonies, by indulging to and dispensing with their omitting those ceremonies, *viz.*, kneeling at the sacrament, the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, and wearing of the surplice.

All this your majesty's indulgence and tender compassion (which with delight we have taken the boldness thus largely to commemorate) we receive with all humility and thankfulness, and, as the best expression thereof, shall never cease to pray for your majesty's long and prosperous reign, and study how in our several stations we may be most instrumental in your majesty's service: and that we may not be defective in ingenuity, we crave leave to profess, that though all things in this frame of government be not exactly suited to our judgment, yet your majesty's moderation hath so great an influence upon us, that we shall, to our utmost, endeavour the healing of the breaches, and promoting the peace and union of the church.

There are some other things that have been propounded by our reverend brethren, which, upon our knees, with all humble importunity, we could beg of your majesty, especially that re-ordination, and the surplice in colleges may not be imposed; and we cannot lay aside our hopes, but that that God

who hath thus far drawn out your majesty's bowels and mercy, will further incline your majesty's heart to gratify us in these our humble desires also.

That we be not further burthensome, we humbly beg leave to thank your majesty for the liberty and respect vouchsafed to our reverend brethren in this weighty affair of accomodation. The God of heaven bless your majesty, and all the royal family.

Your Majesty's most loyal Subjects,

Sam. Clark.	Wm. Cooper.	Eli. Pledger.
Thos. Case.	Wm. Whittaker.	Will. Bates.
Jno. Rawlinson.	Thos. Jacomb.	Jno. Gibbon.
Jno. Sheffield.	Thos. Lye.	Matt. Poole
Thos. Gouge.	Jno. Jackson.	With many
Gab. Sanger	Jno. Meriton.	others.

This address was presented to his majesty at Whitehall, November 16th, by some of these ministers, to whom he was pleased to return a very gracious answer.

XIII.

*A Proclamation prohibiting all unlawful and seditious meetings and conventicles under pretence of religious worship.*¹
—Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iv, pp. 564—5; Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, Oxford, 1844, vol. ii, pp. 302—4.

Charles R.

ALTHOUGH nothing can be more unwelcome to us, than the necessity of restraining some part of that liberty, which was

¹ The insurrection of the Fifth-monarchy men under Venner, took place on Sunday, 6th January, 1660-1, and was finally suppressed on the following Wednesday. It furnished a pretext for this Proclamation. All classes of dissenters were eager to purge themselves of the suspicion of being accomplices

indulged to tender consciences by our late gracious Declaration; yet since divers persons (known by the name of Anabaptists, Quakers, and Fifth-monarchy men, or some such like appellation, as a mark of distinction and separation) under pretence of serving God, do daily meet in great numbers in secret places, and at unusual times, by reason whereof they begin to boast of their multitudes, and to increase in their confidences, as having frequent opportunities to settle a perfect correspondency and confederacy between themselves, of which some evil effects have already ensued, even to the disturbance of the public peace by insurrection and murder, for which the offenders must answer to the law, and far worse may be still expected, unless some speedy course be taken to prevent their further growth.

To the intent therefore that none of those persons, who have presumed to make so ill an use of our indulgence, may be strengthened in such their proceedings by any general words or expressions in our late Declaration; we have thought fit by these presents to publish and declare our royal will and pleasure, that no meeting whatsoever of the persons aforesaid, under pretence of worshipping God, shall at any time hereafter be permitted or allowed, unless it be in some parochial church or chapel in this realm, or in private houses by the

of the rebels. The Anabaptists presented an address to the king, in which they said, "we cannot imagine a reason why [the] bloody tenets, and tragical actions [of the Fifth-monarchy men] should reflect upon those of our persuasion, the persons not being of our belief or practice about baptism; but to the best of our information, they were all, except one, assertors of infant baptism, and never had communion with us in our assemblies." The Independents, and Quakers, also, disowned all connexion with the rebels. But as the oath of allegiance and supremacy was generally tendered to the Baptists and Quakers when discovered in their several religious assemblies, and as they could not conscientiously acknowledge the supremacy of the king in ecclesiastical matters, great numbers of them were thrown into prison in all parts of the kingdom, and kept in close confinement until the coronation of the king, 23rd April following.—Collier's Ecclesiastical History, London, 1714, vol. ii, p. 876; Rapin's History of England, London, 1743, vol. ii, p. 623—5; Crosby's History of the Baptists, London, 1739, vol. ii, pp. 38 and 93; Hanbury's Memorials of the Independents, vol. iii, pp. 592—5.

persons there inhabiting. And that all meetings and assemblies whatsoever in order to any spiritual exercise, or serving of God by the persons aforesaid, unless in the places aforesaid, shall be esteemed, and are hereby declared to be unlawful assemblies, and shall be prosecuted accordingly, and the persons therein assembled shall be proceeded against as persons riotously and unlawfully assembled.

And for the better execution of this our proclamation, and the prevention of all illegal and seditious meetings and conventicles, we do hereby straightly charge and command all mayors, sheriffs, justices of the peace, constables, headboroughs, commanders, and other our chief officers, and ministers, whom it may concern, that they cause diligent search to be made from time to time in all and every the places, where any such meetings or conventicles, as aforesaid, shall or may be suspected. And that they cause all and every the persons therein assembled to be apprehended and brought before one or more justices of the peace, and to be bound over to appear at the next sessions within the respective precincts, and in the mean time to find sureties for their good behaviour, or in default thereof to be committed to the next gaol.

And further we do will and command our justices of the peace, that they cause the oath of allegiance to be tendered to every person so brought before them, and, upon his or their refusal, to proceed according as, by the statute made in the seventh year of the reign of our royal grandfather, of ever blessed memory, they are directed and commanded. Given at our court at Whitehall the tenth day of January, in the twelfth year of our reign, MDCLX. [MDCLXI.]

XIV.

The King's Warrant for the Conference at the Savoy.—Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iv, pp. 570—2; *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, 303—5; *Cardwell's History of Conferences*, Oxford, 1849, pp. 298—302.

CHARLES the Second, by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. To our trusty and well-beloved the most reverend father in God Accepted archbishop of York, the right reverend fathers in God Gilbert bishop of London, John bishop of Durham, John bishop of Rochester, Henry bishop of Chichester, Humphrey bishop of Sarum, George bishop of Worcester, Robert bishop of Lincoln, Benjamin bishop of Peterborough, Bryan bishop of Chester, Richard bishop of Carlisle, John bishop of Exeter, Edward¹ bishop of Norwich; and to our trusty and well-beloved the reverend Anthony Tuckney Dr. in divinity, John Conant Dr. in divinity, William Spurstow Dr. in divinity, John Wallis Dr. in divinity, Thomas Manton Dr. in divinity, Edmund Calamy batchelor in divinity, Richard Baxter clerk, Arthur Jackson clerk, Thomas Case, Samuel Clark, Matthew Newcomen clerks: and to our trusty and well-beloved Dr. Earles dean of Westminster, Peter Heylin Dr. in divinity, John Hacket Dr. in divinity, John Barwick Dr. in divinity, Peter Gunning Dr. in divinity, John Pearson Dr. in divinity, Thomas Pierce Dr. in divinity, Anthony Sparrow Dr. in divinity, Herbert Thorndike batchelor in divinity, Thomas Horton Dr. in divinity, Thomas Jacomb Dr. in divinity, William Bates, John Rawlinson clerks, William Cooper clerk, Dr. John Lightfoot, Dr. John Collinges, Dr. Benjamin Woodbridge, and William Drake clerk, greeting. Whereas by our Declaration of the five and twentieth of October last concerning ecclesiastical affairs, we did

¹ Dr. Edward Reynolds was consecrated Bishop of Norwich on 6th January, 1660-1, and by virtue of his bishopric became also Abbot of St. Bennet in the Holme.

amongst other things, express our esteem of the liturgy of the Church of England, contained in the Book of Common Prayer; and yet, since we find some exceptions made against several things therein, we did by our said Declaration declare we would appoint an equal number of learned divines of both persuasions, to review the same, and to make such alterations therein as should be thought most necessary, and some additional forms in the Scripture phrase, as near as might be, suited unto the nature of the several parts of worship; we therefore, in accomplishment of our said will and intent, and of our continued and constant care and study for the peace and unity of the churches within our dominions, and for the removal of all exceptions and differences, and the occasions of such differences and exceptions from amongst our good subjects, for or concerning the said Book of Common Prayer, or any thing therein contained, do by these our letters patents require, authorize, constitute and appoint you the said accepted archbishop of York, Gilbert bishop of London, John bishop of Durham, John bishop of Rochester, Henry bishop of Chichester, Humphrey bishop of Sarum, George bishop of Worcester, Robert bishop of Lincoln, Benjamin bishop of Peterborough, Bryan bishop of Chester, Richard bishop of Carlisle, John bishop of Exeter, Edward bishop of Norwich; Anthony Tuckney, John Conant, William Spurstow, John Wallis, Thomas Manton, Edmund Calamy, Richard Baxter, Arthur Jackson, Thomas Case, Samuel Clark, and Matthew Newcomen, to advise upon and review the said Book of Common Prayer, comparing the same with the most ancient liturgies which have been used in the church, in the primitive and purest times: and, to that end, to assemble and meet together from time to time, and at such times, within the space of four calendar months now next ensuing, in the master's lodging in the Savoy in the Strand, in the county of Middlesex, or in such other place, or places, as to you shall be thought fit and convenient, to take into your serious and grave considerations, the several directions and rules, forms of prayer, and things in the said Book of Common Prayer contained, and to

advise and consult upon and about the same, and the several objections and exceptions which shall now be raised against the same. And if occasion be, to make such reasonable and necessary alterations, corrections, and amendments therein, as by and between you the said archbishop, bishops, doctors, and persons hereby required and authorized to meet and advise^r as aforesaid, shall be agreed upon to be needful or expedient for the giving satisfaction to tender consciences, and the restoring and continuance of peace and unity, in the churches under our protection and government; but avoiding, as much as may be, all unnecessary alterations² of the forms and liturgy wherewith the people are already acquainted, and have so long received in the Church of England. And our will and pleasure is, that when you the said archbishop, bishops, doctors, and persons authorized and appointed by these our letters patents, to meet, advise, and consult upon and about the premises, as aforesaid, shall have drawn your consultations to any resolution and determination, which you shall agree upon as needful or expedient to be done for the altering, diminishing, or enlarging the said Book of Common Prayer, or any part thereof, that then you forthwith certify and present unto us in writing, under your several hands, the matters and things whereupon you shall so determine, for our approbation; and to the end the same, or so much thereof as shall be approved by us, may be established. And forasmuch as the said archbishop and bishops, having several great charges to attend, which we would not dispense with, or that the same should be neglected upon any great occasion whatsoever, and some of them, being of great age and infirmities, may not be able constantly to attend the execution of the service and authority hereby given, and required by us, in the meetings and consultations aforesaid; we will therefore, and do hereby require and authorize you the said Dr. Earles, Peter Heylin, John Hacket, John Barwick,

² Wilkins, and Collier (*Eccles. Hist.*, Lond., 1714, vol. ii, p. 877) read "abbreviations." Cardwell follows the copy given in *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, where it is "alterations."

Peter Gunning, John Pearson, Thomas Pierce, Anthony Sparrow, and Herbert Thorndike, to supply the place or places of such of the said archbishop and bishops (other than the said Edward bishop of Norwich) as shall by age, sickness, infirmity, or other occasion, be hindered from attending the said meetings or consultations, (that is to say,) that one of you, the said Dr. Earles, Peter Heylin, John Hacket, John Barwick, Peter Gunning, John Pearson, Thomas Pierce, Anthony Sparrow, and Herbert Thorndike, shall from time to time supply the place of each one of them, the said archbishop and bishops, other than the said Edward bishop of Norwich, which shall happen to be hindered, or to be absent from the said meetings or consultations; and shall and may advise, consult, and determine, and also certify and execute all and singular the powers and authorities before mentioned, in and about the premises, as fully and absolutely, as such archbishop or bishops, which shall so happen to be absent, should or might do by virtue of these our letters patents, or any thing therein contained, in case he or they were personally present. And whereas in regard of the distance of some, the infirmities of others, the multitude of constant employments, and other incidental impediments, some of you, the said Edward bishop of Norwich, Anthony Tuckney, John Conant, William Spurstow, John Wallis, Thomas Manton, Edmund Calamy, Richard Baxter, Arthur Jackson, Thomas Case, Samuel Clark, and Matthew Newcomen, may be hindered from the constant attendance in the execution of the service aforesaid; we therefore will, and do hereby require and authorize you, the said Thomas Horton, Thomas Jacomb, William Bates, John Rawlinson, William Cooper, John Lightfoot, John Collinges, Benjamin Woodbridge, and William Drake to supply the place or places of such the commissioners last above mentioned, as shall by the means aforesaid, or any other occasion, be hindered from the said meetings and consultations; (that is to say) that one of you, the said Thomas Horton, Thomas Jacomb, William Bates, John Rawlinson, William Cooper, Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Collinges, Mr. Woodbridge, and Mr.

Drake shall from time to time supply the place of each one of the said commissioners last mentioned, which shall happen to be hindered, or be absent from the said meetings and consultations; and shall and may advise, consult, and determine, and also certify and execute all and singular the powers and authorities before mentioned, in and about the premises, as fully and absolutely, as such of the said last mentioned commissioners, which shall so happen to be absent, should or might do, by virtue of these our letters patents, or any thing therein contained, in case he or they were personally present.

In witness whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patents. Witness our self at Westminster, the five and twentieth day of March, in the thirteenth year of our reign.
[MDCLXI.]

Per ipsum Regem

BARKER.

XV.

*The Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer.*¹—
Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 316-33, Cardwell's History of Conferences, Oxford, 1849, pp. 303-35.

ACKNOWLEDGING with all humility and thankfulness, his majesty's most princely condescension and indulgence, to very many of his loyal subjects, as well in his majesty's most gracious Declaration, as particularly in this present commission, issued forth in pursuance thereof; we doubt not but the right reverend bishops, and all the rest of his majesty's commissioners intrusted in this work, will, in imitation of his

¹ The principal compilers of this paper were Bishop Reynolds, Dr. Wallis, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Newcomen, Dr. Bates, Mr. Clarke, Dr. Jacomb, &c.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 307.

“The fourth day of May, [1661] we had a meeting with the bishops, where “we gave in our paper of Exceptions to them; which they received.”—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 334.

majesty's most prudent and Christian moderation and clemency, judge it their duty (what we find to be the apostles' own practice) in a special manner to be tender of the churches peace, to bear with the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves, nor to measure the consciences of other men by the light and latitude of their own, but seriously and readily to consider and advise of such expedients, as may most conduce to the healing of our breaches, and uniting those that differ.

And albeit we have a high and honourable esteem of those godly and learned bishops and others, who were the first compilers of the public liturgy, and do look upon it as an excellent and worthy work, for that time, when the Church of England made her first step out of such a mist of popish ignorance and superstition wherein it formerly was involved; yet,—considering that all human works do gradually arrive at their maturity and perfection, and this in particular, being a work of that nature, hath already admitted several emendations since the first compiling thereof:—

It cannot be thought any disparagement or derogation either to the work itself, or to the compilers of it, or to those who have hitherto used it, if after more than a hundred years, since its first composure, such further emendations be now made therein, as may be judged necessary for satisfying the scruples of a multitude of sober persons, who cannot at all (or very hardly) comply with the use of it, as now it is, and may best suit with the present times after so long an enjoyment of the glorious light of the gospel, and so happy a reformation: especially considering that many godly and learned men have from the beginning all along earnestly desired the alteration of many things therein, and very many of his majesty's pious, peaceable, and loyal subjects, after so long a discontinuance of it, are more averse from it than heretofore: the satisfying of whom (as far as may be) will very much conduce to that peace and unity which is so much desired by all good men, and so much endeavoured by his most excellent majesty.

And therefore in pursuance of this his majesty's most gracious commission, for the satisfaction of tender consciences, and the procuring of peace and unity amongst ourselves, we judge meet to propose,

First, that all the prayers, and other materials of the liturgy may consist of nothing *doubtful* or *questioned* amongst pious, learned, and orthodox persons, inasmuch as the professed end of composing them is for the declaring of the unity and consent of all who join in the public worship; it being too evident that the limiting of church-communion to things of *doubtful disputation*, hath been in all ages the ground of schism and separation, according to the saying of a learned person.*

“To load our public forms with the private fancies upon which we differ, is the most sovereign way to perpetuate schism to the world's end. Prayer, confession, thanksgiving, reading of the Scriptures, and administration of the sacraments in the plainest and simplest manner, were matter enough to furnish out a sufficient liturgy, though nothing either of private opinion, or of church-pomp, of garments, or prescribed gestures, of imagery, of music, of matter concerning the dead, of many superfluities which creep into the church under the name of *order* and *decency*, did interpose itself. To charge churches and liturgies with things unnecessary, was the first beginning of all superstition, and when scruple of conscience began to be made or pretended, then schism began to break in. If the special guides and fathers of the church would be a little sparing of incumbering churches with superfluities, or not over-rigid, either in reviving obsolete customs, or imposing new, there would be far less cause of schism or superstition; and all the inconvenience were likely to ensue would be but this, they should in so doing yield a little to the imbecility of their inferiors; a thing which St. Paul would never have refused to do. Meanwhile wheresoever false or suspected opinions are made a piece of church-liturgy, he that separates is not the schis-

* Mr. Hales.

matic; for it is alike unlawful to make profession of known, or suspected falsehood, as to put in practice unlawful or suspected action."

II. Further, we humbly desire that it may be seriously considered, that as our first reformers out of their great wisdom did at that time so compose the liturgy, as to win upon the papists, and to draw them into their church-communication, by varying as little as they well could from the Romish forms before in use: so whether in the present constitution, and state of things amongst us, we should not according to the same rule of prudence and charity, have our liturgy so composed, as to gain upon the judgments and affection of all those who in the substantial of the protestant religion are of the same persuasions with our selves: inasmuch as a more firm union and consent of all such, as well in worship as in doctrine, would greatly strengthen the protestant interest against all those dangers and temptations which our intestine divisions and animosities do expose us unto, from the common adversary.

III. That the repetitions, and responsals of the clerk and people, and the alternate reading of the psalms and hymns which cause a confused murmur in the congregation, whereby what is read is less intelligible, and therefore unedifying, may be omitted: the minister being appointed for the people in all public services appertaining unto God, and the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, intimating the people's part in public prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto, and to declare their consent in the close, by saying *Amen*.

IV. That in regard the litany (though otherwise containing in it many holy petitions) is so framed, that the petitions for a great part are uttered only by the people, which we think not to be so consonant to Scripture, which makes the minister the mouth of the people to God in prayer, the particulars thereof may be composed into one solemn prayer to be offered by the minister unto God for the people.

V. That there be nothing in the liturgy which may seem

to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast; the example of Christ fasting forty days and nights being no more imitable, nor intended for the imitation of a Christian, than any other of his miraculous works were, or than Moses his forty days fast was for the Jews: and the act of parliament, 5 Eliz., forbidding abstinence from flesh to be observed upon any other than a politic consideration, and punishing all those who by preaching, teaching, writing, or open speeches, shall notify that the forbearing of flesh is of any necessity for the saving of the soul, or that it is the service of God, otherwise than as other politic laws are.

VI. That the religious observation of saints-days appointed to be kept as holy-days, and the vigils thereof, without any foundation (as we conceive) in Scripture, may be omitted. That if any be retained, they may be called festivals, and not holy-days, nor made equal with the Lord's day, nor have any peculiar service appointed for them, nor the people be upon such days forced wholly to abstain from work, and that the names of all others now inserted in the Calender which are not in the first and second books of Edward the Sixth, may be left out.

VII. That the gift of prayer, being one special qualification for the work of the ministry bestowed by Christ in order to the edification of his church, and to be exercised for the profit and benefit thereof, according to its various and emergent necessity; it is desired that there may be no such imposition of the liturgy, as that the exercise of that gift be thereby totally excluded in any part of public worship. And further, considering the great age of some ministers and infirmities of others, and the variety of several services oft-times concurring upon the same day, whereby it may be inexpedient to require every minister at all times to read the whole; it may be left to the discretion of the minister, to omit part of it, as occasion shall require: which liberty we find to be allowed even in the First Common Prayer Book of Edward VI.

VIII. That in regard of the many defects which have been

observed in that version of the Scriptures, which is used throughout the liturgy (manifold instances whereof may be produced, as in the epistle for the first Sunday after Epiphany, taken out of Romans xii, 1, "Be ye changed in your shape;" and the epistle for the Sunday next before Easter, taken out of Philippians ii, 5, "Found in his apparel as a man;" as also the epistle for the fourth Sunday in Lent, taken out of the fourth of the Galatians, "Mount Sinai is Agar in Arabia, and bordereth upon the city which is now called Jerusalem;" the epistle for St. Matthew's day taken out of the second epistle of Corinth, and the ivth, "We go not out of kind;" the gospel for the second Sunday after Epiphany, taken out of the second of John, "When men be drunk;" the gospel for the third Sunday in Lent, taken out of the xith of Luke, "One house doth fall upon another;" the gospel for the Annunciation, taken out of the first of Luke, "This is the sixth month which was called barren;" and many other places): we therefore desire instead thereof the new translation allowed by authority may alone be used.

IX. That inasmuch as the holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, to furnish us thoroughly unto all good works, and contain in them all things necessary, either in doctrine to be believed, or in duty to be practised; whereas divers chapters of the apoeryphal books appointed to be read, are charged to be in both respects of dubious and uncertain credit: it is therefore desired, that nothing be read in the church for lessons, but the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

X. That the minister be not required to rehearse any part of the liturgy at the communion-table, save only those parts which properly belong to the Lord's supper; and that at such times only when the said holy supper is administered.

XI. That as the word "minister," and not priest or curate, is used in the Absolution, and in divers other places; it may throughout the whole book be so used instead of those two words; and that instead of the word "Sunday," the word "Lord's day" may be everywhere used.

XII. Because singing of psalms is a considerable part of public worship, we desire that the version set forth and allowed to be sung in churches may be amended; or that we may have leave to make use of a purer version.

XIII. That all obsolete words in the Common Prayer, and such whose use is changed from their first significancy, as "aread" used in the gospel for the Monday and Wednesday before Easter; "Then opened he their wits," used in the gospel for Easter Tuesday, &c.; may be altered unto other words generally received and better understood.

XIV. That no portions of the Old Testament, or of the Acts of the Apostles, be called "epistles," and read as such.

XV. That whereas throughout the several offices, the phrase is such as presumes all persons (within the communion of the church) to be regenerated, converted, and in an actual state of grace, (which, had ecclesiastical discipline been truly and vigorously executed, in the exclusion of scandalous and obstinate sinners, might be better supposed; but there having been, and still being a confessed want of that, (as in the liturgy is acknowledged,) it cannot be rationally admitted in the utmost latitude of charity :) we desire that this may be reformed.

XVI. That whereas orderly connection of prayers, and of particular petitions and expressions, together with a competent length of the forms used, are tending much to edification, and to gain the reverence of people to them; there appears to us too great a neglect of both, of this order, and of other just laws, of method.

PARTICULARLY.

1. The collects are generally short, many of them consisting but of one, or at most two sentences of petition; and these generally ushered in with a repeated mention of the name and attributes of God, and presently concluding with the name and merits of Christ; whence are caused many unnecessary intercessions and abruptions, which when many petitions are to be offered at the same time, are neither agreeable to scriptural examples, nor suited to the gravity and seriousness of that holy duty.

2. The prefaces of many collects have not any clear and special respect to the following petitions; and particular petitions are put together, which have not any due order, nor evident connection one with another, nor suitableness with the occasions upon which they are used, but seem to have fallen in rather casually, than from an orderly contrivance.

It is desired, that instead of those various collects, there may be one methodical and entire form of prayer composed out of many of them.

XVII. That whereas the public liturgy of a church should in reason comprehend the sum of all such sins as are ordinarily to be confessed in prayer by the church, and of such petitions and thanksgivings as are ordinarily by the church to be put up to God, and the public catechisms or systems of doctrine, should summarily comprehend all such doctrines as are necessary to be believed, and these explicitly set down; the present liturgy as to all these seems very defective.

PARTICULARLY.

1. There is no preparatory prayer in our address to God for assistance or acceptance; yet many collects in the midst of the worship have little or nothing else.

2. The Confession is very defective, not clearly expressing original sin, nor sufficiently enumerating actual sins, with their aggravations, but consisting only of generals; whereas confession being the exercise of repentance, ought to be more particular.

3. There is also a great defect as to such forms of public praise and thanksgiving as are suitable to gospel-worship.

4. The whole body of the Common-prayer also consisteth very much of mere generals: as, "to have our prayers heard—to be kept from all evil, and from all enemies, and all adversity, that we might do God's will;" without any mention of the particulars in which these generals exist.

5. The Catechism is defective as to many necessary doctrines of our religion; some even of the essentials of Christianity not mentioned except in the Creed, and there not so explicit as ought to be in a catechism.

XVIII. Because this liturgy containeth the imposition of divers ceremonies which from the first reformation have by sundry learned and pious men been judged unwarrantable, as,

1. That public worship may not be celebrated by any minister that dare not wear a surplice.

2. That none may baptize, nor be baptized, without the transient image of the cross, which hath at least the semblance of a sacrament of human institution, being used as an engaging sign in our first and solemn covenanting with Christ; and the duties whereunto we are really obliged by baptism being more expressly fixed to that airy sign than to this holy sacrament.

3. That none may receive the Lord's Supper that dare not kneel in the act of receiving; but the minister must exclude all such from the communion: although such kneeling not only differs from the practice of Christ and of his apostles, but (at least on the Lord's day) is contrary to the practice of the catholic church for many hundred years after, and forbidden by the most venerable councils that ever were in the Christian world. All which impositions are made yet more grievous by that subscription to their lawfulness which the canon exacts, and by the heavy punishment upon the non-observance of them which the act of uniformity inflicts.

And it being doubtful whether God hath given power unto men, to institute in his worship such mystical teaching signs, which not being necessary *in genere*, fall not under the rule of "doing all things decently, orderly, and to edification," and which once granted will, upon the same reason, open a door to the arbitrary imposition of numerous ceremonies of which St. Augustine complained in his days; and the things in controversy being in the judgment of the imposers confessedly indifferent, who do not so much as pretend any real goodness in them of themselves, otherwise than what is derived from their being imposed, and consequently the imposition ceasing, that will cease also, and the worship of God not become indecent without them:

Whereas, on the other hand, in the judgment of the

opposers, they are by some held sinful, and unlawful in themselves; by others very inconvenient and unsuitable to the simplicity of gospel worship, and by all of them very grievous and burthensome, and therefore not at all fit to be put in balance with the peace of the church, which is more likely to be promoted by their removal than continuance: considering also how tender our Lord and Saviour himself is of weak brethren, declaring it much better for a man to have a "millstone hanged about his neck, and be cast into the depth of the sea, than to offend one of his little ones:" and how the apostle Paul (who had as great legislative power in the church as any under Christ) held himself obliged by that common rule of charity, "not to lay a stumbling block, or an occasion of offence before a weak brother, choosing rather not to eat flesh whilst the world stands" (though in itself a thing lawful) "than offend his brother for whom Christ died:" we cannot but desire that these ceremonies may not be imposed on them who judge such impositions a violation of the royalty of Christ, and an impeachment of his laws as insufficient, and are under the holy awe of that which is written, Deut. xii, 32; "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it;" but that there may be either a total abolition of them, or at least such a liberty, that those who are unsatisfied concerning their lawfulness or expediency, may not be compelled to the practice of them, or subscription to them; but may be permitted to enjoy their ministerial function, and communion with the church, without them.

The rather because these ceremonies have for above an hundred years been the fountain of manifold evils in this church and nation, occasioning sad divisions between ministers and ministers, as also between ministers and people; exposing many orthodox, pious, and peaceable ministers to the displeasure of their rulers, casting them on the edge of the penal statutes, to the loss not only of their livings and liberties, but also of their opportunities for the service of Christ and his church; and forcing people either to worship God in such a

manner as their own consciences condemn, or doubt of, or else to forsake our assemblies, as thousands have done. And no better fruits than these can be looked for from the retaining and imposing of these ceremonies, unless we could presume, that all his majesty's subjects should have the same subtilty of judgment to discern even to a ceremony how far the power of man extends in the things of God, which is not to be expected; or should yield obedience to all the impositions of men concerning them, without inquiring into the will of God, which is not to be desired.

We do therefore most earnestly entreat the right reverend fathers and brethren, to whom these papers are delivered, as they tender the glory of God, the honour of religion, the peace of the church, the service of his majesty in the accomplishment of that happy union, which his majesty hath so abundantly testified his desires of, to join with us in importuning his most excellent majesty, that his most gracious indulgence, as to these ceremonies, granted in his royal Declaration, may be confirmed and continued to us and our posterities, and extended to such as do not yet enjoy the benefit thereof.

XIX. As to that passage in his majesty's Commission, where we are authorized and required to compare the present liturgy with the most ancient liturgies which have been used in the church in the purest and most primitive times; we have in obedience to his majesty's Commission, made enquiry, but cannot find any records of known credit, concerning any entire forms of liturgy, within the first three hundred years, which are confessed to be as the most primitive, so the purest ages of the church; nor any impositions of liturgies upon any national church for some hundreds of years after. We find indeed some liturgical forms fathered upon St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Ambrose, but we have not seen any copies of them, but such as give us sufficient evidence to conclude them either wholly spurious, or so interpolated, that we cannot make a judgment which in them hath any primitive authority.

Having thus in general expressed our desires, we come now to particulars, which we find numerous and of a various nature; some, we grant, are of inferior consideration, verbal rather than material, (which, were they not in the public liturgy of so famous a church, we should not have mentioned,) others dubious and disputable, as not having a clear foundation in Scripture for their warrant: but some there be that seem to be corrupt, and to carry in them a repugnancy to the rule of the Gospel; and therefore have administered just matter of exception and offence to many, truly religious and peaceable,—not of a private station only, but learned and judicious divines, as well of other reformed churches as of the church of England,—ever since the reformation.

We know much hath been spoken and written by way of apology in answer to many things that have been objected; but yet the doubts and scruples of tender consciences still continue or rather are increased. We do humbly conceive it therefore a work worthy of those wonders of salvation, which God hath wrought for his majesty now on the throne, and for the whole kingdom, and exceedingly becoming the ministers of ^{the} gospel of peace, with all holy moderation and tenderness to endeavour the removal of everything out of the worship of God which may justly offend or grieve the spirits of sober and godly people. The things themselves that are desired to be removed, not being of the foundation of religion, nor the essentials of public worship, nor the removal of them any way tending to the prejudice of the church or state: therefore their continuance and rigorous imposition can no ways be able to countervail the laying aside of so many pious and able ministers, and the unconceivable grief that will arise to multitudes of his majesty's most loyal and peaceable subjects, who upon all occasions are ready to serve him with their prayers, estates, and lives. For the preventing of which evils we humbly desire that these particulars following may be taken into serious and tender consideration.

CONCERNING MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

Rubric.

That morning and evening prayer shall be used in the accustomed place of the church, chancel, or chapel, except it be otherwise determined by the ordinary of the place; and the chancel shall remain as in times past.

therein, the matter shall be referred to the ordinary."

Rubric.

And here is to be noted, that the minister, at the time of the communion, and at other times, in his ministration shall use such ornaments in the church, as were in use by authority of parliament, in the second year of the reign of Edward the Sixth, according to the act of parliament.

Rubric.

The Lord's Prayer after the absolution ends thus, "Deliver us from evil."

Exception.

We desire that the words of the first rubric may be expressed as in the book established by authority of parliament 5 and 6 Edw. VI thus; "The morning and evening prayer shall be used in such place of the church, chapel, or chancel, and the minister shall so turn him, as the people may best hear, and if there be any controversy

Exception.

Forasmuch as this rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, albe, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer book, 5 and 6 Edw. VI and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we desire it may be wholly left out.

Exception.

We desire that these words, "For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen," may

be always added unto the Lord's prayer; and that this prayer may not be enjoined to be so often used in morning and evening service.

Rubric.

And at the end of every psalm throughout the year, and likewise in the end of *Benedictus*, *Benedicite*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*, shall be repeated, "Glory be to the Father," &c.

repetition which Christ forbids: for the avoiding of which appearance of evil, we desire it may be used but once in the morning, and once in the evening.

Exception.

By this rubric, and other places in the Common Prayer books, the *Gloria Patri* is appointed to be said six times ordinarily in every morning and evening service, frequently eight times in a morning, sometimes ten; which we think carries with it at least an appearance of that vain

Rubric.

In such places where they do sing, there shall the Lessons be sung, in a plain tune, and likewise the Epistle and Gospel.

them with an audible voice tends more to the edification of the church.

Exception.

The Lessons, and the Epistles, and Gospels, being for the most part neither psalms nor hymns, we know no warrant why they should be sung in any place, and conceive that the distinct reading of

Rubric.

Or this canticle, *Benedicite omnia opera.*

Exception.

We desire that some psalm or scripture hymn may be appointed instead of that apocryphal.

IN THE LITANY.

Rubric.

From all fornication,
and all other deadly sin.

altered; "From fornication, and all other heinous, or grievous sins."

Exception.

In regard that the wages
of sin is death; we desire
that this clause may be thus

Rubric.

From battle, and mur-
der, and sudden death.

desire, if it be thought fit, it may be thus read: "From battle and murder, and from dying suddenly, and unprepared."

Exception.

Because this expression of
"sudden death" hath been so
often excepted against, we

Rubric.

That it may please thee,
to preserve all that travel
by land or by water, all
women labouring with
child, all sick persons,
and young children, and
to shew thy pity upon all
prisoners and captives.

Exception.

We desire the term "all"
may be advised upon, as
seeming liable to just excep-
tions; and that it may be
considered, whether it may
not better be put indefinitely,
"those that travel," &c.,
rather than universally.

THE COLLECT ON CHRISTMAS DAY.

Rubric.

Almighty God, which
hast given us thy only
begotten Son, to take our
nature upon him, and
this day to be born of a
pure virgin, &c.

Exception.

We desire that in both
collects the word "this day"
may be left out, it being
according to vulgar accepta-
tion a contradiction.

Rubic.

Then shall follow the collect of the Nativity, which shall be said continually unto new-years-day.

THE COLLECT FOR WHITSUNDAY.

Rubic.

God which upon this day, &c.

Rubic.

The same collect to be read on Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun-week.

Rubic.

The two collects for St. John's day, and Innocent's, the collects for the first day in Lent, for the fourth Sunday after Easter, for Trinity Sunday, for the sixth and twelfth Sunday after Trinity, for St. Luke's day, and Michaelmas day.

Exception.

We desire that these collects may be further considered and abated, as having in them divers things that we judge fit to be altered.

THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Rubic.

So many as intend to be partakers of the holy communion shall signify their names to the curate

Exception.

The time here assigned for notice to be given to the minister is not sufficient.

over night, or else in the morning before the beginning of morning prayer, or immediately after.

Rubric.

And if any of these be a notorious evil liver, the curate, having knowledge thereof, shall call him and advertize him in any wise not to presume to the Lord's table.

sion of their faith, and promised obedience to the will of God, according as is expressed in the considerations of the rubric before the catechism; and that all possible diligence be used for the instruction and reformation of scandalous offenders, whom the minister shall not suffer to partake of the Lord's table until they have openly declared themselves to have truly repented and amended their former naughty lives, as is partly expressed in the rubric, and more fully in the canons."

Rubric.

Then shall the priest rehearse distinctly all the ten commandments, and the people kneeling, shall after every commandment ask God's mercy for transgressing the same.

3. That neither minister nor people may be enjoined to kneel more at the reading of this than of other parts of Scriptures, the rather because many ignorant persons are thereby induced to use the ten commandments as a prayer.

Exception.

We desire the ministers' power both to admit and keep from the Lord's table, may be according to his majesty's Declaration, 25th Oct., 1660, in these words;—"The minister shall admit none to the Lord's supper till they have made a credible profes-

Exception.

We desire,

1. That the preface prefixed by God himself to the ten commandments may be restored.

2. That the fourth commandment may be read as in Exod. xx, Deut. v, "He blessed the Sabbath-day."

4. That, instead of those short prayers of the people intermixed with the several commandments, the minister, after the reading of all, may conclude with a suitable prayer.

Rubric.

After the Creed, if there be no sermon, shall follow one of the homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by common authority.

After such sermon, homily, or exhortation, the curate shall declare, &c., and earnestly exhort them to remember the poor, saying one or more of these sentences following.

Then shall the churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people.

Exhortation.

We be come together at this time to feed at the Lord's supper, unto the which in God's behalf I bid you all that be here present, and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not refuse to come, &c.

Exception.

We desire that the preaching of the word may be strictly enjoined, and not left so indifferent, at the administration of the sacraments; as also that ministers may not be bound to those things which are as yet but future and not in being.

Two of the sentences here cited are apocryphal, and four of them more proper to draw out the people's bounty to their ministers, than their charity to the poor.

Collection for the poor may be better made at or a little before the departing of the communicants.

If it be intended that these exhortations should be read at the communion, they seem to us to be unseasonable.

The way and means thereto is first to examine your lives and conversation; and if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as be not only against God, but also against your neighbours, then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them, and be ready to make restitution and satisfaction.

And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion but with a full trust in God's mercy and with a quiet conscience.

[*Rubr.*] *Before the Confession.*

Then shall this general confession be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy communion either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himself.

[*Rubr.*] *Before the Confession.*

Then shall the priest or the bishop (being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus.

[*Proper*] *Preface on Christmas day, and seven days after.*

Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as this day for us, &c.

We fear this may discourage many from coming to the sacrament, who lie under a doubting and troubled conscience.

We desire it may be made by the minister only.

Exception.

The minister turning himself to the people is most convenient throughout the whole ministration.

First, we cannot peremptorily fix the nativity of our Saviour to this or that day particularly. Secondly, it

[*Proper Preface*] Upon *Whit-*
sunday, and six days after.

According to whose most true promise, the Holy Ghost came down this day from heaven.

Prayer before that which is at the consecration.

Grant us that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood.

Prayer at the consecration.

Hear us, O merciful Father, &c., who in the same night that he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, &c.

Rubric.

Then shall the minister first receive the communion in both kinds, &c., and after deliver it to the

seems incongruous to affirm the birth of Christ and the descending of the Holy Ghost to be on this day for seven or eight days together.

We desire that, whereas these words seem to give a greater efficacy to the blood than to the body of Christ, they may be altered thus, "That our sinful souls and bodies may be cleansed through his precious body and blood."

We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's breaking of the bread is not so much as mentioned.

We desire, that at the distribution of the bread and wine to the communicants, we may use the words of our Saviour as near as may be,

people in their hands, kneeling; and when he delivereth the bread, he shall say, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, and take and eat this in remembrance," &c.

the apostles used, though Christ was personally present amongst them, nor that which was used in the purest and primitive times of the church) may be left free, as it was 1 and 2 Edw. [VI,] "As touching kneeling, &c., they may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth, without blame."

Rubric.

And note, that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one, and shall also receive the sacraments and other rites, according to the order in this book appointed.

"Every minister shall be bound to administer the sacrament of the Lord's supper at least thrice a year, provided there be a due number of communicants manifesting their desires to receive."

and that the minister be not required to deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand, and to repeat the words to each one in the singular number, but that it may suffice to speak them to divers jointly, according to our Saviour's example.

We also desire that the kneeling at the sacrament (it being not that gesture which

Exception.

Forasmuch as every parishioner is not duly qualified for the Lord's supper, and those habitually prepared are not at all times actually disposed, but many may be hindered by the providence of God, and some by the temper of their own spirits, we desire this rubric may be either wholly omitted, or thus altered:—

And we desire that the following rubric in the Common Prayer book, in 5 and 6 Edw. [VI,] established by law as much as any other part of the Common Prayer book, may be restored for the vindicating of our church in the matter of kneeling at the sacrament (although the gesture be left indifferent :) “Although no order can be so perfectly devised but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part; and yet, because brotherly charity willeth that, so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away; therefore are we willing to do the same. Whereas it is ordained in the book of Common Prayer, in the administration of the Lord’s supper, that the communicants kneeling should receive the holy communion, which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ given unto the worthy receivers, and to avoid the profanation and disorder which about the holy communion might else ensue, lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare, that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood: for as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians: and as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven, and not here; for it is against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be in more places than in one at one time.”

OF PUBLIC BAPTISM.

There being divers learned, pious, and peaceable ministers who not only judge it unlawful to baptize children whose parents both of them are atheists, infidels, heretics, or unbaptized, but also such whose parents are excommunicate

persons, fornicators, or otherwise notorious and scandalous sinners; we desire they may not be enforced to baptize the children of such, until they have made due profession of their repentance.

Before Baptism.

Rubic.

Parents shall give notice over night, or in the morning.

Exception.

We desire that more timely notice may be given.

Rubic.

And the godfathers, and the godmothers, and the people with the children, &c.

Exception.

Here is no mention of the parents, in whose right the child is baptized, and who are fittest both to dedicate it unto God, and to covenant for it: we do not know that any persons

except the parents, or some others appointed by them, have any power to consent for the children, or to enter them into covenant. We desire it may be left free to parents, whether they will have sureties to undertake for their children in baptism or no.

Rubic.

Ready at the font.

Exception.

We desire it may be so placed as all the congregation may best see and hear the whole administration.

In the first Prayer.

By the baptism of thy well-beloved Son, &c. didst sanctify the flood Jordan, and all other waters, to the mystical washing away of sin, &c.

It being doubtful whether either the flood Jordan or any other waters were sanctified to a sacramental use, by Christ's being baptized, and not necessary to be asserted, we desire this may be otherwise expressed.

The third Exhortation.

Do promise by you
that be their sureties.

We know not by what right the sureties do promise and answer in the name of the infant: it seemeth to us also to countenance the Anabaptistical opinion of the necessity of an actual profession of faith and repentance in order to baptism. That such a profession may be required of parents in their own name,

The Questions.

Dost thou forsake, &c.
Dost thou believe, &c.
Wilt thou be baptized,
&c.

and now solemnly renewed when they present their children to baptism, we willingly grant: but the asking of one for another is a practice whose warrant we doubt of: and therefore we desire that the two first interrogatories may be put to the parents to be answered in their own names, and the last propounded to the parents or pro-parents thus, "Will you have this child baptized into this faith?"

*The second Prayer before
Baptism.*

May receive remission
of [their] sins by spiritual
regeneration.

This expression seeming inconvenient, we desire it may be changed into this; "May be regenerated and receive the remission of sins."

In the Prayer after Baptism.

That it hath pleased
thee to regenerate this
infant by thy Holy Spirit.

We cannot in faith say, that every child that is baptized is "regenerated by God's Holy Spirit;" at least it is a disputable point, and therefore we desire it may be otherwise expressed.

[Rubric] After Baptism.

Then shall the priest
make a cross, &c.

Concerning the cross in baptism, we refer to our 18th general.

OF PRIVATE BAPTISM.

We desire that baptism may not be administered in a private place at any time, unless by a lawful minister, and in the presence of a competent number: that where it is evident that any child hath been so baptized, no part of the administration may be reiterated in public, under any limitations: and therefore we see no need of any liturgy in that case.

OF THE CATECHISM.

Catechism.

1. *Quest.* What is your name, &c.

2. *Quest.* Who gave you that name?

Ans. My godfathers and my godmothers in my baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

3. *Quest.* What did your godfathers and godmothers do for you in baptism?

[*Ans.* They did promise and vow three things in my name, &c.]

Of the Rehearsal of the Ten Commandments.

10. *Ans.* My duty towards God is to believe in him, &c.

Exception.

We desire these three first questions may be altered; considering that the fargreater number of persons baptized within these twenty years last past, had no godfathers or godmothers at their baptism. The like to be done in the seventh question.

We conceive it might be more safely expressed thus; "Wherein I was visibly admitted into the number of the members of Christ, the children of God, and the heirs (rather than 'inheritors') of the kingdom of heaven."

We desire that the commandments be inserted according to the new translation of the Bible.

In this answer there seems

to be particular respect to the several commandments of the first table, as in the following answer to those of the second. And therefore we desire it may be advised upon, whether to the last word of this answer may not be added, "particularly on the Lord's day," otherwise there being nothing in all this answer that refers to the fourth commandment.

14. *Quest.* How many sacraments hath Christ ordained, &c. ?

Ans. Two only as generally necessary to salvation.

That these words may be omitted, and answer thus given; "Two only, baptism and the Lord's supper."

19. *Quest.* What is required of persons to be baptized ?

Ans. Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God, &c.

20. *Quest.* Why then are infants baptized when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them ?

Ans. Yes: they do perform them by their sureties, who promise and vow them both in their names.

We desire that the entering infants into God's covenant may be more warily expressed, and that the words may not seem to found their baptism upon a really actual faith and repentance of their own; and we desire that a promise may not be taken for a performance of such faith and repentance: and especially, that it be not asserted that they perform these by the promise of their sureties, it being to the seed of believers that the covenant of God is made; and not (that we can find) to all that have such believing sureties, who are neither parents nor pro-parents of the child.

In the general we observe, that the doctrine of the sacraments which was added upon the conference at Hampton Court, is much more fully and particularly delivered than the other parts of the Catechism, in short answers fitted to the

memories of children, and thereupon we offer it to be considered:—

First, Whether there should not be a more distinct and full explication of the Creed, the Commandments and the Lord's Prayer.

Secondly, Whether it were not convenient to add (what seems to be wanting) somewhat particularly concerning the nature of faith, of repentance, the two covenants, of justification, sanctification, adoption, and regeneration.

OF CONFIRMATION.

The last Rubric before the Catechism.

And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation, he shall know for truth, that it is certain by God's word that children, being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved.

Although we charitably suppose the meaning of these words was only to exclude the necessity of any other sacraments to baptized infants; yet these words are dangerous as to the misleading of the vulgar, and therefore we desire they may be expunged.

Rubric after the Catechism.

So soon as the children can say in their mother-tongue the Articles of the Faith, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and can answer such other questions of

We conceive that it is not a sufficient qualification for confirmation, that children be able *memoriter* to repeat the Articles of the Faith, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and

this short Catechism, &c., then shall they be brought to the bishop, &c., and the bishop shall confirm them.

to answer to some questions of this short Catechism; for it is often found that children are able to do all this at four or five years old. 2ndly, It crosses what is said in the

third reason of the first rubric before confirmation, concerning the usage of the church in times past, ordaining that confirmation should be ministered unto them that were of perfect age, that they being instructed in the Christian religion, should openly profess their own faith, and promise to be obedient to the will of God. And therefore, 3rdly, we desire that none may be confirmed but according to his majesty's Declaration, viz., "That confirmation be rightly and solemnly performed by the information, and with the consent of the minister of the place."

Rubric after the Catechism.

Then shall they be brought to the bishop by one that shall be his godfather or godmother.

This seems to bring in another sort of godfathers and godmothers, besides those made use of in baptism; and we see no need either of the one or the other.

The Prayer before the Imposition of Hands.

Who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them the forgiveness of all their sins.

This supposeth that all the children who are brought to be confirmed have the Spirit of Christ, and the forgiveness of all their sins; whereas a great number of children at that age, having committed many sins since their baptism,

do show no evidence of serious repentance, or of any special saving grace; and therefore this confirmation (if administered to such) would be a perilous and gross abuse.

*Rubric before the Imposition
of Hands.*

Then the bishop shall lay his hand on every child severally.

This seems to put a higher value upon confirmation than upon baptism or the Lord's supper; for according to the rubric and order in the

Common Prayer book, every deacon may baptize, and every minister may consecrate and administer the Lord's supper, but the bishop only may confirm.

*The Prayer after Imposition
of Hands.*

We make our humble supplications unto thee for these children; upon whom, after the example of thy holy apostles, we have laid our hands, to certify them, by this sign, of thy favour and gracious goodness towards them.

We desire that the practice of the apostles may not be alleged as a ground of this imposition of hands for the confirmation of children, both because the apostles did never use it in that case, as also because the Articles of the Church of England declare it to be a "corrupt imitation of the apostles' practice," Acts xxv.

We desire that imposition of hands may not be made, as here it is, a sign to certify children of God's grace and favour towards them; because this seems to speak it a sacrament, and is contrary to that fore-mentioned 25th Article, which saith, that "confirmation hath no visible sign appointed by God."

*The last Rubric after Con-
firmation.*

None shall be admitted to the holy communion,

We desire that confirmation may not be made so ne-

until such time as he can say the Catechism, and be confirmed.

cessary to the holy communion, as that none should be admitted to it unless they be confirmed.

OF THE FORM OF SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY.

The man shall give the woman a ring, &c. — shall surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made, whereof this ring given and received is a token and pledge, &c.

Seeing this ceremony of the ring in marriage is made necessary to it, and a significant sign of the vow and covenant betwixt the parties; and Romish ritualists give such reasons for the use and institution of the ring, as are either frivolous or superstitious; it is desired that this ceremony of the ring in marriage may be left indifferent, to be used or forborne.

The man shall say,
With my body I thee worship.

This word “worship” being much altered in the use of it since this form was first drawn up, we desire some other word may be used instead of it.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

These words being only used in baptism, and here in the solemnization of matrimony, and in the absolution

of the sick; we desire it may be considered, whether they should not be here omitted, lest they should seem to favour those who count matrimony a sacrament.

Till death us depart.

This word “depart” is here improperly used.

Rubric.

Then the minister or clerk going to the Lord's table, shall say or sing this psalm.

Next Rubric.

The psalm ended, and the man and the woman kneeling before the Lord's table, the priest standing at the table, and turning his face, &c.

Collect.

Consecrated the state of matrimony to such an excellent mystery.

The said passage in this collect seems to countenance the opinion of making matrimony a sacrament, we desire that clause may be altered or omitted.

Rubric.

Then shall begin the communion, and after the Gospel shall be said a sermon, &c.

Last Rubric.

The new married persons the same day of their marriage must receive the holy communion.

Exception.

We conceive this change of place and posture mentioned in these two rubrics is needless, and therefore desire it may be omitted.

Exception.

Seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

seeing the institution of marriage was before the fall, and so before the promise of Christ, as also for that the

often accompanied with such divertisements as are unsuitable to those Christian duties, which ought to be before and follow after the receiving of that holy sacrament.

OF THE ORDER FOR THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.

Rubric before Absolution.

Here shall the sick person make a special confession, &c., after which confession the priest shall absolve him after this sort: Our Lord Jesus Christ, &c., and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee.

Exception.

Forasmuch as the conditions of sick persons be very various and different, the minister may not only in the exhortation, but in the prayer also be directed to apply himself to the particular condition of the person, as he shall find most suitable to the present occasion, with due regard had both to his spiritual condition and bodily weak-

ness; and that the absolution may only be recommended to the minister to be used or omitted as he shall see occasion.

That the form of absolution be declarative and conditional, as, "I pronounce thee absolved"—instead of, "I absolve thee"—"if thou dost truly repent and believe."

OF THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

Rubric.

But if the sick person be not able to come to the church, and yet is desirous to receive the communion in his house, then he must give knowledge overnight, or else early in the morning, to the curate: and having a con-

Consider, that many sick persons, either by their ignorance or vicious life, without any evident manifestation of repentance, or by the nature of the disease disturbing their intellectuals, be unfit for receiving the sacrament. It is proposed, that the minister be not enjoined to administer

venient place in the sick man's house, he shall there administer the holy communion.

the sacrament to every sick person that shall desire it, but only as he shall judge expedient.

OF THE ORDER FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

We desire it may be expressed in a rubric, that the prayers and exhortations here used are not for the benefit of the dead, but only for the instruction and comfort of the living.

First Rubric.

The priest meeting the corpse at the church-stile, shall say, or else the priest and clerk shall sing, &c.

think fit, for the preventing of many times both ministers and people are exposed unto by standing in the open air.

We desire that ministers may be left to use their discretion in these circumstances, and to perform the whole service in the church, if they

those inconveniences which

The second Rubric.

When they come to the grave, the priest shall say, &c.

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed;

we therefore commit his body to the ground in sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life.

These words cannot in truth be said of persons living and dying in open and notorious sins.

The first Prayer.

We give thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world, &c.

These words may harden the wicked, and are inconsistent with the largest rational charity.

That we, with this our brother, and all other departed in the true faith of thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss.

The last Prayer.

That when we depart this life, we may rest in him, as our hope is this our brother doth.

These words cannot be used with respect to those persons who have not by their actual repentance given any ground for the hope of their blessed estate.

OF THE THANKSGIVING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILD-BIRTH,
COMMONLY CALLED CHURCHING OF WOMEN.

Rubric.

The woman shall come unto the church, and there shall kneel down in some convenient place nigh unto the place where the table stands, and the priest standing by her shall say, &c.

In regard that the women's kneeling near the table is in many churches inconvenient, we desire that these words may be left out, and that the minister may perform that service either in the desk or pulpit.

Rubric.

Then the priest shall say this Psalm cxxi.

Exception.

This Psalm seems not to be so pertinent as some other, viz., as Psalm cxliii, and Psalm cxxviii.

O Lord, save this woman thy servant.

Ans. Which putteth her trust in thee.

It may fall out that a woman may come to give thanks for a child born in adultery or fornication, and therefore we desire that something may be required of her by way of profession of her humiliation, as well as of her thanksgiving.

Last Rubric.

The woman that comes to give thanks, must offer the accustomed offerings.

This may seem too like a Jewish purification, rather than a Christian thanksgiving.

The same Rubric.

And if there be a communion, it is convenient that she receive the holy communion.

We desire this may be interpreted of the duly qualified; for a scandalous sinner may come to make this thanksgiving.

Thus have we in all humble pursuance of his majesty's most gracious endeavours for the public weal of this church, drawn up our thoughts and desires in this weighty affair, which we humbly offer to his majesty's commissioners for their serious and grave consideration; wherein we have not the least thought of depraving or reproaching the Book of Common Prayer, but a sincere desire to contribute our endeavours towards the healing the distempers, and (as soon as may be) reconciling the minds of brethren. And inasmuch as his majesty hath in his gracious Declaration and Commission mentioned new forms to be made and suited to the several parts of worship; we have made a considerable progress therein, and shall (by God's assistance) offer them to the reverend commissioners with all convenient speed. And if the Lord shall graciously please to give a blessing to these

our endeavours, we doubt not but the peace of the church will be thereby settled, the hearts of ministers and people comforted and composed, and the great mercy of unity and stability (to the immortal honour of our most dear sovereign) bestowed upon us and our posterity after us.

XVI.

The Answer of the Bishops to the Exceptions of the Ministers.
—Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, Oxford, 1849,
pp. 335—63.

1. Before we come to the proposals it will be perhaps necessary to say a word or two to the preface, wherein they begin with a thankful acknowledgment of his majesty's most princely condescension; to which we shall only say, that we conceive the most real expression of their thankfulness had been a hearty compliance with his majesty's earnest and passionate request for the use of the present liturgy, at least so much of it as they acknowledge by these papers to be lawful: how far they have in this expressed their thankfulness the world sees, we need not say.

2. It can be no just cause of offence to mind them of their duty, as they do us of ours, telling us it is our duty to imitate the apostles' practice in a special manner, to be tender of the church's peace, and to advise of such expedients, as may conduce to the healing of breaches, and uniting those that differ. For preserving of the church's peace we know no better nor more efficacious way than our set liturgy; there being no such way to keep us from schism, as to speak all the same thing according to the apostle.

3. This experience of former and latter times hath taught us; when the liturgy was duly observed we lived in peace; since that was laid aside there have been as many modes

and fashions of public worship, as fancies. We have had continual dissensions, which variety of services must needs produce, whilst everyone naturally desires and endeavours not only to maintain, but to prefer his own way before all others; whence we conceive there is no such way to the preservation of peace, as for all to return to the strict use and practice of the form.

4. And the best expedients to unite us to that again, and so to peace, are, besides our prayers to the God of peace, to make us all of one mind in a house, to labour to get true humility, which would make us think our guides wiser and fitter to order us than we ourselves, and Christian charity, which would teach us to think no evil of our superiors, but to judge them rather careful guides and fathers to us; which being obtained, nothing can be imagined justly to hinder us from a ready compliance to this method of service appointed by them, and so live in unity.

5. If it be objected that the liturgy is in any way sinful and unlawful for us to join with, it is but reason that this be first proved evidently before anything be altered; it is no argument to say that multitudes of sober pious persons scruple the use of it, unless it be made to appear by evident reasons that the liturgy gave the just grounds to make such scruples. For if the bare pretence of scruples be sufficient to exempt us from obedience, all law and order is gone.

6. On the contrary, we judge that if the liturgy should be altered, as is there required, not only a multitude, but the generality of the soberest and most loyal children of the Church of England would justly be offended, since such an alteration would be a virtual confession that this liturgy were an intolerable burden to tender consciences, a direct cause of schism, a superstitious usage (upon which pretences it is here desired to be altered); which would at once both justify all those which have so obstinately separated from it, as the only pious tender-conscienced men, and condemn all those that have adhered to that, in conscience of their duty

and loyalty, with their loss or hazard of estates, lives, and fortunes, as men superstitious, schismatical, and void of religion and conscience. For this reason and those that follow, we cannot consent to such an alteration as is desired, till these pretences be proved; which we conceive in no wise to be done in these papers, and shall give reasons for this our judgment.

Prop. 1. § 1. To the first general proposal we answer, That as to that part of it which requires that the matter of the liturgy may not be private opinion or fancy, that being the way to perpetuate schism; the church hath been careful to put nothing into the liturgy, but that which is either evidently the Word of God, or what hath been generally received in the catholic church: neither of which can be called private opinion, and if the contrary can be proved, we wish it out of the liturgy.

§ 2. We heartily desire that, according to this proposal, great care may be taken to suppress those private conceptions of prayers before and after sermon, lest private opinions be made the matter of prayer in public, as hath and will be, if private persons take liberty to make public prayers.

§ 3. To that part of the proposal that the prayers may consist of nothing doubtful or questioned by pious, learned, and orthodox persons, they not determining who be those orthodox persons; we must either take all them for orthodox persons, who shall confidently affirm themselves to be such, and then we say first, the demand is unreasonable; for some such as call themselves orthodox have questioned the prime article of our Creed, even the Divinity of the Son of God, and yet there is no reason we should part with our Creed for that. Besides, the proposal requires impossibility; for there never was, nor is, nor can be such prayers made, as have not been, nor will be questioned by some who call themselves pious, learned, and orthodox. If by orthodox be meant those who adhere to Scripture and the catholic consent of antiquity, we do not yet know that any part of our liturgy hath been questioned by such.

§ 4. To those generals “loading public forms with church pomp, garments, imagery, and many superfluities that creep into the church under the name of order and decency, incumbering churches with superfluities, over rigid reviving of obsolete customs, &c.,” we say that if these generals be intended as applicable to our liturgy in particular, they are gross and foul slanders, contrary to their profession, (page ult.) and so either that or this contrary to their conscience; if not, they signify nothing to the present business, and so might with more prudence and candour have been omitted.

Prop. 2. It was the wisdom of our reformers to draw up such a liturgy as neither Romanist nor Protestant could justly except against; and therefore as the first never charged it with any positive errors, but only the want of something they conceived necessary, so it was never found fault with by those to whom the name of protestants most properly belongs, those that profess the Augustan confession: and for those who unlawfully and sinfully brought it into dislike with some people, to urge the present state of affairs as an argument why the book should be altered, to give them satisfaction, and so that they should take advantage by their own unwarrantable acts, is not reasonable.

Prop. 3, 4. The 3rd and 4th proposals may go together, the demand in both being against responsals and alternate readings, in hymns and psalms and litany, &c., and that upon such reason as doth in truth enforce the necessity of continuing them as they are, namely for edification. They would take these away, because they do not edify; and upon that very reason they should continue, because they do edify, if not by informing of our reasons and understandings (the prayers and hymns were never made for a catechism), yet by quickening, continuing, and uniting our devotion, which is apt to freeze or sleep, or flat in a long continued prayer or form: it is necessary therefore for the edifying of us therein to be often called upon and awakened by frequent Amens, to be excited and stirred up by mutual exultations, provocations,

petitions, holy contentions and strivings, which shall most shew his own, and stir up others' zeal to the glory of God. For this purpose alternate reading, repetitions, and responsals are far better than a long tedious prayer. Nor is this our opinion only, but the judgment of former ages, as appears by the practice of ancient Christian churches, and of the Jews also: (Socrat. l. vi, c. 8; Theodor. l. ii, c. 24; 2. Chron. vii, 1, 4; Ezra iii, 11.) But it seems, they say, to be against the Scripture, wherein the minister is appointed for the people in public prayers, the people's part being to attend with silence, and to declare their assent in the close by saying Amen: if they mean that the people in public services must only say this word Amen, as they can no where prove it in the Scriptures, so it doth certainly seem to them that it cannot be proved; for they directly practise the contrary in one of their principal parts of worship, singing of psalms, where the people bear as great a part as the minister. If this way be done in Hopkins', why not in David's Psalms; if in metre, why not in prose; if in a psalm, why not in a litany?

Prop. 5. § 1. It is desired that nothing should be in the liturgy which so much as seems to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast; and this as an expedient to peace; which is in effect to desire that this our church may be contentious for peace sake, and to divide from the church catholic, that we may live at unity among ourselves. For St. Paul reckons them amongst the lovers of contention, who shall oppose themselves against the customs of the churches of God. That the religious observation of Lent was a custom of the churches of God, appears by the testimonies following. Chrys. Serm. xi, in Heb. x, Cyrill. Catec. Myst. 5, St. Aug. Ep. 119. *ut 40 dies ante Pascha observentur, ecclesie consuetudo roboravit.* And St. Hierom ad Marcel. says it was *secundum traditionem apostolorum*: this demand then tends not to peace but dissension. The fasting forty days may be in imitation of our Saviour for all that is here said to the contrary; for though we cannot arrive to his perfection, ab-

staining wholly from meat so long, yet we may fast 40 days together, either Cornelius' fast, till 3 of the clock afternoon, or St. Peter's fast till noon, or at least Daniel's fast, abstaining from meats and drinks of delight, and thus far imitate our Lord.

§ 2. Nor does the act of parliament 5 Eliz. forbid it; we dare not think a parliament did intend to forbid that which Christ's church hath commanded. Nor does the act determine anything about Lent fast, but only provide for the maintenance of the navy, and of fishing in order thereunto, as is plain by the act. Besides we conceive that we must not so interpret one act as to contradict another, being still in force and unrepealed. Now the act of 1 Eliz. confirms the whole liturgy, and in that the religious keeping of Lent, with a severe penalty upon those who shall by open words speak any thing in derogation of any part thereof: and therefore that other act of 5 Eliz. must not be interpreted to forbid the religious keeping of Lent.

Prop. 6. The observation of saints' days is not as of divine but ecclesiastical institution, and therefore it is not necessary that they should have any other ground in Scripture than all other institutions of the same nature, so that they be agreeable to the Scripture in the general end, for the promoting piety. And the observation of them was ancient, as appears by the rituals and liturgies, and by the joint consent of antiquity, and by the ancient translation of the Bible, as the Syriac and Ethiopic, where the lessons appointed for holydays are noted and set down; the former of which was made near the apostles' times. Besides our Saviour himself kept a feast of the church's institution, viz. the feast of the dedication (St. John x, 22). The chief end of these days being not feasting, but the exercise of holy duties, they are fitter called holydays than festivals: and though they be all of like nature, it doth not follow that they are equal. The people may be dispensed with for their work after the service, as authority pleaseth. The other names are left in the calendar, not that they should be so kept

as holydays, but they are useful for the preservation of their memories, and for other reasons, as for leases, law-days, &c.

Prop. 7. § 1. This makes all the liturgy void, if every minister may put in and leave out at his discretion.

§ 2. The gift or rather spirit of prayer consists in the inward graces of the spirit, not in extempore expressions, which any man of natural parts, having a voluble tongue and audacity, may attain to without any special gift.

§ 3. But if there be any such gift, as is pretended, it is to be subject to the prophets and to the order of the church.

§ 4. The mischiefs that come by idle, impertinent, ridiculous, sometimes seditious, impious, and blasphemous expressions, under pretence of the gift, to the dishonour of God and scorn of religion, being far greater than the pretended good of exercising the gift, it is fit that they who desire such liberty in public devotions, should first give the church security, that no private opinions should be put into their prayers, as is desired in the first proposal; and that nothing contrary to the faith should be uttered before God, or offered up to him in the church.

§ 5. To prevent which mischief the former ages knew no better way than to forbid any prayers in public, but such as were prescribed by public authority. Con. Carthag. Can. 106, Milev. Can. 12.

Prop. 9. As they would have no saints' days observed by the church, so no apocryphal chapter read in the church, but upon such a reason as would exclude all sermons as well as apocrypha; viz. because the holy Scriptures contain in them all things necessary, either in doctrine to be believed, or in duty to be practised. If so, why so many unnecessary sermons? why any more but reading of Scriptures? If notwithstanding their sufficiency sermons be necessary, there is no reason why these apocryphal chapters should not be as useful, most of them containing excellent discourses, and rules of morality. It is heartily to be wished that sermons were as good. If their fear be that, by this mean, those books may

come to be of equal esteem with the canon, they may be secured against that by the title which the church hath put upon them, calling them apocryphal: and it is the church's testimony which teacheth us this difference, and to leave them out were to cross the practice of the church in former ages.

Prop. 10. That the minister should not read the communion service at the communion table, is not reasonable to demand, since all the primitive church used it, and if we do not observe that golden rule of the venerable council of Nice, "Let ancient customs prevail, till reason plainly requires the contrary," we shall give offence to sober Christians by a causeless departure from catholic usage, and a greater advantage to enemies of our church, than our brethren, I hope, would willingly grant. The priest standing at the communion table seemeth to give us an invitation to the holy sacrament, and minds us of our duty, viz. to receive the holy communion, some at least every Sunday; and though we neglect our duty, it is fit the church should keep her standing.

Prop. 11. It is not reasonable that the word minister should be only used in the liturgy. For since some parts of the liturgy may be performed by a deacon, others by none under the order of a priest, viz. absolution, consecration, it is fit that some such word as priest should be used for those officers, and not minister, which signifies at large every one that ministers in that holy office, of what order soever he be; the word curate signifying properly all those who are trusted by the bishops with cure of souls, as anciently it signified, is a very fit word to be used, and can offend no sober person. The word Sunday is ancient, (Just. Mart. Ap. 2,) and therefore not to be left off.

Prop. 12. Singing of psalms in metre is no part of the liturgy, and so no part of our commission.

Prop. 15. "The phrase is such, &c." The church in her prayers useth no more offensive phrase than St. Paul uses, when he writes to the Corinthians, Galatians, and others,

calling them in general the churches of God, sanctified in Christ Jesus, by vocation saints, amongst whom notwithstanding there were many, who by their known sins (which the apostle endeavoured to amend in them) were not properly such, yet he gives the denomination to the whole from the greater part, to whom in charity it was due, and puts the rest in mind what they have by their baptism undertaken to be, and what they profess themselves to be; and our prayers and the phrase of them surely supposes no more than that they are saints by calling, sanctified in Christ Jesus, by their baptism admitted into Christ's congregation, and so to be reckoned members of that society, till either they shall separate themselves by wilful schism, or be separated by legal excommunication; which they seem earnestly to desire, and so do we.

Prop. 16. § 1. The connection of the parts of our liturgy is conformable to the example of the churches of God before us, and have as much dependence as is usually to be seen in many petitions of the same psalm; and we conceive the order and method to be excellent, and must do so, till they tell us what that order is which prayers ought to have, which is not done here.

§ 2. The collects are made short as being best for devotion, as we observed before, and cannot be accounted faulty for being like those short but prevalent prayers in Scripture: "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner:" "Son of David, have mercy on us:" "Lord, increase our faith."

§ 3. Why the repeated mention of the name and attributes of God should not be most pleasing to any godly person, we cannot imagine; or what burden it should seem, when David magnified one attribute of God's mercy twenty-six times together, (Psa. cxxxvi.) Nor can we conceive why the name and merits of Jesus with which all our prayers should end, should not be as sweet to us as to former saints and martyrs, with which here they complain our prayers do so frequently end. Since the attributes of God are the ground of our hope of obtaining all our petitions, such prefaces of prayers as are

taken from them, though they have no special respect to the petitions following, are not to be termed unsuitable, or said to have fallen rather casually than orderly.

Prop. 17. § 1. Exc. 1. There are besides a preparative exhortation several preparatory prayers: "Despise not, O Lord, humble and contrite hearts;" which is one of the sentences in the preface: and this; "That those things may please him, which we do at this present;" at the end of the Absolution. And again immediately after the Lord's prayer before the psalmody: "O Lord, open thou our lips, &c."

§ 2. Exc. 2. This which they call a defect, others think they have reason to account the perfection of the liturgy, the offices of which being intended for common and general services, would cease to be such by descending to particulars, as in confession of sin; while it is general, all persons may and must join in it, since in many things we offend all. But if there be a particular enumeration of sins, it cannot be so general a confession, because it may happen that some or other may by God's grace have been preserved from some of those sins enumerated, and therefore should by confessing themselves guilty, tell God a lie; which needs a new confession.

§ 3. As for original sin, though we think it an evil custom springing from false doctrine, to use any such expressions as may lead people to think that to the persons baptized (in whose persons only our prayers are offered up) original sin is not forgiven in their holy baptism; yet for that there remains in the regenerate some relics of that which are to be bewailed, the church in her confession acknowledgeth such desires of our own hearts as render us miserable by following them: that there is no health in us: that without God's help our frailty cannot but fall: that our mortal nature can do no good thing without him: which is a clear acknowledgment of original sin.

§ 4. Exc. 3. We know not what public prayers are wanting, nor do they tell us; the usual complaint hath been, that there were too many. Neither do we conceive any

want of public thanksgivings: there being in the liturgy *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, *Benedicite*, *Glory be to God on high*, *Therefore with Angels and Archangels*, *The doxology*, *Glory be to the Father*, &c., all peculiar, as they require, to gospel worship, and fit to express our thanks and honour to God upon every particular occasion; and occasional thanksgivings after the litany, of the frequency whereof themselves elsewhere complain, who here complain of defect. If there be any forms wanting, the church will provide.

§ 5. Exc. 4. They complain that the liturgy contains too many generals, without mention of the particulars; and the instances are such petitions as these: That we may do God's will: to be kept from all evil: almost the very terms of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer: so that they must reform that, before they can pretend to mend our liturgy in these petitions.

§ 6. Exc. 5. We have deferred this to the proper place, as you might have done.

Prop. 18. § 1. We are now come to the main and principal demand as is pretended, viz., the abolishing the laws which impose any ceremonies, especially three—the surplice, the sign of the cross, and kneeling. These are the yoke, which, if removed, there might be peace. It is to be suspected, and there is reason for it from their own words, that somewhat else pinches, and that if these ceremonies were laid aside, and these, or any other prayers, strictly enjoined without them, it would be deemed a burden intolerable: it seems so, by No. 7, where they desire that when the liturgy is altered, according to the rest of their proposals, the minister may have liberty to add and leave out what he pleases. Yet because the imposition of these ceremonies is pretended to be the insupportable grievance, we must of necessity either yield that demand, or shew reason why we do not; and that we may proceed the better in this undertaking, we shall reduce the sum of their complaint to these several heads, as we find them in their papers.

The law for imposing these ceremonies they would have abrogated for these reasons :—

1. § 2. It is doubtful whether God hath given power to men to impose such signified signs, which though they call them significant, yet have in them no real goodness, in the judgment of the imposers themselves, being called by them things indifferent; and therefore fall not under St. Paul's rule of *omnia decenter*, nor are suitable to the simplicity of the Gospel worship.

2. § 3. Because it is a violation of the royalty of Christ, and an impeachment of his laws as insufficient, and so those that are under the law of Deut. xii, "Whatsoever I command you, observe to do; you shall take nothing from it, nor add anything to it;" you do not observe these.

3. § 4. Because sundry learned, pious, and orthodox men have, ever since the reformation, judged them unwarrantable; and we ought to be, as our Lord was, tender of weak brethren, not to offend his little ones, nor to lay a stumblingblock before a weak brother.

4. § 5. Because these ceremonies have been the fountain of many evils in this church and nation, occasioning sad divisions betwixt minister and minister, betwixt minister and people, exposing many orthodox preachers to the displeasure of rulers. And no other fruits than these can be looked for from the retaining these ceremonies.

§ 6. Rule 1. Before we give particular answer to these several reasons, it will not be unnecessary to lay down some certain general premises or rules, which will be useful in our whole discourse. 1. That God hath not given a power only, but a command also, of imposing whatsoever should be truly decent and becoming his public service (1 Cor. xiv). After St. Paul had ordered some particular rules for praying, praising, prophesying, etc., he concludes with this general canon. Let all things be done *εὐσχημόνως*, in a fit scheme, habit, or fashion, decently; and that there may be uniformity in those decent performances, let there be a *τάξις*, rule or canon, for that purpose.

§ 7. Rule 2. Not inferiors but superiors must judge what is convenient and decent. They who must order that all be done decently, must of necessity first judge what is convenient and decent to be ordered.

§ 8. Rule 3. These rules and canons for decency made and urged by superiors are to be obeyed by inferiors, till it be made as clear that now they are not bound to obey, as it is evident in general, that they ought to obey superiors. For if the exemption from obedience be not as evident as the command to obey, it must needs be sin not to obey.

§ 9. Rule 4. Pretence of conscience is no exemption from obedience, for the law, as long as it is a law, certainly binds to obedience. (Rom. xiii.) "Ye must needs be subject." And this pretence of a tender gainsaying conscience cannot abrogate the law, since it can neither take away the authority of the law-maker, nor make the matter of the law in itself unlawful. Besides, if pretence of conscience did exempt from obedience, laws were useless; whosoever had not list to obey, might pretend tenderness of conscience, and be thereby set at liberty; which if once granted, anarchy and confusion must needs follow.

§ 10. Rule 5. Though charity will move to pity, and relieve those that are truly perplexed or scrupulous, yet we must not break God's command, in charity to them; and therefore we must not perform public services undecently or disorderly for the ease of tender consciences.

§ 11. Ans. 1. These premised, we answer to your first reason, that those things which we call indifferent, because neither expressly commanded nor forbidden by God, have in them a real goodness, a fitness and decency, and for that cause are imposed, and may be so by the rule of St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv), by which rule, and many others in Scripture, a power is given to men to impose signs, which are never the worse, surely, because they signify something that is decent and comely: and so it is not doubtful whether such power be given. It would rather be doubtful whether the church could impose such idle signs, if any such there be, as signify nothing.

§ 12. Ans. 2. To the second, that it is not a violation of Christ's royalty to make such laws for decency, but an exercise of his power and authority, which he hath given to the church; and the disobedience to such commands of superiors is plainly a violation of his royalty: as it is no violation of the king's authority, when his magistrates command things according to his laws; but disobedience to the command of those injunctions of his deputies, is violation of his authority. Again, it can be no impeachment of Christ's laws as insufficient, to make such laws for decency, since our Saviour, as is evident from the precepts themselves, did not intend by them to determine every minute and circumstance of time, place, manner of performance, and the like, but only to command in general the substance of those duties, and the right ends that should be aimed at in the performance, and then left every man in particular (whom for that purpose he made reasonable) to guide himself by rules of reason, for private services; and appointed governors of the church to determine such particularities for the public. Thus our Lord commanded prayers, fasting, etc.: for the times and places of performance, he did not determine every of them, but left them to be guided as we have said. So that it is no impeachment of his laws as insufficient, to make laws for determining those particulars of decency, which himself did not, as is plain by his precepts, intend to determine, but left us governors for that purpose; to whom he said, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you;" and "Let all things be done decently and in order:" of whom he hath said to us, "Obey those that have the oversight over you:" and told us that if we will not hear his church, we must not be accounted as Christians, but heathens and publicans. And yet nevertheless they will not hear it and obey it in so small a matter as a circumstance of time, place, habit, or the like, which she thinks decent and fit, and yet will be accounted for the best Christians, and tell us that it is the very awe of God's law (Deut. xii, 32) that keeps them from obedience to the church in these commands; not well considering that it

cannot be any adding to the word of God, to command things for order and decency which the word of God commands to be done, so as they be not commanded as God's immediate word, but as the laws of men; but that it is undeniably adding to the Word of God to say that superiors may not command such things, which God hath no where forbidden, and taking from the Word of God to deny that power to men which God's word hath given them.

§ 13. Ans. 3. The command for decent ceremonies may still continue in the church notwithstanding the xii of Deut., and so it may too for all the exceptions taken against them by sundry learned, pious, and orthodox persons, who have judged them, they say, unwarrantably. And if laws may be abrogated as soon as those that list not to obey will except against them, the world must run into confusion. But those that except are weak brethren, whom, by Christ's precept and example, we must not offend. If by weak we understand ignorant, they would take it ill to be so accounted; and it is their own fault if they be, there having been much written as may satisfy any that have a mind to be satisfied. And as king James of blessed memory said at Hampton Court, "If after so many years preaching of the Gospel, there be any yet unsatisfied, I doubt it proceeds rather out of stubbornness of opinion than out of tenderness of conscience." If by tenderness of conscience they mean a fearfulness to sin, this would make them most easy to be satisfied, because most fearful to disobey superiors. But suppose there be any so scrupulous, as not satisfied with what hath been written, the church may still without sin urge her command for these decent ceremonies, and not be guilty of offending her weak brother; for since the scandal is taken by him, not given by her, it is he that by vain scrupulosity offends himself, and lays the stumblingblock in his own way.

§ 14. The case of St. Paul, not eating of flesh, if it offended his brother, is nothing to the purpose; who there speaks of things not commanded either by God or by his church, neither having in them anything of decency, or significancy

to serve in the church. St. Paul would deny himself his own liberty, rather than offend his brother; but if any man breaks a just law or custom of the church, he brands him for a lover of schism and sedition. 1 Cor. xi, 16.

§ 15. Ans. 4. That these ceremonies have occasioned many divisions is no more fault of theirs, than it was of the gospel that the preaching of it occasioned strife betwixt father and son, &c. The true cause of those divisions is the cause of ours, which St. James tells us is lust, and inordinate desires of honours or wealth, or licentiousness, or the like. Were these ceremonies laid aside, there would be the same divisions, if some who think Moses and Aaron took too much upon them, may be suffered to deceive the people, and to raise in them vain fears and jealousies of their governors; but if all men would, as they ought, study peace and quietness, they would find other and better fruits of these laws of rites and ceremonies, as edification, decency, order, and beauty, in the service and worship of God.

§ 16. There hath been so much said not only of the lawfulness, but also of the conveniency of those ceremonies mentioned, that nothing can be added. This in brief may here suffice for the surplice; that reason and experience teach that decent ornaments and habits preserve reverence, and are held therefore necessary to the solemnity of royal acts, and acts of justice, and why not as well to the solemnity of religious worship. And in particular no habit more suitable than white linen, which resembles purity and beauty, wherein angels have appeared, (Rev. xv,) fit for those, whom the Scripture calls angels: and this habit was ancient. Chrys. Hom. 60, ad Antioch.

§ 17. The cross was always used in the church *in immortalis lavacro*, (Tertull.) and therefore to testify our communion with them, as we are taught to do in our creed, as also in token that we shall not be ashamed of the cross of Christ, it is fit to be used still, and we conceive cannot trouble the conscience of any that have a mind to be satisfied.

§ 18. The posture of kneeling best suits at the communion

as the most convenient, and so most decent for us, when we are to receive as it were from God's hand the greatest of seals of the kingdom of heaven. He that thinks he may do this sitting, let him remember the prophet Malachi. Offer this to the prince, to receive his seal from his own hand sitting, see if he will accept of it. When the church did stand at her prayers, the manner of receiving was *more adorantium*, (S. Ang. Ps. xviii, Cyril. Catech. Mystag. 5.) rather more than at prayers. Since standing at prayer hath been generally left, and kneeling used instead of that (as the church may vary in such indifferent things), now to stand at communion, when we kneel at prayers, were not decent, much less to sit, which was never the use of the best times.

Prop. 19. That there were ancient liturgies in the church is evident: S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and others; and the Greeks tell us of St. James, much elder than they. And though we find not in all ages whole liturgies, yet it is certain that there were such in the oldest times, by those parts which are extant; as *Sursum corda, &c.*, *Gloria Patri, &c.*, *Benedicite, Hymnus Cherubinus, &c.*, *Vere dignum et justum, &c.*, *Dominus vobiscum, et cum spiritu tuo*, with divers others. Though those that are extant may be interpolated, yet such things as are found in them all consistent to catholic and primitive doctrine, may well be presumed to have been from the first, especially since we find no original of these liturgies from general councils.

CONCERNING MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

§ 1. Rub. 1. We think it fit that the rubric stand as it is, and all to be left to the discretion of the ordinary.

§ 2. Rub. 2. For the reasons given in our answer to the 18th general, whither you refer us, we think it fit that the rubric continue as it is.

§ 3. Lord's pr. "Deliver us from evil." These words, "for thine is the kingdom," &c., are not in St. Luke, nor in the ancient copies of St. Matthew, never mentioned in the

ancient comments, nor used in the Latin church, and therefore questioned whether they be part of the gospel; there is no reason that they should be always used.

§ 4. Lord's pr. often used. It is used but twice in the morning and twice in the evening service; and twice cannot be called often, much less so often. For the litany, communion, baptism, &c., they are offices distinct from morning and evening prayer, and it is not fit that any of them should want the Lord's prayer.

§ 5. Gloria Patri. This doxology being a solemn confession of the blessed Trinity, should not be thought a burden to any Christian liturgy, especially being so short as it is; neither is the repetition of it to be thought a vain repetition, more than "his mercy endureth for ever," so often repeated, Psa. cxxxvi. We cannot give God too much glory, that being the end of our creation, and should be the end of all our services.

§ 6. Rub. 2. "In such places where they do sing," &c. The rubric directs only such singing as is after the manner of distinct reading, and we never heard of any inconvenience thereby, and therefore conceive this demand to be needless.

§ 7. Benedicite. This hymn was used all the church over, (Cone. Tolet. can. 13.) and therefore should be continued still as well as Te Deum (Ruffin. Apol. cont. Hieron.) or Veni Creator, which they do not object against as apocryphal.

IN THE LITANY.

§ 1. The alterations here desired are so nice, as if they that made them were given to change.

§ 2. "From all other deadly sin," is better than "from all other heinous sin," upon the reason here given, because the wages of sin is death.

§ 3. "From sudden death," as good as "from dying suddenly;" which therefore we pray against, that we may not be unprepared.

§ 4. "All that travel," as little liable to exceptions as

“those that travel,” and more agreeable to the phrase of Scripture, (1 Tim. ii, 1,) “I will that prayers be made for all men.”

§ 5. “The two collect[s for St. John’s day and Innocents’, &c.”] We do not find, nor do they say, what is to be amended in these collects; therefore to say anything particularly were to answer to we know not what.

THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

§ 1. *Kyrics.* To say, “Lord, have mercy upon us,” after every commandment is more quick and active than to say it once at the close; and why Christian people should not upon their knees ask their pardon for their life forfeited for the breach of every commandment, and pray for grace to keep them for the time to come, they must be more than ignorant that can scruple.

§ 2. *Homilies.* Some livings are so small that they are not able to maintain a licensed preacher; and in such and the like cases this provision is necessary. For can any reason be given, why the minister’s reading a homily, set forth by common authority, should not be accounted preaching of the word, as well as his reading (or pronouncing by heart) a homily or sermon of his own or any other man’s.

§ 3. *Sentences.* The sentences tend all to exhort the people to pious liberality, whether the object be the minister or the poor; and though some of the sentences be apocryphal, they may be useful for that purpose. Why collection for the poor should be made at another time, there is no reason given, only change desired.

§ 4. 3[rd] *Exhort.* The first and third exhortations are very seasonable before the communion, to put men in mind how they ought to be prepared, and in what danger they are to come unprepared, that if they be not duly qualified, they may depart, and be better prepared at another time.

§ 5. *Exc. 1.* “We fear this may discourage many.” Certainly themselves cannot desire that men should come to the

holy communion with a troubled conscience, and therefore have no reason to blame the church for saying, "it is requisite that men come with a quiet conscience," and prescribing means for quieting thereof. If this be to discourage men, it is fit they should be discouraged, and deterred, and kept from the communion, till they have done all that is here directed by the church, which they may well do, considering that this exhortation shall be read in the church the Sunday or holy-day before.

§ 6. [Exc. 3.] Minister's turning. The minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks to them, as in Lessons, Absolution, and Benedictions, it is convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient church ever did: the reasons of which you may see, Aug. lib. 2, de ser. Dom. in monte.

§ 7. Exc. 4. It appears by the greatest evidences of antiquity, that it was upon the 25th day of December. S. Aug. in Psal. cxxxii.

§ 8. [Exc. 5.] "That our sinful bodies," &c. It can no more be said those words do give greater efficacy to the blood than to the body of Christ, than when our Lord saith, "This is my blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins," etc., and saith not so explicitly of the body.

§ 9. [Exc. 7.] It is most requisite that the minister deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand, and repeat the words in the singular number; for so much as it is the propriety of sacraments to make particular oblation to each believer, and it is our visible profession that, by the grace of God, Christ tasted death for every man.

§ 10. Kneel at sacr. [Exc. 8.] Concerning kneeling at the sacrament we have given account already; only thus much we add, that we conceive it an error to say that the Scripture affirms the apostles to have received not kneeling. The posture of the paschal supper we know; but the institution

of the holy sacrament was after supper; and what posture was then used, the Scripture is silent. The rubric at the end of the [first Book of Common Prayer, Edw. VI, 1549,] that leaves kneeling, crossing, &c., indifferent, is meant only at such times as they are not prescribed and required. But at the eucharist kneeling is expressly required in the rubric following.

§ 11. Com[municate] three times a year. [Exc. 9.] This desire to have the parishioners at liberty, whether they will ever receive the communion or not, savours of too much neglect and coldness of affection towards the holy sacrament. It is more fitting that order should be taken to bring it into more frequent use, as it was in the first and best times. Our rubric is directly according to the ancient Council of Eliberis, can. 81, (Gratian de Consecrat.) No man is to be accounted a good catholic Christian that does not receive three times in the year. The distempers which indispose men to it must be corrected, not the receiving of the sacrament therefore omitted. It is a pitiful pretence to say they are not fit, and make their sin their excuse. Formerly our church was quarrelled at for not compelling men to the communion; now for urging men. How should she please?

§ 12. This rubric is not in the liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry. Besides, the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th Article of the Church of England. The time appointed we conceive sufficient.

PUBLIC BAPTISM.

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] "Until they have made due profession of repentance," &c. We think this desire to be very hard and uncharitable, punishing the poor infants for the parents' sakes, and giving also too great and arbitrary a power to the minister to judge which of his parishioners he pleaseth atheists, infidels, heretics, &c., and then in that name to reject their children from being baptized. Our church

concludes more charitably, that Christ will favorably accept every infant to baptism, that is presented by the church according to our present order. And this she concludes out of holy Scriptures (as you may see in the office of baptism) according to the practice and doctrine of the catholic church. (Cypr. Ep. 59, August. Ep. 28, et de verb. Apost. Serm. 14.)

§ 2. [Exc. 2.] The time appointed we conceive sufficient.

§ 3. [Exc. 3.] “And the godfathers,” &c. It is an erroneous doctrine, and the ground of many others, and of many of your exceptions, that children have no other right to baptism, than in their parents’ right. The church’s primitive practice (S. Aug. Ep. 23) forbids it to be left to the pleasure of parents, whether there shall be other sureties or no. It is fit we should observe carefully the practice of venerable antiquity, as they desire, Prop. 18.

§ 4. [Ex. 4.] The font usually stands, as it did in primitive times, at or near the church door, to signify that baptism was the entrance into the church mystical; “we are all baptized into one body” (1 Cor. xii, 13); and the people may hear well enough. If Jordan, and all other waters, be not so far sanctified by Christ as to be the matter of baptism, what authority have we to baptize? And sure his baptism was *dedicatio baptismi*.

§ 5. [Ex. 5.] It hath been accounted reasonable, and allowed by the best laws, that guardians should covenant and contract for their minors to their benefit. By the same right the church hath appointed sureties to undertake for children, when they enter into covenant with God by baptism. And this general practice of the church is enough to satisfy those that doubt.

§ 6. “Receive remission of sins by spiritual regeneration.” [Exc. 6.] Most proper, for baptism is our spiritual regeneration, (St. John iii.) “Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit,” &c. And by this is received remission of sins, (Acts ii, 3.) “Repent and be baptized every one of you, for

the remission of sins." So the Creed: "One baptism for the remission of sins."

§ 7. [Exc. 7.] "We cannot in faith say that every child that is baptized is regenerate," &c. Seeing that God's sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not *ponere obicem*, put any bar against them (which children cannot do); we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; and the denial of it tends to Anabaptism, and the contempt of this holy sacrament, as nothing worthy, nor material whether it be administered to children or no. Concerning the cross we refer to our answer to the same in general.

PRIVATE BAPTISM.

"We desire that baptism may not be administered in a private place;" and so do we, where it may be brought into the public congregation. But since our Lord hath said, (St. John iii,) "Unless one be born of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," we think it fit that they should be baptized in private, rather than not at all. It is appointed now to be done by the lawful minister.

Nor is any thing done in private, reiterated in public, but the solemn reception into the congregation, with the prayers for him, and the public declaration before the congregation, of the infant, now made by the godfathers, that the whole congregation may testify against him, if he does not perform it; which the ancients made great use of.

OF THE CATECHISM.

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] Ans. 2. Though divers have been of late baptized without godfathers, yet many have been baptized with them; and those may answer the questions as they are; the rest must answer according to truth. But there's no reason to alter the rule of the Catechism for some men's irregularities.

§ 2. Ans. 2. ["Wherein I was made a member of Christ,

&c.”] [Exc. 2.] We conceive this expression as safe as that which they desire, and more fully expressing the efficacy of the sacrament, according to St. Paul, the 26 and 27 Gal. iii, where St. Paul proves them all to be children of God, because they were baptized, and in their baptism had put on Christ : “if children, then heirs,” or, which is all one, “inheritors,” Rom. viii, 17.

§ 3. Ten com[mandments] [Exc. 3.] We conceive the present translation to be agreeable to many ancient copies : therefore the change to be needless.

§ 4. “My duty towards God,” &c. [Exc. 4.] It is not true that there is nothing in that answer which refers to the fourth commandment : for the last words of the answer do orderly relate to the last commandment of the first table, which is the fourth.

§ 5. “Two only as generally necessary to salvation,” &c. [Exc. 5.] These words are a reason of the answer, that there are two only, and therefore not to be left out.

§ 6. “We desire that the entering of infants,” &c. [Exc. 6.] The effect of children’s baptism depends neither upon their own present actual faith and repentance (which the Catechism says expressly they cannot perform,) nor upon the faith and repentance of their natural parents or pro-parents, or of their godfathers or godmothers ; but upon the ordinance and institution of Christ. But it is requisite that when they come to age they should perform these conditions of faith and repentance, for which also their godfathers and godmothers charitably undertook on their behalf. And what they do for the infant in this case, the infant himself is truly said to do, as in the courts of this kingdom daily the infant does answer by his guardian : and it is usual for to do homage by proxy, and for princes to marry by proxy. For the further justification of this answer, see St. Aug. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. *Nihil aliud credere, quam fidem habere : ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulum credere, qui fidei nondum habet effectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum. Quia*

et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Itaque parvulum, etsi nondum fides illa, quæ in credentium voluntate consistit, tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum, fidelem facit.

§ 7. [Exc. 7.] The Catechism is not intended as a whole body of divinity, but as a comprehension of the articles of faith, and other doctrines most necessary to salvation; and being short, is fittest for children and common people, and as it was thought sufficient upon mature deliberation, and so is by us.

CONFIRMATION.

§ 1. Rub. 1. [Exc. 1.] It is evident that the meaning of these words is, that children baptized, and dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed: wherein we see not what danger there can be of misleading the vulgar by teaching them truth. But there may be danger in this desire of having these words expunged, as if they were false; for St. Austin says he is an infidel that denies them to be true. Ep. 23, ad Bonifac.

§ 2. “Rub. after the Catechism.” [Ex. 2.] “We conceive that it is not a sufficient qualification,” &c. We conceive that this qualification is required rather as necessary than as sufficient; and therefore it is the duty of the minister of the place (can. 61) to prepare children in the best manner to be presented to the bishop for confirmation, and to inform the bishop of their fitness, but submitting the judgment to the bishop, both of this and other qualifications; and not that the bishop should be tied to the minister’s consent. Comp. this rub. to the second rub. before the Catechism, and there is required what is further necessary and sufficient.

§ 3. [Exc. 3.] “They see no need of godf.” Here the compilers of the liturgy did, and so doth the church, that there may be a witness of the confirmation.

§ 4. [Exc. 4.] “This supposeth that all children,” &c. It supposeth, and that truly, that all children were at their baptism regenerate by water, and the Holy Ghost, and had

given unto them the forgiveness of all their sins: and it is charitably presumed that, notwithstanding the frailties and slips of their childhood, they have not totally lost what was in baptism conferred upon them; and therefore adds, "Strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them their manifold gifts of grace," &c. None that lives in open sin ought to be confirmed.

§ 5. "Rub. before the imposition of hands." [Exc. 5.] Confirmation is reserved to the bishop *in honorem ordinis*, to bless being an act of authority. So it was of old: St. Hierom, Dial. adv. Lucifer. says it was *totius orbis consensus in hanc partem*: and St. Cyprian to the same purpose, Ep. 73; and our church doth everywhere profess, as she ought, to conform to the catholic usages of the primitive times, from which causelessly to depart argues rather love of contention than of peace. The reserving of confirmation to the bishop doth argue the dignity of the bishop above presbyters, who are not allowed to confirm, but does not argue any excellency in confirmation above the sacraments. St. Hierom argues the quite contrary (ad. Lucif. c. 4.):—That because baptism was allowed to be performed by a deacon, but confirmation only by a bishop, therefore baptism was most necessary, and of the greatest value: the mercy of God allowing the most necessary means of salvation to be administered by inferior orders, and restraining the less necessary to the higher, for the honour of their order.

§ 6. [Exc. 6.] Prayer after the imposition of hands is grounded upon the practice of the apostles (Heb. vi, 2; and Acts viii, 17;) nor doth 25th article say that confirmation is a corrupt imitation of the apostles' practice, but that the five commonly called sacraments have ground partly of the corrupt following the apostles, &c., which may be applied to some other of these five, but cannot be applied to confirmation, unless we make the church speak contradictions.

§ 7. [Exc. 7.] We know no harm in speaking the language of Holy Scripture (Acts viii, 15,) "they laid their hands upon

them, and they received the Holy Ghost." And though imposition of hands be not a sacrament, yet it is a very fit sign, to certify the persons what is then done for them, as the prayer speaks.

[§ 8. Last rubric] after confirmation. [Exc. 8.] There is no inconvenience that confirmation should be required before the communion, when it may be ordinarily obtained. That which you here fault, you elsewhere desire.

[SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY.]

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] The ring is a significant sign, only of human institution, and was always given as a pledge of fidelity and constant love: and here is no reason given why it should be taken away; nor are the reasons mentioned in the Roman ritualists given in our Common Prayer book.

§ 2. Exc. 3. These words, "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," if they seem to make matrimony a sacrament, may as well make all sacred, yea civil, actions of weight to be sacraments, they being usual at the beginning and ending of all such. It was never heard before now that those words make a sacrament.

§ 3. [Exc. 5.] They go to the Lord's table because the communion is to follow.

§ 4. Col. "Consecrated the estate of matrimony to such an excellent mystery," &c. [Exc. 6.] Though the institution of marriage was before the fall, yet it may be now, and is, consecrated by God to such an excellent mystery as the representation of the spiritual marriage between Christ and his church (Eph. v, 23.) We are sorry that the words of Scripture will not please. The church, in the 25th article, hath taken away the fear of making it a sacrament.

§ 5. Rub. "The new married persons the same day of their marriage must receive the holy communion." [Exc. 7.] This inforces none to forbear marriage, but presumes (as well it may) that all persons marriageable ought to be also fit to receive the holy sacrament; and marriage being so solemn a covenant of God, they that undertake it in the fear of God

will not stiek to seal it by receiving the holy communion, and accordingly prepare themselves for it. It were more Christian to desire that those licentious festivities might be suppressed, and the communion more generally used by those that marry: the happiness would be greater than can easily be expressed. *Unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio.* Tertull. lib. 2, ad uxorem.

VISITATION OF THE SICK.

§ 1. "Forasmuch as the conditions," &c. [Exc. 1.] All which is here desired is already presumed, namely, that the minister shall apply himself to the particuler condition of the person; but this must be done according to the rule of prudence and justice, and not according to his pleasure. Therefore, if the sick person shew himself truly penitent, it ought not to be left to the minister's pleasure to deny him absolution, if he desire it. Our church's direction is according to the 13th canon of the venerable Council of Nice, both here and in the next that follows.

§ 2. Exc. 2. The form of absolution in the liturgy is more agreeable to the Scriptures than that which they desire, it being said in St. John xx, "Whose sins you remit, they are remitted," not, whose sins you pronounce remitted; and the condition needs not to be expressed, being always necessarily understood.

COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

It is not fit the minister should have power to deny this viation, or holy communion, to any that humbly desire it according to the rubric; which no man disturbed in his wits can do, and whosoever does must in charity be presumed to be penitent, and fit to receive.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

§ 1. Rub. 1. [Exc. 2.] It is not fit so much should be left to the discretion of every minister; and the desire that all may be said in the church, being not pretended to be for the ease of

tender consciences, but of tender heads, may be helped by a cap better than a rubric.

§ 2. [Exc. 5.] We see not why these words may not be said of any person whom we dare not say is damned, and it were a breach of charity to say so even of those whose repentance we do not see: for whether they do not inwardly and heartily repent, even at the last act, who knows? and that God will not even then pardon them upon such repentance, who dares say? It is better to be charitable, and hope the best, than rashly to condemn.

CHURCHING WOMEN.

§ 1. Exc. 1. It is fit that the woman performing especial service of thanksgiving should have a special place for it, where she may be perspicuous to the whole congregation, and near the holy table, in regard of the offering she is there to make. They need not fear popery in this, since in the Church of Rome she is to kneel at the church door.

§ 2. Exc. 2. The psalm cxxi is more fit and pertinent than those others named, as cxiii, cxxviii, and therefore not to be changed.

§ 3. Exc. 3. If the woman be such as is here mentioned, she is to do her penance before she is churched.

§ 4. Exc. 4. Offerings are required as well under the gospel as the law; and amongst other times most fit it is, that oblations should be when we come to give thanks for some special blessing. Psa. lxxvi, 10, 11. Such is the deliverance in childbearing.

§ 4. Exc. 5. This is needless, since the rubric and common sense require that no notorious person be admitted.

THE CONCESSIONS.

§ 1. We are willing that all the epistles and gospels be used according to the last translation.

§ 2. That when anything is read for an epistle which is not in the epistles, the superscription shall be, "For the epistle."

§ 3. That the Psalms be collated with the former translation, mentioned in rubric, and printed according to it.

§ 4. That the words "this day," both in the collects and prefaces, be used only upon the day itself; and for the following days it be said, "as about this time."

§ 5. That a longer time be required for signification of the names of the communicants: and the words of the rubric be changed into these, "at least some time the day before."

§ 6. That the power of keeping scandalous sinners from the communion may be expressed in the rubric according to the 26th and 27th canons; so the minister be obliged to give an account of the same immediately after to the ordinary.

§ 7. That the whole preface be prefixed to the commandments.

§ 8. That the second exhortation be read some Sunday or holyday before the celebration of the communion, at the discretion of the minister.

§ 9. That the general confession at the communion be pronounced by one of the ministers, the people saying after him, all kneeling humbly upon their knees.

§ 10. That the manner of consecrating the elements be made more explicit and express, and to that purpose these words be put into the rubric, "Then shall he put his hand upon the bread and break it," "then shall he put his hand unto the cup."

§ 11. That if the font be so placed as the congregation cannot hear, it may be referred to the ordinary to place it more conveniently.

§ 12. That those words, "Yes, they do perform those," &c., may be altered thus, "Because they promise them both by their sureties," &c.

§ 13. That the words of the last rubric before the catechism may be thus altered, "that children being baptized have all things necessary for their salvation, and dying before they commit any actual sins, be undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed."

§ 14. That to the rubric after confirmation these words may be added, “or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.”

§ 15. That those words, “with my body I thee worship,” may be altered thus, “with my body I thee honour.”

§ 16. That those words, “till death us depart,” be thus altered, “till death us do part.”

§ 17. That the words “sure and certain” may be left out.

XVII.

*The Petition for peace and concord presented to the Bishops with the proposed Reformation of the Liturgy.*¹—A Petition for Peace with the Reformation of the Liturgy as it was presented to the Rt. Rev. Bishops, London, 1661.

Most Reverend Fathers and Reverend Brethren,
 THE special providence of God, and his majesty's tender regard for the peace and consciences of his subjects, and his desire of their concord in the things of God, hath put into our hands this opportunity of speaking to you as humble petitioners, as well as commissioners, on the behalf of these yet troubled and unhealed churches, and of many thousand souls that are dear to Christ; on whose behalf, we are pressed in spirit in the sense of our duty, most earnestly to beseech you, as you tender the peace and prosperity of these churches, the comfort of his majesty in the union of his subjects, and the peace of your souls in the great day of your accounts, that laying by all former and present exasperating and alienating differences, you will not now deny us your consent and assistance to those means that shall be proved honest and cheap, and needful to those great, desirable ends, for which we all profess to have our offices, and our lives.

¹ This paper was drawn up by Baxter.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 334.

The things which we humbly beg of you are these.

1. That you will grant what we have here proposed and craved of you in our preface; even your charitable interpretation, acceptance of, and consent unto the alterations and additions to the liturgy now tendered unto you, that being inserted, as we have expressed, *it may be left to the minister's choice to use one or other at his discretion* upon his majesty's approbation, according to his gracious Declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs. And that (seeing we cannot obtain the form of episcopal government, described by the late reverend primate of Ireland, and approved by many episcopal divines) we may at least enjoy those benefits of reformation in discipline, and that freedom from subscription, oaths, and ceremonies, which are granted in the said Declaration, by the means of your charitable mediation and request.

2. Seeing some hundreds of able, holy, faithful ministers are of late cast out, and not only very many of their families in great distress, but (which is of far greater moment) abundance of congregations in England, Ireland, and Wales, are overspread with lamentable ignorance, and are destitute of able, faithful teachers: and seeing too many that are insufficient, negligent, or scandalous, are over the flocks (not meaning this as an accusation of any that are not guilty, nor a dishonourable reflection on any party, much less on the whole church) we take this opportunity earnestly to beseech you, that you will contribute your endeavours to the removal of those that are the shame and burdens of the churches; and to the restoration of such as may be an honour and blessing to them. And to that end, that it be not imputed to them as their unpardonable crime, that they were born in an age and country which required ordination by parochial pastors, without diocesans: and that re-ordination (whether absolute or hypothetical) be not made necessary to the future exercise of their ministry. But that an universal confirmation may be granted of those ordained as aforesaid, they being still responsible for any personal insufficiency or crime. Were these two granted (the confirmation of the grants in his

majesty's Declaration, with the liberty of the reformed liturgy offered you, and the restoring of able, faithful ministers to a capacity to be serviceable in the church of God, without forcing them against their consciences to be re-ordained) how great would be the benefits to this unworthy nation! How glad would you make the people's hearts! How thankful should we be (for the cause of Christ, and the souls of men) to those that grant them, and procure them! Being conscious that we seek not great things for ourselves, or for our brethren; that we are ambitious of no greater wealth, or honour, than our daily bread, with such freedom and advantage for the labours of our ministry, as may most conduce to the success, the increase of holiness and peace; we shall take the boldness to second these requests, with many of our reasons, which we think should prevail for your consent: choosing rather to incur whatsoever censures or offence may by any be taken against our necessary freedom of expression, than to be silent at such a time as this, when thousands of the servants of the Lord, that are either deprived of their faithful teachers, or in fears of losing them, together with the freedom of their consciences in God's worship, do cry day and night to heaven for help, and would cry also in your ears with more importunate requests, if they had but the opportunity as now we have.

And 1. We beseech you bear with us while we remember you, that you are pastors of the flock of Christ, who are bound to feed them, and to preach in season and out of season, and to be laborious in the word and doctrine; but are not bound to hinder all others from this blessed work, that dare not use a cross or surplice, or worship God in a form which they judge disorderly, defective, or corrupt, when they have better to offer him, (Mal. i, 13, 14.) Is it not for matter and phrase at least as agreeable to the holy Scriptures? If so, we beseech you suffer us to use it, who seek nothing by it, but to worship God as near we can, according to his will, who is jealous in the matters of his worship. If indeed yours have more of strength, and ours of weakness, yet let not

fathers cast the children from the house of God, because they are sick or weak, and need the more compassion; let not our physicians resolve their patients shall all be famished, or cast off, whose temperature and appetites cannot agree to feed on the same dish, with the same preparation and sauce. He that thrice charged Peter as he loved him, to feed his lambs and sheep, did never think of charging him to deny them food or turn them out of his fold, or forbid all others to feed them, unless they could digest such forms and ceremonies, and superscriptions as ours.

2. May we presume to mind you, that the Lord of the harvest hath commanded us to pray that more labourers may be sent into the harvest, (for still proportionably the harvest is great, and the labourers are few, Matt. ix, 37,) and that the Lord hath not furnished them with his gifts in vain, nor lighted these candles to put under a bushel, but to be set on a candlestick, that they may give light to all that are in the house, Matt. v, 15; and that there are few nations under the heavens of God, as far as we can learn, that have more able, holy, faithful, laborious, and truly peaceable preachers of the gospel, (proportionably) than those are that are now cast out in England, and are like in England, Scotland, and Ireland, to be cast out, if the old conformity be urged. This witness is true, which in judgment we bear, and must record against all the reproaches of uncharitableness, which the justifier of the righteous at his day will effectually confute. We therefore beseech you, that when thousands of souls are ready to famish for want of the bread of life, and thousands more are grieved for the ejection of their faithful guides, the labourers may not be kept out, upon the account of such forms or ceremonies, or re-ordination; at least till you have enow as fit as they to supply their places, and then we shall never petition you for them more.

3. And we beseech you consider when you should promote the joy and thankfulness of his majesty's subjects for his happy restoration, whether it be equal and seasonable to bring upon so many of them so great calamities as the

change of able, faithful ministers, for such as they cannot comfortably commit the conduct of their souls to, and the depriving them of the liberty of the public worship; calamities far greater than the mere loss of all their worldly substance can amount to. In a day of common joy to bring this causelessly on so many of his majesty's subjects, and to force them to lie down in heart-breaking sorrows, as being almost as far undone, as man can do it; this is not a due requital of the Lord for so great deliverances. Especially considering, that if it were never so certain, that it is the sin of the ministers that dare not be re-ordained, or conform; it's hard that so many thousand innocent people should suffer even in their souls for the faults of others.

4. And if we thought it would not be misinterpreted, we would here remember you, how great and considerable a part of the three nations they are, that must either incur these sufferings, or condole them that undergo them; and how great a grief it will be to his majesty, to see his grieved subjects; and how great a joy it will be to him, to have their hearty thanks and prayers, and see them live in prosperity, peace, and comfort, under his most happy government.

5. And we may plead the nature of their cause, to move you to compassionate your poor afflicted brethren in their sufferings. It is, in your own account, but for refusing conformity to things indifferent, or at the most, of no necessity to salvation. It is in their account for the sake of Christ, because they dare not consent to that which they judge to be an usurpation of his kingly power, and an accusation of his laws as insufficient, and because they dare not be guilty of addition to, or diminution of his worship, or of worshipping him after any other law, than that by which they must be judged, or such as is merely subordinate to that. Suppose they be mistaken in thinking the things to be so displeasing to God; yet it is commendable in them to be fearful of displeasing him, and careful to obey him; a disposition necessary to all that will be saved, and therefore

to be loved and cherished in them by the pastors of the Church; who should be very tender of putting them to suffering, or casting them out of the church, because they dare not do that which they judge to be so great a sin against the Lord, deserving damnation to themselves. Should not the love of Christ command us to be tender of those that are so tender of his honour, and to take heed what we do to men for taking heed of sin, and being afraid to offend the Lord; and should not the special love of Christians, and the common love of men, command us, to be loth to drive men by penalties, upon that which they judge doth tend to their everlasting damnation, and which indeed doth tend to it, because they judge it so to do? For he that will do that which he thinks to be so great a sin as is before described, to please men, or to escape their punishment, no doubt deserveth the wrath of God; and should we not be loth to drive men upon sin and condemnation, though we were sure that their own infirmity is the occasion? If it be said that, by this rule, nothing shall be commanded if men will but scruple it, we answer—things in themselves necessary, or commanded by God, must be commanded by man, because scruples make them not unnecessary, and make not void the laws of God, and it will be a sin even to the scrupulous to disobey. But things dispensable, and of themselves unnecessary, should not be rigorously urged upon him, to whom they would be a sin, and cause of condemnation. It is in case of things indifferent in your own judgment, that we now speak. If it be said, that it is humour, pride, or singularity, or peevishness, or faction, and not true tenderness of conscience that causeth the doubts, or nonconformity of these men, we answer,—such crimes must be fastened only on the individuals, that are first proved guilty of them; and not upon multitudes unnamed and unknown, and without proof; and you know it is the prerogative of God to search the heart, and that he hath said, “Judge not, that ye be not judged: for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again:” Matt.

vii, 1, 2. "And who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master, he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand:" Rom. xiv, 4. And who can pretend to be better acquainted with their hearts, than they are themselves? "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man, which is in him:" 1 Cor. ii, 11. And they are ready to appeal to the dreadful God, the searcher of hearts, and the hater of hypocrisy, that if it were not for fear of sinning against him, and wounding their consciences, and hazarding, and hindering their salvation, they would readily obey you in all these things. That it is their fear of sin and damnation that is their impediment, they are ready to give you all the assurance, that man can give by the solemnest professions, or by oath if justly called to it.

And one would think that a little charity might suffice to enable you to believe them, when their non-compliance brings them under suffering, and their compliance, is the visible way to favour, safety, and prosperity in the world. And if men that thus appeal to God concerning the intention of their own hearts, cannot be believed, even when the state of their worldly interest bears witness to their professions, but another shall step into the throne of the heart-searching God, and say *it is not as they say, or swear, it is not conscience, but obstinacy or singularity*, all human converse upon these terms will be overthrown. And what remedy have they, but patiently to wait, till God, that they have appealed to, shall decide the doubt, and shew who were the assertors of truth or falsehood?

6. And we crave leave to represent to you the great disproportion in necessity and worth, between the things in question, and the salvation of so many, as may be obtained by the free and faithful exercise of the ministry of those that now are, and that are yet like to be laid aside. Do you think the Lord that died for souls, and hath sent us to learn what that meaneth, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice:" Matt. ix, 13, is better pleased with re-ordination, subscrip-

tion, and ceremonies, than with the saving of souls, by the means of his own appointment? If it be said that public order, and peace, and concord, do promote the salvation of many, and therefore are to be preferred before the salvation of fewer, we answer—concord in holy obedience to God doth indeed promote the salvation of all that entertain it; but concord in ceremonies, or re-ordination, or oaths of obedience to diocesans, or in your questioned particular forms of prayer, do neither in their nature, or by virtue of any promise of God, so much conduce to men's salvation as the preaching of the gospel doth, by able, faithful, and laborious ministers. And how comes it to pass that unity, concord, and order, must be placed in those things which are no way necessary thereto? Will there not be order and concord in holy obedience, and acceptable worshipping of God, on the terms which we now propose and crave, without the foresaid matter of offence? We here shew you that we are no enemies to order; and our long importunity for the means of concord, doth shew that we are not enemies to concord.

If it be said, that other men that will conform to the things in question may convert and save souls better than those that are factious and disobedient,—we first humbly crave that reproach may not be added to affliction, and that none may be called factious that are not proved such; and that laws imposing things indifferent in your judgment, and sinful in theirs, may not be made the rule to judge of faction: but that men who live inoffensively under civil government, and in matters of faith and worship, subscribe to all contained in the holy Scriptures, and endeavour to promote universal peace and charity on these terms, may not be made offenders by the making of laws and canons, that must force them to be such; consequently, Daniel was an offender, that would not forbear praying openly by the space of thirty days. But antecedently to that law, he was confessed just by them that said “ We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God:” Dan. vi, 5, 7, 10. The law which he must break was made

to make him a breaker of that law : take away that law, and take away his fault. We accuse none of the like intentions, but we must say that, it is easy to make any man an offender, by making laws which his conscience will not allow him to observe ; and it's as easy to make that same man cease to seem disobedient, obstinate, or factious, without any change at all in him, by taking down such needless laws. We may again remember you what Christ a second time doth press, Matt. xii, 7. "But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless."

And next, to the rest of the objection, we answer—that sad experience tells the world, that if the ministers that we are pleading for, be laid aside, there are not competent men enough to supply their rooms, and equally to promote the salvation of the flocks. This is acknowledged by them who still give it as the reason why ministers are not to be trusted with the expressing of their desires in their own words, nor so much as to choose which chapter to read, as well as which text to preach on to their auditors, because we shall have ministers so weak, as to be unfit for such a trust ; and men that are not wise enough for so easy a part of their duty, as to choose fit portions of Scripture to read, are unlikely to afford an equal assistance to the salvation of the people, instead of the labours of such as we are speaking for.

7. And it must be remembered, that in our ordination we must profess that we are persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, etc., and that we will teach or maintain nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which we are persuaded may be concluded and proved by the same, and that one of the Articles of the church containeth the same doctrine of the Scripture's sufficiency ; and to these we are called to subscribe ; and the persons that we now speak for, are ready to subscribe to all contained in the holy Scriptures, and willing to be obliged, by the laws of men, to practise it. And he that hath all things necessary to salvation, is received of God, and should therefore be re-

ceived by the church, if the apostle's argument be good, Rom. xiv, 1, 3. "For God hath received him." Seeing then you do profess that none of your impositions that cannot be concluded from the Scripture, are necessary to salvation, let them not consequentially be made necessary to it, and *more* necessary than that which is ordinarily necessary.

If you say, that so many men shall be forbidden to preach, unless they dare subscribe and use these things, you will tempt them to infer, that preaching being ordinarily necessary to salvation, Rom. x, 14, and these things, called indifferent, being made necessary to preaching, and preferred before it, therefore they are made necessary to salvation, and preferred before that which God hath made necessary.

If it be said that this will as much follow the making of any other indifferent thing to be necessary to preaching, and so the church shall make no orders, we answer—

1. That smaller things must not be imposed by unproportionable penalties.

2. That though the church may prefer a sober, peaceable preacher, before one that is schismatical and unpeaceable (which is not at all to exclude preaching), yet the church may not make anything necessary to preaching itself, that, is of itself unnecessary, and not antecedently necessary, at least by accident.

8. And if our religion be laid upon your particular liturgy, we shall teach the papists further to insult, by asking us, where was our religion two hundred years ago? The Common Prayer Book, as differing from the Mass Book, being not so old; and that which might then be the matter of a change, is not so unchangeable itself, but that those alterations may be accepted for ends so desirable as are now before us.

9. And we humbly crave that we may not in this be more rigorously dealt with than the pastors and people of the ancient churches were. If we may not have the liberty of the primitive times, when, for aught that can be proved,

no liturgical forms were imposed upon any church, yet at least let us have the liberty of the following ages, when under the same prince there were diversity of liturgies, and particular pastors had the power of making and altering them for their particular churches.

10. And if you should reject (which God forbid) the moderate proposals which now and formerly we have made, we humbly crave leave to offer it to your consideration, what judgment all the protestant churches are likely to pass on your proceedings, and how your cause and ours will stand represented to them, and to all succeeding ages. Though we earnestly desire the toleration of those that are tolerable, and the peaceable liberties of all that agree on the catholic terms of primitive simplicity in doctrine, worship, and discipline, yet have we ourselves so far drawn near you, as that the world will say, you reject those that are for episcopacy itself, and set forms of liturgy, and are not so much as charged by you at all, as disagreeing in any point of faith, if you shall reject us. If after our submission to his majesty's Declaration, and after our own proposals of the primitive episcopacy, and of such a liturgy as here we tender, we may not be permitted to exercise our ministry, or enjoy the public worship of God, the pens of those learned, moderate bishops will bear witness against you, that were once employed as the chief defenders of that cause (we mean such as Reverend Bishop Hall, and Ussher), who have published to the world that much less than this might have served to our fraternal unity and peace. If you would not grant this liberty and communion to others, with whom Christ will hold communion in grace and glory; yet it will appear more strange to the world, that you should cast out the episcopal also, that dare not go beyond the rule of Holy Scripture, and the example of primitive simplicity.

And we doubt not but you know, how new and strange a thing it is that you require in the point of re-ordination. When a canon amongst those called the Apostles', deposeth those that re-ordain, and that are re-ordained; and when it

is a thing that both papists and protestants condemn; when not only the former bishops of England, that were more moderate, were against it, but even the most fervent adversaries of the presbyterian way, such as Bishop Bancroft himself; how strange must it needs seem to the reformed churches, to the whole Christian world, and to future generations, that so many able, faithful ministers should be laid by as broken vessels, because they dare not be re-ordained, and that so many have been put upon so new and so generally disrelished a thing?

11. And we crave leave to remember you, that the Holy Ghost hath commanded you to oversee the flock, not by constraint, but willingly, not as being lords over God's heritage, but as ensamples to the flock; and that it is not only more comfortable to yourselves to be loved as the fathers than to be esteemed the afflictors of the church, but that it is needful to the ends of your ministry for the people. When you are loved, your doctrine will more easily be received; but when men think that their souls or liberties are endangered by you, it's easy to judge how much they are like to profit by you.

12. And you know if we are not in point of ceremonies or forms in everything of your mind, it is no more strange to have variety of intellectual apprehensions in the same kingdom and church, than variety of temperatures and degrees of age and strength. If his majesty should expel all those from his dominions, that are not so wise as solidly to judge, whether the liturgy as before, or as thus reformed, be the best, yea, whether this be intolerable in comparison of yours, and whether God be pleased or displeased with your ceremonies, it would be too great a diminution of his subjects; and if you should turn all such out of the kingdom of Christ, it would be liker a dissipating than a gathering, and a destroying than an edifying of his church; and you have not your power to destruction, but to edification, 2 Cor. x, 8; xiii, 10. You must do all things for the people's edifying, 2 Cor. xii, 19; Eph. iv, 12.

13. And how Christ will take it of you, to cast out from the ministry or communion of the church, or to grieve and punish all those that dare not conform to you in these matters, for fear of displeasing the law-giver of the church, we beseech you to judge (when your souls are most seriously thinking of the day of your accounts), by such passages of holy Scripture as may fully acquaint you with his mind. He is himself a merciful High-Priest, a gracious Saviour, a tender governor. He despiseth not the day of small things, Zech. iv, 10. "He feedeth his flock like a shepherd; he gathereth his lambs with his arm, and carrieth them in his bosom; and gently leadeth those that are with young." Isa. xl, 11. "A bruised reed will he not break, and the smoking flax will he not quench:" Isa. xlii, 3; Matt. xii, 20. God doth instruct the ploughman to discretion, and teacheth him not to thresh the fetches with a threshing-instrument, nor to turn the cart-wheel upon the cummin, but the fetches are beaten out with a staff, and the cummin with a rod, Isa. xxviii, 26, 27. God's servants are his jewels, Mal. iii, 17. He will spare them as a man spareth his son that serves him, and he that toucheth them, toucheth the apple of his eye, Zech. ii, 8. Remember the near relation they stand in to God in Christ, that they are the children of God, co-heirs with Christ, Rom. viii, 17; the members of his body, his flesh and bone, which he cannot hate, whoever hate them, Eph. v, 29, 30. Remember how dear they cost him, and to what honour he will advance them, and that these same persons that love him in sincerity must be where he is, to behold his glory, John xii, 26; xvii, 24; and shall be like the angels of God, Luke xx, 36; and shall judge the world, 1 Cor. vi, 2, 3; and that Christ will come to be glorified and admired in them, 2 Thess. i, 10; and they shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father, Matt. xiii, 43. Remember with what tender usage he treated his weak, imperfect members upon earth; and when he was ascending to prepare a place for them, that they might be with him where he is, how affectionately he bespeaketh them, John xx, 17.

“Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend up to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.” And lest you should say that he will not own those little ones that (whether for truth’s sake, or for their infirmities) do bear disgraceful titles in the world, remember that at the day of judgment he will say, “Inasmuch as you did it not, or did it, to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it not, or did it, unto me:” Matt. xxv, 40—45. If his elect cry to him day and night, though he bear long, he will avenge them, and that speedily, Luke xviii, 7, 8. Bear with us while we add this terrible passage, which we once before made mention of:—“Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me: but whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea:” Matt. xviii, 5, 6. Undoubtedly, if you consider duly by such passages, how Christ will take it, to have his servants not only not visited, not relieved, but to be afflicted, not only in body, but in soul, with that great affliction to be cast out of the ministry, or church, for an unavoidable dissent in things indifferent, you will never join with those that shall stretch forth a hand against them for such a cause as this. If yet the old pretence be made, that they suffer as schismatics, and disobedient, we must say again, if any shall make men disobedient by imposing things unnecessary, which they know are by learned, pious, peaceable men, esteemed sins against the Lord, and then shall thus heavily afflict them for the disobedience which they may easily cure by the forbearance of those impositions; let not our souls come into their secret, nor our honour be united to their assembly. If they shall smite or cast out a supposed schismatic, and Christ shall find an able, holy, peaceable minister, or other Christian, wounded, or mourning, out of doors, let us not be found among the actors, not stand among them in the day of their accounts, when tribulation shall be recompensed to the troublers of believers, 2 Thess. i, 6.

14. We beseech you also to consider, that men have not their understandings at their own command, much less can they be commanded by others. If they were never so willing to believe all that is imposed on them to be lawful, they cannot therefore believe it, because they would; the intellect being not free. And to dissemble, and say, and swear, and do, the things which they believe not, is such an aggravated hypocrisy (being in the matters of God, and joined with perfidiousness) as we may suppose cannot render them acceptable to any that have not renounced religion and humanity; much less should they be constrained to it. And when it is known that men's judgments are against the things imposed, and that penalties are no means adapted to the informing and changing of the judgment, but to force men to do the things they know, we conceive they should not be used, and so used, in the case of things indifferent, where they are not necessary to the common good, and where the sufferers, have never had sufficient means to change their judgments.

If it be said that, it is their own fault that their judgments are not changed, and that the means have been sufficient—we answer, that it is their fault, is the point in question; which the sword can easier take for granted, than the tongue or pen can prove: but if it be so, it is their fault, as it is that they are the sons of Adam, partakers of the common corruption of human nature; and as it is their fault that they are not all of the highest form in the school of Christ, above the common ignorance and frailties of believers; and that they are not all the most judicious divines of the most subtle wits; and had not the same education and society to advance your opinions, and represent things to their understandings, just as they are represented unto yours. And if men must be cast out of the church, or ministry, because they are not wiser than such learned men as the pastors of the most of the reformed churches, and as Hildersham, Bayne, Parker, Ames, Dod, Ball, Nichols, and many such others as have here taken this conformity to be a sin, how few, alas, how very few will there be left!

And if it be said, that men do willingly keep out the light, — we must say, that few men are obstinate against the opinions that tend to their ease and advancement in the world, and to save them from being vilified as schismatics, and undone; and when men profess before the Lord, that they do impartially study and pray for knowledge, and would gladly know the will of God at the dearest rate; we must again say, that those men must prove that they know the dissenters' hearts better than they are known to themselves, that expect to be believed by charitable Christians, when they charge them with wilful ignorance, or obstinate resisting of the truth.

15. And we crave leave to ask whether you do not yourselves in some things mistake, or may not do so for aught you know; and whether your understandings are not still imperfect, and all men differ not in some opinions or other? And if you may mistake in any thing, may it not be in as great things as these? Can it be expected, that we should all be past erring about the smallest ceremonies and circumstances of worship? And then should not the consciousness of your own infirmity, provoke you rather to compassionate human frailty, than to cast out your brethren, for as small failings as your own?

16. And we further offer to your consideration, whether this be doing as you would be done by? Would you be cast out for every fault that is as bad as this? and doth this shew that you love your neighbour as yourselves? Put yourselves in their case, and suppose that you had studied, conferred, and prayed, and done your best to know whether God would have you to be re-ordained, to use these forms or ceremonies, or subscriptions, or not; and having done all, you think that God would be displeased if you should use them; would you then be used yourselves, as your dissenting brethren are now used, or are like to be? Love them as yourselves, and we will crave no further favour for them.

17. But nothing more affecteth us, than to think of the lamentable divisions, that have been caused and are still like to be, whilst things unnecessary are so imposed: and on the

contrary, how blessed an unity and peace we might enjoy if these occasions of division were removed, and we might but have leave to serve God as his apostles did. As in doctrinals, ten thousand will sooner agree in an explicit belief of the creed, than an hundred in an explicit belief of all that Ockam or Scotus have determined; so, in the matters of government and worship, it is easier to agree upon few things, than upon many; upon great, and certain, and necessary things, than upon small, uncertain, and unnecessary things; and upon things that God himself hath revealed or appointed, than upon things that proceed from no surer an original than the wit or will of man. The strict prohibition of adding to, or diminishing from the things commanded by the lawgiver of the church, Deut. xii, 32, doth put such a fear in the minds of multitudes of the loyal subjects of Christ—lest by such additions or diminutions in the matters of his worship, they should provoke him to displeasure—as will be a certain perpetual hindrance to any common unity or concord in such human impositions, of which many of the servants of the jealous God will have a continual jealousy.

With grieved hearts we now renew the lamentable divisions occasioned already by these impositions ever since the reformation in the days of King Edward VI, and the grievous fruits of those divisions! How they destroyed charity (the character of Christ's disciples) and exasperated men's minds against each other; how they corrupted men's prayers and other exercises of devotions, and made them pray and preach against one another; how their tongues were emboldened to the censuring of each other, one party calling the other factious, schismatical, singular, and disobedient; and the other calling them antichristian, proud, tyrannical, superstitious, persecutors, and formalists; and such language still increasing the uncharitableness and divisions; till the increase of imposing rigour on the one side, and of impatience under sufferings on the other side, was too great a preparation to those greater calamities which are yet bitter to the remembrance of all whose interests or passions have not con-

quered their humanity. And the continuance of so much of the causes and effects, doth infallibly prove, that if the same impositions be settled upon us, the same heart divisions will be still continued: brethren will disdain the name and love of brethren to each other; which yet Christ himself by condescending and reproving love, vouchsafeth to them all. Instead of loving one another with a pure heart, fervently, there will be, if not hating, yet grudging at one another, censuring and despising one another; which effects will still increase their cause, and make one side think that they are necessitated to be more rigorous in their coercions, and the other think that they are allowed to be more censorious against those by whom they suffer.

And how many thousands on both sides, by such a stream of temptations, will undoubtedly be carried on in a course of sin from day to day, and by heart sin, and tongue sin, by pulpit sins, or sins in other parts of worship, will dishonour God and provoke him to indignation against them and the land, we may not without astonishment and grief of heart foresee or foretell.

And it is easy to foresee how the innocent will be numbered with the faulty; and those that do but feel their sufferings, and the sufferings of the church on these occasions, and do but groan and sigh to God, and pray for succour and deliverance, will be thought to be guilty of discontent and faction, and bringing the government of the church, and consequently of the kingdom, into hatred or dislike, and so their sufferings will be increased: and he that is commanded by the laws of humanity to be compassionately sensible of the calamities of others, shall be thought an offender for being sensible of his own. It is easy to foresee, how those expressions in men's sermons, or prayers, or familiar conference, which seem to any misunderstanding, or suspicious, or malicious hearers, to intimate any sense of sufferings, will be carried to the ears of rulers, and represented as a crime. And nature having planted in all men an unwillingness to suffer, and denied to all men a love of calamity, and necessitated men to feel when

they are hurt, and made the tongue and countenance the index of our sense; these effects will be unavoidable, while such impositions are continued, and while a fear of sinning will not suffer men to swallow and digest them. And what wrong such divisions about religion will be to the kingdom, and to his majesty, we shall not mention, because our governors themselves may better understand it.

On the other side, what universal ease, and peace, and joy would be the fruits of that happy unity and concord, which the reasonable forbearances which we humbly petition for, would certainly produce; how comfortable would our ministerial labours be, when we had no such temptations, burdens, or disquietments; when we lay not under the reproofs of conscience, nor the suspicions or displeasure of our superiors, but might serve the Lord without distraction, and be among his servants without such fears! (Phil. i, 14; 1 Cor. xvi, 10.) How much would the hands of the builders be strengthened for the work of God, when they speak the same things, and there are no divisions among them, but they are perfectly joined together in the same mind and judgment, (1 Cor. i, 10,) when they are like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind, doing nothing through strife or vain glory, which will never be while the one calls the other factious and schismatical, and the other calleth him superstitious and tyrannical; but when Christ hath taught us in lowliness of mind to esteem others better than ourselves, and not to look every man on his own things (his own gifts, and virtues, and worth, and interest) but every man also on the things of others; and till the same mind be in us, that was in Christ Jesus, that humbled himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and made himself of no reputation. (Phil. ii, 5—8.) How much should we honour the body, the spirit, the hope, the Lord, the faith, the baptism, the God and father of all believers, which are one, if we were one among ourselves; which will never be, till with lowliness, and meekness, and long-suffering, we forbear one another in love, instead of hating, reviling, and persecuting one another; and

till we endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit (though given in various degrees) rather than an unity in unnecessary things, in the bond of peace, (Ephes. iv, 2—7,) and till the well-jointed and compacted body do edify itself in love, by a due contribution of mutual supply, and grow in Christ the proper head, instead of contending with itself, and dis-jointing and tearing itself into pieces, because of our different measure of understanding, and our unavoidable differences about some small unnecessary things! (verses 13—16.) How beautiful would our holy assemblies be, and how delightful the worship of God there celebrated, if we had all laid by the unchristian spirit of hatred, envy, emulation, murmuring, wrath, variance, strife, heresies, seditions, and all uncharitableness, and with one mind, and one mouth did glorify God, (Gal. v, 19—21; Rom. xv, 16,) which will never be done, till those that are strong do bear the infirmities of the weak, and please not themselves, but every one of us please his neighbour, for his good to edification, instead of vilifying him, or undoing him; and till instead of casting each other out of the church or ministry, on account of things indifferent, we received one another, as Christ received us to the glory of God, (Rom. xv, 1, 2, 6, 7,) and till we are thus like-minded one towards another according to Christ Jesus, (verse 5,) instead of being selfishly-minded as men, or maliciously as enemies! (1 Cor. iii, 3; 1 Cor. xiv, 20; Col. iii, 8; Titus iii, 3.) If the very babes were fed with the sincere milk of the word, and all malice, and guile, and hypocrisy, and envies, and evil speaking, were laid aside it would prove the best way to their growth, and a surer way to your present and eternal peace, than casting them out because they cannot bear your burdens, or digest some unnecessary things. (1 Pet. ii, 1—3.) How good and how happy a thing it would be for brethren to dwell together in unity, (Psa. cxxxiii, 1,) and as those that by one spirit are baptized into one body, and know they have need of one another, to contribute honour to the parts that lack it; yea to bestow more abundant honour upon those members which we think to be less honourable, and more

abundant comeliness, on the uncomely parts, as knowing those members are necessary that seem to be more feeble. If indeed we would have no schism in the body, the natural way is, for the members to have the same care one for another, as suffering all with one that suffereth, and rejoicing all with one that's honoured. (1 Cor. xii, 12, 13, 21—26.) Take their sufferings as your own, and you will not be hasty to bring them unto suffering. It must be the primitive simplicity of faith, worship, and discipline, that must restore the primitive charity, unity, and peace, and make the multitude of believers to be of one heart, and of one soul, and to converse with gladness and singleness of heart, as having all things common. (Acts iv, 32, and ii, 46.) No such things as our controverted impositions were then made necessary to the unity and concord of the members of the church.

18. And we humbly offer to your consideration, which way will most gratify Satan in his cause and servants, and which will most promote the work and interest of Jesus Christ. The ungodly that have an inbred enmity to holiness, and to the holy seed, will be glad to see so many of them suffer, and glad under the shelter of your displeasure and afflictings, to find opportunity to reproach them, and add affliction to affliction. The common adversaries of our religion, and of the king and kingdom, will rejoice to see us weakened by our divisions, and employed in afflicting or censuring one another, and to see so many able ministers laid aside, that might do much displeasure to Satan, by the weakening of his kingdom, and by promoting the gospel and kingdom of the Lord. And whether this will tend to the edification of the saints, and the pleasing of Christ, we have inquired before.

19. And if what you stand for, be indeed of God, this course of unmerciful imposition, is the greatest wrong to it, that you can easily be drawn to, unawares; while so many truly fearing God, are cast out or trodden down, and tempted to think ill of that which themselves and the church thus suffer by, and when so many of the worst befriend this way

because it gratifieth them, it tendeth to make your cause judged of according to the quality of its friends and adversaries. And how great a hand this very thing hath had already in the dislike of (that has befallen,) diocesans, ceremonies, and the liturgy, is a thing too generally known to need proof.

20. Lastly we repeat what formerly we have said, that the Holy Ghost hath already so plainly decided the point in controversy, in the instance of meats and days, Rom. xiv, 15, that it seemeth strange to us that yet it should remain a controversy. A weak brother that maketh an unnecessary difference of meats and days, is not to be cast out, but so to be received and not to be troubled with such doubtful disputations. Despising and judging the servants of the Lord, whom he receiveth and can make to stand, and that upon such small occasion, is unbecoming true believers. (verses 1—5.) All should be here left to the full persuasion of their own mind. (verse 5.) Both parties here acknowledge the sovereignty of Christ, and in observing, or not observing such things, they do it all to him, (verses 6—9;) his judgment should affright us from despising or judging one another, (verses 10—12;) instead of judging others we should judge it our duty, that none of us put a stumbling-block, or occasion to fall in his brother's way. (verse 13.) If we grieve those that esteem that unclean which we do not, we walk not charitably; destroy not the work of God, nor him for whom Christ died, by your indifferent things. (verses 14, 15, 20.) It is evil to him that judgeth it to be evil. (verses 14, 20.) Do you believe these things to be indifferent, have this belief to yourself before God, and condemn not yourselves in that which you allow, (verse 22;) your brother is damned if he practice doubtfully, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin, (verse 23;) and you drive him upon damnation! We may well conclude then, that it is good, even yourselves to avoid such things unnecessary, by which your brother stumbleth, is offended, or made weak. (verse 21.) Much more

to forbear the forcing them upon him, which those that the apostle reproveth did not attempt. It is the kingdom of God that we must all promote; and that kingdom consisteth not in meat or drink, but in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. And he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and should be approved of men. (verses 17, 18.) Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another. (verse 19.)

If you say, rulers' imposition maketh indifferent things cease to be indifferent; we answer,

1. They are not indifferent, in the judgment of dissenters, though they be so in yours.

2. Paul was a ruler of the Church himself, and yet would deny his own liberty, rather than offend the weak, so far was he from taking away the liberty of others. (1 Cor. viii, 13.) And it is to the Church of Rome and Corinth, and so to the pastors as well as the rest, that Paul thus writeth. We beseech you therefore plead not law against us, when our request is that you will join with us in petitioning to his majesty, and the parliament, that there may be no such law.

The apostles and elders (Acts xv, 28) declare unto the churches, that it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and them, to lay upon them no greater burden than necessary things; imposing them because antecedently necessary (for that is given as the reason of their selection and imposition;) and only not making unnecessary things necessary by imposition, for then the imposition had been unnecessary. Though it was not a simple, unchangeable necessity, yet it was a necessity by accident, *pro tempore et loco*, antecedent to the imposition of that assembly. Seeing then such things commend us not to God, and, if you use them, at least you are not the better; sin not against Christ, by sinning against your brethren (1 Cor. viii, 8—12); much more take heed of forcing them to sin.

We have presumed to be thus plain and large, in shewing

you some of our reasons, for your consent, to the necessary abatement of things unnecessary to the consciences of your brethren.

In the conclusion we beseech you to compare with these the reasons that can move you to deny us these requests. If you will needs use such things yourselves, will it gain you so much to force them upon others as will answer all the afore-said inconveniences? Will it cost you as dear to grant this liberty, or abate these things, as the imposition will cost your brethren and you? O how easily, how safely, how cheaply, yea, with what commodity and delight, may you now make this nation happy, in granting your brethren these requests!

If you say that others will be still unsatisfied, and you shall never know when you have done, we answer—

1. The cause of the nonconformists hath been long ago stated, at the troubles at Frankford; and having continued still the same, you have no reason to suspect them of any considerable change.

2. Grant us but the freedom that Christ and his apostles left unto the churches; use necessary things as necessary, and unnecessary as unnecessary, and charitably bear with the infirmities of the weak, and tolerate the tolerable, while they live peaceably, and then you will know when you have done. And for the intolerable, we beg not your toleration: we intercede for those that have Christ for their Intercessor in the highest. We know when all's done, there will be heresies. (1 Cor. xi, 19.) "There will be self-lovers, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than of God, having a form of godliness, while they deny the power:" 2 Tim. iii, 2—4. There will be "filthy dreamers, that defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities:" Jude 8. "And many will follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth will be evil spoken of:" 2 Pet. ii, 2. It is not these for whom we are petitioners; but

for those that are faithful to God and the king; that fear offending; that agree with you in all things necessary to salvation, and the common union of believers; and that you are like to see at Christ's right hand, who will finally justify them, and take them to his glory. If you suppose us in all this to have pleaded our own cause, we hope we are not such as are intolerable in the ministry or communion of the church; if you suppose us to plead the cause of others, we hope you will accept our desires as impartial, when it is supposed the persons differ from us as well as from you. We have now faithfully, and not unnecessarily, or unreasonably, spread before you the case of thousands of the upright of the land. We have proposed honest and safe remedies for our present distractions, and the preventing of the feared increase. We humbly beg your favourable interpretation of our plain and earnest language, which the urgency of the cause commands, and your consent to these our necessary requests; which if you grant us, you will engage us to thankfulness to God and you, and to employ our faculties and interests with alacrity to assist you for the common peace. But if you reject our suit (which God forbid), we shall commit all to him that judgeth righteously, and wait in hope for the blessed day of universal judgment, when the Lord of Hosts, their strong Redeemer, shall thoroughly plead his people's cause, and execute judgment for them, and bring them forth into the light, and they shall behold his righteousness. In the meantime, we will bear the indignation of the Lord, because we have sinned against him. Come, Lord Jesus! Come quickly! Amen.

XVIII.

The Rejoinder of the Ministers to the Answer of the Bishops.

—The Grand Debate between the most Reverend the Bishops, and the Presbyterian Divines, appointed by his sacred Majesty, as Commissioners for the Review and Alteration of the Book of Common Prayer, &c., being an exact account of their whole proceedings. The most perfect copy. London, 1661. pp. 1—148.

To the most Reverend Archbishop and Bishops, and the Reverend their Assistants, commissioned by his Majesty to treat about the alteration of the Book of Common Prayer.¹

Most Reverend Father and Reverend Brethren,

When we received your papers, and were told that they contained not only an Answer to our Exceptions against the present liturgy; but also several concessions, wherein you seem willing to join with us in the alteration and reformation of it; our expectations were so far raised, as that we promised ourselves, to find your concessions so considerable, as would have greatly conduced to the healing of our much to be lamented divisions, the settling of the nation in peace, and the satisfaction of tender consciences, according to his majesty's most gracious Declaration, and his royal Commission in pursuance thereof: but having taken a survey of them, we find ourselves exceedingly disappointed, and that they will fall far short of attaining those happy ends, for which this meeting was first designed; as may appear both by the paucity of the concessions, and the inconsiderableness of them, they being for the most part verbal and literal, rather than real and substantial. For in them you allow not the laying aside of the reading of the apocrypha for lessons, though it shut out some hundreds of chapters of holy Scripture, and sometimes the Scripture itself is made

¹ This preface was drawn up by Mr. Calamy.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 357.

to give way to the apocryphal chapters; you plead against the addition of the doxology unto the Lord's prayer; you give no liberty to omit the too frequent repetitions of *Gloria Patri*, nor of the Lord's prayer in the same public service; nor do you yield that the psalms be read in the new translation; nor the word priest to be changed for minister or presbyter, though both have been yielded unto in the Scottish liturgy; you grant not the omission of the responsals, no, not in the litany itself, though the petitions be so framed, as the people make the prayer, and not the minister; nor to read the communion service in the desk, when there is no communion; but in the late form, instead thereof, it is enjoined to be done at the table, though there be no rubric in the Common Prayer book requiring it. You plead for the holiness of Lent, contrary to the statute; you indulge not the omission of any one ceremony; you will force men to kneel at the sacrament, and yet not put in that excellent rubric in the 5 and 6 of Edward VI, which would much conduce to the satisfaction of many that scruple it. And whereas divers reverend bishops and doctors, in a paper in print before these unhappy wars began, yielded to the laying aside of the cross, and the making many material alterations, you, after twenty years sad calamities and divisions, seem unwilling to grant what they of their own accord then offered; you seem not to grant that the clause of the fourth commandment in the Common Prayer book (the Lord blessed the seventh day) should be altered according to the Hebrew, (Exodus xx,) the Lord blessed the Sabbath day; you will not change the word Sunday into the Lord's day, nor add anything to make a difference between holydays that are of human institution, and the Lord's day, that is questionless of apostolical practice; you will not alter deadly sin in the litany into heinous sin, though it hints to us that some sins are in their own nature venial; nor that answer in the catechism of two sacraments only generally necessary to salvation, although it intimates that there are other New Testament sacraments, though two only necessary to salvation; you speak of singing David's psalms, allowed by

authority, by way of contempt, calling them Hopkins' psalms; and though singing of psalms be an ordinance of God, yet you call it one of our principal parts of worship, as if it were disclaimed by you; and are so far from countenancing the use of conceived prayer in the public worship of God (though we never intended thereby the excluding of set forms) as that you seem to dislike the use of it even in the pulpit, and heartily desire a total restraint of it in the church; you will not allow the omission of the *Benedicite*, nor a psalm to be read instead of it; nor so much as abate the reading of the chapters out of the Old Testament and the Acts, for the Epistles. But rather than you will gratify us therein, you have found out a new device, that the minister shall say, "for the epistle." You will not so much as leave out in the collect for Christmas Day these words (*this day*) though at least, it must be a great uncertainty, and cannot be true *stylo veteri et novo*. In public baptism you are so far from giving a liberty to the parent to answer for his own child (which seems most reasonable,) as that you force him to the use of sureties, and cause them to answer in the name of the infant, that he doth believe, and repent, and forsake the devil and all his works: which doth much favour the *Anabaptistical* opinion for the necessity of an actual profession of faith and repentance in order to baptism. You will not leave the minister, in the visitation of the sick, to use his judgment or discretion in absolving the sick person, or giving the sacrament to him, but enjoin both of them, though the person to his own judgment seem never so unfit; neither do you allow the minister to pronounce the absolution in a declarative and conditional way, but absolutely and unconditionally. And even in one of your concessions, in which we suppose you intend to accommodate with us, you rather widen than heal the breach; for in your last rubric before the catechism you would have the words thus altered, *That children being baptized, have all things necessary for salvation; and dying before they commit any actual sin, be undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed*. Which assertion, if understood of all infants, even of heathen, is certainly false; and if only of

the infants of Christians, is doubtful, and contrary to the judgment of many learned Protestants, and will give little satisfaction to us or others. Some more we might name, which for brevity sake we omit. All which considered, we altogether despair of that happy success which thousands hope and wait for from this his Majesty's commission; unless God shall incline your hearts for the peace and union of the nation, to a more considerable and satisfactory alteration of the liturgy. In which, that we may the better prevail, we here tender a reply to your answer, both against our general and particular exceptions; of which we desire a serious perusal, and candid interpretation. We have divided both your preface and answer into several sections, that so you might more easily understand to which of the particulars both in the one and in the other our reply doth refer.

REPLY.²

The strain of these papers we fear is like to persuade many that your design is not the same with ours. Being assured, that it is our duty to do what we can to the peace and concord of believers, especially when we had the past and present calamities of these nations to urge us, and his majesty's commands and gracious promises to encourage us, we judged the fittest means to be by making known the hindrances of our concord, and without reviving the remembrance of those things that tend to exasperate, to apply ourselves with due submission to those that may contribute much to our recovery; and without personal reflections, to propose the remedies which we knew would be most effectual, and humbly and earnestly to petition you for your consent. But instead of consent, or amicable debates in order to the removal of our differences, we have received from you a paper abounding with sharp accusations, as if your work were to prove us bad, and make us odious; which, as it is attempted upon mistake, by unrighteous means, so, were it accomplished, we know not how it will conduce to the concord which ought

² This reply was drawn up by Baxter.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 334.

to be our common end. If we understand Christ's commission, or the king's, and our duty as Christians, or as ministers, our work now assigned us, was not to search after, and aggravate the faults of one another, (though of our own in season we are willing to hear) but to review the liturgy, and agree upon such alterations, diminutions, and enlargements, as are needful to our common unity and peace. What is amiss in us, we shall thankfully accept your charitable assistance to discover; but we take not that for the question which his majesty called us to debate, nor do our judgments or dispositions lead us to recriminations, nor to cast such impediments in the way of our desired accord. And were it not that our calling, and our master's work, are concerned somewhat in our just vindication, we should not trouble you with so low, so private, and unnecessary a work, but leave such causes to the righteous judge, who will quickly, impartially, infallibly, and finally decide them.

PREFACE.

§ 1. *Ans.* Before we come to the proposals, it will be perhaps necessary to say a word or two to the Preface, wherein they begin with a thankful acknowledgment of his majesty's most princely condescension; to which we shall only say, that we conceive the most real expression of their thankfulness had been an hearty compliance with his majesty's earnest and passionate request for the use of the present liturgy, at least so much of it as they acknowledge by these papers to be lawful: how far they have in this expressed their thankfulness, the world sees, we need not say.

Reply. 1. As we hope it is no matter of offence to acknowledge his majesty's gracious condescension; so when his majesty by his Declaration hath granted us some liberty as to the use of the liturgy before the alteration, and hath by his commission engaged us in a consultation for the alteration of it; we conceive our brethren (or the world, to whose observation they appeal) had no warrant to censure us as unthankful to his majesty, because of our present forbearance to use

it, or part of it, before the intended alteration; at least till they had heard us speak for ourselves, and render an account of the reasons of our forbearance, and they had gone before us more exemplarily in their own obedience to his majesty's Declaration. As to our own consciences, if we thought not the Common Prayer book to be guilty of the general and particular faults which we have laid open to you, we durst not have found fault with it: and while we took it to be a defective, disorderly, and inconvenient mode of worship, it would be our sin to use it of choice, while we may prefer a more convenient way, whatever we ought to do in case of necessity, when we must worship God inconveniently, or not at all. And as to our people, for whose edification, and not destruction, we have our power or offices, we have taken that course, as far as we are able to understand, which most probably tended to their good, and to prevent their hurt and separation from the Church: and consequently that course which did most conduce to his majesty's ends, and to his real service, and the church's peace: none of which would be promoted by our obtruding that upon our people, which we knew them unable to digest, or by our hasty offending them with the use of that, which we are forced to blame, and are endeavouring to correct and alter. And we see not how it can be justly intimated that we use no part of it, when we use the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Commandments, the Psalms, the Chapters, and some other parts. And how much more you expect we should have used, that we might have escaped this brand of ingratitude, we know not. But we know that charity suffereth long and thinketh no evil, (1 Cor. xiii, 4, 5,) and that we have not attempted to obtrude any mode of worship on our brethren, but desired the liberty to use things of that nature as may conduce to the benefit of our flocks. And as we leave them to judge what is most beneficial to their own flocks, who know them, and are upon the place; so it is but the like freedom which we desire: we are loth to hurt our people knowingly. The time is short; if you will answer our reasonable proposals, it will not be too

late at the expiration of our commission, or the date of the reformed liturgy to use it: greater liberty hath been used about liturgies in purer times of the Church, with less offence and accusation.

§ 2. *Ans.* It can be no just cause of offence to mind them of their duty as they do us of ours, telling us it is our duty to imitate the apostles' practice in a special manner, to be tender of the church's peace, and to advise of such expedients, as may conduce to the healing of breaches, and uniting those that differ. For preserving of the church's peace we know no better nor more efficacious way than our set liturgy, there being no such way to keep us from schism as to speak all the same thing according to the apostle.

Reply. If you look to the time past, by our duties we suppose you mean our faults. For it is not duty when it is past. If you in these words respect only the time present and to come, we reply, 1. The liturgy we are assured will not be a less, but a more probable means of concord after the desired reformation than before; the defects and inconveniences make it less fit to attain the end. 2. Whether the apostle by speaking the same thing did mean either, all using this liturgy of ours, or all using any one form of liturgy as to the words, may easily be determined. This is of much later date, unless you will denominate the whole form of the Lord's prayer, and some little parts. And those that affirm, that the apostles then had any other, must undertake the task of proving it, and excusing the churches for losing and disusing so precious a relief, which if preserved would have prevented all our strifes about these things; and, in the meantime, they must satisfy our arguments for the negative. As 1. If a liturgy had been indited by the apostles for the churches, being by universal officers inspired by the Holy Ghost, and so of universal use, it would have been used and preserved by the Church as the Holy Scriptures were. But so it was not. *Ergo* no such liturgy was indited by them for the churches. 2. If a prescript form of words had been delivered them, there would have been no

such need of exhorting them to speak the same thing, for the liturgy would have held them close enough to that. And if the meaning had been, see that you use the same liturgy, some word or other to some of the churches would have acquainted us with the existence of such a thing, and some reproofs we should have found of those that used various liturgies, or formed liturgies of their own, or used extemporary prayers: and some express exhortations to use the same liturgy or forms. But the holy Scripture is silent in all those matters. It is apparent, therefore, that the churches then had no liturgy, but took liberty of extemporate expressions, and spoke in the things of God, as men do in other matters, with a natural plainness and seriousness, suiting their expressions to the subjects and occasions. And though divisions began to disturb their peace and holy order, the apostles instead of prescribing them a form of divine services for their unity and concord, do exhort them to use their gifts and liberties aright, and speak the same thing for matter, avoiding disagreements, though they used not the same words. 3. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, sufficiently intimate to us that the churches, quickly after the apostles, did use the personal abilities of their pastors in prayer; and give us no hint of any such liturgy of apostolical fabrication and imposition; and therefore doubtless there was nothing: for it could not have been so soon lost or neglected. 4. It is ordinary with those of the contrary judgment, to tell us that the extraordinary gifts of the primitive Christians were the reason why there were no prescribed forms in those times, and that such liturgies came in upon the ceasing of those gifts. And 1 Cor. xiv, describeth a way of public worshipping unlike to prescript forms of liturgy. So that the matter of fact is proved and confessed. And then how fairly the words of the apostle, exhorting them to speak the same thing, are used to prove that he would have them use the same forms or liturgy; we shall not tell you by any provoking aggravations of such abuse of Scripture. And indeed for all the miraculous gifts of those times, if prescript forms had been

judged by the apostles to be the fittest means for the concord of the churches, it is most probable that they would have prescribed such. Considering—1, That the said miraculous gifts were extraordinary, and belonged not to all, nor to any at all times, and therefore could not suffice for the ordinary public worship; 2. And those gifts began even betimes to be abused, and need the apostles' canons for their regulation, which he giveth them in that 1 Cor. xiv, without a prescript liturgy; 3. Because even then divisions had made not only an entrance, but an unhappy progress in the churches, to cure which the apostle exhorts them oft to unanimity and concord, without exhorting them to read the same or any Common Prayer book; 4. Because that the apostles knew that perilous times would come, in which men would have itching ears, and would have heaps of teachers, and would be self-willed, and unruly, and divisions, and offences, and heresies would increase; and *ergo*, as upon such foresight they indited the holy Scriptures to keep the church, in all generations, from error and divisions in points of doctrine, so the same reason and care would have moved them to do the same to keep the churches in unity in point of worship, if indeed they had taken prescribed forms to be needful to such a unity: they knew that after their departure the church would never have the like advantage, infallible, authorized, and enabled for delivering the universal law of Christ. And seeing in those parts of worship, which are of stated use, and still the same, forms might have suited all ages as this age, and all countries as this country: (in the substance) there can no reason be given, why the apostles should leave this undone, and not have performed it themselves, if they had judged such forms to be necessary, or the most desirable means of unity. If they had prescribed them, 1. The church had been secured from error in them. 2. Believers had been preserved from divisions, about the lawfulness and fitness of them, as receiving them from God. 3. All churches and countries might have had one liturgy, as they have one Scripture, and so have all spoke the same things. 4. All ages would

have had the same without innovation, (in all the parts that require not alteration) whereas now on the contrary, 1. Our liturgies being the writings of fallible men, are liable to error, and we have cause to fear subscribing to them, as having nothing contrary to the Word of God. 2. And matters of human institution have become the matter of scruple and contention. 3. And the churches have had great diversity of liturgies. 4. And one age hath been mending what they supposed they received from the former faulty and imperfect. So that our own, which you are so loth to change, hath not continued yet three generations. And it is most evident that the apostles, being intrusted with the delivery of the entire rule of faith and worship, and having such great advantages for our unity and peace, would never have omitted the forming of a liturgy of universal usefulness, to avoid all the foresaid inconveniences, if they had taken this course of unity to be so needful or desirable as you seem to do. Whereas, therefore, you say you know no better or more efficacious way than our liturgy, &c.—We reply, 1. The apostles knew the best way of unity, and of speaking the same thing in the matters of God. But the apostles knew not our liturgy, (nor any Common Prayer book, for aught hath yet been proved) *ergo* the said liturgy is not the best way of unity, or speaking the same thing, &c. 2. The primitive church in the next ages after the apostles, knew the best way of unity, &c. But they knew not our liturgy, *ergo* our liturgy (not known till lately) is not the best way of unity. If it be said that our liturgy is ancient, because the *Sursum Corda*, the *Gloria Patri*, &c., are ancient; we answer, if indeed it be those ancient sentences that denominate our liturgy, we crave the justice to be esteemed users of the liturgy, and not to suffer as refusers of it, as long as we use all that is found in it of such true antiquity.

§ 3. *Ans.* This experience of former and latter times hath taught us, when the liturgy was duly observed we lived in peace; since that was laid aside, there have been as many modes and fashions of public worship as fancies. We have had

continual dissensions, which variety of services must needs produce, whilst everyone naturally desires and endeavours not only to maintain, but to prefer his own way before all others; whence we conceive there is no such way for the preservation of peace, as for all to return to the strict use and practice of the form.

Reply. Pardon us while we desire you to examine whether you speak as members that suffer with those that suffer, or rather as insensible of the calamities of your brethren, that is, as uncharitable. You say you lived in peace, but so did not the many thousands that were fain to seek them peaceable habitations in Holland and in the deserts of America, nor the many thousands that lived in danger of the High Commission, or Bishops' Courts at home, and so in danger of every malicious neighbour that would accuse them of hearing sermons abroad, when they had none at home, or of meeting in a neighbour's house to pray, or of not kneeling in the receiving of the sacrament, &c. We would not have remembered you of these things, but that you necessitate us by pleading your peace in those days as an argument for the imposing of the liturgy. 2. Might not Scotland as strongly argue from this medium against the liturgy, and say, before the liturgy was imposed on us, we had peace, but since then we have had no peace? 3. When the strict imposing of the strict use and practice of these forms was the very thing that disquieted this nation (taking in the concomitant ceremonies and subscription), when this was it that bred the divisions which you complain of, and caused the separations from the churches, and the troubles in the churches; it is no better arguing to say we must return to the strict use of that form if we will have peace, than it was in the Israelites to say, we will worship the queen of heaven, because then we had peace and plenty, when that was it that deprived them of peace and plenty (we compare not the causes, but the arguments); nor is it any better an argument, than if a man in a dropsy, or ague, that caught it with voracity or intemperance, should say, while I did eat and drink liberally, I had no dropsy or

ague, but since my appetite is gone, and I have lived temperately, I have had no health, *ergo*, I must return to my intemperance, as the only way to health. Alas, is this the use that is made of all our experiences of the causes and progress of our calamities? What! have you, and we, and all, smarted as we have done, and are you so speedily ready to return to the way that will engage you in violence against them that should be suffered to live in peace? If the furnace that should have refined us, and purified us all to a greater height of love, have but inflamed us to greater wrath, woe to us, and to the land that beareth us! What doleful things doth this prognosticate you, that prisons, or other penalties, will not change men's judgments! And if it drive some to comply against their consciences, and destroy their souls, and drive the more conscientious out of the land, or destroy their bodies, and breed in the minds of men a rooted opinion, that bishops that are still hurting and afflicting them (even for the things in which they exercise the best of their understanding, and cautiously to avoid sin against God), are no fathers, friends, or edifiers, but destroyers! Alas! who will have the gain of this? O let us no more bite and devour one another, lest we be devoured one of another (Gal. v, 15), or Christ be provoked to decide the controversy more sharply than we desire or expect. 4. But really hath liberty to forbear the liturgy produced such divisions as you mention? The licence or connivance that was granted to heretics, apostates, and foul-mouthed railers against the Scripture, ministry, and all God's ordinances, indeed bred confusions in the land; but it is to us matter of admiration to observe (clean contrary to your intimation) how little discord there was in prayer, and other parts of worship, among all the churches throughout the three nations that agreed in doctrine and that forbore the liturgy. It is wonderful to us, in the review, to consider with what love, and peace, and concord, they all spoke the same things, that were tied to no form of words; even those that differed in some points of discipline, even to a withdrawing from local communion with us, yet strangely agreed with

us in worship. And where have there been less heresies, schisms, than in Scotland, where there was no such liturgy to unite them? If you tell us of those that differ from us in doctrine, and are not of us, it is as impertinent to the point of our own agreement in worship, as to tell us of the papists.

§ 4. *Ans.* And the best expedients to unite us to that again, and so to peace, are, besides our prayers to the God of peace, to make us all of one mind in a house, to labour to get true humility, which would make us think our guides wiser and fitter to order us than we ourselves, and Christian charity, which would teach us to think no evil of our superiors, but to judge them rather careful guides and fathers to us; which being obtained, nothing can be imagined justly to hinder us from a ready compliance to this method of service appointed by them, and so live in unity.

Reply. Prayer and humility are indeed the necessary means of peace: but if you will let us pray for peace in no words but what are in the Common Prayer book, their brevity and unaptness, and the customariness, that will take off the edge of fervour with human nature, will not give leave (or help sufficient) to our souls to work towards God, upon this subject, with that enlargedness, copiousness, and freedom as is necessary to due fervour. A brief, transient touch and away, is not enough to warm the heart aright; and cold prayers are like to have a cold return, and therefore, even for peace sake, let us pray more copiously and heartily than the Common Prayer book will help us to do. And whether this be that cause, or whether it be that the Common Prayer book hath never a prayer for itself, we find that its prayers prevail not to reconcile many sober, serious persons to it that live in faithful, fervent prayer. 2. And for humility, we humbly conceive it would most effectually heal us, and by causing the pastors of the church to know that they are not to rule the flocks as lords, but as ensamples, not by constraint, but willingly (1 Pet. v, 2, 3); and it would cause them not to think so highly of themselves, and so meanly of their brethren, as to

judge no words fit to be used to God in the public worship, but what they prescribe, and put into our mouths, and that other men are generally unable to speak sensibly, or suitably, unless they tell us what to say; or, that all others are unfit to be trusted with the expressing of their own desires. Humility would persuade the pastors of the church at least to undertake no more than the apostles did, and no more to obtrude or impose their own words upon all others in the public worship. If they found any unfit to be trusted with the expression of their minds in public prayer, they would do what they could to get meet men in their places, and till then they would restrain and help such as need it, and not upon that pretence as much restrain all the ablest ministers, as if the whole church were to be nominated, measured, or used according to the quality of the most unworthy. And it is also true, that humility in private persons and inferiors would do much to our peace, by keeping them in due submission, and obedience, and keeping them from all contentions and divisions which proceed from self-conceitedness and pride. But yet, 1.—The humblest, surest subjects may stumble upon the scruple, whether bishops differ not from presbyters only in degree, and not in order or office (it being a controversy, and no resolved point of faith even among the papists, whose faith is too extensive, and favour too ecclesiastical, ambition too great), and consequently they may doubt whether men in the same order do, by divine appointment, owe obedience unto those that gradually go before them. 2. And they may scruple whether such, making themselves the governors of their brethren, make not themselves indeed of a different order or office, and so encroach not on the authority of Christ, who only maketh officers purely ecclesiastical; and whether it be no disloyalty to Christ to own such officers. 3. And among those divines that are for a threefold episcopacy (besides that of presbyters, who are *episcopi gregis*), viz., general, unfixed bishops, like the evangelists or apostles (in their measure), and the fixed bishops of parochial churches, that have presbyters to assist them, to whom they do preside,

and also the presidents of larger synods, yet is it a matter of very great doubt, whether a fixed diocesan being the pastor of many hundred churches, having none under him that hath the power of jurisdiction or ordination, be indeed a governor of Christ's appointment or approbation, and whether Christ will give us any more thanks for owning them as such, than the king will give us for owning a usurper. Humility alone will not seem to subject these men to such a government.

4. And though their coercive magistratical power be easily submitted to, as being from the king (how unfit subjects soever churchmen are of such a power), yet he that knoweth his superiors best, doth honour God more, and supposeth God more infallible than man, and will feel himself most indispensably bound by God's commands, and bound not to obey man against the Lord. And whereas there is much said against the peoples taking on them to judge of the lawfulness of things commanded them by superiors, we add—

5. That humble men may believe that their superiors are fallible; that it is no impossibility to command things that God forbids; that, in such cases, if we have sufficient means to discern the sinfulness of such commands, we must make use of them, and must obey God rather than men; that when the apostles acted according to such a resolution (Acts iv, 19), and Daniel and the three witnesses (Dan. vi, 3), they all exercised a judgment of discerning upon the matter of their superiors' commands; that not to do so at all, is to make subjects brutes, and so no subjects, because not rational, free agents, or to make all governors to be gods. And, lastly—That it will not save us from hell, nor justify us at judgment, for sinning against God, to say, that superiors commanded us; nor will it prove all the martyrs to be sinners and condemned, because they judged of their superiors' commands, and disobeyed them. All which we say to shew the insufficiency of the remedy here by you propounded (the humility of inferiors), unless you will also add your help. Without obedience there is no order or lasting concord to be expected; and by abasing the eternal God, so far as to set him and his laws

below a creature, under pretence of obedience to the creature, no good can be expected, because no peace with heaven; without which, peace with men is but a confederacy hastening each party to destruction: and therefore, absolute obedience must be given only to God, the absolute Sovereign. In all this we suppose that we are all agreed. And therefore—6, and lastly, We must say, that the way to make us think the bishops to be so wise, and careful guides and fathers to us, is not for them to seem wiser than the apostles, and make those things of standing necessity to the churches unity, which the apostles never made so, nor to forbid all to preach the gospel, or to hold communion with the church, that dare not conform to things unnecessary. Love and tenderness are not used to express themselves by hurting and destroying men for nothing; and to silence and reject from church communion for a ceremony, and in the meantime to persuade men that they love them, is but to stab or famish all the sick persons in the hospital or family, whose stomachs cannot take down the dish we offer them, or whose throats are too narrow to swallow so big a morsel as we send them; and when we have done, to tell them, the only remedy is for them to believe we love them, and are tender of them. And who knows not that a man may think well of his superiors, that yet may question whether all that he teacheth or commandeth him be lawful.

§ 5. *Ans.* If it be objected that the liturgy is in any way sinful and unlawful for us to join with, it is but reason that this be first proved evidently, before anything be altered: it is no argument to say that multitudes of sober pious persons scruple the use of it, unless it be made to appear by evident reasons that the liturgy gave the just grounds to make such scruples. For if the bare pretence of scruples be sufficient to exempt us from obedience, all law and order is gone.

Reply. To this passage we humbly crave your consideration of these answers; 1. We have not only said, (that sober pious persons scruple the liturgy,) but we have opened to you those defects, and disorders, and corruptions, which must

needs make the imposing of it unlawful, when God might be more fitly served. 2. It is strange, that you must see it first evidently proved unlawful for men to join with the liturgy (you mean, we suppose, to join with you in the using of it, or when you use it,) before you will see reason to alter anything in it. What if it be only proved unlawful for you to impose it, though not for others to join with you when you do impose it, is this no reason to alter it? Should you not have some care to avoid sin yourselves, as well as to preserve others from it? An inconvenient mode of worship is a sin in the imposer, and in the chooser, and voluntary user, that might offer God better, and will not, (Mal. i, 13, 14.) And yet it may not be only lawful, but a duty, to him that by violence is necessitated to offer up that or none. And yet we suppose the imposers should see cause to make an alteration. If you lived where you must receive the Lord's Supper sitting, or not at all, it's like you would be of this mind yourselves. 3. Why should it be called a bare pretence of scruples, as if you searched the hearts, and knew (not only that they are upon mistake, but) that they are not real, when the persons not only profess them real, but are willing to use all just means that tend to their satisfaction? they study, read, pray, and will be glad of conference with you, at any time, upon equal terms, if they may be themselves believed. 4. Even groundless scruples about the matter of an unnecessary law, which hath that which to the weak both is and will be an appearance of evil, may be sufficient to make it the duty of rulers to reverse their impositions, though they be not sufficient to justify the scrupulous. 5. If a man should think that he ought not to obey man, even when he thinketh it is against the commands of God, though he be uncertain, (as in case of going on an unquestioned warfare, or doing Docg's execution, &c.) yet it followeth not, that all law and order is gone, as long as all laws and orders stand that are visibly subservient to the laws of God, and to his sovereignty, or consistent with them; and when the subject submitteth to suffering where he dare not obey.

§ 6. *Ans.* On the contrary, we judge that if the liturgy should be altered as is there required, not only a multitude, but the generality of the soberest and most loyal children of the church of England would justly be offended, since such an alteration would be a virtual confession that this liturgy were an intolerable burden to tender consciences, a direct cause of schism, a superstitious usage (upon which pretences it is here desired to be altered;) which would at once both justify all those which have so obstinately separated from it, as the only pious, tender-conscienced men, and condemn all those that have adhered to that, in conscience of their duty and loyalty, with their loss or hazard of estates, lives, and fortunes, as men superstitious, schismatical, and void of religion and conscience. For this reason and those that follow, we cannot consent to such an alteration as is desired, till these pretences be proved; which we conceive in no wise to be done in these papers, and shall give reasons for this our judgment.

Reply. If the liturgy should be altered, as is here required, and desired by us, that it could be no just offence to the generality (or any) of the soberest and most loyal children of the church (as you speak) is easy to be proved, by laying together the considerations following:—1. Because it is by themselves confessed to be alterable, as not having itself its former constitution, till less than 200 years ago. 2. And themselves affirm it to be not necessary to salvation, but a thing indifferent, while they exclude all higher institutions from the power of the church. 3. They confess it lawful to serve God without this liturgy, without which he was served by other churches above 1460 years, and without which he is now served by other churches, when the contrary-minded doubt whether with it he be lawfully served. 4. Those that desire the alteration, desire no more than to serve God as the churches did in the days of the apostles, that had their most infallible conduct. 5. And they offer also such forms as are more unquestionable as to their congruency to the Word of God, and to the nature of the several parts of worship. 6. And yet, though they desire the surest concord and a uni-

versal reformation, they desire not to impose on others what they offer, but can thankfully accept a liberty to use what is to their own consciences most unquestionably safe, while other men use that which they like better. So that set all this together, with the consideration of the necessity of the preaching the word, and communion that is hereupon denied, and you may see it proved, that to have such a liturgy so altered, that is confessed alterable, for so desirable an end, to the use only of those that cannot well use it, without urging others to anything that they do themselves account unlawful, cannot be a matter of just offence to the generality of sober children of the church, nor to any one. And as to the reason given, it is apparently none. For, 1. Of those that scruple the unlawfulness of it, there are many that will not peremptorily affirm it unlawful, and condemn all that use it, but they dare not use it doubtingly themselves. 2. When our papers were before you, we think it not just that you should say, that it is here desired to be altered, on the pretence that it is a direct cause of schism and a superstitious usage: have we any such expressions? If we have, let them be recited; if not, it is hard that this should even by you be thus affirmed, as is said by us, which we have not said. We have said that the ceremonies have been the fountain of much evil, occasioning divisions, but not what you charge us to have said in words or sense. 3. And may not you alter them without approving, or seeming to approve the reason upon which the alteration is desired, when you have so great store of other reasons? The king in his Declaration is far enough from seeming to own the charge against the things which he was pleased graciously to alter so far as is there expressed. If a patient have a conceit that some one thing would kill him, if he took it, the physician may well forbear him in that one thing, when it is not necessary to his health, without owning his reasons against it: if his majesty have subjects so weak as to contend about things indifferent, and if both sides err, one thinking them necessary, and the other sinful, may he not gratify either of them, without seeming to approve their error? By this reason

of yours he is by other men in such a case necessitated to sin; for if he settle those things which some count necessary, he seems to approve of their opinion, that they are necessary: if he take them down when others call them sinful, he seems to own their charge of the sinfulness. But indeed he needeth not to do either, he may take them down, or leave them indifferent, professedly for unity and peace, and professedly disown the errors on both sides. We are sorry if any did esteem these forms and ceremonies any better than mutable indifferent modes and circumstances of worship; and did hazard estate or life for them as any otherwise esteemed: and we are sorry, that, by our divisions, the adversary of peace hath gotten so great an advantage against us as that the argument against necessary charitable forbearance is fetched from the interest of the reputation of the contending parties, that things may not be abated to others which you confess are indifferent and alterable, and which many of them durst not use, though to save their lives: and this because it will make them thought the pious, tender-conscienced men, and make others thought worse of. But with whom will it have these effects? Those that you call the generality of the sober loyal children of the church, will think never the worse of themselves, because others have liberty to live by them, without these things: and the rest, whose liberties you deny, will think rather the worse of you, than the better, for denying them their liberty in the worshipping of God. You undoubtedly argue here against the interest of reputation, which you stand for: your prefaces to your indulgencies, and your open professions, and (if you will needs have it so) your own practices, will tell the world loud enough, that the things which you adhered to with so great hazards, are still lawful in your judgment; and it will be your honour, and add to your reputation, to abate them to others, when it is in your power to be more severe. And if you refuse it, their sufferings will tell the world loud enough that, for their parts, they still take them to be things unlawful. As for the reasons by them produced to prove them sinful, they have been publicly

made known in the writings of many of them ; in Ames his Fresh Sute against the ceremonies, and in the Abridgment, &c., and in Bradshaw's, Nicols', and other men's writings.

Prop. 1. § 1. *Ans.* To the first general proposal we answer, that as to that part of it which requires that the matter of the liturgy may not be private opinion or fancy, that being the way to perpetuate schism ; the church hath been careful to put nothing into the liturgy, but that which is either evidently the Word of God, or what hath been generally received in the catholic church ; neither of which can be called private opinion : and if the contrary can be proved, we wish it out of the liturgy.

Reply. We call those opinions which are not determined certainties ; and, though the greater number should hold them as opinions, they are not therefore the doctrines of the church, and therefore might be called private opinions ; but indeed we used not the word (that we can find) : the thing we desired was, that the materials of the liturgy may consist of nothing doubtful, or questioned among pious, learned, and orthodox persons. We said also, that the limiting church communion to things of doubtful disputation, hath been in all ages the ground of schism and separation ; which is not to say, that the liturgy itself is a superstitious usage, or a direct cause of schism. And we cited the words of a learned man (Mr. Hales), not as making every word our own, but as a testimony *ad hominem*, because he was so highly valued by yourselves, as we suppose, and therefore we thought his words might be more regarded by you than our own. 2. Where you say that the church hath been careful to put nothing in the liturgy but that which is either evidently the Word of God, or that which had been generally received in the catholic church :—we reply, 1. We suppose there is little or nothing now controverted between us, which you will say is evidently the Word of God, either the forms or ceremonies, or any of the rest. 2. If by in the church you mean, not by the church but by any part in the church, how shall we know that

they did well? And if by the generality you mean, not all, but the greater part, you undertake the proof of that which is not easy to be proved; it being so hard to judge of the majority of persons in the catholic church in any notable differences. We do take it for granted, that you limit not the catholic church, as the papists do, to the confines of the Roman empire; but indeed we can only wish that your assertion were true, while we must show it to be untrue. If you speak of the primitive church, or of a universality of time, as well as place, (if not, it is more against you that the primitive catholic church was against you,) the very thing in question that containeth the rest (that it is needful to the peace of the church, that all the churches under one prince should use one form of liturgy) was not received by the catholic church, nor by the generality in it, when it is so well known that they used diversity of liturgies and customs in the Roman empire. The generality in the catholic church received not the Lord's supper kneeling, at least on any Lord's days, when it was forbidden by divers general councils, and when this prohibition was generally received as an apostolical tradition. We have not heard it proved that the surplice or cross, as used with us, were received by the universal church. It is a private opinion not received by the catholic church, that it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience. Though it be every man's duty to be perfect *pro statu viatoris*, yet it is not requisite that no man come till he be perfect. He that hath but a weak faith (though not a full trust) must come to have it strengthened; and he that hath an unquiet conscience, must come to receive that mercy which may quiet it. It is a private opinion, and not generally received in the catholic church, that one of the people may make the public confession at the sacrament in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy communion. It is a private, and not generally received

distinction, that the body of Christ makes clean our bodies, and his blood washeth our souls. It is a doubtful opinion, to speak easily, that when the Lord's supper is delivered with a prayer not made in the receiver's name, but thus directed to him by the minister (the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c., preserve thy body and soul), it is so intolerable a thing for the receiver not to kneel in hearing the prayer, that he must else be thrust from the communion of the church, and yet that no minister shall kneel that indeed doth pray: but he may pray standing, and the hearers be cast out for standing at the same words. It is not a generally received, but a private opinion, that every parishioner (though impenitent, and conscious of his utter unfitness, and though he be in despair, and think he shall take his own damnation) must be forced to receive thrice a year; when yet even those that have not a full trust in God's mercy, or have not a quiet conscience, were before pronounced so incapable, as that none such should come to the communion. Abundance more such instances may be given, to show how far from truth the assertion is, that the church hath been careful to put nothing into the liturgy but that which is either evidently the Word of God, or which hath been generally received in the catholic church, unless you speak of some unhappy unsuccessful carefulness. But we thankfully accept of your following words, (and if the contrary can be proved, we wish it out of the liturgy,) which we entreat you to perform, and impartially receive our proofs.

But then we must also entreat you,—1. That the primitive church's judgment and practice may be preferred before the present declined, much corrupted state. And 2. If God's law, rather than the sinful practices of men breaking that law, may be the church's rule for worship;—for you call us to subscribe to Article 19, that as the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch hath erred, so also the church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith; and, saith Rogers, in Article 20, they are out of the way which think that either

one man, as the pope, or any certain calling of men, as the clergy, hath power to decree and appoint rites or ceremonies, though of themselves good, unto the whole church of God, dispersed over the universal world:—and, indeed, if you would have all that corruption brought into our liturgy, and discipline, and doctrine, which the papists, Greeks, and others, that undoubtedly make up the far greater number of the now universal church, do use; you would deserve no more thanks of God or man than he that would have all kings, and nobles, and gentry levelled with the poor commons, because the latter are the greater number; or than he that would have the healthful conformed to the sick, when an epidemical disease hath made them the majority; or than he that would teach us to follow a multitude to do evil, and to break more than the least commands, because the greater number break them: we pray you, therefore, to take it for no justification of any uncertain or faulty passage in our liturgy, though the greater number now are guilty of it.

3. And we must beseech you, if the church's judgment or practice must be urged, that you would do us the justice as to imitate the ancient churches in your sense of the quality, and the mode and measure of using and imposing things, as well as in the materials used and imposed. Consider not only whether you find such things received by the ancient churches, but also consider how they were received, esteemed, and used—whether as necessary or indifferent, as points of faith or doubtful opinions, whether forced on others or left to their free choice. If you find that the generality of the ancient churches received the white garment after baptism and the tasting of milk and honey as ceremonies, freely, though generally used, you should not, therefore, force men to use them: if you find that the doctrine of the millennium or of angels' corporeity was generally received as an opinion, it will not warrant you to receive either of them as a certain necessary truth. If you find that the general councils forbade kneeling in any adoration on the Lord's days, but without force against dissenters, you may not go deny the

sacrament to all that kneel, nor yet forbid them to kneel in praying. So if you find some little parcels of our liturgy, or some of our ceremonies used as things indifferent, left to choice, forced upon none, but one church differing from another in such usages or observances, this will not warrant you to use the same things as necessary to order, unity, or peace, and to be forced upon all. Use them no otherwise than the churches used them.

Prop. 1. § 2. *Ans.* We heartily desire that, according to this proposal, great care may be taken to suppress those private conceptions of prayers before and after sermon, lest private opinions be made the matter of prayer in public, as hath, and will be, if private persons take liberty to make public prayers.

Reply. The desire of your hearts is the grief of our hearts; the conceptions of prayer by a public person, according to a public rule, for a public use, are not to be rejected as private conceptions: we had hoped you had designed no such innovation as this in the church. When we have heard any say that it would come to this, and that you designed the suppression of the free prayers of ministers in the pulpit, suited to the variety of subjects and occasions, we have rebuked them as uncharitable in passing so heavy a censure on you. And what would have been said of us a year ago, if we should have said that this was in your hearts? Nothing will more alienate the hearts of many holy, prudent persons from the Common Prayer, than to perceive that it is framed and used as an instrument to shut out all other prayers, as the ministers' private conceptions. Such an end and design will make it, under the notion of a means, another thing than else it would be, and afford men such an argument against it as we desire them not to have: but we hope you speak not the public sense. As the apostles desired (as aforesaid) that all would speak the same things, without giving them (that ever was proved) a form of words to speak them in, so might we propose to you that uncertain opinions be made no part of our liturgy, without putting all their words into their mouths

in which their desires must be uttered. Your hearty desire, and the reason of it, makes not only against extemporary prayer, but all prepared, or written forms, or liturgies, that were indited only by one man, and have not the consent antecedently of others. And do you think this was the course of the primitive times? Basil thus used his private conceptions at Cæsarea, and Gregory Thaumaturgus, before him, at Neocæsarea, and all pastors in Justin Martyr's and Tertullian's days. And how injurious is it to the public officers of Christ, the bishops and pastors of the churches, to be called private men! Who are public persons in the church, if they be not? Every single person is not a private person, else kings and judges would be so. And have you not better means to shut out private opinions, than the forbidding ministers praying in the pulpit, according to the variety of subjects and occasions? You have first the examination of persons to be ordained, and may see that they be able to speak sense, and fit to manage their proper works with judgment and discretion, before you ordain them; and some confidence may be put in a man in his proper calling and work, to which he is admitted with so great care as we hope (or desire) you will admit them. If you are necessitated to admit some few that are injudicious, or unmeet, we beseech you, not only to restore the many hundred worthy men laid by, to a capacity, but that you will not so dishonour the whole church, as to suppose all such, and to use all as such, but restrain those that deserve restraint, and not all others for their sakes. And next, you have a public rule (the holy Scripture) for these men to pray by; and if any of them be intolerably guilty of weaknesses or rashness, or other miscarriages, the words being spoken in public, you have witness enow; and sure there is power enough in magistrates and bishops to punish them, and if they prove incorrigible, to cast them out. In all other professions, these means are thought sufficient to regulate the professors. His majesty thinks it enough to regulate his judges, that he may choose able men, and fit to be trusted in their proper work, and that they are responsible for all their

maladministrations, without prescribing them forms, beyond which they may not speak anything in their charge. Physicians being first tried, and responsible for their doings, are constantly trusted with the lives of high and low, without tying them to give no counsel or medicine, but by the precept of a book, or determination of a college. And it is so undeniable that your reason makes more against preaching, and for only reading homilies, as that we must like it the worse, if not fear what will become of preaching also. For, 1. It is known that in preaching a man hath far greater opportunity and liberty to vent a false or private opinion, than in prayer. 2. It is known, *de eventu*, that it is much more ordinary. And if you say, that he speaks not the words of the church, but his own, nor unto God, but man, and therefore it is less matter; we answer—It is as considerable, if not much more, from whom he speaks, than to whom he speaks, as the minister of Christ, in his stead and name, (2 Cor. v, 19, 20.) And it is as a higher, so a more reverend thing, to speak in God's name to the people, than in the people's name to God; and to speak that which we call God's word, or truth, or message, than that which we call but our own desire. We make God a liar, or corrupt in his words, if we speak a falsehood in his name; we make but ourselves liars, if we speak a falsehood to him in our own names; the former, therefore, is the more heinous and dreadful abuse, and more to be avoided; or if but equally, it shews the tendency of your reason, for we will not say of your design, as hoping you intend not to make us ruffians. We do, therefore, for the sake of the poor threatened church, beseech you that you will be pleased to repent of these desires, and not to prosecute them, considering that to avoid a lesser evil (avoidable by safer means), you will bring a far greater evil on the churches, and such as is like to strip these nations of the glory in which they have excelled the rest of the world, even a learned, able, holy ministry, and a people sincere and serious, and understanding in the matters of their salvation.

For, 1. As it is well known that an ignorant man may read a prayer and homily as distinctly and laudably as a learned divine, and so may do the work of a minister, if this be it; so it is known that man's nature is so addicted to ease and sensual diversions, as that multitudes will make no better preparations when they find that no more is necessary. When they are as capable of their places and maintenance if they can but read, and are forced upon no exercise of their parts, which may detect and shame their ignorance, but the same words are to be read by the ablest and the ignorantest man; it is certain that this will make multitudes idle in their academical studies, and multitudes to spend their time idly all the year, in the course of their ministry: and when they have no necessity that they are sensible of, of diligent studies, it will let loose their fleshly, voluptuous inclinations, and they will spend their time in sports, and drinking, and prating, and idleness, and this will be a seminary of lust: or they will follow the world, and drown themselves in covetousness and ambition, and their hearts will be like their studies. As it is the way to have a holy, able ministry, to engage them to holy studies, to meditate on God's law day and night, so it is the way to have an ignorant, profane, and scandalous ministry (and consequently enemies to serious godliness in others,) to impose upon them but such a work as in ignorance and idleness they may perform as well as the judicious and the diligent. If it be said that their parts may be tried and exercised some other way, we answer, where should a minister's parts be exercised, if not in the pulpit, or the church, and in catechising, in private baptism, and communion, and in the visitation of the sick? Their work also is such as a schoolboy may do as well as they, their ignorance having the same cloak, in public. If it be said that a minister's work is not to shew his parts, we answer, but his ministerial work is, to shew men their sins, and to preach the wonderful mysteries of the gospel; to help men to search and understand the Scriptures, and to search and to know their hearts, and to know God in Christ, and to hope for the glory that is to be

revealed; and fervently to pray for the success of his endeavours, and the blessings of the gospel on the people, and cheerfully to praise God for his various benefits, which cannot be well done without abilities. A physician's work is not to shew his parts ultimately, but it is to do that for the cure of diseases which without parts he cannot do; and in the exercise of his parts, on which the issue much depends, to save men's lives. The ostentation of his good works is not the work of a good Christian: and yet he must so let his light shine before men, that they may see his good works, and glorify God. And undeniable experience tells us, that God ordinarily proportioneth the success and blessing to the skill, and holiness, and diligence of the instruments, and blesseth not the labours of ignorant, ungodly drones, as he doth the labours of able, faithful ministers: and also that the readiest way to bring the gospel into contempt with the world, and cause all religion to dwindle away into formality first, and then to barbarism and brutishness, is to let in an ignorant, idle, vicious ministry, that will become the people's scorn. Yea, this is the way to extirpate Christianity out of any country in the world, which is decaying apace when men grow ignorant of the nature and reasons of it, and unexperienced in its power and delightful fruits, and when the teachers themselves grow unable to defend it. And we must add that, whatsoever can be expected duly to affect the heart, must keep the intellect, and all the faculties awake in diligent attention and exercise: and in the use of a form which we have frequently heard and read, the faculties are not so necessitated and urged to attention, and serious exercise, as they be when from our own understanding we are set about the natural work of representing to others what we discern and feel. Man's mind is naturally slothful, and will take its ease, and remit its seriousness longer than it is urged by necessity, or drawn out by delight. When we know beforehand that we have no more to do but read a prayer or homily, we shall ordinarily be in danger of letting our minds go another way, and think of other matters, and be senseless of the work in

hand. Though he is but an hypocrite that is carried on by no greater motive than man's observation and approbation; yet is it a help not to be despised, when even a necessity of avoiding just shame with men, shall necessarily awake our invention, and all our faculties to the work, and be a concurrent help with spiritual motives. And common experience tells us, that the best are apt to lose a great deal of their affection by the constant use of the same words or forms. Let the same sermon be preached a hundred times over, and try whether a hundred for one will not be much less moved by it, than they were at first. It is not only the common corruption of our nature, but somewhat of innocent infirmity that is the cause of this. And man must cease to be man, or to be mortal, before it will be otherwise; so that the nature of the thing, and the common experience of our own dispositions, and of the effect on others, assureth us, that understanding serious godliness is like to be extinguished, if only forms be allowed in the church, on pretence of extinguishing errors and divisions. And though we have concurred to offer you our more corrected *Nepenthes*, yet must we, before God and men, protest against the dose of opium which you here prescribe or wish for, as that which plainly tendeth to cure the disease by the extinguishing of life, and to unite us all in a dead religion. And when the prayers that avail must be effectual and fervent, James v, 16, and God will be worshipped in spirit and truth, and more regardeth the frame of the heart than the comeliuess of expression; we have no reason to be taken with anything that pretends to help the tongue, while we are sure it ordinarily hurts the heart. And it is not the affirmations of any men in the world, persuading us of the harmlessuess of such a course, that can so far unman us, as to make us disbelieve both our own experience, and common observation of the effect on others. Yet we confess that some forms have their laudable use, to cure that error and vice, that lieth on the other extreme. And might we but sometimes have the liberty to interpose such words as are needful to call home and quicken

attention and affection, we should think that a convenient conjunction of both might be a well-tempered means to the common constitutions of most. But still we see the world will run into extremes, whatever be said or done to hinder it. It is but lately that we were put to it, against one extreme, to defend the lawfulness of a form of liturgy; now the other extreme it troubleth us, that we are forced against you, even such as you, to defend the use of such prayers of the pastors of the churches, as are necessarily varied according to subjects and occasions, while you would have no prayer at all in the church, but such prescribed forms. And why may we not add, that whoever maketh the forms imposed on us, if he use them, is guilty as well as we of praying according to his private conceptions; and that we never said it proved from Scripture, that Christ appointed any to such an office, as to make prayers for other pastors and churches to offer up to God; and that this being none of the work of the apostolic, or common ministerial office in the primitive church, is no work of any office of divine institution?

Prop. 1. § 3. *Ans.* To that part of the proposal, that the prayers may consist of nothing doubtful or questioned by pious, learned, and orthodox persons; they not determining who be those orthodox persons; we must either take all them for orthodox persons, who shall confidently affirm themselves to be such, and then we say, first, the demand is unreasonable; for some such as call themselves orthodox, have questioned the prime article of our creed, even the divinity of the Son of God, and yet there is no reason we should part with our creed for that. Besides, the proposal requires impossibility; for there never was, nor is, nor can be such prayers made, as have not been, nor will be questioned by some who call themselves pious, learned, and orthodox. If by orthodox be meant those who adhere to Scripture and the catholic consent of antiquity, we do not yet know that any part of our liturgy hath been questioned by such.

Reply. And may we not thus mention orthodox persons to men that profess they agree with us in doctrinals, unless we

digress to tell you who they be? What if we were pleading for civil concord among all that are loyal to the king, must we needs digress to tell you who are loyal? We are agreed in one rule of faith, in one holy Scripture, and one creed, and differ not (you say) about the doctrinal part of the thirty-nine Articles. And will not all this seem to tell you who are orthodox? If you are resolved to make all that a matter of contention which we desire to make a means of peace, there is no remedy while you have the ball before you, and have the wind and sun, and the power of contending without control. But we perceive, that the catholic consent of antiquity must go into your definition of the orthodox; but how hard it is to get a reconciling determination, what ages shall go with you, and us, for the true antiquity, and what is necessary to that consent that must be called catholic, is unknown to none but the inexperienced. And indeed we think a man that searcheth the holy Scripture, and sincerely and unreservedly gives up his soul to understand, love, and obey it, may be orthodox, without the knowledge of church history; we know no universal lawgiver, nor law to the church, but one, and that law is the sufficient rule of faith, and consequently the test of the truly orthodox, though we refuse not church history, or other means that may help us to understand it. And to acquaint you with what you do not know, we ourselves (after many pastors of the reformed churches) do question your liturgy, as far as is expressed in our papers; and we profess to adhere to Scripture and the catholic consent of antiquity, as described by Vicentius Lirinensis. If you will say, that our pretence and claim is unjust, we call for your authority to judge our hearts, or depose us from the number of the orthodox, or else for your proofs to make good your accusation. But however you judge, we rejoice in the expectation of the righteous judgment, that shall finally decide the controversy; to which, from this aspersion, we appeal.

Prop. 1. § 4. *Ans.* To those generals, “loading public forms with church pomp, garments, imagery, and many superfluities

that creep into the church under the name of order and decency, encumbering churches with superfluities, over rigid reviving of obsolete customs, &c.," we say, that if these generals be intended as applicable to our liturgy in particular, they are gross and foul slanders, contrary to their profession, (page ult.) and so either that or this contrary to their conscience; if not, they signify nothing to the present business, and so might with more prudence and candour have been omitted.

Reply. You needed not go a fishing for our charge; what we had to say against the liturgy, which we now desired you to observe, was here plainly laid before you; answer to this, and suppose us not to say, what we do not, to make yourselves matter of reproaching us with gross and foul slanders. Only we pray you answer Mr. Hales, as Mr. Hales, (whom we took to be a person of much esteem with you,) especially that passage of his which you take no notice of, as not being so easy to be answered, for the weight and strength which it carries with it; viz., that the limiting of the church communion to things of doubtful disputation, hath been in all ages the ground of schism and separation, and that he that separates from suspected opinions is not the separatist. And may we not cite such words of one that we thought you honoured, and would hear, without contradicting our profession of not intending depravation or reproach against the book without going against our consciences? If we cite the words of an author for a particular use (as to persuade you of the evil of laying the church's unity upon unnecessary things) must we be responsible therefore for all that you can say against his words in other respects? We suppose you would be loth your words should have such interpretations, and that you should be under such a law for all your citations. Do as you would be done by.

Prop. 2. *Ans.* It was the wisdom of our reformers to draw up such a liturgy as neither Romanist nor Protestant could justly except against; and therefore as the first never charged it with any positive errors, but only the want of something they conceived necessary, so it was never found fault with by

those to whom the name of Protestants most properly belongs, those that profess the Augustan confession: and for those, who unlawfully and sinfully brought it into dislike with some people, to urge the present state of affairs, as an argument why the book should be altered, to give them satisfaction, and so that they should take advantage by their own unwarrantable acts, is not reasonable.

Reply. If it be blameless, no man can justly except against it: but, *de facto*, the Romanists never charged it with any positive errors, is an assertion that maketh them reformed, and reconcilable to us, beyond all belief: is not the very using it in our own tongue a positive error in their account? Is it no positive error in the papists' account, that we profess to receive these creatures of bread and wine? Do they think we have no positive error in our catechism about the sacrament, that affirmeth it to be bread and wine after the consecration, and makes but two sacraments necessary? &c. 2. And unless we were nearer agreed than we are, it seemeth to us no commendation of a liturgy, that the papists charge it with no positive error. 3. That no divines, or private men at home, or of foreign churches that ever found fault with the liturgy, are such to whom the name of Protestant properly belongeth, is an assertion that proveth not what authority of judging your brethren you have, but what you assume and commendeth your charity no more than it commendeth the papists, that they deny us to be catholics. Calvin and Bucer subscribed the Augustan confession, and so have others that have found fault with our liturgy. 4. If any of us have blamed it to the people, it is but with such a sort of blame, as we have here expressed against it to yourselves; and whether it be unlawful and sinful, the impartial comparing of your words with ours, will help the willing reader to discern. But if we prove indeed that it is defective and faulty, that you bring it for an offering to God when you or your neighbours have a better, which you will not bring, nor suffer them that would (Mal. i, 13,) and that you call evil good in justifying its blemishes, which in humble modesty we besought you to

amend, or excuse us from offering, then God will better judge of the unlawful act than you have done. But you have not proved, that all, or most of us, have caused the people at all to dislike it; if any of us have, yet weigh our argument, though from the present state of affairs: or, if you will not hear us, we beseech you hear the many ministers in England, that never meddled against the liturgy, and the many moderate episcopal divines that have used it, and can do still, and yet would earnestly entreat you to alter it, partly because of what in it needs alteration, and partly in respect to the commodity of others; or at least we beseech you recant, and obliterate such passages as would hinder all yourselves from any act of reformation hereabout; that if any man among you would find fault with some of the grosser things, which we laid open to you, tenderly and sparingly, and would reform them, he may not presently forfeit the reputation of being a Protestant. And lastly, we beseech you deny not again the name of Protestants to the Primate of Ireland, the Archbishop of York, and the many others that had divers meetings for the reformation of the liturgy, and who drew up that catalogue of faults, or points, that needed mending, which is yet to be seen in print; they took not advantage of their own unwarrantable acts for the attempting of that alteration.

Prop. 3, 4. *Ans.* The third and fourth proposals may go together, the demand in both being against responsals and alternate readings in hymns, and psalms, and litany, &c., and that upon such reason as doth in truth enforce the necessity of continuing them as they are, namely, for edification. They would take these away, because they do not edify; and upon that very reason they should continue, because they do edify, if not by informing of our reasons and understandings (the prayers and hymns were never made for a catechism,) yet by quickening, continuing, and uniting our devotion, which is apt to freeze, or sleep, or flat in a long continued prayer, or form: it is necessary therefore for the edifying of us therein, to be often called upon and awakened by frequent Amens, to

be excited and stirred up by mutual exultations, provocations, petitions, holy contentions, and strivings, which shall most shew his own, and stir up others' zeal to the glory of God. For this purpose alternate reading, repetitions, and responsals, are far better than a long tedious prayer. Nor is this our opinion only, but the judgment of former ages, as appears by the practice of ancient Christian churches, and of the Jews also. But it seems, they say, to be against the Scripture, wherein the minister is appointed for the people in public prayers, the people's part being to attend with silence, and to declare their assent in the close by saying Amen; if they mean that the people in public services must only say this word Amen, as they can no more prove it in the Scriptures, so it doth certainly seem to them that it cannot be proved; for they directly practice the contrary in one of their principal parts of worship, singing of psalms, where the people bear as great a part as the minister. If this way be done in Hopkins', why not in David's psalms? If in metre, why not in prose? If in a psalm, why not in a litany?

Reply. What is most for edification, is best known by experience, and by the reason of the thing. For the former, you are not the masters of all men's experience, but of your own, and others that have acquainted you with the same, as theirs. We also may warrantably profess in the name of ourselves, and many thousands of sober, pious persons, that we experience that these things are against our edification, and we beseech you do not by us, what you would not do by the poor labouring servants of your family, to measure them all their diet for quality or quantity, according to your own appetites, which they think are diseased, and would be better if you worked as hard as they. And we gave you some of the reasons of our judgment. 1. Though we have not said that the people may not in psalms to God concur in voice, (we speak of prayer which you should have observed) and though we only concluded it agreeable to the Scripture practice, for the people in prayer to say but their Amen; yet knowing not from whom to understand the will of God, and

what is pleasing to him, better than from himself, we considered what the Scripture saith of the ordinary way of public worship; and finding ordinarily that the people spoke no more in prayer (as distinct from psalms and praise) than their Amen, or mere consent, we desired to imitate the surest pattern. 2. As we find that the minister is the mouth of the people to God in public (which Scripture, and the necessity of order do require), so we were loth to countenance the people's invading of that sacred office, so far as they seem to us to do;—1. By reading half the psalms and hymns;—2. By saying half the prayers, as the minister doth the other half;—3. By being one of them the mouth of all the rest in the confession at the Lord's Supper;—4. By being the only petitioners, in the far greatest part of all the litany, by their good Lord deliver us, and we beseech thee to hear us good Lord. While the minister only reciteth the matter of the prayer, and maketh none of the request at all, we fear lest, by parity of reason, the people will claim the work of preaching, and other parts of the ministerial office. 3. And we mentioned that which all our ears are witnesses of, that while half the psalms, and hymns, &c., are said by such of the people as can say them, the murmur of their voices in most congregations, is so unintelligible and confused, as must hinder the edification of all the rest. For who is edified by that which he cannot understand? We know not what you mean by citing 2 Chron. vii, 1, 4; Ezra iii, 11, where there is not a word of public prayer, but in one place of an acclamation, upon an extraordinary sight of the glory of the Lord, which made them praise the Lord, and say, he is good, for his mercy is for ever; when the prayer that went before was such as you call a long tedious prayer uttered by Solomon alone, without such breaks, and descants. And in the other places is no mention of prayer at all, but of singing praise, and that not by the people, but by the priests, and Levites, saying the same words, for he is good, for his mercy endures for ever towards Israel. The people are said to do no more than shout with a great shout, because the foundation of the

house was laid: and if shouting be it that you would prove, it is not the thing in question. Let the ordinary mode of praying in Scripture be observed, in the prayers of David, Solomon, Ezra, Danicl, or any other, and if they were by breaks, and frequent beginnings and endings, and alternate interlocations of the people, as yours are, then we will conform to your mode, which now offends us. But if they were not, we beseech you reduce yours to the examples in the Scripture: we desire no other rule to decide the controversy by. As to your citation, 1. Socrates there tells us of the alternate singing of the Arians in the reproach of the orthodox, and that Chrysostom (not a synod) compiled hymns to be sung in opposition to them in the streets, which came in the end to a tumult and bloodshed. And hereupon he tells us of the original of alternate singing, viz., a pretended vision of Ignatius, that heard angels sing in that order. And what is all this to alternate reading, and praying, or to a divine institution, when here is no mention of reading, or praying, but of singing hymns; and that not upon pretence of apostolical tradition, but a vision of uncertain credit? Theodoret also speaketh only of singing psalms alternately, and not a word of reading or praying so. And he fetcheth that way of singing also, as Socrates doth, but from the Church at Antioch, and not from any pretended doctrine, or practice of the apostles. And neither of them speaks a word of the necessity of it, or of forcing any to it: so that all these your citations, speaking not a word so much as of the very subjects in question, are marvellously impertinent. The words—their worship—seem to intimate, that singing psalms is part (of our worship) and not of yours; we hope you disown it not: for our parts we are not ashamed of it. Your distinction between Hopkins' and David's psalms, as if the metre allowed by authority to be sung in churches made them to be no more David's psalms, seemeth to us a very hard saying. If it be because it is a translation, then the prose should be none of David's psalms neither, nor any translation be the Scripture. If it be because it is in metre, then the exactest

translation in metre should be none of the Scripture. If because it is done imperfectly, then the old translation of the Bible, used by the Common Prayer book, should not be Scripture. As to your reason for the supposed priority,—1. Scripture examples telling us that the people had more part in the psalms, than in the prayers or readings, satisfy us that God and his church then saw a disparity of reason. 2. Common observation tells us, that there is more order and less hinderance of edification in the people's singing, than in their reading and praying together vocally.

Prop. 5. § 1. *Ans.* It is desired that nothing should be in the liturgy which so much as seems to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast; and this as an expedient to peace; which is, in effect, to desire that this our church may be contentious for peace sake, and to divide from the church catholic, that we may live at unity among ourselves. For Saint Paul reckons them amongst the lovers of contention, who shall oppose themselves against the customs of the churches of God. That the religious observation of Lent was a custom of the churches of God, appears by the testimonies following. Chrysost. Ser. 11, in Heb. x, Cyrill. Catec. Myst. 5, St. August., Ep. 119, *ut 40 dies ante Pascha observentur, ecclesie consuetudo, roboravit*; and St. Hierom ad Marcell. says, it was *secundum traditionem apostolorum*. This demand then tends not to peace, but dissension. The fasting forty days may be in imitation of our Saviour, for all that is here said to the contrary; for though we cannot arrive to his perfection, abstaining wholly from meat so long, yet we may fast forty days together, either Cornelius' fast, till three of the clock afternoon, or Saint Peter's fast till noon, or at least Daniel's fast, abstaining from meats and drinks of delight, and thus far imitate our Lord.

Reply. If we had said, that the church is contentious if it adore God in kneeling on the Lord's days, or use not the white garment, [and] milk and honey after baptism, which had more pretence of apostolical tradition, and were generally used more anciently than Lent, would you not have thought

we wronged the church? If the purer times of the church have one custom, and later times a contrary, which must we follow? Or must we necessarily be contentious for not following both; or, rather, may we not, by the example of the church that changeth them, be allowed to take such things to be matters of liberty, and not necessity? If we must needs conform to the custom of other churches in such things, or be contentious, it is either because God hath so commanded, or because he hath given those churches authority to command it. If the former, then what churches or what ages must we conform to? If all must concur to be our pattern, it will be hard for us to be acquainted with them, so far as to know of such concurrences; and in our case we know that many do it not. If it must be the most, we would know where God commandeth us to imitate the greater number, though the worse; or hath secured us that they shall not be the worst; or why we are not tied rather to imitate the purer ages than the more corrupt? If it be said, that the church hath authority to command us, we desire to know what church that is, and where to be found and heard, that may command England and all the churches of his majesty's dominions. If it be said to be a general council—1. No general council can pretend to more authority than that of Nicæa, whose 20th canon, backed with tradition and common practice, now binds not us, and was laid by without any repeal by following councils. 2. We know of no such things as general councils, at least that have bound us to the religious observation of Lent. The bishops of one empire could not make a general council. 3. Nor do we know of any such power that they have over the universal church; there being no visible head of it, or governors, to make universal laws, but Christ, as Rogers, on the 20th Article fore-cited, shews. Our 21st Article saith, that general councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes; and doubtless, all the heathen, and Mahometans, and all the contending Christian princes, will never agree together (nor never did) to let all their Christian subjects

concur to hold a general council. It saith also—"And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God; therefore, things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture." And if they may err in things pertaining unto God, and ordained by them as necessary to salvation, much more in lesser things. And are we contentious if we err not with them? Our 34th Article determineth this controversy, saying—"It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word:" and after—"every particular, or national church, hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies, or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." They that believe not this should not subscribe it, nor require it of others. As for the testimonies cited by you, they are to little purpose. We deny not that the custom of observing Lent, either fewer days or more, was as ancient as those authors. But—1. That Lent was not known or kept in the second or third ages, you may see as followeth;—Tertull. de jejun. l. 2, cap. 14, pleading to the Montanists.—*Si omnem in totum devotionem temporum, et dierum, et mensium, et annorum erasit apostolus, cur pascha celebramus annuo circulo in mense primo? cur quadraginta inde diebus in omni exultatione decurrimus? cur stationibus quartam et sextam, sabbati dicamus? et jejuniis Parascevem? quamquam vos etiam sabbatum, si quando continuatis, nunquam nisi in pascha jejunandum, etc.* And cap. 15, excusing that rigor of their fasts.—*Quantula est apud nos interdictio ciborum? Duas in anno hebdomadas xerophagiarum, nec totas, exceptis scilicet sabbatis et dominicis, offerimus Deo.* The old general fast at that time was only the voluntary, unconstrained fasting on Good Friday,

and after that, on one or two days more, and then on six. Iræneus, in a fragment of an epistle in Euseb. Hist., lib. 5, cap. 26, Gr. Lat. 23, saith, "The controversy is not only of the day of Easter, but of the kind of fast itself; for some think they should fast one day, some two, others more; some measure their day by forty hours of day and night; and this variety of those that observe the fasts, began not now in our age, but long before us with our ancestors, who, as is most like, propagated to posterity the custom which they retain, as brought in by a certain simplicity and private will. And yet all these lived peaceably among themselves, and we keep peace among ourselves, and the difference of fasting is so far from violating the consonancy of faith, as that it even commendeth it." Thus Iræneus. Read the rest of the chapter. Thus is the true reading confessed by Bellarmine, Rigaltius, &c., and Dionys. Alexand., Ep. Can. ad Basil., p. 881. Balsamo saith, "Nor do all equally and alike sustain those six days of fasting; but some pass them all fasting, some two, some three, some four, some more." And the Catholics in Tertull. de jejuniis, cap. 2, say;—*Itaque de cætero differenter jejunandum ex arbitrio, non ex imperio novæ disciplinæ, pro temporibus et causis uniuscujusque. Sic et apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum, et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum.* And Socrates admireth at many countries, that all differed about the number of days, and yet called it *quadragesima*, lib. 5, c. 22, Lat. Gr. 21. So Sozomen lib. 7, c. 19, Gr.; et Niceph. lib. 12, cap. 34, which may help you to expound Hierom, and the rest cited by you, as Rigaltius doth ad Tertull., de jejuniis, cap. 2, as shewing that they did it with respect to Christ's forty days' fast, but not as intending any such thing themselves as any fast of forty days. It is against the Montanists, that the *Quadragesima* was but once a year that Hierom useth the title of apostolic tradition. And how to expound him, see Epist. ad Lucin, *unaquæque provincia abundet in suo sensu, et precepta majorum leges apostolicas arbitretur.* But saith August. ad Casulan, Ep. 86. *In evangelicis et apostolicis*

literis, totoque instrumento quod appellatur testamentum novum, animo id revolvens video preceptum esse jejunium: quibus autem diebus non oportet jejunare, et quibus oporteat, precepto domini vel apostolorum non invenio definitum. And that Christians' abstinence in Lent was voluntary,—*quanto magis quisque vel minus voluerit, vel potuerit,*—August. affirmeth, cont. Faustum Manich. lib. 30, cap. 5. And Socrates ubi supr. saith. *Ac quoniam nemo de care preceptum literarum monumentis proditum potest ostendere, perspicuum est apostolos liberam potestatem in eadem cujusque mente, ac arbitrio permississe: ut quisque nec metu, nec necessitate inductus quod bonum sit ageret.* And Prosper de vit. Contempl. lib. 2, c. 24, *veruntamen sic jejunare, vel abstinere debemus ut nos non jejunandi, vel abstinendi necessitate subdamus, ne jam devoti, sed inviti, rem voluntariam faciamus.* And Cassianus, lib. 2, col. 21, cap. 30, saith—*in primitivâ ecclesiâ equale fuisse jejunium per totum annum: ac frigescente devotione, cum negligenterur jejunia, inductum quadrag. a sacerdotibus.* But when you come to describe your fast, you make amends for the length by making it indeed no fast; to abstain from meats and drinks of delight, where neither the thing nor the delight is profitable to further us in our duty to God, is that which we take to be the duty of every Christian all the year, as being a part of our mortification and self-denial, who are commanded to crucify the flesh, and to make no provision to satisfy the lusts of it, and to subdue our bodies; but when those meats and drinks do more help than hinder us in the service of God, we take it to be our duty to use them, unless, when some other accident forbids it, that would make it otherwise more hurtful; and for fasting till noon, we suppose it is the ordinary way of diet to multitudes of sedentary persons, both students and tradesmen, that find one meal a day sufficient for nature; if you call this fasting, your poor brethren fast all their lifetime, and never knew that it was fasting; but to command hard labourers to do so, is but to make it a fault to have health, or to do their necessary work. We

beseech you bring not the clergy under the suspicion of gluttony, by calling our ordinary, wholesome temperance by the name of fasting: sure princes may feed as fully and delightfully as we; yet Solomon saith, “woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child and thy princes eat in the morning; blessed art thou, O land, when thy king is the son of nobles and thy princes eat in due season, for strength and not for drunkenness.” For mere sensual delight it is never lawful; and when it is for strength it is not to be forbidden, unless, when by accident, it will infer a greater good to abstain. Eccles. x, 16, 17: so Prov. xxxi, 4, 6,—“it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink: give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to those that be of heavy hearts.”

Prop. 5. § 2. *Ans.* Nor does the act of parliament 5 Elizabeth forbid it; we dare not think a parliament did intend to forbid that which Christ’s church hath commanded. Nor does the act determine anything about Lent fast, but only provide for the maintenance of the navy, and of fishing in order thereunto, as is plain by the act. Besides we conceive that we must not so interpret one act as to contradict another, being still in force and unrepealed. Now the act of 1 Elizabeth confirms the whole liturgy, and in that the religious keeping of Lent, with a severe penalty upon all those who shall by open words speak anything in derogation of any part thereof; and therefore that other act of 5 Elizabeth must not be interpreted to forbid the religious keeping of Lent.

Reply. If when the express words of a statute are cited, you can so easily put it off, by saying it does not forbid it, and you dare not think that a parliament did intend to forbid that which Christ’s church hath commanded, and you must not interpret it as contradicting that act which confirms the liturgy, we must think that indeed we are no less regardful of the laws of the governors than you. But first, we understand not what authority this is that you set against the king and parliament, as supposing they will not forbid what it commands? You call it Christ’s church, we suppose you

mean not Christ himself, by his apostles infallibly directed and inspired. If it be the national Church of England, they are the king's subjects; and why may he not forbid a ceremony which they command; or why should they command it if he forbid it? If it be any foreign church, there is none hath power over us. If it be any pretended head of the church universal, whether pope or general council, having power to make laws that bind the whole church, it is a thing so copiously disproved by Protestants against both the Italian and French Papists, that we think it needless to confute it, nor indeed dare imagine that you intend it. We know not therefore what you mean; but whatever you mean you seem to contradict the fore-cited Article of the church of England, that makes all human laws about rites and ceremonies of the church to be unchangeable, by each particular national church; and that it is not necessary that ceremonies or traditions be in all places one, or utterly like. We most earnestly beseech you be cautious how you obtrude upon us a foreign power, under the name of Christ's church, that may command ceremonies which king and parliament may not forbid. Whether it be one man or a thousand, we fear it is against our oaths of allegiance and supremacy for us to own any such power. And (not presuming upon any immodest challenge) we are ready in the defence of those oaths and the protestant religion, to prove against any in an equal conference, that there is no such power; and for the statute, let the words themselves decide the controversy, which are these:—Be it enacted, that whosoever shall by preaching, teaching, writing, or open speech, notify that any eating of fish, or forbearing of flesh, mentioned in this statute, is of any necessity for the saving of the soul of man, or that it is the service of God, otherwise than as other political laws are and be, that then such persons are and shall be punished, as the spreaders of false news are, and ought to be. And whereas you say the act determines not anything about Lent fast, it speaks against eating flesh on any days now usually observed as fish days: and Lent is such, and the sense of the act for the liturgy may better be

tried by this, which is plain, than this reduced to that which is more obscure.

Prop. 6. *Ans.* The observation of saints' days is not as of divine but ecclesiastical institution, and therefore it is not necessary that they should have any other ground in Scripture than all other institutions of the same nature, so that they be agreeable to the Scripture in the general end, for the promoting piety. And the observation of them was ancient, as appears by the rituals and liturgies, and by the joint consent of antiquity and by the ancient translations of the Bible, as the Syriac and Ethiopic, where the lessons appointed for holydays are noted and set down, the former of which was made near the apostles' times. Besides our Saviour himself kept a feast of the church's institution, viz, the feast of the dedication, (St. John x, 22.) The chief end of these days being not feasting, but the exercise of holy duties, they are fitter called holydays than festivals; and though they be all of like nature, it doth not follow that they are equal. The people may be dispensed with for their work, after the service, as authority pleaseth. The other names are left in the calendar, not that they should be so kept as holydays, but they are useful for the preservation of their memories, and for other reasons, as for leases, law days, &c.

Reply. The antiquity of the translations mentioned is far from being of determinate certainty; we rather wish than hope that the Syriac could be proved to be made near the apostles' times. But, however, the things being confessed of human institution, and no foreign power having any authority to command his majesty's subjects, and so the imposition being only by our own governors, we humbly crave that they may be left indifferent, and the unity or peace of the church, or liberty of the ministers not laid upon them.

Prop. 7. § 1. *Ans.* This makes all the liturgy void, if every minister may put in and leave out at his discretion.

Reply. You mistake us: we speak not of putting in and leaving out of the liturgy, but of having leave to intermix some exhortations or prayers besides, to take off the dead-

ness which will follow, if there be nothing but the stinted forms; we would avoid both the extreme that would have no forms, and the contrary extreme that would have nothing but forms. But if we can have nothing but extremes, there is no remedy; it is not our fault. And this moderation and mixture which we move for is so far from making all the liturgy void, that it will do very much to make it attain its end, and would heal much of the distemper which it occasioneth, and consequently would do much to preserve the reputation of it; as for instance, if besides the forms in the liturgy, the minister might at baptism, the Lord's supper, marriage, &c., interpose some suitable exhortation or prayer upon special occasion when he finds it needful. Should you deny this at the visitation of the sick, it would seem strange, and why may it not be granted at other times? It is a matter of far greater trouble to us, that you would deny us and all ministers the liberty of using any other prayers besides the liturgy, than that you impose these.

Prop. 7. § 2. *Ans.* The gift or rather spirit of prayer consists in the inward graces of the spirit, not in *ex tempore* expressions, which any man of natural parts, having a voluble tongue, and audacity, may attain to without any special gift.

Reply. All inward graces of the spirit are not properly called the spirit of prayer, nor is the spirit of prayer that gift of prayer which we speak of. Nor did we call it by the name of a special gift, nor did we deny that ordinary men of natural parts and voluble tongues may attain it. But yet we humbly conceive that as there is a gift of preaching, so also of prayer, which God bestows in the use of means, diversified much according to men's natural parts, and their diligence, as other acquired abilities are; but also much depending on that grace that is indeed special, which maketh men love and relish the holy subjects of such spiritual studies, and the holy exercise of those graces that are the soul of prayer; and consequently making men follow on such exercises

with delight and diligence, and therefore with success. And also God is free in giving or denying his blessing to man's endeavours. If you think there be no gift of preaching, you will too dishonourably level the ministry. If reading be all the gift of prayer or preaching, there needs no great understanding or learning to it. Nor should cobblers and tinkers be so unfit men for ministers as they are thought; nor would the reason be very apparent, why a woman might not speak by preaching or praying in the church.

Prop. 7. § 3. *Ans.* But if there be any such gift, as is pretended, it is to be subject to the prophets, and to the order of the church.

Reply. The text speaks (as Dr. Hammond well shews) of a subjection to that prophet himself, who was the speaker. Inspiration excluded not the prudent exercise of reason; but it is a strange ordering, that totally excludeth the thing ordered. The gift of preaching (as distinct from reading) is to be orderly and with due subjection exercised; but not to be on that pretence extinguished and cast out of the church: and indeed if you should command it, you are not to be obeyed, whatever we suffer; and why then should the gift of prayer (distinct from reading) be cast out?

Prop. 7. § 4. *Ans.* The mischiefs that come by idle, impertinent, ridiculous, sometimes seditious, impious, and blasphemous expressions under pretence of the gift, to the dishonour of God, and seorn of religion, being far greater than the pretended good of exercising the gift: it is fit that they who desire such liberty in public devotions, should first give the church security that no private opinions should be put into their prayers, as is desired in the first proposal; and that nothing contrary to the faith should be uttered before God, or offered up to him in the church.

Reply. The mischiefs which you pretend, are inconveniences attending human imperfection, which you would cure with a mischief; your argument from the abuse against the use is a palpable fallacy, which cast out physicians in some countries, and rooted up vines in others, and condemneth the

reading of the scriptures in a known tongue among the Papists. If the apostles (that complained then so much of divisions, and preaching false doctrines, and in envy and strife, &c.) had thought the way of cure had been, in sending ministers about the world, with a prayer book, and sermon book, and to have tied them only to read either one or both of these, no doubt but they would have been so regardful of the church, as to have composed such a prayer book, or sermon book themselves, and not left us to the uncertainties of an authority not infallible, nor to the divisions that follow the impositions of a questionable power, or that which unquestionably is not universal, and therefore can procure no universal concord. If one man among you draw up a form of prayer, it is his single conception: and why a man as learned and able may not be trusted to conceive a prayer, for the use of a single congregation, without the dangers mentioned by you, as one man to conceive a prayer for all the churches in a diocese or nation, we know not. These words—that the mischief is greater than the pretended good—seem to express an unjust accusation, of ordinary conceived prayer, and a great undervaluing of the benefits. If you intimate that the crimes expressed by you are ordinarily found in ministers' prayers, we that hear such, much more frequently than you, must profess we have not found it so, allowing men their different measures of exactness; as you have even in writing. Nay, to the praise of God we must say, that multitudes of private men can ordinarily pray without any such imperfection, as should nauseate a sober person; and with such seriousness, and aptness of expression as is greatly to the benefit and comfort of ourselves, when we join with them: and if such general accusations may serve in a matter of public, and common fact, there is no way for the justification of the innocent. And that it is no such common guilt, will seem more probable to them that consider that, such conceived prayers, both prepared and extemporate, have been ordinarily used in the pulpits in England and Scotland, before our days till now; and there hath been power enough in the bishops and others,

before the wars, to punish those that speak ridiculously, seditiously, impiously, or blasphemously; and yet so few are the instances (even when jealousy was most busy) of ministers punished, or once accused of any such fault in prayer, as that we find it not easy to remember any considerable number of them: there being great numbers punished for not reading the book, for playing on the Lord's days, or for preaching too oft, and such like, for one that was ever questioned for such kind of praying. And the former showed that it was not for want of will to be severe, that they spared them as to the latter. And if it be but few that are guilty of any intolerable faults of that nature in their prayers, we hope you will not go on to believe, that the mischiefs that come by the failings of those few are far greater than the benefit of conceived prayer by all others. We presume not to make our experiences the measure of yours, or of other men's. You may tell us what doth most good, or hurt to yourselves, and those that have so communicated their experiences to you; but we also may speak our own, and theirs that have discovered them to us. And we must seriously profess, that we have found far more benefit to ourselves, and to our congregations (as far as our conference, and converse with them, and our observation of the effects alloweth us to discern) by conceived prayers, than by the Common Prayer book. We find that the benefit of conceived prayer is to keep the mind in serious employment, and to awaken the affections, and to make us fervent, and importunate. And the inconvenience is that some weak men are apt, as in preaching and conference, so in prayer, to shew their weakness by some unapt expressions, or disorder, which is an evil no way to be compared with the fore-mentioned good, considering that it is but in the weak, and that if that weakness be so great as to require it, forms may be imposed on those few, without imposing them on all for their sakes (as we force not all to use spectacles, or crutches, because some are purlind or lame); and considering that God heareth not prayers, for the rhetoric, and handsome cadences, and neatness of expressions, but will bear more with some incuriosity

of words (which yet we plead not for) than with an hypocritical, formal, heartless, lip service: for he knoweth the meaning of the spirit even in the groans, which are not uttered in words. And for the Common Prayer our observation telleth us, that though some can use it judiciously, seriously, and we doubt not profitably, yet as to the most of the vulgar, it occasioneth a relaxing of their attention, and intention, and a lazy taking up with a corpse, or image of devotion, even the service of the lips, while the heart is little sensible of what is said. And had we not known it we should have thought it incredible, how utterly ignorant abundance are of the sense of the words which they hear, and repeat themselves from day to day even about Christ himself, and the essentials of Christianity. It is wonderful to us to observe that rational creatures can so commonly separate the words from all the sense and life, so great a help or hinderance even to the understanding, is the awakening or not awakening of the affections about the things of God. And we have already shewed you many unfit expressions in the Common Prayer book, especially in the Epistles and Gospels, through the faultiness of your translations:—as Eph. iii, 15. “Father of all that is called father in heaven and earth;” “and that Christ was found in his apparel as a man;” “that mount Sinai is Agar in Arabia, and bordereth upon the city now called Jerusalem:” Gal. iv, 25. “This is the sixth month which is called barren:” Luke i. “And when men be drunk:” John ii, with many such like, which are parts of your public worship: and would you have us hence conclude, that the mischiefs of such expressions are worse, than all the benefits of that worship? And yet there is this difference in the cases, that weak and rash ministers were but here and there one; but the Common Prayer is the service of every church, and every day had we heard any in extemporary prayer use such unmeet expressions, we should have thought him worthy of sharp reprehension, yea though he had been of the younger or weaker sort. Divers other unfit expressions, are mentioned in the exceptions of the late arch-

bishop of York, and Primate of Ireland, and others (before spoken of,) and there is much in the prejudice or diseased curiosity of some hearers to make words seem idle, impertinent, or ridiculous which are not so, and which perhaps they understand not. Some thought so of the inserting in the late Prayer book, the private opinion of the souls departed praying for us; and our praying for the benefit of their prayers. As for the security which you call for (though as is shewed,) you have given us none at all against such errors in your forms, yet we have before shewed you, that you have as much as among imperfect men can be expected; the same that you have that physicians shall not murder men, and that lawyers and judges shall not undo men, and that your pilot shall not cast away the ship. You have the power in your hands of taking or refusing as they please or displease you, and of judging them by a known law for their proved miscarriages, according to the quality of them: and what would you have more?

Prop. 7. § 5. *Ans.* To prevent which mischief the former ages knew no better way than to forbid any prayers in public, but such as were prescribed by public authority. Con. Carthag. Can. 106, Milev. Can. 12.

Reply. To what you allege out of two councils, we answer, 1. The acts of more venerable councils are not now at all observed (as Nicæan 1. Can. ult., &c.,) nor many of these same which you cite. 2. The Scripture, and the constant practice of the more ancient church allowed what they forbid. 3. Even these canons shew that then the churches thought not our liturgy to be necessary to their concord, nor indeed had then any such form imposed on all, or many churches to that end. For the Can. of Council Carth., (we suppose you meant Council 3. Can. 23.) mentioneth prayers even at the altar, and alloweth any man to describe and use his own prayers, so he do but first *cum instructoribus fratribus eas conferre*, take advice about them with the abler brethren. If there had been a stated form before imposed on the churches, what room could there be for this course? And even this

much seems but a caution, made newly upon some late abuse of prayer. The same we may say de Concil. Milevit Can. 12. If they were but *a prudentioribus tractatæ, vel comprobatæ in Synodo*, new prayers might by any man at any time be brought in, which sheweth they had no such stated public liturgy as is now pleaded for. And even this seemeth occasioned by Pelagianism; which by this caution they would keep out.

We hope your omission of our 8th desire (for the use of the new translation) intimateth your grant that it shall be so. But we marvel then that we find, among your concessions, the alteration of no part but the Epistles and Gospels.

Prop. 9. *Ans.* As they would have no saints' days observed by the church, so no apocryphal chapter read in the church, but upon such a reason, as would exclude all sermons, as well as apocrypha, viz., because the holy Scriptures contain in them all things necessary either in doctrine to be believed, or in duty to be practised. If so, why so many unnecessary sermons? Why any more but reading of Scriptures? If notwithstanding their sufficiency, sermons be necessary, there is no reason why these apocryphal chapters should not be as useful, most of them containing excellent discourses, and rules of morality. It is heartily to be wished that sermons were as good. If their fear be that by this means those books may come to be of equal esteem with the canon, they may be secured against that by the title which the church hath put upon them, calling them apocryphal: and it is the church's testimony which teaches us this difference; and to leave them out, were to cross the practice of the church in former ages.

Reply. We hoped when our desires were delivered in writing they would have been better observed and understood. We asked not that no apocryphal chapter may be read in the church, but that none may be read as lessons; for so the chapters of holy Scripture there read, are called in the book; and to read them in the same place under the same title, without any sufficient note of distinction, or notice given to the people that they are not canonical Scripture,

(they being also bound with our Bibles) is such a temptation to the vulgar to take them for God's word, as doth much prevail, and is like to do so still. And when papists second it with their confident affirmations, that the apocryphal books are canonical, well refelled by one of you, the Rt. Reverend Bishop of Durham, we should not needlessly help on their success. If you cite the apocrypha as you do other human writings, or read them as homilies, (when and where there is reason to read such) we speak not against it. To say that the people are secured by the church's calling them apocrypha, is of no force till experience be proved to be disregardable; and till you have proved that the minister is to tell the people at the reading of every such chapter that it is but apocryphal; and that the people all understand Greek so well as to know what apocrypha signifieth. The more sacred and honourable are these dictates of the Holy Ghost recorded in Scripture, the greater is the sin, by reading the apocrypha without sufficient distinction, to make the people believe that the writings of man are the revelation and laws of God. And also we speak against the reading of the apocrypha, as it excludeth much of the canonical Scriptures, and taketh in such books in their stead, as are commonly reputed fabulous. By this much you may see how you lost your answer by mistaking us, and how much you will sin against God, and the church, by denying our desire.

Prop. 10. *Aus.* That the minister should not read the communion service at the communion table, is not reasonable to demand, since all the primitive church used it, and if we do not observe that golden rule, of the venerable Council of Nicea, let ancient customs prevail, till reason plainly requires the contrary, we shall give offence to sober Christians by a causeless departure from catholic usage, and a greater advantage to enemies of our church, than our brethren, I hope, would willingly grant. The priest standing at the communion table seemeth to give us an invitation to the holy sacrament, and minds us of our duty, viz., to receive the holy communion, some at least every Sunday; and though we

neglect our duty, it is fit the church should keep her standing.

Reply. We doubt not but one place in itself is as lawful as another, but when you make such differences as have misleading intimations, we desire it may be forborne. That all the primitive church used, when there was no communion in the sacrament, to say service at the communion table, is a crude assertion, that must have better proof before we take it for convincing; and it is not probable, because they had a communion every Lord's day. And if this be not your meaning, you say nothing to the purpose. To prove that they used it when there was a communion, is no proof that they used it when there was none. And you yourselves disuse many things more universally practised than this can at all be fairly pretended to have been. The Council of Nicæa gives no such golden rule as you mention. A rule is a general applicable to particular cases, the council only speaks of one particular;—"let the ancient custom continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have the power of them all." The council here confirmeth this particular custom, but doth not determine in general of the authority of custom. That this should be called a catholic usage shews us how partially the word (catholic) is sometimes taken. And that this much cannot be granted us, lest we advantage the enemies of the church, doth make us wonder whom you take for its enemies, and what is that advantage which this will give them. But we thank you that here we find ourselves called brethren, when before we are not so much as spoken to, but your speech is directed to some other (we know not whom) concerning us. Your reason is that which is our reason to the contrary. You say the priest standing at the communion table seems to give us an invitation to the holy communion, &c. What, when there is no sacrament by himself or us intended; no warning of any given; no bread and wine prepared? Be not deceived, God is not mocked. Therefore we desire that there may be no such service at the table when no communion is intended,

because we would not have such gross dissimulation used in so holy things, as thereby to seem (as you say) to invite guests when the feast is not prepared, and if they came we would turn them empty away. Indeed if it were to be a private mass, and the priest were to receive alone for want of company, and it were really desired that the people should come, it were another matter. Moreover there is no rubric requiring this service at the table [when there is no communion.]

Prop. 11. *Ans.* It is not reasonable that the word minister should be only used in the liturgy. For since some parts of the liturgy may be performed by a deacon, others by none under the order of a priest, viz., absolution, consecration, it is fit that some such word as priest, should be used for those offices, and not minister, which signifies at large everyone that ministers in that holy office, of what order soever he be; the word curate signifying properly all those who are trusted by the bishops with cure of souls, as anciently it signified, is a very fit word to be used, and can offend no sober person. The word Sunday is ancient, Just. Mart., Ap. 2, and therefore not to be left off.

Reply. The word minister may well be used instead of priest and curates, though the word deacon, for necessary distinction, stand; yet we doubt not but priest, as it is but the English of presbyter, is lawful. But it is from the common danger of mistake [and abuse] that we argue. That all pastors else are but the bishops' curates, is a doctrine that declares the heavy charge and account of the bishops, and tends much to the ease of the presbyters' minds, if it could be proved; if by curates you mean such as have not, directly by divine obligation, the cure of souls, but only by the bishop's delegation. But if the office of a presbyter be not of divine right, and so if they be not the curates of Christ, and pastors of the church, none are. And for the ancient use of it, we find not that it was so from the beginning. And as there is difference between the ancient bishops of one single church and a diocesan that hath many hundred, so is there between their curates. But why will you not yield so much as to change

the word Sunday into the Lord's day, when you know that the latter is the name used by the Holy Ghost in Scripture, and commonly by the ancient writers of the church, and more becoming Christians. Justin Martyr, speaking to infidels, tells how they called the day, and not how Christians called it. All he saith is, that on Sunday, that is so called by heathens, the Christians hold their meetings. See the usage of the church in this point in August. cont. Faustum Manichæum, lib. 18, cap. 5.

Prop. 12. *Ans.* Singing of psalms in metre is no part of the liturgy, and so no part of our commission.

Reply. If the word liturgy signify the public worship, God forbid we should exclude the singing of psalms; and sure you have no fitter way of singing than in metre. When these, and all prayers conceived by private men (as you call the pastors), whether prepared or extemporate (and, by parity of reason, preaching), are cast out, what will your liturgy be? We hope you make no question whether singing psalms and hymns were part of the primitive liturgy: and seeing they are set forth and allowed to be sung in all churches, of all the people together, why should they be denied to be part of the liturgy. We understand not the reason of this.

Prop. 13 and 14 we suppose you grant, by passing them by.

Prop. 15. *Ans.* [The phrase is such, &c.] The church in her prayers useth no more offensive phrase than St. Paul uses, when he writes to the Corinthians, Galatians, and others, calling them in general the churches of God, sanctified in Christ Jesus, by vocation saints; amongst whom, notwithstanding, there were many who by their known sins (which the apostle endeavoured to amend in them) were not properly such, yet he gives the denomination to the whole, from the greater part to whom in charity it was due; and puts the rest in mind what they have by their baptism undertaken to be, and what they profess themselves to be; and our prayers, and the phrase of them, surely supposes no more than that they are saints by calling, sanctified in Christ Jesus, by their baptism admitted into

Christ's congregation, and so to be reckoned members of that society, till either they shall separate themselves by wilful schism, or be separated by legal excommunication, which they seem earnestly to desire, and so do we.

Reply. But is there not a very great difference between the titles given to the whole church (as you say, from the greater part, as the truth is from the better part, though it were the less), and the titles given to individual members, where there is no such reason? We call the field a corn-field, though there be much tares in it, because of the better part, which denominateth; but we will not call every one of these tares by the name of corn. When we speak of the church, we will call it holy, as Paul doth; but when we speak to Simon Magnus, we will not call him holy, but say, "Thou art in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity, and hast no part or lot in the matter," &c. We will not persuade the people that every notorious drunkard, fornicator, worldling, &c., that is buried is a brother, of whose resurrection to life eternal we have sure and certain hope, and all because you will not excommunicate them. We are glad to hear of your desire of such discipline; but when shall we see more than desire, and the edge of it be turned from those that fear sinning, to those that fear it not?

Prop. 16. § 1. *Ans.* The connection of the parts of our liturgy is conformable to the example of the churches of God before us, and has as much dependance as is usually to be seen in many petitions of the same Psalm; and we conceive the order and method to be excellent, and must do so, till they tell us what that order is which prayers ought to have, which is not done here.

Reply. There are two rules of prayer; one is the nature of the things, compared (in matter and order) with nature and necessity; the other is the revealed will of God in his Word; in general, the holy Scripture, more especially the Lord's prayer. The liturgy (for the greatest part of the prayers for daily use) is confused, by which soever of those you measure it. You seem much to honour the Lord's prayer, by your

frequent use of it (or part of it) ; we beseech you dishonour it not practically by denying it for matter and order to be the only ordinary and perfect rule we know about particular administrations ; where it is but certain select requests that we are to put up, suited to the particular subject and occasion, we cannot follow the whole method of the Lord's prayer, which containeth the heads of all the parts ; where we are not to take in all the parts, we cannot take them in that order. But that none of all your prayers should be formed to that perfect rule, that your litany, which is the comprehensive prayer, and that the body of your daily prayers (broken into several collects) should not (as set together) have any considerable respect unto that order, nor yet to the order which reason and the nature of the thing requireth, which is observed in all things else, and yet that you should so admire this, and be so tenacious of that which, in conceived prayer, you would call by worse names than confusions—this shows us the wonderful power of prejudice. We are thus brief in this exception, lest we should offend by instances. But seeing you conceive the order and method to be excellent, and to be willing to hear more, as to this and the following exception, we shall, when you desire it, annex a catalogue of defects and disorders, which we before forbore to give you. The Psalms have ordinarily an observable method. If you find any whose parts you cannot so well set together, as to see the beauty of method, will you turn your eye from the rest, and from the Lord's prayer, and choose that one to be your precedent, or excuse disorder on that pretence?

Prop. 16 § 2. *Ans.* The collects are made short as being best for devotion, as we observed before, and cannot be accounted faulty for being like those short but prevalent prayers in Scripture—"Lord, be merciful to me a sinner." "Son of David, have mercy on us." "Lord, increase our faith."

Reply. We do, in common speech, call that a prayer which containeth all the substance of what in that business and address we have to say unto God, and that a petition which containeth one single request ; usually, a prayer hath many

petitions. Now if you intend in your address to God, to do no more than speak a transient request or ejaculation (which we may do in the midst of other business), then, indeed, your instances are pertinent. But why then do you not give over when you seem to have done, but come again and again, and offer as many prayers, almost, as petitions? This is to make the prayers short (as a sermon is that is cut into single sentences, every sentence having an exordium and epilogue as a sermon); but it is to make the prayers much longer than is needful or suitable to the matter. Do you find this the way of the saints in Scripture? Indeed, Abraham did so, when God's interlocution answering the first prayer, called him to vary his request. (Gen. xviii.) But that's not our case. The Psalms and Prayers of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Asa, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, and the other prophets, of Christ himself (John xvii), are usually one continued speech, and not like yours, as we said before.

Prop. 17. § 3. *Ans.* Why the repeated mention of the name and attributes of God should not be more pleasing to any godly person we cannot imagine; or what burden it should seem, when David magnified one attribute of God's mercy twenty-six times together. (Psa. cxxxvi.) Nor can we conceive why the name and merits of Jesus, with which all our prayers should end, should not be as sweet to us as to former saints and martyrs, with which here they complain our prayers do so frequently end: since the attributes of God are the ground of our hope of obtaining all our petitions, such prefaces of prayers as are taken from them, though they have no special respect to the petitions following, are not to be termed unsuitable or said to have fallen rather casually than orderly.

Reply. As we took it to be no controversy between us, whether the mention of God's name is deservedly sweet to all his servants; so we thought it was none, that this reverend name is reverently to be used, and not too lightly, and therefore not with a causeless frequency tossed in men's mouths even in prayer itself; and that tautologies and vain

repetitions are not the better but the worse, because God's name is made the matter of them. Is it not you that have expressed your offence (as well as we) against those weak ministers that repeat, too frequently, the name and attributes of God in their extemporate prayers? And is it ill in them, and is the same, and much more, well in the Common Prayer? O have not the faith or worship of our glorious God in respect of persons. Let not that be called ridiculous, idle, impertinent, or worse in one which is accounted commendable in others. Do you think it were not a faulty crossing of the mind and method of Jesus Christ, if you should make six prayers of the six petitions of the Lord's prayer, and set the preface and conclusion unto each, as, Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, for thine is the kingdom, &c., and so over all the rest? Yet we know that the same words may be oft repeated (as David doth God's enduring mercy,) without such tautological vanity, when it is not from emptiness, or neglect of order, or affectation; but in psalms or hymns, where affections are to be elevated by such figurative elegancies and strains as are best besecming poetry or rapture, we are not against such repetitions. But if we may (according to the Common Prayer book) begin and end, and begin and seem to withdraw again, and make a prayer of every petition or two, and begin and end every such petition with God's name and Christ's merits, as making up half the form or near, nothing is an affected empty tossing of God's name in prayer if this be not. We are persuaded, if you should hear a man in a known extemporate prayer do thus, it would seem strange and harsh even to yourselves.

Prop. 17. § 1. *Ans.* There are, besides a preparative exhortation, several preparatory prayers,—“Despise not, O Lord, humble and contrite hearts,”—which is one of the sentences in the preface; and this—“that those things may please him which we do at this present”—at the end of the absolution: and again, immediately after the Lord's prayer, before the psalmody,—“O Lord open thou our lips,” &c.

Reply. “Despise not, O Lord, humble and contrite hearts,” is not a prayer, for assistance and acceptance in that worship, suited to the duty of a people addressing themselves to God, but it is recited as a scripture invitation to repentance; and “that those things may please him which we do at this present” are no words of prayer, but part of an exhortation to the people; and “O Lord open thou our lips” comes after the exhortation, confession, absolution, and Lord’s prayer, and *ergo* is not in the place of such an address as we are speaking of. What will not serve to justify that which we have a mind to justify; and to condemn that which we have a mind to condemn?

Prop. 17. § 2. *Ans.* This which they call a defect, others think they have reason to account the perfection of the liturgy, the offices of which being intended for common and general services, would cease to be such, by descending to particulars; as in confession of sin, while it is general, all persons may and must join in it, since in many things we offend all; but if there be a particular enumeration of sins, it cannot be so general a confession, because it may happen that some or other may by God’s grace have been preserved from some of those sins enumerated, and therefore should by confessing themselves guilty, tell God a lie, which needs a new confession.

Reply. If general words be its perfection, it is very culpable in tediousness and vain repetitions; for what need you more than, “Lord, be merciful to us sinners”? There is together a general confession of sin, and a general prayer for mercy, which comprehend all the particulars of the people’s sins and wants. We gave you our reason, which you answer not; confession is the exercise of repentance, and also the helper of it; and it is no true repentance which is not particular, but only general. If you say that you repent that you have sinned, and know not wherein, or do not repent of any particular sin, you do not indeed repent, for sin is not existent but in the individuals. And if you ask for grace, and know not what grace, or desire no particular graces; indeed you

desire not grace at all. We know there is time and use for general confessions and requests; but still as implying particulars, as having gone before, or following; or at least it must be supposed that the people understand the particulars included, and have inward confessions and desires of them: which cannot here be supposed, when they are not at all mentioned, nor can the people generally be supposed to have such quick and comprehensive minds; nor is there leisure to exercise such particular repentance or desire, while a general is named. And we beseech you let Scripture be judge, whether the confessions and prayers of the servants of God have not been particular. As to your objection or reason, we answer: 1. There are general prayers with the particular, or without them. 2. There are particular confessions and prayers proper to some few Christians, and there are others common to all; it is these that we expect, and not the former. 3. The church's prayers must be suited to the body of the assembly, though perhaps some one, or few may be in a state not fit for such expressions. What a lamentable liturgy will you have, if you have nothing in it, but what every one in the congregation may say as true of and suitable to themselves! Then you must leave out all thanksgiving for our justification and forgiveness of sins, and adoption, and title to glory, &c., because many in the assembly are hypocrites, and have no such mercies, and many more that are sincere, are mistaken in their own condition, and know not that they have the mercies which they have, and therefore dare not give thanks for them, lest they speak an untruth. Then the liturgy that now speaks as in the persons of the sanctified must be changed, that the two fore-mentioned sorts (or the latter at least), may consent; and when you have done, it will be unsuitable to those that are in a better state, and have the knowledge of their justification. This is the argument which the sectaries used against singing of David's Psalms in the congregations, because there is much in them that many cannot truly say of themselves. But the church must not go out of that way of worship prescribed by God, and suited to

the state of the ordinary sort of the spiritual worshippers, because of the distempers, or the super-eminent excellencies of some few. It were easy to go over David's Psalms, and your own liturgy, and shew you very much that by this argument must be cast out; he that finds any passage unsuitable to himself, is not to speak it of himself.

Prop. 17. § 3. *Ans.* As for original sin, though we think it an evil custom springing from false doctrine, to use any such expressions as may lead people to think that to the persons baptized (in whose persons only our prayers are offered up), original sin is not forgiven in their holy baptism; yet for that there remains in the regenerate some relics of that which are to be bewailed, the church in her confession acknowledgeth such desires of our own hearts as render us miserable by following them:—that there is no health in us; that without God's help our frailty cannot but fall: that our mortal nature can do no good thing without him; which is a clear acknowledgment of original sin.

Reply 1. He that hath his original sin forgiven him, may well confess that he was born in iniquity and conceived in sin, and was by nature a child of wrath, and that by one man sin entered into the world, and that judgment came on all men to condemnation, &c. The pardoned may confess what once they were, and from what rock they were hewn; even actual sins must be confessed, after they are forgiven, unless the autinomians hold the truth against us in such points. 2. All is not false doctrine that crosseth men's private opinions, which you seem here to obtrude upon us. We know that the papists, and perhaps some others, hold that all the baptized are delivered from the guilt of original sin. But, as they are in the dark, and disagreed in the explication of it, so we have more reason to incline to either of the ordinary opinions of the protestants, than to this of theirs. 3. Some learned protestants hold that visibly all the baptized are church members, pardoned, and justified, which is but that they are probably justified indeed, and are to be used by the church, upon a judgment of charity, as those that are really

justified, but that we have indeed no certainty that they are so; God keeping that as a secret to himself concerning individuals, till by actual faith and repentance it be manifest to themselves. Another opinion of many protestants is, that all persons that are children of the promise, or that have the conditions of pardon and justification in the covenant mentioned, are to receive that pardon by baptism: and all such are pardoned, and certainly in a state of justification and salvation thereupon; and that the promise of pardon is made to the faithful and to their seed; and therefore that all the faithful and their seed in infancy have this pardon given them by the promise, and solemnly delivered them, and sealed to them by baptism, which investeth them in the benefits of the covenant. But, withall that, first, the professed infidel and his seed, as such, are not the children of the promise, and therefore if the parent ludicrously or forcedly, or the child by error be baptized, they have not thereby the pardon of their sin before God. 2. That the hypocrite that is not a true believer at the heart, though he profess it, hath no pardon by baptism before God, as being not an heir of the promise, nor yet any infant of his as such: but though such are not pardoned, the church that judgeth by profession, taking professors for believers, must accordingly use them and their seed. 3. But though the church judge thus charitably of each professor in particuar, till his hypocrisy be detected, yet doth it understand that hypocrites there are and still will be in the church, though we know them not by name; and that, therefore, there are many externally baptized and in communion that never had the pardon of sin, indeed, before God, as not having the condition of the promise of pardon: such as Simon Magus was. We have less reason to take this doctrine for false, than that which pronounceth certain pardon and salvation to all baptized infants whatsoever. And were we of their judgment, we should think it the most charitable act in the world to take the infants of heathens and baptize them. And if any should then dis-

patch them all to prevent their lapse, they were all certainly saved. We hope by "some relics" you mean that which is truly and properly sin. For our parts we believe according to the ninth article, that original sin standeth in the corruption of the nature of every man, whereby man is far gone from original righteousness, and inclined to evil; and that this infection of nature doth remain in the regenerate. And though there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin. You say, the church acknowledgeth such desires, &c. Devices and desires are actual sins, and not original, which consisteth in privation and corrupt inclination. The next words—"there is no health in us," it seems the translators that put it into the liturgy misunderstood; but however you seem here plainly by your misinterpretation to misunderstand it. *Nulla salus in nobis* is spoken actively and not possessively or passively; the plain sense is, that there is no help, deliverance, and salvation in ourselves; we cannot help ourselves out of this misery, but must have a better Saviour; as Christ is oft called our salvation, so we are denied to be our own: so that yet here is no confession at all of original sin, but of the effects. The two next sentences confess a debility and privation, but not that it was *ab origine*, but may for anything that is there said be taken to be since contracted. Nor are the words in this confession, but in some other collects elsewhere, which proves not that this confession saith anything of original sin.

Prop. 17. § 4. *Ans.* We know not what public prayers are wanting, nor do they tell us; the usual complaint hath been that there were too many. Neither do we conceive any want of public thanksgivings; there being in the liturgy, *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, *Benedicite*, "Glory be to God on high," "Therefore with angels and archangels," the *Doxology*, "Glory be to the Father," &c., all peculiar, as they require, to gospel worship, and fit to express our thanks and honour to God upon every particular occasion; and occasional thanks-

givings after the litany, of the frequency whereof themselves elsewhere complain, who here complain of defect. If there be any forms wanting, the church will provide.

Reply. We have shewn you, in the forms which we offered you, what we judge wanting; the Right Reverend Bishop of Exeter hath taken notice of the same want, and proposed a supply. Those you name are either but general sentences, or extend but to some few particulars, as being suited to the persons and particular occasions of them, and none, save the *Te Deum*, designed to be the distinct praise of the church for the benefits of redemption, as the suitable and sufficient performance of this great part of the liturgy. However, it will do you no harm that your brethren be gratified with fuller expressions and variety. They that have complained of too many (because you shred your petitions into almost as many prayers, and so the thanksgivings into such briefs), yet complained not of too much; but that too many (by the multitudes of prefaces and epilogues) was the cause of too little.

Prop. 17. § 5. *Ans.* They complain that the liturgy contains too many generals, without mention of the particulars, and the instances are such petitions as these—"That we may do God's will;" "To be kept from all evil;" almost the very terms of the petitions of the Lord's prayer; so that they must reform that, before they can pretend to mend our liturgy in these petitions.

Reply. We complain not that there are generals, but that there is nothing but generals in so great a part of your prayers, and therefore they are very defective. And if really these generals suffice you, a few lines may serve instead of your whole book. Instead of all your confessions, it may serve to say, that we have greatly sinned, and no more. Instead of all your litany or deprecations, it is enough to say, "Deliver us from all evil." Instead of all your petitions for grace, peace, rain, fair weather, health, &c., it is enough to say, Give us the good we want. Indeed, the Lord's Prayer hath general requests, because it is the design of it to be the

rule of prayer, and so contains but the heads to which all prayers are to be reduced. But if, therefore, you will have no more particulars, why do you use any prayer but the Lord's prayer? We hope you do not think to supply any defects pretended to be found in its generals, nor to correct the order of it. If it be but because you would not, on every particular occasion, be so long as to say the whole, you may take that head which suiteth that occasion: and so, "Give us this day our daily bread," may serve instead of all the collects for temporal supplies; and all your offices may be blotted out, and one of the petitions of the Lord's prayer placed in the stead of each of them.

Prop. 17. § 6. *Ans.* We have deferred this to the proper place, as you might have done.

Reply. It was the proper place under the head of defectiveness, to instance in this as well as other defects.

Prop. 18. § 1. *Ans.* We are now come to the main and principal demand, as is pretended, viz., the abolishing the laws which impose any ceremonies, especially three—the surplice, the sign of the cross, and kneeling; these are the yoke, which if removed, there might be peace. It is to be suspected, and there is reason for it, from their own words, that somewhat else pinches, and that if these ceremonies were laid aside, and these, or any other prayers, strictly enjoined without them, it would be deemed a burden intolerable. It seems so, by No. 7, where they desire that when the liturgy is altered, according to the rest of their proposals, the minister may have liberty to add and to leave out what he pleases; yet because the imposition of these ceremonies is pretended to be the insupportable grievance, we must of necessity either yield that demand, or shew reason why we do not; and that we may proceed the better in this undertaking, we shall reduce the sum of their complaint to these several heads, as we find them in their papers. The law for imposing these ceremonies they would have abrogated for these reasons.

Reply. To what you object (to intimate your suspicion of us) from No. 7, we have before answered. We must confess,

the abatement of ceremonies, with the exclusion of all prayers and exhortations, besides what is read, will not satisfy us. The liberty which we desired in all the parts of worship, not to add to the liturgy, nor take from it, but to interpose upon just occasion, such words of prayer or exhortation, as are requisite, and not to be tied at every time to read the whole, we are assured will do much to preserve the liturgy, and bring it into more profitable use, and take off much of men's offence. And pardon us while we tell you this certain truth, that if once it be known that you have a design to work out all prayers (even those of the pulpit) except such as you prescribe, it will make many thousand people, fearing God, to be averse to that which else they would have submitted to, and to distaste both your endeavours and ours, as if we were about drawing them into so great a snare. And, as the proverb is, you may as well think to make a coat for the moon, as to make a liturgy that shall be sufficiently suited to the variety of places, times, subjects, accidents, without the liberty of intermixing such prayers or exhortations as alterations and diversities require.

Prop. 18. § 2. *Ans.* 1st. It is doubtful whether God hath given power to men to impose such signified signs, which though they call them significant, yet have in them no real goodness, in the judgment of the imposers themselves, being called by them things indifferent, and therefore fall not under St. Paul's rule of *omnia decenter*, nor are suitable to the simplicity of gospel worship.

Prop. 18. § 2. *Ans.* 2ndly. Because it is a violation of the royalty of Christ, and an impeachment of his laws as insufficient; and so those that are under the law of Deut. xii. Whatsoever I command you, observe to do, you shall take nothing from it, nor add anything to it; you do not observe these. *See Hooker, Bk. iii, § 4.*

Prop. 18. § 2. *Ans.* 3rdly. Because sundry learned, pious, and orthodox men have, ever since the reformation, judged them unwarrantable, and we ought to be, as our Lord was, tender of weak brethren, not to offend his little ones, nor to

lay a stumbling block before a weak brother. See Hooker, *Bk. iv*, § 1.

Prop. 18. § 2. *Ans.* 4thly. Because these ceremonies have been the fountain of many evils in this church and nation, occasioning sad divisions betwixt minister and minister; betwixt minister and people exposing many orthodox preachers to the displeasure of rulers; and no other fruits than these can be looked for from the retaining these ceremonies.

Reply. We had rather you had taken our reasons as we laid them down, than to have so altered them; *ergo* having told you that some hold them unlawful, and others inconvenient, &c., and desired that they may not be imposed on such, who judge such impositions a violation of the royalty of Christ, &c., you seem to take this as our own sense, and that of all the ceremonies, of which we there made no mention. You refer us to Hooker; since whose writings, Ames in his *Fresh Suit*, and Bradshaw, and Parker, and many others have written that against the ceremonies, that never was answered, that we know of, but deserves your consideration.

Prop. 18. § 3. *Ans.* Before we give particular answer to these several reasons, it will not be unnecessary to lay down some certain general premises, or rules, which will be useful in our whole discourse. 1. That God hath not given a power only, but a command also of imposing whatsoever should be truly decent, and becoming his public service, 1 Cor. xiv. After St. Paul had ordered some particular rules for praying, praising, prophesying, &c., he concludes with this general canon, let all things be done *εὐσχημόνως* in a fit scheme, habit, or fashion, decently, and that there may be uniformity in those decent performances, let there be a *τάξις*, rule, or canon for that purpose.

Reply. As to your first rule we answer. 1. It is one thing to impose in general, that all be done decently and in order; this God himself hath imposed by his apostle: and it is another thing to impose in particular, that this or that be used, as decent and orderly. Concerning this we add, it is in the text said let it be done, but not let it be imposed; yet

from other Scriptures we doubt not but circumstances of mere decency and order, as determined time, place, utensils, &c., which are common to things civil, and sacred, though not the symbolical ceremonies, which afterwards we confute, may be imposed with the necessary cautions and limitations afterward laid down. But 1. that if any usurpers will pretend a power from Christ, to impose such things on the church though the things be lawful, we must take heed how we acknowledge a usurped power by formal obedience. 2. A just power may impose them but to just ends, as the preservation and success of the modified worship or ordinances. And if they really conduce not to those ends, they sin in imposing them. 3. Yet the subjects are bound to obey a true authority in such impositions, where the matter belongs to the cognizance and office of the ruler, and where the mistake is not so great as to bring greater mischiefs to the church than the suspending of our active obedience would do. 4. But if these things be determined under pretence of order and decency, to the plain destruction of the ordinances modified, and of the intended end, they cease to be means, and we must not use them. 5. Or if under the names of things decent, and of order, men will meddle with things that belong not to their office, as to institute a new worship for God, new sacraments, or anything forbidden in the general prohibition of adding or diminishing, this is a usurpation, and not an act of authority, and we are bound in obedience to God to disobey them. 6. Where governors may command at set times, and by proportionable penalties enforce, if they command when it will destroy the end, or enforce by such penalties as destroy or cross it, they greatly sin, by such commands. Thus we have more distinctly given you our sense, about the matter of your first rule.

Prop. 18. § 4. *Ans.* Rule 2. Not inferiors but superiors must judge what is convenient and decent; they who must order that all be done decently, must, of necessity, first judge what is convenient and decent to be ordered.

Reply. Your second rule, also, is too crudely delivered, and, therefore, we must add:—1. A judgment is a sentence, in

order to some execution, and judgments are specified from the ends to which they are such means. When the question is either,—what law shall be made?—or, what penalty shall be exercised?—the magistrate is the only judge and not the bishop or other subject. In the first he exercises his *judicium discretionis* in order to a public act; in the second, he exerciseth a public judgment. When the question is,—what order *pro tempore* is fittest, in circumstantial, for this present congregation? the proper presbyters, or pastors, of that congregation are the directive judges by God's appointment.

3. The magistrate is ruler of these pastors, as he is of physicians, philosophers, and other subjects. He may make them such general rules, especially for restraint, to go by, as may not destroy the exercise of their own pastoral power: as he may forbid a physician to use some dangerous medicine on his subjects, and may punish him when he wilfully killeth any of them; but may not, on that pretence, appoint him what, and how, and when, and to whom he shall administer, and so become physician himself alone.

4. When the question is,—who shall be excluded from the communion of a particular church?—the pastors of the church (or congregation) are the first proper judges.

5. When the question is,—who shall be excluded from (or received into) the communion of all the associated churches, of which we are naturally capable of communion?—the associated pastors or bishops of these churches, in synods, are judges: beyond this there are no judges.

6. When the question is,—whether the laws of magistrates, or canons of bishops, are agreeable or not to the Word of God, and so the obedience is lawful or unlawful?—the conscience of each individual subject is the judge, *per judicium discretionis*, as to his own practice; and if men had not this judgment of discerning, but must act upon absolute implicit obedience, then first, man were ruled as unreasonable; secondly, the magistrates were made a God, or such a leviathan as Hobbes describeth him; thirdly, and then all sin might lawfully be committed, if commanded. But we are assured none of this is your sense.

Prop. 18. § 5. *Ans.* Rule 3. These rules and canons, for

decency made and urged by superiors, are to be obeyed by inferiors, till it be made as clear that now they are not bound to obey, as it is evident in general, that they ought to obey superiors; for if the exemption from obedience be not as evident as the command to obey, it must needs be sin not to obey.

Reply. To your third rule we add; it is first considerable what the thing is and then how it is apprehended. If it be really lawful, and well commanded, and to be obeyed, it is no ignorance, doubt, or error of the subject that can exempt him from the duty of obeying; but it may ensnare him in a certainty of sinning, whether he obey or disobey; for as God commandeth him to obey, and also not to do that which man commandeth, when God forbiddeth it, so he obligeth the erroneous, first to lay down his errors, and so to obey. But if a thing be forbidden of God, and commanded of men, and one man erroneously thinks it lawful and that he should obey, and another is in doubt between both, it is neither a duty nor lawful for either of them here to obey. For man's error changeth not God's law nor disobligeth himself from obedience; but this man's duty is both to lay by that error and to refuse obedience. But if the question be only of the order of such a person's duty, we answer:—If the thing be really lawful, and obedience a duty, then he that doubteth or erreth should, if possible, suddenly lay by his errors or doubt, and so obey; but if that cannot be, he should first go about the fittest means for his better information till he be resolved, and so obey. And so, on the contrary, if really the thing commanded be unlawful, if he be sure of it, he must resolve against it; if he hesitate, he is not, therefore, allowed to do a thing forbidden, because he is ignorant, for his ignorance is supposed culpable itself; but he is first to consult and use the best means for his instruction till he know the truth, and in the meantime to suspend his act. But yet because of human frailty, between several faults, we must consider, when we cannot avoid all as we would, in what order most safely to watch, and to avoid them. And so when I have done my best, and cannot discern whether a command

be just and the thing lawful or not ; if it have the face of idolatry, blasphemy, or some heinous sin, that is commanded ; and our disobedience have the appearance but of an effect of involuntary ignorance ; it is more excusable in us to fear the greater sin and so to suspend till we are better satisfied, than to do that which we suspect to be so heinous a sin, though, indeed, it prove no sin : so, on the contrary, if our disobedience be like to bring infamy or calamity on the church, and our obedience appear to be but about a very small sin, if we doubt of it, it is more excusable to obey than to disobey, though both be faulty, supposing the thing to be indeed unlawful, and we discern it not. So that your rule of obeying, where you are not as sure, &c., is an unsure rule, unless as we have fullier cautioned it.

Prop. 18. § 6. *Ans.* Rule 4. Pretence of conscience is no exemption from obedience, for the law as long as it is a law, certainly binds to obedience : Rom. xiii. Ye must needs be subject. And this pretence of a tender or gausaying conscience cannot abrogate the law, since it can neither take away the authority of the lawmaker, nor make the matter of the law in itself unlawful. Besides, if pretence of conscience did exempt from obedience, laws were useless ; whosoever had not list to obey might pretend tenderness of conscience, and be thereby set at liberty, which if once granted, anarchy and confusion must needs follow.

Reply. Neither pretence of conscience, nor real error of conscience exempteth from the obligation to obey : though sometime it may so ensnare as that obeying shall become of the two the greater sin ; so also real errors, or pretence of conscience, will justify no man for obeying when it is by God forbidden.

Prop. 18. § 7. *Ans.* Rule 5. Though charity will move to pity, and relieve those that are truly perplexed or scrupulous : yet we must not break God's command, in charity to them, and therefore we must not perform public services undecently or disorderly, for the ease of tender consciences.

Reply. O that you would but do all that God alloweth you,

yea that he hath commanded you, for these ends ! How happy would you make yourselves, and these poor afflicted churches. But as to the instance of your rule we answer :—1. When the indecency and disorder is so small as that it will not cross the ends, so much as our disobedience would, we are here so far more conformable, and peaceable than you, as that we would, even in God's worship, do some things indecent and disorderly, rather than disobey : and so should you do rather than destroy your brethren, or hinder that peace, and healing of the church. For order is for the thing ordered, and not contrarily. For example, there is much disorder lies in the Common Prayer book, yet we would obey it, as far as the ends of our calling do require. It would be indecent to come without a band, or other handsome raiment into the assembly : yet, rather than not worship God at all, we would obey if that were commanded us. We are as confident that surplices, and copes are indecent, and kneeling at the Lord's table is disorderly, as you are of the contrary : and yet if the magistrate would be advised by us (supposing himself addicted against you), we would advise him to be more charitable to you, than you here advise him to be to us. We would have him, if your conscience require it, to forbear you in this indecent and disorderly way. But to speak more distinctly :—1. There are some things decent and orderly, when the opposite species is not indecent or disorderly. 2. There are some things indecent and disorderly, in a small and tolerable degree ; and some things in a degree intolerable. 1. When things decent are commanded, whose opposites would not be at all indecent, there charity, and peace, and edification, may command a relaxation ; or rather should at first restrain from too severe impositions :—as it is decent to wear either a cloak or a gown, a cassock buttoned or unbuttoned, with a girdle or without, to sit, stand, or kneel in singing of a psalm, to sit or stand in hearing the word read, or preached, &c. 2. When a circumstance is indecent or disorderly, but in a tolerable degree, to an inconvenience ; obedience, or charity,

or edification, may command us to do it, and make it not only lawful, but a duty *pro hic, et nunc*, while the preponderating accident prevailth. Christ's instances go at least as far as this, about the priests in the temple breaking the sabbath blamelessly, and David's eating the shewbread, which was lawful for none to eat ordinarily, but the priests, and the disciples rubbing the ears of corn. I will have mercy and not sacrifice is a lesson that he sets us to learn, when two duties come together, to prefer the greater, if we would escape sin. And sure to keep an able preacher in the church, or a private Christian in communion, is a greater duty *cæteris paribus* than to use a ceremony which we conceive to be decent. It is more orderly to use the better translation of the Scripture, than the worse, as the Common Prayer book doth; and yet we would have no man cast out, for using the worse. It is more orderly, decent, and edifying, for the minister to read all the psalms, than for the people to read each second verse; and yet we would not cast out men from the church or ministry merely for that disorder. It is more orderly and decent to be uncovered in divine worship, than covered; and yet rather than a man should take cold, we could allow him to hear a chapter or sermon covered: why not, much more rather than he should be cast out? But let us come to the application. It is no indecent disorderly worshipping of God, to worship him without our cross, surplice, and kneeling in the reception of the sacrament. 1. If it were, then Christ and his apostles had worshipped indecently and disorderly; and the primitive church that used not the surplice, nor the transient image of the cross in baptism (but in an unguent); yea the church for many hundred years that received the sacrament without kneeling. 2. Then if the king, parliament, and convocation should change these ceremonies, it seems you would take yourselves bound to retain them; for you say you must not worship God indecently. But that they may be changed by authority our Articles determine, and therefore charity may well require the magistrate to change them without any wrong to the

worship of God. 3. We appeal to the common judgment of the impartial, whether, in the nature of the thing, there be anything that tells them that it is indecent to pray without a surplice in the reading place, and not indecent to pray without in the pulpit; and that it is indecent to baptize without crossing, and not to receive the Lord's supper without; and that it is indecent for the receiver to take the Lord's supper without kneeling, and not for the minister to give it him standing that prayeth in the delivery.

Prop. 18. § 8. *Ans.* These premised we answer to your first reason,—that those things which we call indifferent, because neither expressly commanded nor forbidden by God, have in them a real goodness, a fitness, and decency, and for that cause, are imposed, and may be so by the rule of St. Paul; by which rule and many others in Scripture, a power is given to men to impose signs, which are never the worse surely, because they signify something that is decent and comely, and so it is not doubtful whether such power be given. It would rather be doubtful, whether the church could impose such idle signs, if any such there be, as signify nothing.

Reply. To your first answer we reply:—1. We suppose you speak of a moral goodness; and if they are such indeed as are within their power, and really good, that is of their own nature fitter than their opposites, they may be imposed by just authority by equal means, though not by usurpers, nor by penalties that will do more harm than the things will do good. 2. Signs that signify nothing, we understand not. It is one thing to be decent, and another to signify something that is decent: what you mean by that we know not. The cross signifieth our not being ashamed to profess the faith of Christ crucified, &c., do you call that something that is decent? It is something necessary to salvation. 3. Signs are exceeding various: at present we use but two distinctions. 1. Some are signs, *ex primaria intentione instituentis*, purposed, and primarily instituted to signify, as an escutcheon, or a sign at an inn door, in common matters; and as

the sacrament and cross in sacred matters: and some are signs but consequently, secondarily, and not essentially as intended by the institutor; so hills and trees may shew us what o'clock it is. And so every creature signifieth some good of mercy or duty, and may be an object of holy meditation: so the colour and shape of our clothes may mind us of some good, which yet was none of the primary or proper end of the maker or wearer. 2. Signs are either arbitrary expressions of a man's own mind in a matter, where he is left free, or they are covenanting signs between us and God in the covenant of grace, to work grace on us as moral causes, and to engage us sacramentally to him; such we conceive the cross in baptism to be. The preface to the Common Prayer book saith, "They are apt to teach and excite, &c.," which is a moral operation of grace; and the canon saith, "it is an honourable badge, whereby the infant is dedicated to him that died on the cross; we are signed with it in token that hereafter we shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight, &c." Now if a thing may be commanded merely as a decent circumstance of worship, yet it is unproved that a thing that in its nature as instituted, and in the primary intention, is thus sacramentally to dedicate and engage us in covenant to God by signifying the grace and duty of the covenant, be lawfully commanded by man. 1. Decent circumstances are necessary *in genere*. There must be some fit time, place, gesture, vesture (as such), utensils, &c. But that there be some such dedicating, engaging signs, in our covenanting with God, signifying the grace of the covenant, and our state and duty as soldiers under Christ (besides God's sacraments) this is not necessary *in genere*, and therefore it is not left to man to determine *de specie*. 2. If there be any reason for this use of the cross, it must be such as was in the apostles' days, and concerneth the universal church in all ages and places; and then the apostles would have taken care of it. Thus much here in brief of signs; and more anon when you again call us to it.

Prop. 18. § 9. *Ans.* To the second, that it is not a violation of Christ's royalty to make such laws for decency, but an exercise of his power and authority, which he hath given to the church, and the disobedience to such commands of superiors is plainly a violation of his royalty: as it is no violation of the king's authority, when his magistrates command things according to his laws, but disobedience to the command of those injunctions of his deputies, is violation of his authority. Again, it can be no impeachment of Christ's laws, as insufficient, to make such laws for decency, since our Saviour, as is evident by the precepts themselves, did not intend by them to determine every minute and circumstance of time, place, manner of performance, and the like, but only to command in general the substance of those duties, and the right ends that should be aimed at in the performance, and then left every man in particular (whom for that purpose he made reasonable) to guide himself by rules of reason, for private services; and appointed governors of the church to determine such particularities for the public. Thus our Lord commanded prayers, fasting, etc.: for the times and places of performance, he did not determine every of them, but left them to be guided as we have said. So that it is no impeachment of his laws as insufficient, to make laws for determining those particulars of decency, which himself did not, as is plain by his precepts, intend to determine, but left us governors for that purpose; to whom he said, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you;" and "Let all things be done decently and in order:" of whom he hath said to us, "Obey those that have the oversight over you:" and told us that if we will not hear his church, we must not be accounted as Christians, but heathens and publicans. And yet nevertheless they will not hear it and obey it in so small a matter as a circumstance of time, place, habit, or the like, which she thinks decent and fit, and yet will be accounted for the best Christians, and tell us that it is the very awe of God's law (Deut. xii, 32) that keeps them from obedience to the church in these commands; not well considering that it

cannot be any adding to the Word of God, to command things for order and decency which the Word of God commands to be done, so as they be not commanded as God's immediate Word, but as the laws of men; but that it is undeniably adding to the Word of God to say that superiors may not command such things, which God hath nowhere forbidden, and taking from the Word of God to deny that power to men which God's Word hath given them.

Reply. To make laws, to determine of undetermined circumstance, necessary *in genere*, to be some way determined and left to magistrates, or ministers *de specie*, and to do this according to the general rule of Scripture, and in order to the main end, and not against it, is not against the royalty or will of Christ; but to make new dedicating, covenanting symbols to signify the doctrine of the covenant of grace, and solemnly engage us unto God, and place these in the public worship which are not mere circumstances, but substantial institutions, not necessary, *in genere*, (that there should be any such at all, besides God's sacraments,) we fear this is a violation of the royalty of Christ, and a reflection on his laws as insufficient. For, first, if it belong to the power proper to Christ, then it is a violation of his royalty for any man to exercise it; but it belongeth to the power proper to Christ; *ergo*, &c. The minor is proved thus—If it belong to the universal head, or ruler of the church as such, then it belongs to the power proper to Christ (for we are ready to prove there is none under him, no universal head or ruler, personally, or collectively, and civilly one); but, &c. If, in the reason of it, it should be the matter of an universal law, if of any, then it should be the work of the universal law-giver, if any; but, &c. If, in the reason of it, it be equally useful to the church universal as to any particular church or age, then it should, according to the reason of it, be the matter of an universal law, if of any; but, &c., it hath the same aptitude to engage us to a duty of universal necessity, and hath no reason proper to this age or place for it, but common to all. Moreover, it is nowhere committed to the

power or care of man—*ergo*, it is proper to the care and power of Christ. No text is shewed that giveth man power in such things. To do all things decently and orderly, and to edification, is no giving of power, on that pretence, to make new covenanting, dedicating signs: to do God's work decently, &c., is not to make more such of our own heads; it is but the right modifying of the work already set us. And to do all decently, orderly, and to edification, was a duty in Moses' time, when yet such things as these in question might not be added by any but God. When we say by God, we mean by his inspired instruments; and when we say by Christ, we mean by his inspired instruments. If we should make laws that everyone is publicly to taste vinegar and gall, as a sign that we are not ashamed of, but resolved, through all flesh-displeasing difficulties, to follow Christ, that did so, and thus to engage and dedicate ourselves to him—this were to do more than to do all things decently and orderly which he appointed. If milk were to be publicly sucked or drank by all, in profession that we will feed on the sincere milk of his word, and so dedicate us to him by covenant; or if we were to put on an helmet and other armour, in token that we will be his soldiers to the death, and manfully fight under, &c.—these engagements, by such public signs, are sacraments in the sense as the word was used of old, when it signified a soldier's solemn listing, or covenanting with his commander. Thus by distinguishing decent and orderly modes, and circumstances necessary *in genere*, from new ordinances, even solemn dedicating, covenanting, or such like mystical signs, we have shewed you what we grant, and where you fail, and what is indeed a wrong to Christ, and an accusation of his laws, and what not; and how unjust your following accusation of us is, who never yet told you we would be accounted the best Christians: but to desire to please Christ as near as we can, is not blameworthy. Abundance of things, of lesser moment than these, are commanded by God in the law, to which he added that sanction, Deut. xii, 32: "Whatever things I command thee," &c. And we conceive that the words, "As my father

sent me, so," &c., had somewhat proper to the extraordinary mission. "And if he hear not the church," &c., is neither spoken of a church universal, nor of magistrates making laws for such ceremonies or signs. But if he hear not the church with which he was in communion, and which admonisheth him for his sin, let that church reject him from their communion.

Prop. 10. § 10. *Ans.* The command for decent ceremonies may still continue in the church, notwithstanding the xii of Deut., and so it may too for all the exceptions taken against them by sundry learned, pious, and orthodox persons, who have judged them, they say, unwarrantable. And if laws may be abrogated as soon as those that list not to obey will except against them, the world must needs run into confusion. But those that except are weak brethren, whom, by Christ's precept and example, we must not offend. If by weak we understand ignorant, they would take it ill to be so accounted; and it is their own fault if they be, there having been so very much written as may satisfy any that have a mind to be satisfied. And as king James of blessed memory said at Hampton Court, "If after so many years preaching of the Gospel, there be any yet unsatisfied, I doubt it proceeds rather out of stubbornness of opinion than out of tenderness of conscience." If by tenderness of conscience they mean a fearfulness to sin, this would make them most easy to be satisfied, because most fearful to disobey superiors. But suppose there be any so scrupulous, as not satisfied with what hath been written, the church may still, without sin, urge her command for these decent ceremonies, and not be guilty of offending her weak brother; for since the scandal is taken by him, not given by her, it is he that by vain scrupulosity offends himself, and lays the stumblingblock in his own way.

Reply. But the command for man's institution of a new worship of God, or of rites sacramental, or so like to sacraments as the cross is; or for the unnecessary imposition of unnecessary things, which should be left to every prudent minister's discretion; and this upon pain of being cast out of

the church or ministry; and the law for subscribing that all these are lawful, and for swearing obedience to the bishops; all these laws are not to be found in Scripture. If you should but command your servant to do what you bid him decently and orderly, you would think he mistook you, if upon that pretence he would do any other work, which he could but say tended to the decency of yours. And we would gladly hear what you think yourselves is forbidden in Deut. xii, 32, if not such human ordinances, and why you forbear giving the truer sense of the text? It is a sad case with the poor church, when God's wisdom, that made a few and necessary things the matter of his church's concord, is no more valued. But we will be wiser: and when the experience of the church that hath been torn into pieces fourteen hundred years, by men's inventions, and needless usages, and impositions, is yet of no more force with us that come after them, but whatever can be said, or done, or seen, we will still make laws, that all men shall be *tantum non*, unchristened, and damned (that is, cast out of the ministry or church communion), that will not wear this or that, or bow thus or thus, or look this way or that way, or say this word or that word; and, when we have laid such a needless snare, we will uncharitably cry out the world will be brought into confusion, because men that list not to obey, would have the laws abrogated, where hath Christ set you to make such laws? Is it not work enough for us and you to obey the laws that he hath made? Why made he none for postures, and vestures, and words, and teaching signs of this nature, if he would have had them? If he had not told us that there is one lawgiver, one Lord, and that his word is able to make us wise unto salvation, and that he would lay no greater burden on us than necessary things, and would not have us despise or judge each other on such occasions: if he had but told us that he left any officers, after his inspired apostles, for the making of ceremonies, or new laws of worship, or teaching engaging signs for the church, we would as gladly understand and obey his will in these things as you. What hurt is it to us to use a cross or

other ceremony, if it were not for fear of disobeying God? Enforce God's laws upon us zealously if you will, and see if we will disobey. But that the world shall run into confusion, rather than we shall have leave to serve God as Peter and Paul did, without crossing, surplices, and kneeling at the sacrament, and then that we shall be reproached as the cause of all by our disobedience, God hath told the world by his word, and will tell them by his judgments, that this is not his way to unity and peace. As to the argument from your brethren's weakness, we say, first, it is not your strength to slight it or them; nor is it their weakness that they are willing to be esteemed weak. The apostle called those weak that placed a necessity in indifferent things, (Rom. xiv,) and not those that understood their indifferency. But the truth is, the nature of things indifferent is not well understood by all on either side; some may think evil of some things that deserve it not, and in this they are weak, though in other matters they may be strong. And for the rest, we speak according to the worst that you yourselves can charitably suppose, you can say no more of them, but that they are weaker, that is, in this know less than you, though perhaps we may take them to be stronger, that is, to be more in the right; yet are we not so confident as to censure you or others; but speak of things difficult and doubtful as they are. But how prove you that we would take it ill to be ourselves, or have those we speak of accounted ignorant in such things as these? Use us no worse than the ignorant should be used; and till you would turn a man out of the ministry or church for being ignorant of the nature of a ceremony, (which never was in his creed, the decalogue, or Scripture,) deal not so by us, that would be wiser if we knew how. That all our ignorance is our own fault we deny not, but it is an excess of confidence and uncharitableness to tell us that there is so very much written as may satisfy any man that hath a mind to be satisfied, when we profess in his sight that knoweth the hearts, that we have a mind to be satisfied, and would know the truth at what rate soever if we knew how. What would you have us do

that we do not, to be satisfied? Do we not read as much for ceremonies as the dissenters used to do against them? Many books against them are yet unanswered, and we never shunned any public or private conference with any of you; and such reasonings as these are not like to convince us. If you will be the judges of your brethren's hearts, and say it is not tenderness of conscience, but stubbornness, we shall refer that to the day when your hearts, and ours, shall be opened. Must none be tender conscienced that dare not venture to obey you in such things? When you may with undoubted safety forbear the imposing of your ceremonies, and so forbear the casting out of your brethren, if you will not, who shows less tenderness of conscience? That the scandal is taken and not given is still the thing in question, as to many things; and if it were not just occasion of offence, you ought not to lay that which another's weakness will turn into a stumbling block unnecessarily before them. If the apostle's argument be good, (Rom. xiv,) the church may not urge unlawful things, nor things merely lawful upon such penalties as will exclude things necessary. If an idle word be to be accounted for, an idle law is not laudable, much less when all men must be excluded the ministry or communion that scruple it; when yet a man may be a profane swearer for twelve pence an oath, and may swear an hundred times before he pays that twelve pence. A papist shall pay twelve pence for not coming to church; and a protestant be thrust out of your communion for not kneeling at the sacrament; and a minister suspended, imprisoned, undone, for not crossing a child or wearing a surplice. May magistrates or the church thus urge their commands? Can anything be spoken plainer than the Scripture speaks against this course? And would you make the world believe that the brethren that do not all that you bid them are so unreasonably and obstinately scrupulous, as to have no matter of offence, but what they lay before themselves, when they have the practice of the apostles and the custom of the primitive church for many hundred years against you, and this called by them an apostolical tra-

dition, and decreed by the most uncharitable councils that ever were? If you had but one of these (the decree of a general council, or practice of all the purest churches alone) for one of your ceremonies, you would think him uncharitable that so reproached you for pretending conscience?

Prop. 18. § 11. *Ans.* The case of St. Paul, not eating of flesh, if it offended his brother, is nothing to the purpose; who there speaks of things not commanded either by God or by his church, neither having in them anything of decency, or significancy to serve in the church. St. Paul would deny himself his own liberty, rather than offend his brother; but if any man breaks a just law or custom of the church, he brands him for a lover of schism and sedition. (1 Cor. xi, 16.)

Reply. But because, at our last meeting, it was said with so much confidence by one, that the case in Rom. xiv and xv was nothing to ours, we shall here say the more to what you say, that St. Paul's not eating flesh is nothing to the purpose: your reasons are, first, because he speaks of nothing commanded by God or his church; secondly, nor of anything of decency or significancy to serve in the church. To the first we have often told you, that which is undeniable; First, that Paul was a governor of that church himself, that had no superior to control him. If you say that he then wrote not as a governor; we answer, Yes: for he then wrote as an apostle, and wrote the epistle that was to be a standing law or canon to them: if this be not an act of his office and authority, there was none such; and then you must say the like of all the rest of the epistles. Secondly. Moreover, as Paul the apostle excludeth all such impositions; so he wrote to all the resident pastors that were at Rome, for he wrote to the whole church: and therefore these commands extend to the governors, that they make not such things the matter of contempt or censures, or any other uncharitable course, but bear with one another in them. Will you call men obstinate self-offenders, that differ from you, when you have no better answers than these, to the plain decisions of the Holy Ghost? What we speak of Rom. xiv, xv, we speak also of 1 Cor. viii.

And, Thirdly. It is to the rulers of the church that we are speaking, and it is they that answer us : and shall the rulers say, " If it were not a thing commanded, we might bear with you," when it is themselves that command them ecclesiastically; and we intreat them but to forbear that, and to concur with us in petitioning the king to forbear commanding them coercively, who no doubt will easily forbear it, if they do their part. Fourthly. Yea, *à fortiori*, it layeth a heavier charge on such governors, than others. If it be so heinous a sin as Paul maketh it, to censure or despise one another, for meats, and days, and such like things; how much more to excommunicate, silence, and undo one another, and deprive thousands of souls of the preaching of the gospel that consented not to their pastors' nonconformity? Fifthly. Paul letteth you know that these things are not the centre or matter of our necessary concord, but of mutual forbearance, and therefore condemneeth all that will make them necessary to our unity, ministry, or communion. Sixthly. And the difference is wholly to the advantage of our cause. For those that Paul spake to, were not come so high as to go about to force others to do as they did; but only to despise them for not doing it.

2. And therefore to your second reason we answer :—1. If the things had been different, yet so was Paul's injunction different from our request; for Paul goeth so high as to command them to deny their own liberty in not eating lawful meats themselves, lest they offend and hurt their brethren: whereas we are now desiring you, that you would not force others to do that which they take to be a sin, and that with penalties that fall heavier on the church than on them. They had on both sides fairer pretences than you have. The cases before us to be compared, are four; the case of the refusers of meats, and observers of days then; the case of the users of those meats and non-observers of those days; the case of our imposers; and the case of nonconformists. The pretence of their refusers of meats had in 1 Cor. viii, was that, being offered to idols, they thought it made them partakers of the idolatry; and so they sinned through weakness in being

offended at others, and censuring them that used their liberty. And had they not here a fairer pretence, for their offence and censures, than you for your impositions? You cannot shew half so great an appearance of good in the things commanded, as they could do of evil in the things for which they were offended. And the offended censurer in Rom. xiv, had this pretence, that the thing was forbidden in God's own law, even the meats, which he refused; and the days commanded which he observed: and he knew not that the law in these matters of order and ceremony was abrogated, which Peter was ignorant of, when he refused to eat things common and unclean: but you have no pretence of God's own command, for the matter of your impositions, as these men had for the matter of their offence and censure, so that here you are on the worsè side. And for the other party that in 1 Cor. viii abused their liberty, and Rom. xiv, despised their brethren, they had a double pretence: one was that it was their liberty; and if every scrupulous party should drive them from their lawful meat and drink, they knew not whither they might drive them: another was, that the law was abrogated by Christ; and therefore if they complied in practice with the scrupulous, or did not shew their difference, they might seem to be guilty of the restoring of the law, and complying with the Jews, and the heretics, that both then were enemies to the church, and agreed in this. Had not these men now a far fairer pretence for eating, (1 Cor. viii,) and for the dissent shewed, (Rom xiv,) than you ever yet produced for forcing others from ministry and church into sin and hell, if they will not obey you against their consciences; and all for that which you never pretended to shew a command of God for, and others shew you, as they think, Scripture, and councils, and customs against? To tell us then that Paul spake of things not decent and significant, is (pardon our plainness) to say much less than nothing: for it was not against imposing that Paul spake, but using and not using, censuring and despising; and their arguments were suitable to their cause, of another kind of moment, than decency or indecency, significancy or

insignificancy, even from supposed idolatry, rejecting God's law, and complying with the Jews and heretics, in restoring the law, and casting away the liberties purchased by Christ, even in their private eating and drinking.

To be no more tedious now, we humbly offer in any way convenient to try it out with that reverend brother that so confidently asserted the disparity of the cases, and to prove that these scriptures most plainly condemn your impositions now in question; though we should have thought that one impartial reading of them might end the controversy, and save the church and you from the sad effects. As to that 1 Cor. xi, 16 we answer, first, it is uncertain whether the word custom refer to the matter of hair, or to contention; so many expositors judge *q. d.* the churches of God are not contentious. Secondly. Here is no institution, much less by fallible men, of new covenanting, dedicating, or teaching symbols or ceremonies, nor is here any unnecessary thing enjoined, but that which nature, and the custom of the country, had made so decent as that the opposite would have been abusively indecent. This is not your case. A cross or surplice is not decent by nature or common reputation, but by institution; (that is not all: for if it be not instituted because decent, it it will not be decent because instituted;) nor are these so decent as the opposite to be indecent. The apostles worshipped God as decently without them, as you do with them; the minister prayeth in the pulpit as decently without the surplice as in the reading place with it. Thirdly. Paul doth but exhort them to this undoubted comeliness, (as you may well do, if men will do anything which nature or common reputation makes to be slovenly, unmannerly, or indecent, as being covered in prayer or singing psalms, or any such like, about which we will never differ with you,) but even here he talks not of force, or such penalties as tend to the greater hurt of the church, and the ruin of the person.

Prop. 18. § 12. *Ans.* That these ceremonies have occasioned many divisions is no more fault of theirs, than it was of the gospel that the preaching of it occasioned strife betwixt

father and son, &c. The true cause of those divisions is the cause of ours, which St. James tells us is lust, and inordinate desires of honour, or wealth, or licentiousness, or the like. Were these ceremonies laid aside, there would be the same divisions, if some, who think Moses and Aaron took too much upon them, may be suffered to deceive the people, and to raise in them vain fears and jealousies of their governors; but if all men would, as they ought, study peace and quietness, they would find other and better fruits of these laws of rites and ceremonies, as edification, decency, order, and beauty, in the service and worship of God.

Reply. Whether the ceremonies be as innocent, as to divisions, as the gospel, (a strange assertion) will better appear when what we have said, and what is more fully said by Dr. Ames, Bradshaw, and others, is well answered. If the true cause of our divisions be, as you say, lust and inordinate desires of honour, or wealth, or licentiousness, then the party that is most lustful, ambitious, covetous, and licentious, are likeliest to be most the cause. And for lust, and licentiousness, we should take it for a great attainment of our ends, if you will be entreated to turn the edge of your severity against the lustful, and licentious: O that you would keep them out of the pulpits, and out of the communion of the church, till they reform! And for ourselves, we shall take your admonitions, or severities, thankfully, whenever we are convicted by you of any such sins; we are loth to enter upon such comparison, between the ministers ejected (for the most part), and those that are in their rooms, as tends to shew by this rule who are likeliest to be the dividers. And for inordinate desire of honour and wealth, between your lordships and us; we are contented that this cause be decided by all England, even by our enemies, at the first hearing, without any further vindication of ourselves; and so let it be judged who are the dividers: only we must say, that your intimation of this charge on us that seek not for bishoprics, deaneries, archdeaconries, or any of your preferments; that desire not, nor could accept pluralities of benefices, with cure of souls;

that never sought for more than food or raiment with the liberty of our ministry, even one place with a tolerable maintenance; whose provoking cause hath been our constant opposition to the honours, wealth, lordships, and pluralities of the clergy; yea who would be glad, on the behalf of the poor congregations, if many of our brethren might have leave to preach to their flocks for nothing; we say, your intimation maketh us lift up our hearts and hands to heaven, and think, Oh what is man! What may not by some history be told the world! Oh how desirable is the blessed day of the righteous universal judgment of the Lord! How small a matter, till then, should it be to us to be judged of man! We hope, upon pretence of not suffering us to deceive the people, you will not deny us liberty to preach the necessary saving truths of the gospel, considering how terrible a symptom and prognostic this was in the Jews, 1 Thes. ii, 15, 16. "who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and persecuted the apostles; and God they pleased not, and were contrary to all men, forbidding to preach to the Gentiles, that they might be saved, to fill up their sins always: for wrath was come upon them to the utmost." We can as easily bear whatever you can inflict upon us, as the hinderers of the gospel, and silencers of faithful ministers, and troublers of the churches, can bear what God will inflict on them. And so the will of the Lord be done.

Prop. 18. § 13. *Ans.* There hath been so much said not only of the lawfulness, but also of the conveniency of those ceremonies mentioned, that nothing can be added: this in brief may here suffice for the surplice, that reason and experience teach that decent ornaments and habits preserve reverence, and are held therefore necessary to the solemnity of royal acts, and acts of justice, and why not as well to the solemnity of religious worship. And in particular no habit more suitable than white linen, which resembles purity and beauty, wherein angels have appeared (Rev. xv), fit for those, whom the Scripture calls angels: and this habit was ancient. Chrys. Hom. 60, ad Antioch.

Reply. First, if nothing can be added, then we doubt the unanswered writings extant against these impositions will never be well answered. Secondly. We are desirous that no indecent vestures or habits be used in God's service. Those that scruple the surplice do it not as it is a habit determined of, as decent; but as they think it is made a holy vestment, and so part of external worship, as Aaron's vestments were; as may be seen in the arguments of Cotton and Nicholls lately printed together.

Prop. 18. § 14. *Ans.* The cross was always used in the church *in immortalis lavacro*, (Tertull.) and therefore to testify our communion with them, as we are taught to do in our creed, as also in token that we shall not be ashamed of the cross of Christ, it is fit to be used still; and we conceive cannot trouble the conscience of any that have a mind to be satisfied.

Reply. That the cross was always used in the church in baptism is an assertion certainly untrue, and such as we never heard or read till now. Do you believe it was used in the baptism of the eunuch, Lydia, the jailor, Cornelius, the three thousand Acts ii, or in those times? And when it did come up, it was with Chrism, and not our airy, transient image; and therefore you so far differ from the users. Secondly. The condemnation of genuflection on the Lord's days in adoration was at least as ancient and universal, and commanded by councils when the cross was not; and yet you can dispense with that, and many such usages. And if you will yourselves fall in with custom, yet every ancient common custom was never intended to be a matter of necessity to union or toleration of our brethren. Use no other force about the cross than the church then did. Thirdly. Your saying that you conceive it cannot trouble the conscience of any that have a mind to be satisfied, doth but express your uncharitable censoriousness, while your brethren have studied and prayed, and conferred for satisfaction (its like as much as you), and profess their earnest desire of it, and their readiness to hear or read anything that you have to say in order to their satisfaction.

Prop. 18. § 15. *Ans.* The posture of kneeling best suits at the communion as the most convenient, and so most decent for us, when we are to receive as it were from God's hand the greatest of seals of the kingdom of heaven. He that thinks he may do this sitting, let him remember the prophet Malachi:—"offer this to the prince," to receive his seal from his own hand, sitting, "see if he will accept of it." When the church did stand at her prayers, the manner of receiving was *more adorantium*, (S. Aug. Psa. xviii, Cyril. Catech. Mystag. 5.) rather more than at prayers. Since standing at prayer hath been generally left, and kneeling used instead of that (as the church may vary in such indifferent things), now to stand at communion, when we kneel at prayers, were not decent, much less to sit, which was never the use of the best times.

Reply. To all this about kneeling, we say, first, we have considered the text in Malachi, and what you say; and yet, first, we find that our betters, even Christ's apostles, and the universal church, for many hundred years, thought not kneeling more decent; nor did the church in the first age think sitting unmeet in that service to the King of the church: and we hope you reprehend them not. Secondly. You require not the adults that are baptized, to receive that seal or sacrament kneeling. Thirdly. When kneeling at prayers was in use in the apostles' times, yet kneeling in the reception of the sacrament was not. Fourthly. Why can you so lightly put off both the practice and canons of the church, in this, more than in other such things? However, you cannot here deny, *de facto*, but that kneeling on the Lord's day in the receiving of the sacrament was, for many hundred years of the purer times of the church, disused and condemned. And why do you not tell us what other general council repealed this, that we may see whether it be such as we are any way bound by? When you say the church may vary in such indifferent things: first, if kneeling or standing at prayer be an indifferent thing, then so are they at this sacrament. Secondly. Then you follow the changes, and we the old pattern. Thirdly.

Then the canons of general councils and customs, pretended to be from apostolical tradition, may be changed. Fourthly. What is it that you call the church, that changeth, or may change these? A council, or a popular custom? Bring us not under a foreign power. Fifthly. The thing then being so indifferent and changeable, you may change it, if you please, for ends that are not indifferent. Sixthly. And if now the ministers may pray standing, why may not the people receive standing? Seventhly. When you say that to sit was never the use of the best times, you deny the aposties' and primitive times to be the best. As to the extent of the church they were not the best, but as to purity of administrations they were.

Prop. 18. § 16. *Ans.* That there were ancient liturgies in the church is evident: S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and others; and the Greeks tell us of St. James, much elder than they. And though we find not in all ages whole liturgies, yet it is certain that there were such in the oldest times, by those parts which are extant; as *Sursum corda, &c., Gloria Patri, &c., Benedicite, Hymnus Cherubinus, &c., Vere dignum et justum, &c., Dominus vobiscum, et cum spiritu tuo,* with divers others. Though those that are extant may be interpolated, yet such things as are found in them all consistent to catholic and primitive doctrine may well be presumed to have been from the first; especially since we find no original of these liturgies from general councils.

Reply. We know there wanteth not a Lindanus, a Coccius, to tell the world of St. Peter's Liturgy, which yet prayeth that by the intercession of St. Peter, and Paul, we may be defended, &c., and mentioneth Linus, Cletus, Clemens, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lucia, Barbara, and abundance such: shall we therefore conclude, that there were liturgies from the first, and that what is here consentient to antiquity, was in it? There wants not a Marg. de la Bigne, a Greg. de Valent, a Coccius to commend to us the liturgy of Mark, that prayeth, *Protege civitatem istam propter martyrem tuum et evangelistam Marcum, etc.,* and tells us that the king

where the author lived was an orthodox Christian, and prayeth for the pope, subdeacons, lectors, cantors, monks, &c. Must we therefore believe that all that is orthodox in it is ancient? So there wants not a Bigne, Bellarmine, &c., to tell us of St. James' liturgy, that mentions the confessors, the Deiparam, the anchorets, &c., which made Bellarmine himself say *de Liturgia Jacobi sic sentio, eam aut non esse ejus, aut multa à posterioribus eidem addita sunt*. And must we prove the antiquity of liturgies by this, or try ours by it? There wants not a Sainctius, a Bellarmine, a Valentia, a Paresius to predicate the liturgy of S. Basil, as bearing witness to transubstantiation, for the sacrifice of the mass, for praying to saints, &c., when yet the exceeding disagreement of copies, the difference of some forms from Basil's ordinary forms, the prayers for the most pious and faithful emperors, shew it unlikely to have been Basil's. Many predicate Chrysostom's mass or liturgy, as making for praying to the dead, and for them, the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, &c., when, in one edition, Chrysostom is prayed to in it, saith Cook: in another, Nicolaus, and Alexius, that lived 1080, is mentioned: in another, doctrines are contained (as *de contaminata Maria*, &c.) clean contrary to Chrysostom's doctrine: must we now conclude that all is ancient, that is orthodox, when one copy is scarce like another? Or can we try our liturgy by such as this? The shreds cited by you prove a liturgy indeed, such as we have used while the Common Prayer book was not used, where the psalms, the words of baptism, and the words of consecration, commemoration, and delivery of the Lord's Supper, and many other, were used in a constant form, when other parts were used as the minister found most meet; so *Sursum Corda* was but a warning before, or in the midst of devotion, such as our "Let us pray," and will no more prove that the substance of prayer was not left to the minister's present or prepared conceptions, than *Ite missa est* will prove it. The *Gloria patri* Bellarmine himself saith, according to the common opinion, was formed in the Council of Nicæa, which was in the 4th century. And

even then such a particular testimony against the Arians might well stand with a body of unimposed prayers; and rather shews that in other things they were left at liberty. If the Benedicite, the hymns, or other passages here mentioned, will prove such a liturgy as pleaseth you, we pray you bear with our way of worship, which hath more of hymns and other forms than these come to. That these liturgies had no original from general Councils adds nothing with us to their authority, but sheweth that they had an arbitrary original: and all set together, shews that then they had many liturgies in one prince's dominion, and those alterable, and not forced; and that they took not one liturgy to be any necessary means to the church's unity or peace, but bore with those that used various at discretion. We well remember that Tertullian tells the heathens that Christians shewed by their conceived hymns, that they were sober at their religious feasts, it being their custom *ut quisque de Scripturis sanctis, vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocetur in medium Deo canere*, Apol. cap. 39. Note here 1. that though there be more need of forms for singing than for praying, yet even in this, the Christians in public had then a liberty of doing it *de proprio ingenio*, and by their own wit or parts. 2. That those that did not *de proprio ingenio*, did it *de Scripturis sanctis*, and that there is no mention of any other liturgy, from which they fetch so much as their hymns. And the same Tertullian, Apol. cap. 30, describing the Christians' public prayers saith *sine monitore, quia de pectore, oramus*, we pray without a monitor or promptor, because we do it from the heart, or from our own breast. And before him Justin Martyr, Ap. 2, p. 77, saith, ὁ προεξὼς εὐχας ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἄμην. But if all these words seem not plain enough to some, it is no wonder when they rest not in the greater plainness of the holy Scriptures, where prayer is so frequently mentioned, as much of the employment of believers; and so many directions, encouragements, and exhortations given

about it: and yet no liturgy or stinted forms, except the Lord's prayer, is prescribed to them, or once made mention of; no man directed here to use such, no man exhorted to get him a Prayer book, or to read or learn it, or to beware that he add or diminish not: whereas the holy Scriptures that were then given to the church, men are exhorted to read, and study, and meditate in, and discourse of, and make it their continual delight: and it is a wonder that David, that mentions it so oft in the cixth Psalm, doth never mention the liturgy, or Common Prayer book, if they had any; and that Solomon, when he dedicated the house of prayer without a Prayer book, would only beg of God to hear what prayers or what supplication soever, shall be made of any man, or of all the people of Israel, when every one shall know his own sore, and his own grief, and shall spread forth his hands in that house, (2 Chron. vi, 29,) and that he giveth no hint of any liturgy or form, so much as in those common calamities; and talks of no other book than the knowledge of their own sores, and their own griefs. And in the case of psalms, or singing unto God; where it is certain, that they had a liturgy or form, (as we have,) they are carefully collected, preserved, and delivered to us, as a choice part of the holy Scripture. And would it not have been so with the prayers? or would they have been altogether unmentioned, if they also had been there prescribed to, and used by the church, as the psalms were? Would Christ and his apostles, even where they were purposely giving rules for prayer, and correcting its abuse, as Matt. vi; 1 Cor. xiv, &c., have never mentioned any forms but the Lord's prayer, if they had appointed such, or desired such to be imposed, and observed? These things are incredible to us when we most impartially consider them. For our own parts, as we think it uncharitable to forbid the use of spectacles to them that have weak eyes, or of crutches to them that have weak limbs; and as uncharitable to undo all that will not use them, whether they need them or not: so we can think no better of them, that will suffer none to use such forms, that need them; or that will suffer none to pray

but in the words of other men's prescribing, though they are at least as able as the prescribers.

And to conclude, we humbly crave, that ancient customs may not be used against themselves, and us; and that you will not innovate, under the shelter of the name of antiquity. Let those things be freely used among us, that were so used in the purest primitive times. Let unity and peace be laid on nothing, on which they laid them not; let diversity of liturgies, and ceremonies be allowed, where they allowed it. May we but have love and peace, on the terms as the ancient church enjoyed them, we shall then hope we may yet escape the hands of uncharitable destroying zeal. We therefore humbly recommend to your observation the concurrent testimony of the best histories of the church concerning the diversity of liturgies, ceremonies, and model observances, in the several churches under one and the same civil government: and how they then took it to be their duty to forbear each other in these matters, and how they made them not the test of their communion, or centre of their peace. Concerning the observation of Easter itself, when other holy-days and ceremonies were urged, were less stood upon, you have the judgment of Irenæus, and the French bishops, in whose name he wrote, in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 23, where they reprehend Victor for breaking peace with the churches, that differed about the day, and the antecedent time of fasting, and tell him that the variety began before their times, when yet they nevertheless retained peace, and yet retain it: and the discord in their fasting declared, or commended the concord of their faith, that no man was rejected from communion by Victor's predecessors on that account, but they gave them the sacrament, and maintained peace with them, and particularly Polycarp, and Anicetus, held communion in the eucharist, notwithstanding this difference. Basil Epist. 63, doth plead his cause with the presbyters, and whole clergy of Neccæsarea, that were offended at his new psalmody, and his new order of Monastics: but he only defendeth himself, and urgeth none of them to imitate him, but telleth them also of

the novelty of their own liturgy, that it was not known in the time of their own late renowned Bp. Gregory Thaumaturgus; telling them that they had kept nothing unchanged to that day of all that he was used to (so great alterations in forty years were made in the same congregation); and he professeth to pardon all such things, so be it the principal things be kept safe. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 51. c. 21., about the Easter difference saith that, neither the apostles, nor the gospels, do impose a yoke of bondage on those that betake themselves to the doctrine of Christ, but left the feast of Easter, and other festivals, to the observation of the free and equal judgment of them that had received the benefits. And therefore because men used to keep some festivals, for the relaxing themselves from labour, several persons, in several places, do celebrate, of custom, the memorials of Christ's passion arbitrarily, or at their own choice. For neither our Saviour, nor the apostles commanded the keeping of them by any law, nor threaten any mulct, or penalty, &c. It was the purpose of the apostles not to make laws for the keeping of festivals, but to be authors to us of the reason of right living, and of piety. And having shewed that it came up by private custom, and not by law, and having cited Irenæus, as before, he addeth, that those that agree in the same faith, do differ in point of rites and ceremonies, and instancing in divers, he concludeth that because no man can shew, in the monuments of writings, any command concerning this, it is plain, that the apostles herein permitted free power to every one's mind and will; that every man might do that which was good, without being induced by fear, or by necessity. And having spoken of the diversity of customs, about the assemblies, marriage, baptism, &c., he tells us that, even among the Novatians themselves, there is a diversity in their manner of their praying; and that among all the forms of religions and parties, you can nowhere find two, that consent among themselves in the manner of their praying. And repeating the decree of the Holy Ghost, Acts 15, "to impose no other burden but things necessary," he reprehendeth them that,

neglecting this, will take fornication as a thing indifferent, but strive about festivals, as if it were a matter of life; overturning God's laws, and making laws to themselves, &c. And Sozomen Hist. Eccles. l. 7. c. 18 and 19, speaketh to the same purpose, and tells us that the Novatians themselves determined in a synod at Sangar in Bythinia, that the difference about Easter being not a sufficient cause for breach of communion, all should abide in the same concord, and in the same assembly, and every one should celebrate this feast as pleased himself: and this canon they called *ἀδιάφορον*. And, c. 19, he saith of Victor and Polycarp, that they deservedly judged it frivolous, or absurd, that those should be separated, on account of a custom, that consented in the principal heads of religion: for you cannot find the same traditions in all things alike, in all churches, though they agree among themselves; and, instancing in some countries, where there is but one bishop in many cities, and in others bishops are ordained in the villages, after many other instances, he adds, that they use not the same prayers, singings, or readings, nor observe the same time of using them. And what liturgy was imposed upon Constantine the Emperor, or what bishops or synods, were then the makers of liturgies, when he himself made public prayers for himself and auditory, and for his soldiers? Euseb. de vit. Constantini, lib. iv, c. 18, 20, &c. But the diversity, liberty, and change of liturgies in the churches under the same prince, are things so well known, as that we may suppose any further proof of it to be needless.

In the conclusion, therefore, we humbly beseech you, that as antiquity and the custom of the churches in the first ages is that which is most commonly and confidently pleaded against us, that your mistake of antiquity may not be to our cost, or paid so dear for as the loss of our freedom for the serving of God in the work of the ministry to which we are called. We beseech you let us not be silenced, or cast out of the ministry or church, for not using the liturgy, cross, surplice, kneeling at the sacrament, till ye have either shewed the world that the practice or canons of the catholic church

have led you the way, as doing it, or requiring it to be done. And make not that so necessary as to force men to it on such dreadful terms, which the ancient churches used with diversity and indifferency of liberty. We beseech you, shew the world some proof that the ancient churches did ever use to force or require ministers to subscribe to their liturgies, as having nothing in them contrary to the Word of God, or to swear obedience to their bishops, before you impose such things on us, while yet you pretend to imitate antiquity. And have but that moderation towards your brethren, as in suffering, or at death, or judgment, you would most approve. Remember how displeasing the remembrance of such differences about ceremonies was to Bishop Ridley, as towards Bishop Hooper, when they were in prison; and how the Arians' fury made the orthodox gladly to go to the churches of the Novatians, and meet with them, and join with them in prayer, and had almost been united with them in the bond of concord, if the Novatians, in the stiff maintaining of their old customs, had not utterly refused it. But yet in other matters they embraced each other with so singular a benevolence and love, that they would willingly have died for each other, as Socrat. tells us, *Hist. lib. ii, c. 30.* And may we not all here see our duty? When Atticus was urged to deny to the Novatians the liberty of their meetings within the city, he refused it, because they had suffered for the faith in the Arians' persecution, and changed nothing in the faith, though they separated from the church; and was so far from violence against dissenters, as that he gave large relief to them that differed from him in religion, *Socrat. Hist. lib. vii, c. 25.* It was the much praised saying of Theodosius, to him that asked him why he put none to death that wronged him—"I would I could rather make them that are dead, alive:" *Socrat. lib. vii, c. 22.* Much more should Christian bishops be enemies to cruelty, who know that charity is more essential to Christianity than this or that form of liturgy or ceremonies. If you think it unsufferable that we should have differences about such things, remember that there will be no perfect

unity till there is perfect charity and sanctity ; and that destroying one another, and consequently destroying charity, is an unhappy way to unity ; and that unity is to be held in things necessary, and liberty in things unnecessary, and charity in both. Remember that it was in a far greater difference, where Constantine persuadeth the Christians to mutual forbearance, by the example of the philosophers, that suffered differences in abundance of their opinions. Euseb. de vita Constant., lib. ii, c. 67 ; and that Valens, the Arian, was made more moderate, and abated his persecution of the orthodox, by the oration of Themistius, who bade him not wonder at the dissensions of Christians, for they were small, if compared with the multitude and crowd of opinions that are among the heathen philosophers, as being more than three hundred ; and that God will, by this diversity of opinions, manifest his glory, and make men the more reverence him, who is so hardly known : Socrat. lib. iv, c. 27. Those that dissent from you in these tolerable cases, cannot change their own opinions ; but you can, if you will, forbear hurting of your brethren. Do that which you can do, rather than urge them by unsuitable means to that which they cannot do. These are not matters sufficient to justify contention and uncharitable usage of your brethren. When many of the Macedonian faction petitioned the good emperor Jovianus to depose those that affirmed the Son to be unlike the Father, and to put their party in their places, he gave them no answer, but this, “ I hate contentions, and I love and honour them that are addicted to concord : ” Socrat. lib. iv, c. 21. “ Then,” saith Euseb. Hist., lib. viii, c. 1, “ did the Lord obscure the daughter of Sion, and cast down the glory of Israel, &c., when those that seemed our pastors, rejecting the rule of godliness, were enflamed among themselves with mutual contentions, and drove on only those contentions, threatenings, emulations, mutual hatred, and enmity, and the like, tyrants prosecuted their ambition.”

We thought it no impertinent digression here to take this occasion again to crave your exercise of the ancient

charity, and our enjoyment of the ancient liberty, instead of forcing the anciently free liturgy and ceremonies, and that by unproportionable penalties. And if yet we cannot prevail with you, we shall still beg for peace of the God of peace, where we have better hopes to be heard; and shall hold on in seeking it, how ill soever our endeavours may be interpreted or succeed. And as the good man wept, Socrat. lib. iv, c. 18., when he saw a woman pompously adorned, because he was not so careful to please God as she was to allure men; so we shall confess we ought to weep that we cannot be more charitable and laborious in building up the church in holiness and peace, than others are by uncharitable courses to afflict it. And it shall be our hope that, whether by their labours or their sufferings, God will serve and honor himself by those many faithful servants of his, whom he hath called into his work, and whose cause we plead; and that however they are used they shall not be unuseful to the ends of their vocation: as Theodoret observes, Hist., lib. iv, c. 30, that in a calamitous time, "the moderator of the universe raised up such guides as were sufficient in so great a fluctuation, and opposed the valour of the leaders to the greatness of the enemy's incursion, and gave the best remedies in the hardest times of pestilence, so that the banished pastors did, from the uttermost parts of the earth, corroborate their own, and refute the adversaries by their writings." And for ourselves, as we were truly desirous to do our parts to preserve your reputation with the flocks, in order to the success of your government for their good, and never envied you even that worldly honor or revenue which yet some have thought unsuitable to the simplicity and employment of Christ's ministers; so if you will neither suffer us quietly to serve God or conscientiously to serve you, we shall be the less solicitous for that part of our task, from which you have power to discharge us. And as Basil said to Valens the emperor, that would have him pray for the life of his son, "If thou wilt receive the true faith, and restore the churches to concord, thy son shall live;" which, when he refused, he said, "The will of God,

then, be done with thy son ;” so we say to you. If you will put on charity, and promote your brethren’s and the church’s peace, God will honor you, and good men will honor you, and your calling will have advantage by it. But if you will do contrary, the will of the Lord be done with your honors. But know that them that honor him he will honor, and those that despise him shall be lightly esteemed; and that by the course of uncharitable violence, which we deprecate, you will most deeply wound the cause of your pre-eminence, even more than its adversaries could have done. And if it be the will of God that suffering at home where we have served him must be our lot, we doubt not but he will furnish us with strength and patience, and we shall remember such examples as Ruffin recordeth, Hist., lib. ii, c. 3. When a military bishop sent his soldiers to assault three thousand scattered Christians, there appeared a strange kind of warfare when the assaulted offered their necks, saying only, *Amice, ad quid venisti?* Friend, why camest thou thither? Or if we must be removed from the land of our nativity, as Maris told Julian, “he thanked God that had deprived him of his sight, that he might not see the face of such a man,” Socrates, Hist. lib. iii, c. 10; so we shall take it as a little abatement of our affliction, that we see not the sins and calamities of the people, whose peace and welfare we so much desire. Having taken this opportunity here to conclude this part with these requests and warnings, we now proceed to the second part, containing the particulars of our Exceptions and your Answers.

CONCERNING MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

§ 1. Rub. 1. *Ans.* We think it fit that the rubric stand as it is, and all to be left to the discretion of the ordinary.

Reply. We thought the end and use more considerable than custom, and that the ordinary himself should be under the rule of doing all to edification.

§ 2. Rub. 2. *Ans.* For the reasons given in our Answer to the 18th general, whither you refer us, we think it fit that the rubric continue as it is.

Reply. We have given you reason enough against the imposition of the usual ceremonies; and would you draw forth those absolute ones to increase the burden?

§ 3. Lord's prayer. "Deliver us from evil." *Ans.* These words, "for thine is the kingdom," &c., are not in St. Luke, nor in the ancient copies of St. Matthew, never mentioned in the ancient comments, nor used in the Latin church, and therefore questioned whether they be part of the gospel; there is no reason that they should be always used.

Reply. We shall not be so over-credulous as to believe you, that these words are not in the ancient copies. It is enough that we believe that some few ancient copies have them not, but that the most, even the generality (except those few) have them. The judgment of our English translators, and almost all other translators of Matthew, and of the reverend Bp. of Chester among yourselves, putting the copy that hath it in his Bible, (as that which is most received and approved by the church,) do shew on which side is the chief authority: if the few copies that want it had been thought more authentic and credible, the church of England and most other churches, would not have preferred the copies that have this doxology. And why will you in this contradict the later judgment of the church, expressed in the translation allowed and imposed? The Syriac, Ethiopic, and Persian translations also have it: and if the Syriac be as ancient as you yourselves even now asserted, then the antiquity of the doxology is there evident; and it is not altogether to be neglected, which by Chemnitius and others is conjectured, that Paul's words, in 2 Tim. iv, 18, were spoken as in reference to this doxology. And as Pareus and other protestants conclude, it is more probable the Latins neglected, than that the Greeks inserted, of their own heads, this sentence. The Socinians and Arians have as fair a pretence for their exception against 1 John v, 6, 7. Musculus saith, *non cogitant vero similis esse, ut Græcorum ecclesia magis quàm Latina, quod ab evangelistis Græca scriptum est, integrum servarit, nihilque de suo adjecerit. Quid de Græca ecclesia dico? vidi ipse*

vetustissimum evangelium secundum Matthæum, codicem Chaldæis et elementis, et verbis conscriptum, in quo coronis ista perinde atque in Græcis legebatur. Nec Chaldæi solum, sed et Arabes Christiani pariformiter cum Græcis orant, et exemplar Hebræum à docto et celebri D. Sebast. Munstero vulgatum, hanc ipsam coronidem habet; cum ergo consentiant hæc in re Hebræorum, Chaldæorum, Arabum, et Græcorum ecclesiæ valde inconsideratum videtur, quod uni Latinorum ecclesiæ, contra omnes reliquas, tantum tribuitur authoritatis, ut quod sola diversum legit, ab evangelistis traditum esse credatur: quod vero reliquæ omnes concorditer habent et orant, pro additio et peregrino habeatur. And that Luke hath it not, will no more prove that it was not a part of the Lord's prayer, than all other omissions of one evangelist will prove that such words are corruptions in the other that have them. All set together give us the gospel fully, and from all we must gather it.

§ 4. Lord's prayer often used. *Ans.* It is used but twice in the morning and twice in the evening service; and twice cannot be called often, much less so often. For the litany, communion, baptism, &c., they are offices distinct from morning and evening prayer, and it is not fit that any of them should want the Lord's prayer.

Reply. We may better say we are required to use it six times every morning than but twice; for it is twice in the common morning prayer, and once in the litany, and once in the communion service, and once at baptism, (which in great parishes is usual every day) and once to be used by the preacher in the pulpit. And, if you call these distinct offices, that maketh not the Lord's prayer the seldomer used. Sure we are, the apostles thought it fit that many of their prayers should be without the Lord's prayer.

§ 5. Gloria Patri. *Ans.* This doxology being a solemn confession of the blessed Trinity, should not be thought a burden to any Christian liturgy, especially being so short as it is; neither is the repetition of it to be thought a vain repetition, more than "his mercy endureth for ever," so

often repeated, Psa. cxxxvi. We cannot give God too much glory, that being the end of our creation, and should be the end of all our services.

Reply. Though we cannot give God too much glory, we may too often repeat a form of words wherein his name and glory is mentioned; there is great difference between a psalm of praise and the praise in our ordinary prayers: more liberty of repetition may be taken in psalms, and be an ornament; and there is difference between that which is unusual (in one Psalm of one hundred and fifty,) and that which is our daily course of worship. When you have well proved that Christ's prohibition of battology extendeth not to this (Matt. vi); we shall acquiesce.

§ 6. Rub. 2. "In such places where they do sing," &c.
Ans. The rubric directs only such singing as is after the manner of distinct reading, and we never heard of any inconvenience thereby, and therefore conceive this demand to be needless.

Reply. It tempteth men to think they should read in a singing tone: and to turn reading scripture into singing, hath the inconvenience of turning the edifying simplicity and plainness of God's service into such affected, unnatural strains and tones, as is used by the mimical and ludicrous, or such as feign themselves in raptures: and the highest things (such as words and modes that signify raptures) are most loathsome when forced, feigned, and hypocritically affected; and, therefore, not fit for congregations that cannot be supposed to be in such raptures; this we apply, also, to the sententious mode of prayers.

§ 7. Benedicite. *Ans.* This hymn was used all the church over, (Conc. Tolet. can. 13,) and therefore should be continued still as well as Te Deum (Ruffin. Apol. cont. Hieron.) or Veni Creator, which they do not object against as apocryphal.

Reply. You much discourage us in these great straits of time, to give us such loose and troublesome citations; you turn us to Ruffin Apol. in gross, and tell us not which of the

councils of Tolet. (among at least thirteen) you mean: but we find the words in council 4. But that provincial, Spanish council, was no meet judge of the affairs of the universal church unto the universal church: nor is it certain by their words whether *quem* refer not to *Deum* rather than to *hymnum*: but if you so regard that council, remember that, Can. 9, it is but once a day that the Lord's prayer is enjoined, against them that used it on the Lord's day only; and that, Can. 17, it is implied, that it was said but once on that day. The Benedicite is somewhat more cautiously to be used than human compositions that profess to be but human; when the apocryphal writings, that are pretended by the papists to be canonical, and used so like the canon in our church, we have the more cause to desire that a sufficient distinction be still made.

IN THE LITANY.

§ 1. *Ans.* The alterations here desired are so nice, as if they that made them were given to change.

Reply. We bear your censure: but profess, that if you will desert the products of changers, and stick to the unchangeable rule delivered by the Holy Ghost, we shall joyfully agree with you. Let them that prove most given to change, from the unchangeable rule and example, be taken for the hinderers of our unity and peace.

§ 2. *Ans.* "From all other deadly sin," is better than "from all other heinous sin," upon the reason here given; because the wages of sin is death.

Reply. There is so much mortal poison in the Popish distinction of mortal and venial sin, (by which abundance of sins are denied to be sins at all properly, but only analogically,) that the stomach that feareth it, is not to be charged with niceness. The words here seem to be used by way of distinction, and all "deadly sin" seemeth not to be spoken of "all sin." And if so, your reason from Rom. vi, 23, is vain, and ours firm.

§ 3. *Ans.* “From sudden death,” as good as “from dying suddenly;” which therefore we pray against, that we may not be unprepared.

Reply. We added “unprepared” as expository, or hinting to shew the reason why sudden death is prayed against, and so to limit our prayers to that sudden death, which we are unprepared for; there being some ways of sudden death no more to be prayed against, than death itself simply considered may. When you say “from sudden death” is as good as “from dying suddenly” we confess it is. But not so good as “from dying suddenly and unpreparedly.” We hope you intend not to make any believe, that our turning the adjective to an adverb was our reformation. And yet we wondered to hear this made a common jest upon us, as from those that had seen our papers. Would you have had us say “from sudden and unprepared death?” You would then have had more matter of just exception against the words “unprepared death” than now you have against “dying suddenly.” A man may be well prepared to die suddenly by martyrdom for Christ, or by war for his prince, and many other ways.

§ 4. *Ans.* “All that travel,” as little liable to exceptions as “those that travel,” and more agreeable to the phrase of Scripture, (1 Tim. ii, 1,) “I will that prayers be made for all men.”

Reply. An universal is to be understood properly, as comprehending all the individuals, and so is not an indefinite. And we know not that we are bound to pray for thieves, and pirates, and traitors that travel by land, or water, on such errands as Faux, or the other powder plotters, or the Spanish Armada, in 1588, or as Parry, or any that should travel on the errand as Clement or Raviliae did to the two King Henrys of France. Are these niceties with you?

§ 5. *Ans.* “The two collect[s for St. John’s day and Innocents’, &c.”] We do not find, nor do they say, what is to be amended in these collects; therefore to say anything particularly were to answer to we know not what.

Reply. We are glad that one word in the proper collects, hath appeared such to you as needs a reformation, especially when you told us before that the liturgy was never found fault with by those to whom the name of Protestant most properly belongs; which looked upon our hopes of reformation, almost as destructively as the papists' doctrine of infallibility doth, when we dealt with them. As for the collects mentioned by us, you should not wonder that we brought not in a particular charge against them. For first, we had a conceit that it was best for us to deal as gently and tenderly as we could with the faults of the liturgy, and therefore we have under our generals, hid abundance of particulars, which you may find in the Abridgment of the Lincolnshire ministers, and in many other books. And secondly, we had a conceit, that you would have vouchsafed to have treated with us personally in presence, according to the sense of his majesty's commission, and then we thought to have told you particularly of such matters: but you have forced us to confess, that we find ourselves deceived.

THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

§ 1. Kyries. *Ans.* To say, "Lord, have mercy upon us," after every commandment is more quick and active than to say it once at the close; and why Christian people should not upon their knees ask their pardon for their life forfeited for the breach of every commandment, and pray for grace to keep them for the time to come, they must be more than ignorant that can scruple.

Reply. We thank you for saying nothing against our four first requests; though we are thought more than ignorant for our scruple, we can truly say, we are willing to learn. But your bare opinion is not enough to cure ignorance, and more. By your reason, you may make kneeling the gesture for hearing the Scriptures read, and hearing sermons, and all. If you will but interweave prayers, he must be more than ignorant that will not kneel. The universal church of Christ was more than ignorant for many hundred years, that not only

neglected, but prohibited genuflexion in all adoration each Lord's day; when now, the xx Exodus or v Deut. may not be heard or read without kneeling, save only by the clergy.

§ 2. Homilies. *Ans.* Some livings are so small that they are not able to maintain a licensed preacher; and in such and the like cases this provision is necessary. For can any reason be given, why the minister's reading a homily, set forth by common authority, should not be accounted preaching of the Word, as well as his reading (or pronouncing by heart) a homily or sermon of his own, or any other man's.

Reply. When the Usurper would quickly have brought livings to that competency, as would have maintained able preachers, we may not question whether just authority will do it. Secondly. When abundance of able ministers, cast out, would be glad of liberty to preach for nothing, this pretence hath no taste or sense in it. Thirdly. When we may not, without the imputation of uncharitableness, once imagine that your lordships, with your deans, and other officers, do not value the saving of souls above money, we may conclude that you will voluntarily allow so much out of your ample revenues as will supply such places, or many of them; the rather because we find you charging them as desiring inordinately the honours and wealth of the world, that would have had all ministers to have had 100*l.* or 80*l.* per annum a piece; and therefore may conclude that you will take no more, if you hate that sin more than they do that are accused of it. But the next part of your answer frighteth us more; to which we say, that we will not differ with you for the name, whether reading homilies may be called preaching. But we take the boldness to say, that it is another manner of preaching that Christ and his apostles sent men to perform, and which the church hath gloried in, and been edified by, to this day, and which thousands of souls have been brought to heaven by, and which we again desire may be enjoined, and not left so indifferent.

§ 3. Sentences. *Ans.* The sentences tend all to exhort the people to pious liberality, whether the object be the minister, or the poor, and though some of the sentences be apocryphal, they may be useful for that purpose. Why collection for the poor should be made at another time, there is no reason given, only change desired.

Reply. 1. We have oft told you why the Apocrypha should be cautiously used in the church. That usurper that should pretend to the crown, and have a more numerous party than the king (that hath the undoubted right), will be looked on more suspiciously than ordinary subjects. 2. It is a sordid thing for ministers to love money; and it is sordid, unless in extraordinary necessities, to have them beg, and beg for themselves, and beg under pretence of serving God, even in times when the clergy seem advanced. 3. We confess ourselves deceived in thinking we should have free, personal debates with you, which made us reserve many of our reasons. Our reasons are, 1, for less disturbance. 2. Because the people's affections are much more raised usually, and so fitter for returns, when they have received. 3. Because especially it is most seasonable to do the acts of gratitude, when we have received the obliging benefits; and so say, "What shall I give the Lord for all his benefits?" when we have partaken of them; and to offer ourselves first, and, with ourselves, what he giveth us, unto him, when we have received him, and his grace offered to us.

These are the reasons that brought us under your censure of desiring a change.

§ 4. 3 [rd] Exhort. *Ans.* The first and third exhortations are very seasonable before the communion, to put men in mind how they ought to be prepared, and in what danger they are to come unprepared; that if they be not duly qualified, they may depart, and be better prepared another time.

Reply. But is it not more seasonable, that, in so great business, such warning go a considerable time before? Is there then leisure of self-examination, and making restitution,

and satisfaction, and going to the minister for council to quiet his conscience, &c., in order to the present sacrament? We yet desire these things may be sooner told them.

§ 5. Exc. 1. *Ans.* We fear this may discourage many. Certainly themselves cannot desire that men should come to the holy communion with a troubled conscience, and therefore have no reason to blame the church for saying, it is requisite that men come with a quiet conscience, and prescribing means for quieting thereof. If this be to discourage men, it is fit they should be discouraged and deterred, and kept from the communion, till they have done all that is here directed by the church, which they may well do, considering that this exhortation shall be read in the church the Sunday or holyday before.

Reply. But we can and do desire that many that have a troubled conscience, and cannot otherwise quiet it, should come to the communion for remedy, and not be discouraged or kept away.

§ 6. [Exc. 3.] Minister's turning. *Ans.* The minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks to them, as in Lessons, Absolution, and Benedictions, it is convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient church ever did: the reasons of which you may see, Aug. lib. 2, de Ser. Dom. in Monte.

Reply. It is not yet understood by us why the ministers or people (for which you mean by "they all" we know not) should turn another way in prayer: for we think the people should hear the prayers of the minister, if not, Latin prayers may serve; and then you need not except against extemporate prayers, because the people cannot own them, for how can most of them own what they hear not, whatever it be? As for Augustine's reason for looking towards the east when we pray, *Ut admoneatur animus ad naturam excellentiorem se convertere, id est, ad Dominum; cum ipsum corpus ejus, quod est terrenum, ad corpus excellentius, id est, ad corpus cæleste*

convertitur, we suppose you will not expect that we should be much moved by it; if we should, why should not we worship towards any of the creatures visible, when we can pretend such reasons for it as minding us of superior things? And why should we not look southward when the sun is in the south?

And we fear the worshipping towards the sun, as representing or minding us of Christ's heavenly body, is too like to the prohibited worshipping before an image, and too like that worshipping before the host of heaven, in which the old idolatry consisted, or at least which was the introduction of it; of which our Protestant writers treat at large against the papists, on the point of image-worship. See also Vossius de *Idolatriâ*, lib. ii, cap. 23, &c.

§ 7. Exc. 4. *Ans.* It appears by the greatest evidences of antiquity, that it was upon the 25th day of December. S. Aug. in *Psa.* cxxxii.

Reply. It is not Aug. alone in *Psa.* cxxxii that must tell us which way the greatest evidences of antiquity go; and his reasoning that John must decrease, and Christ must increase, as proved by John's being born when the days decrease, and Christ's being born when the days increase, doth not much invite us to receive his testimony. We conceive the ancient opinion of Jerusalem, and other eastern churches that were nearest to the place, is a greater argument for the contrary than you have here given us for what you thus affirm. We might set Epiphanius against Augustine, and call the Greek churches, till in the midst of Chrysostom's time, when they changed their opinion. And in our time the judgment of the famous chronologers, Scaliger, Berraldus, Broughton, Calvisius, Capellus, Clopenburgius, with many others, are not contemptible, as set against such an unproved assertion as this.

§ 8. [Exc. 5.] "That our sinful bodies," &c. *Ans.* It can no more be said those words do give greater efficacy to the blood than to the body of Christ, than when our Lord saith, "This is my blood which is shed for you and for many

for the remission of sins," etc., and saith not so explicitly of the body.

Reply. Sure Christ there intimateth no such distinction as is here intimated: there his body is said to be broken for us, and not only for our bodies.

§ 9. [Exe. 7.] To every communicant kneeling. *Ans.* It is most requisite that the minister deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand, and repeat the words in the singular number; for so much as it is the propriety of sacraments to make particular obsequation to each believer, and it is our visible profession that, by the grace of God, Christ tasted death for every man.

Reply. 1. Did not Christ know the propriety of sacraments better than we, and yet he delivered it in the plural number to all at once, with a take ye, eat ye, drink ye all of it; we had rather study to be obedient to our Master, than to be wiser than he. 2. As God maketh the general offer, which giveth to no man a personal interest, till his own acceptance first appropriate it; so it is fit that the minister that is God's agent imitate him, when his example and the reason of it so concur to engage us to it; Clemens Alexandr. Stromat., lib. i, Prope, in it giveth a reason, as we understand him, for the contrary; that man being a free agent, must be the chooser or refuser for himself,——*αὐτον δι' ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιστρέπειν.* *Quemadmodum eucharistiam cum quidem, ut mos est diviserint, permittunt unicuique ex populo ejus partem sumere:* and after rendereth this reason, *ἀρίστη γὰρ πρὸς τὴν ἀκριβῆ αἰρήσιν καὶ φυγὴν ἢ συνείδησις:* *ad accuratè enim perfecteque eligendum ac fugiendum, optima est conscientia.*

And that thing is so agreeable to your own doctinal principles, that we fear you disrelish it, because it comes from us.

§ 10. Kneel at sac. [Exe. 8.] *Ans.* Concerning kneeling at the sacrament we have given account already; only thus much we add, that we conceive it an error to say that the Scripture affirms the apostles to have received not kneeling. The posture of the paschal supper we know; but the institution of the holy sacrament was after supper; and what posture

was then used, the Scripture is silent. The rubric at the end of the [first Book of Common Prayer, Edw. VI, 1549,] that leaves kneeling, crossing, &c., indifferent, is meant only at such times as they are not prescribed and required. But at the eucharist kneeling is expressly required in the rubric following.

Reply. Doubtless, when Matthew and Mark say it was as they did eat, to which before it is said, that they sat down; and when interpreters generally agree upon it, this would easily have satisfied you, if you had been as willing to believe it, as to believe the contrary. Matt. xxvi, 20, 21, 26: the same phrase is used verse 26, as in verse 21, where it sheweth, they were still sitting. For the sense of the rubric if you prove that the makers so interpret it, we shall not deny it; but the reason of both seems the same.

§ 11. Com[municate] three times a year. [Exc. 9.] *Ans.* This desire to have the parishioners at liberty, whether they will ever receive the communion or not, savours of too much neglect and coldness of affection towards the holy sacrament. It is more fitting that order should be taken to bring it into more frequent use, as it was in the first and best times. Our rubric is directly according to the ancient Council of Eliberis, can. 81. (Gratian de Consecrat.) No man is to be accounted a good catholic Christian that does not receive three times in the year. The distempers which indispose men to it must be corrected, not the receiving of the sacrament therefore omitted. It is a pitiful pretence to say they are not fit, and make their sin their excuse. Formerly our church was quarrelled at for not compelling men to the communion; now for urging men. How should she please?

Reply. We confess it is desirable that all our distempers and unfitnesses should be healed; and we desire with you that sacraments may be oftener: but that every person in the parish that is unfit, be forced to receive, is that which we cannot concur with you to be guilty of. Two sorts we think unfit, to be so forced at least. First, abundance of people, grossly ignorant and scandalous, that will eat and drink

judgment to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body. Secondly, many melancholy, and otherwise troubled doubting souls, that if they should receive the sacrament before they find themselves more fit, would be in danger to go out of their wits, with fear, lest it would seal them to destruction, and as the liturgy saith, lest the devil enter into them as into Judas : or at least it would grievously deject them. As formerly, so now, there is great reason at once to desire, that the unprepared be not forced to the sacrament, and yet that so great a part of the body of the church may not be let alone in your communion, without due admonition and discipline, that ordinarily neglect or refuse the church's communion in this sacrament : those that are so profane should be kept away, but withal they should be proceeded with by discipline, till they repent, or are cast out of the church.

§ 12. *Ans.* This rubric is not the liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law ; nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry. Besides, the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th Article of the Church of England. The time appointed we conceive sufficient.

Reply. Can there be any hurt or danger in the people's being taught to understand the church aright? Hath not Bishop Hall taught you in his life of a Romanist beyond sea, that would have faced him down, that the church of England is for transubstantiation, because of our kneeling, p. 20? And the same bishop (greatly differing from you) saith in the same book, p. 294, "but to put all scruples out of the mind of any reader concerning this point, let that serve for the upshot of all, which is expressly set down in the fifth rubric in the end of the communion set forth, as the judgment of the church of England, both in King Edward and Queen Elizabeth's times (note that) though lately upon negligence (note upon negligence) omitted in the impression ;" and so recites the words. Where you say, there is no great need, &c. We reply, 1. Profaneness may be opposed nevertheless for our instructing the people against idolatry. 2. The abounding of

papists, who in this point seem to us idolatrous, sheweth that there is danger of it. 3. The commonness of idolatry throughout the world, and the case of the Israelites of old, shew that man's nature is prone to it. 4. Profaneness and idolatry befriend each other; as God is jealous against idolatry, so should all faithful pastors of the church be, and not refuse such a caution to the people and say, there is no great need of it.

PUBLIC BAPTISM.

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] "Until they have made due profession of repentance," &c. *Ans.* We think this desire to be very hard and uncharitable, punishing the poor infants for the parents' sakes, and giving also too great and arbitrary a power to the minister to judge which of his parishioners he pleaseth atheists, infidels, heretics, &c., and then in that name to reject their children from being baptized. Our church concludes more charitably, that Christ will favourably accept every infant to baptism, that is presented by the church according to our present order. And this she concludes out of holy Scripture (as you may see in the office of baptism) according to the practice and doctrine of the catholic church. (Cypr. Ep. 59, August. Ep. 28, et de verb. Apost. Serm. 14.)

Reply. We perceive you will stick with us in more than ceremonies. To your reasons we reply, 1. By that reason, all the children of all heathens or infidels in the world should be admitted to baptism; because they should not be punished for the parents' sakes. 2. But we deny that it is (among Christians that believe original sin) any absurdity to say, that children are punished for their parents' sakes. 3. But yet we deny this to be any such punishment at all, unless you will call their non-deliverance a punishment. They are the children of wrath by nature, and have original sin. The covenant of grace that giveth the saving benefits of Christ, is made to none but the faithful, and their seed. Will you call

this a punishing them for their fathers' sakes, that God hath extended his covenant to no more? Their parents' infidelity doth but leave them in their original sin and misery, and is not further itself imputed to them. If you know of any covenant or promise of salvation made to all without condition, or to infants, or on any other condition or qualification, but that they be the seed of the faithful dedicated to God; you should do well to shew it us, and not so slightly pass over things of so great moment, in which you might much help the world out of darkness, if you can make good what you intimate. If indeed you mean as you seem to speak, that it is uncharitableness to punish any infants for the parent's faults, and that a non-liberation is such a punishment; then you must suppose that all the infants of heathens, Jews, and Turks are saved (that die in infancy,) or else Christ is uncharitable. And if they are all saved without baptism, then baptism is of no such use, or necessity, as you seem to think. What then is the privilege of the seed of the faithful, that they are holy, and that the covenant is made with them, and God will be their God? We fear you will again revive the opinion of the Anabaptists among the people, when they observe that you have no more to say for the baptizing of the children of the faithful, than of infidels, heathens, and atheists. To your second objection we answer, you will drive many a faithful labourer from the work of Christ, if he may not be in the ministry unless he will baptize the children of heathens, infidels, and excommunicate ones, before their parents do repent. And the first question is not, who shall be the judge? But, whether we must be all thus forced? Is not the question as great, who shall be the judge of the unfitness of persons for the Lord's supper? And yet, there, you think it not a taking too much upon us to keep away the scandalous, if they have their appeals to you? And is it indeed a power too great and arbitrary to have a *judicium discretionis* about our own acts; and not to be forced to baptize the children of heathens against our consciences? Who judged for the baptizers in the primitive

church, what persons they should baptize? We act but as engines under you, not as men, if we must not use our reason; and we are more miserable than brutes or men, if we must be forced to go against our consciences, unless you will save us harmless before God. O that in a fair debate you would prove to us that such children as are described are to be baptized, and that the ministers that baptize them, must not have power to discern whom to baptize. But who mean you by the churches, that must present every infant that Christ may accept them? Is every infant first in the promise of pardon? If so, shew us that promise, and then sure God will make good that promise, though heathen parents present not their children to him, as your grounds suppose; if not, then will the sign save those that are not in the promise? But is it the godfathers that are the church? Who ever called them so? And if by the church you mean the minister, and by presenting, you mean baptizing them, then any heathen's child that a minister can catch up and baptize shall be saved: which, if it could be proved, would persuade us to go hunt for children in Turkey, Tartary, or America, and secretly baptize them, in a habit that should not make us known. But there is more of fancy than charity in this; and Christ never invited any to him but the children of the promise to be thus presented and baptized.

§ 2. [Exc. 2.] The time appointed we conceive sufficient.

Reply. We conjecture the words that conclude your former subject being misplaced, are intended as your answer to this: and if all the children of any sort in the world that are brought to us, must by us be baptized without distinction, indeed it is no great matter what time we have notice of it.

§ 3. [Exc. 3.] "And the godfathers," &c. *Ans.* It is an erroneous doctrine, and the ground of many others, and of many of your exceptions, that children have no other right to baptism, than in their parents' right. The church's primitive practice forbids it to be left to the pleasure of parents, whether there shall be other sureties or no. (S. Aug. Ep. 23.) It is

fit we should observe carefully the practice of venerable antiquity, as they desire, Prop. 18.

Reply. It seems we differ in doctrine, though we subscribe the same articles. We earnestly desire you distinctly to tell us, what is the infant's title to baptism, if it be not to be found in the parent? Assign it, and prove it when you have done, as well as we prove their right, as they are the seed of believers, dedicated by them to God, and then we promise to consent. It is strange to us to hear so much of the churches' primitive practice, where so little evidence of it is produced. Aug., Ep. 23, talketh not of primitive practice: *ab initio non fuit sic*. Was it so in the apostles' days? And afterwards you prove not that it was the judgment of the catholic church, that bare sponsors instead of parents. Pro-parents, or owners of the children, might procure to the children of all infidels, a title to baptism and its benefits. Such susceptors as became the owners or adopters of the children, are to be distinguished from those that *pro forma* stand by for an hour during the baptizing of the children, and ever after leave them to their parents; who, as they have the natural interest in them, and power of their disposal, and the education of them, so are fittest to covenant in their names.

§ 4. [Exc. 4.] *Ans.* The font usually stands, as it did in primitive times, at or near the church door, to signify that baptism was the entrance into the church mystical; "we are all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii, 13); and the people may hear well enough. If Jordan, and all other waters, be not so far sanctified by Christ as to be the matter of baptism, what authority have we to baptize? And sure his baptism was *dedicatio baptismi*.

Reply. Our less difference of the font and flood Jordan, is almost drowned in the greater before going. But to the first we say that we conceive the usual situation for the people's hearing is to be preferred before your ceremonious position of it. And to the second we say, that *dedicatio baptismi* is an unfitting phrase; and yet, if it were not, what is that to the

sanctification of Jordan, and all other waters? Did Christ sanctify all corn or bread, or grapes or wine, to an holy use, when he administered the Lord's supper? Sanctifying is separating to an holy use. But the flood Jordan, and all other water, is not separated to this holy use, in any proper sense, no more than all mankind is sanctified to the priestly office, because men were made priests.

§ 5. [Exc. 5.] *Ans.* It hath been accounted reasonable, and allowed by the best laws, that guardians should covenant and contract for their minors to their benefit. By the same right, the church hath appointed sureties to undertake for children, when they enter into covenant with God by baptism. And this general practice of the church is enough to satisfy those that doubt.

Reply. 1. Who made those sureties guardians of the infants, that are neither parents nor pro-parents, nor owners of them? We are not now speaking against sponsors; but you know that the very original of those sponsors is a great controversy: and whether they were not at first most properly sponsors for the parents that they should perform that part they undertook, because many parents were deserters, and many proved negligent. Sponsors then excluded not parents from their proper undertaking, but joined with them. God-fathers are not the infants' guardians with us, and therefore have not power thus to covenant and vow in their name. We intreat you to take heed of leaving any children, indeed, out of the mutual covenant that are baptized. How are those in the covenant, that cannot consent themselves, and do it not by any that truly represent them, nor have any authority to act as in their names? The authority of parents being most unquestionable (who by nature, and the word of God, have the power of disposing of their children, and consequently of choosing and covenanting for them), why should it not be preferred? At least you may give leave to those parents that desire it, to be the dedicators of and covenanters for their own children, and not force others on them, whether they will or no. 2. But the question is not of covenanting, but

professing present, actual believing, forsaking, &c., in which though we believe the church's sense was sound, yet we desire that all things that may render it liable to misunderstanding may be avoided.

§ 6. [Exc. 6.] "Receive remission of sins by spiritual regeneration." *Ans.* Most proper, for baptism is our spiritual regeneration, St. John iii. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit," &c. And by this is received remission of sins, Acts ii, 38. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins." So the creed: "One baptism for the remission of sins."

Reply. Baptism, as an outward administration, is our visible sacramental regeneration: baptism, as containing, with the sign, the thing signified, is our spiritual, real regeneration. As we are regenerated before baptism (as you know adult believers are), so we cannot pray to receive remission of sins by that same regeneration renewed. As we are regenerated really in baptism, that regeneration and remission are conjunct benefits. But if baptism at once give regeneration and remission, it follows not that it gives remission by regeneration: but as regeneration comprehendeth the whole change, real or physical, and relative; so we acknowledge, that, as the part is given by the whole, you may say that remission is given by regeneration, but more fitly *in* it than *by* it. But we are not willing to make more ado about words than needs.

§ 7. [Exc. 7.] "We cannot in faith say that every child that is baptized is regenerate," &c. *Ans.* Seeing that God's sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not *ponere obicem*, put any bar against them (which children cannot do); we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; and the denial of it tends to anabaptism, and the contempt of this holy sacrament, as nothing worthy, nor material, whether it be administered to children or no. Concerning the cross, we refer to our answer to the same in general.

Reply. All God's sacraments attain their proper end. But whether the infants of infidels be the due subjects, and whether their end be to seal up grace and salvation to them that have no promise of it, or whether it be only to seal the covenant to believers and their seed, are questions yet undecided, wherein we must intreat you not to expect that we should implicitly believe you; and it is as easy for us to tell you, that you are promoting anabaptism, and much more easy to prove it. We take those but for words of course.

PRIVATE BAPTISM.

“We desire that baptism may not be administered in a private place.” *Ans.* And so do we, where it may be brought into the public congregation. But since our Lord hath said, St. John iii, “Unless one be born of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,” we think it fit that they should be baptized in private, rather than not at all. It is appointed now to be done by the lawful minister.

Reply. We must needs suppose you are disputing with Protestants, who ordinarily shew the Papists, that that text, John iii, asserteth no absolute necessity of baptism to salvation. But we believe as well as you, that it is the regular way of solemn initiation into the covenant and church of Christ, which none that indeed are the children of the promise should neglect. As coronation solemnizeth his entrance upon the kingdom, that had before the title; and as marriage solemnizeth that which before was done by consent; so baptism solemnizeth the mutual covenant, which before had a mutual consent: and none is authorised to consent for infants but those that by nature, and God's law, have the power of disposing of them, and whose will is *in sensu forensi*, the children's will: it solemnly investeth us in what we had an antecedent right to, and therefore belongs to none but those that have that right; and this we are ready to make good by any fair debate that you will allow us.

Ans. Nor is anything done in private, reiterated in public, but the solemn reception into the congregation, with the prayers for him, and the public declaration before the congregation, of the infant, now made by the godfathers, that the whole congregation may testify against him, if he does not perform it, which the ancients made great use of.

Reply. Do you not say in the rubric “and let them not doubt, but the child so baptized is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again.” And after, “I certify you that in this case all is well done, &c.” And yet you do not renew all the baptismal covenant, renouncing the flesh, &c., and engaging into the Christian belief; and that you may see that the church of England taketh not all infants infallibly to be regenerated by baptism (unless you grant that they repent to the substance of baptism) the baptismal prayer is here used, for the fore-baptized, that God will give his Holy Spirit to this infant, that he being born again, and made heir of everlasting salvation, &c., which sheweth that he is now supposed to be *regenerandus, non regeneratus*. Do they pray for his regeneration, whom they account regenerate already? You must either confess that there they repeat much of the substance of baptism, and take the child as not baptized, or else that they take the baptized child to be not regenerate. And then we may well take them for unregenerate, that shew no signs of it, at years of discretion, but live a carnal and ungodly life, though they can say the Catechism, and seek confirmation.

OF THE CATECHISM.

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] *Ans.* 2. Though divers have been of late baptized without godfathers, yet many have been baptized with them; and those may answer the questions as they are; the rest must answer according to truth. But there is no reason to alter the rule of the Catechism for some men's irregularities.

Reply. If you will have a Catechism proper to those that

had godfathers, give leave to others to use one that will teach them, as you say, to answer according to truth: and let us, in the same, have that liberty of leaving out the doubtful opinion of godfathers and godmothers, and that which we think too childish a beginning,—“what is your name?” and let us use one that speaks more of the necessary doctrines of salvation, and nothing but necessaries.

§ 2. *Ans.* 2. [“Wherein I was made a member of Christ,” &c. *Exc.* 2.] We conceive this expression as safe as that which they desire, and more fully expressing the efficacy of the sacrament, according to St. Paul, the 26 and 27, Gal iii, where St. Paul proves them all to be children of God, because they were baptized, and in their baptism had put on Christ; “if children, then heirs,” or, which is all one, “inheritors,” Rom. viii, 17.

Reply. By baptism Paul means not the carcase of baptism, but the baptismal dedication, and covenanting with God; they that do this by themselves, if at age, or by parents or pro-parents authorized (if infants) sincerely, are truly members of Christ and children of God, and heirs of heaven; they that do this but hypocritically, and verbally, as Simon Magus did, are visibly such as the others are really: but really are still in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity, and have no part or lot in this business, their hearts being not right in the sight of God. This is that truth which we are ready to make good.

§ 3. Ten com[mandments] [*Exc.* 3.] *Ans.* We conceive the present translation to be agreeable to many ancient copies: therefore the change to be needless.

Reply. What ancient copy hath the seventh day in the end of the fourth commandment, instead of the sabbath day? Did King James cause the Bible to be new translated to so little purpose? We must bear you witness that, in some cases, you are not given to change.

§ 4. [*Exc.* 4.] “My duty towards God,” &c. *Ans.* It is not true that there is nothing in that answer which refers to the fourth commandment: for the last words of the answer

do orderly relate to the last commandment of the first table, which is the fourth.

Reply. And think you, indeed, that the 4th commandment obligeth you no more to one day in seven, than equally to all the days of your life? This exposition may make us think that some are more serious, than else we could have imagined, in praying after that commandment, Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

§ 5. [Exc. 5.] “Two only as generally necessary to salvation,” &c. *Ans.* These words are a reason of the answer, that there are two only, and therefore not to be left out.

Reply. The words seem to imply by distinction, that there may be others not so necessary: and the Lord’s supper was not by the ancients taken to be necessary to the salvation of all.

§ 6. [Exc. 6.] “We desire that the entering of infants,” &c. *Ans.* The effect of children’s baptism depends neither upon their own present actual faith and repentance (which the Catechism says expressly they cannot perform), nor upon the faith and repentance of their natural parents or pro-parents, or of their godfathers or godmothers; but upon the ordinance and institution of Christ. But it is requisite that when they come to age they should perform these conditions of faith and repentance, for which also their godfathers and godmothers charitably undertook on their behalf. And what they do for the infant in this case, the infant himself is truly said to do, as in the courts of this kingdom daily the infant does answer by his guardian: and it is usual for to do homage by proxy, and for princes to marry by proxy. For the further justification of this answer, see St. Aug. Ep. 23. ad. Bonifac. *Nihil aliud credere, quam fidem habere: ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulum credere, qui fidei nondum habet effectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum. Quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Itaque parvulum etsi nondum fides illa, quæ in credentium voluntate consistit, tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum, fidelem facit.*

Reply. 1. You remove not at all the inconvenience of the words, that seem to import what you yourselves disclaim. 2. We know that the effects of baptism do depend on all the necessary con-causes, on God's mercy, or Christ's merits, on the institution, and on baptism itself according to its use, as a delivering investing sign and seal; and they depend upon the promise sealed by baptism; and the promise supposeth the qualified subject, or requisite condition in him, that shall have the benefit of it. To tell us therefore of a common cause, on which the effect depends, viz., the institution of baptism itself, when we are inquiring after the special condition that proveth the person to be the due subject, to whom both promise and baptism doth belong; this is but to seem to make an answer. Either all baptized absolutely are justified and saved, or not. If yea, then Christianity is another kind of thing than Peter or Paul understood, that thought it was not the washing of water, but the answer of a good conscience to God. Then let us catch heathens and dip them, and save them in despite of them. But if any condition be requisite (as we are sure there is) our question is, what it is? and you tell us of baptism itself. Did ever Augustine [teach that every one baptized] *jure, vel injuria*, was to be esteemed a believer? We grant with Austin, that infants of believers, *propter sacramentum fidei*, are visibly and professedly to be numbered with believers; but neither Austin, nor we, will ever grant you that this is true of all that you can catch, and use this form of baptism over. The seal will not save them that have no part in the promise.

§ 7. [Exc. 7.] *Ans.* The Catechism is not intended as a whole body of divinity, but as a comprehension of the articles of faith, and other doctrines most necessary to salvation; and being short, is fittest for children and common people, and, as it was thought, sufficient upon mature deliberation, and so is by us.

Reply. The creed, the decalogue, and the Lord's prayer, contain all that is absolutely necessary to salvation at least. If you intended no more, what need you make a Catechism?

If you intend more, why have you no more? But, except in the very words of the creed, the essentials of Christianity are left out. If no explication be necessary, trouble them with no more than the text of the creed, &c. If explication be necessary, let them have it; at least in a larger Catechism, fitter for the riper.

CONFIRMATION.

§ 1. Rub. 1. [Exc. 1.] *Ans.* It is evident that the meaning of these words is, that children baptized, and dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed: wherein we see not what danger there can be of misleading the vulgar by teaching them truth. But there may be danger in this desire of having these words expunged, as if they were false; for St. Austin says he is an infidel that denies them to be true. Ep. 23, ad Bonifac.

Reply. What? all children saved, whether they be children of the promise or no? Or can you shew us a text that saith whoever is baptized shall be saved? The Common Prayer book plainly speaks of the non-necessity of unction, confirmation, and other popish ceremonies and sacraments, and meaneth that *ex parte ecclesiæ*, they have all things necessary to salvation, and are undoubtedly saved, supposing them the due subjects, and that nothing be wanting *ex parte sui*; which certainly is not the case of such as are not children of the promise and covenant. The child of an heathen doth not *ponere obicem* actually, *quo minus baptizetur*, and yet being baptized is not saved, on your own reckoning (as we understand you); therefore the parent can *ponere obicem*, and either hinder the baptism, or effect, to his infant. Austin speaks not there of all children whatever, but those that are offered *per aliorum spiritualem voluntatem*, by the parents usually, or by those that own them after the parents be dead, or they [be] exposed, or become theirs. He speaks also of what may be done, *et de eo quod fieri non posse arbitratur*. But our question is, what is done? and not, what God can

do. Our great question is, what children they be that baptism belongeth to?

§ 2. "Rub. after the Catechism." [Ex. 2.] "We conceive that it is not a sufficient qualification," &c. *Ans.* We conceive that this qualification is required rather as necessary than as sufficient; and therefore it is the duty of the minister of the place (can. 61) to prepare children in the best manner to be presented to the bishop for confirmation, and to inform the bishop of their fitness; but submitting the judgment to the bishop, both of this, and other qualifications, and not that the bishop should be tied to the minister's consent. Compare this rubric to the second rubric before the catechism, and there is required what is further necessary and sufficient.

Reply. 1. If we have all necessary ordinarily, we have that which is sufficient *ad esse*: there is more ordinarily necessary than to say those words. 2. Do you owe the king no more obedience? Already do you contradict his Declaration, which saith, confirmation shall be performed by the information, and with the consent of the minister of the place! But if the minister's consent shall not be necessary, take all the charge upon your own souls, and let your souls be answerable for all.

§ 3. [Exc. 3.] "They see no need of godfathers." *Ans.* Here the compilers of the liturgy did, and so doth the church, that there may be a witness of the confirmation.

Reply. It is like to be your own work as you will use it, and we cannot hinder you from doing it in your own way. But are godfathers no more than witnesses? &c.

§ 4. [Exc. 4.] "This supposeth that all children," &c. *Ans.* It supposeth, and that truly, that all children were at their baptism regenerate by water and the Holy Ghost, and had given unto them the forgiveness of all their sins: and it is charitably presumed that, notwithstanding the frailties and slips of their childhood, they have not totally lost what was in baptism conferred upon them; and therefore adds, "Strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the

Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them their manifold gifts of grace," &c. None that lives in open sin ought to be confirmed.

Reply. 1. Children, baptized without right, cannot be presumed to be really regenerate and pardoned. 2. We speak only of those that, by living in open sin, do show themselves to be unjustified, and these you confess should not be confirmed. O that you would but practise that: if not, this confession will witness against you.

§ 5. [Exc. 5.] "Rubric before the imposition of hands." *Ans.* Confirmation is reserved to the bishop *in honorem ordinis*, to bless being an act of authority. So it was of old: St. Hierom, Dial. adv. Lucifer. says it was *totius orbis consensio in hanc partem*: and St. Cyprian to the same purpose, Ep. 73; and our church doth everywhere profess, as she ought, to conform to the catholic usages of the primitive times, from which causelessly to depart, argues rather love of contention than of peace. The reserving of confirmation to the bishop doth argue the dignity of the bishop above presbyters, who are not allowed to confirm, but does not argue any excellency in confirmation above the sacraments. St. Hierom argues the quite contrary (ad Lucif. c. 4.):—That because baptism was allowed to be performed by a deacon, but confirmation only by a bishop, therefore baptism was most necessary, and of the greatest value: the merey of God allowing the most necessary means of salvation to be administered by inferior orders, and restraining the less necessary to the higher, for the honour of their order.

Reply. O that we had the primitive episcopacy, and that bishops had no more churches to oversee than in the primitive times they had; and then we would never speak against this reservation of confirmation to the honour of the bishop. But when that bishop of one church is turned into that bishop of many hundred churches; and when he is now a bishop of the lowest rank, that was an archbishop, when archbishops first came up, and so we have not really existent

any mere bishops (such as the ancients knew) at all, but only archbishops and their curates, marvel not, if we would not have confirmation proper to archbishops, nor one man undertake more than a hundred can perform! But if you will do it, there is no remedy. We have to acquit ourselves.

§ 6. [Exc. 6.] *Ans.* Prayer after the imposition of hands is grounded upon the practice of the apostles (Heb. vi, 2; and Acts viii, 17;) nor doth 25th article say that confirmation is a corrupt imitation of the apostles' practice, but that the five commonly called sacraments have ground partly of the corrupt following the apostles, &c., which may be applied to some other of these five, but cannot be applied to confirmation, unless we make the church speak contradictions.

Reply. But the question is not of imposition of hands in general, but this imposition in particular; and you have never proved, that this sort of imposition, called confirmation, is mentioned in those texts: and the 25th article cannot more probably be thought to speak of any one of the five as proceeding from the corrupt imitation of the apostles, than of confirmation as a supposed sacrament.

§ 7. [Exc. 7.] *Ans.* We know no harm in speaking the language of holy Scripture (Acts viii, 15,) "they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." And though imposition of hands be not a sacrament, yet it is a very fit sign, to certify the persons what is then done for them, as the prayer speaks.

Reply. It is fit to speak the Scripture language in Scripture sense; but if those that have no such power to give the Holy Ghost will say, receive the Holy Ghost, it were better for them to abuse other language than Scripture language.

§ 8. [Last rubric] after confirmation. [Exc. 8.] *Ans.* There is no inconvenience that confirmation should be required before the communion, when it may be ordinarily obtained. That which you here fault, you elsewhere desire.

Reply. We desire that the credible approved profession of faith, and repentance, be made necessities: but not that all

the thousands in England that never yet came under the bishops' hands (as not one of many ever did, even when they were at the highest) may be kept from the Lord's supper: for some cannot have that imposition, and others will not, that yet are fit for communion with the church.

[SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY.]

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] *Ans.* The ring is a significant sign, only of human institution, and was always given as a pledge of fidelity and constant love: and here is no reason given why it should be taken away; nor are the reasons mentioned in the Roman ritualists given in our Common Prayer book.

Reply. We crave not your own forbearance of the ring; but the indifferency in our use of a thing so mis-used, and unnecessary.

§ 2. Exc. 3. *Ans.* These words, "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," if they seem to make matrimony a sacrament, may as well make all sacred, yea civil actions of weight to be sacraments, they being usual at the beginning and ending of all such. It was never heard before now that those words make a sacrament.

Reply. Is there no force in an argument drawn from the appearance of evil, the offence and the danger of abuses, when other words enow may serve turn?

§ 3. [Exc. 5.] *Ans.* They go to the Lord's table because the communion is to follow.

Reply. They must go to the table, whether there be a communion or not.

§ 4. Col. [Exc. 6.] "Consecrated the estate of matrimony to such an excellent mystery," &c. *Ans.* Though the institution of marriage was before the fall, yet it may be now, and is, consecrated by God to such an excellent mystery as the representation of the spiritual marriage between Christ and his church, Eph. v, 23. We are sorry that the words of Scripture will not please. The church, in the 25th article, hath taken away the fear of making it a sacrament.

Reply. When was marriage thus consecrated? If all things, used to set forth Christ's offices, or benefits, by way of similitude, be consecrated; then a judge, a father, a friend, a vine, a door, a way, &c., are all consecrated things: Scripture phrase pleaseth us, in Scripture sense.

§ 5. Rub. [Exc. 7.] "The new married persons the same day of their marriage must receive the holy communion." *Ans.* This inforces none to forbear marriage, but presumes (as well it may) that all persons marriageable ought to be also fit to receive the holy sacrament; and marriage being so solemn a covenant of God, they that undertake it in the fear of God will not stick to seal it by receiving the holy communion, and accordingly prepare themselves for it. It were more Christian to desire that those licentious festivities might be suppressed, and the communion more generally used by those that marry: the happiness would be greater than can easily be expressed. *Unde sufficimus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio.* Tertull. lib. 2, ad Uxorem.

Reply. Indeed! will you phrase and modify your administrations upon such a supposition, that all men are such as they ought to be, and do what they ought to do? Then take all the world for saints, and use them accordingly, and blot out the doctrine of reproof, excommunication, and damnation from your Bibles! Is it not most certain that very many married persons are unfit for the Lord's supper, and will be when you and we have done our best? And is it fit then to compel them to it? But the more unexpected the more welcome is your motion, of that more Christian course of suppressing of licentious festivities. When shall we see such reformation undertaken?

VISITATION OF THE SICK.

§ 1. [Exc. 1.] "Forasmuch as the condition," &c. *Ans.* All which is here desired is already presumed, namely, that the minister shall apply himself to the particular condition of

the person; but this must be done according to the rule of prudence and justice, and not according to his pleasure. Therefore, if the sick person shew himself truly penitent, it ought not to be left to the minister's pleasure to deny him absolution, if he desire it. Our church's direction is according to the 13th canon of the venerable council of Nicæa, both here and in the next that follows.

Reply. But the question is, whether he shew himself truly penitent or not. If we have not, here neither, a judgment of discretion for the conduct of our own actions, what do we with reason? Why are we trusted in the office, and whose judgment must we follow? The bishop cannot have leisure to become the judge whether this man be penitent. It must, then, be the minister or the man himself. And must we absolve every man that saith he repenteth? Then we must believe an incredible profession, which is against reason. Some are known infidels, and in their health profess that they believe not the Scripture to be true, and make a mock at Jesus Christ; and perhaps, in a sickness that they apprehend no danger in, will send for the minister in scorn, to say I repent, and force him to absolve them, that they may deride him and the gospel. Some of us have known, too, many of those that have for twenty or thirty years been common drunkards, seldom sober a week together, and still say, when they came to themselves, that they were sorry for it, and did unfeignedly repent; and as they said in health, so they said in sickness, dying within a few days or weeks after they were last drunk. Must we absolve all these? Some die with a manifest hatred of an holy life, reviling at those that are careful to please God; yet saying they hate them not as holy, but because they are all hypocrites, or the like: and yet will they say they repent of their sins. Some forbear not their accustomed swearing and cursing while they profess repentance. Some make no restitution for the wrong which they say they repent of. And must we take all these for truly penitent? If not, the minister must judge. What you mean by your saying, "Our church's direction is accord-

ing to the 13th canon of the venerable council of Nicæa, both here and in the next that follows," we know not: the second council of Nicæa you cannot mean (its canon being uncertain), and the 13th is of no such sense. And the 13th can. of the first council of Nicæa, is only that lapsed catechumens shall be three years *inter* and *ientes* before they pray again with the catechumens. This shews they then took not up with every word of seeming penitence as true repentance; but what it is to your purpose we know not, nor is there any other canon in that council for you. The 11th canon is sufficiently against you. The lapsed, that truly repented, were to remain among the penitent for three years, and seven years more if they were *fideles*, &c. *Ab omnibus vero illud præcipue observetur, ut animus eorum, et fructus pœnitentiæ attendatur: quicumque enim cum omni timore, et lacrimis perseverantibus, et operibus bonis, conversationem suam, non verbis solis sed opere et veritate demonstrant, cum tempus statutum etiam ab his fuerit impletum, et orationibus jam cæperint communicare, licebit etiam episcopo humanius circa res aliquot cogitare.* We know this rigor as to time was unjust, and that to the dying it was abated: but you see here that bare words (that were not by seriousness and by deeds made credible) were not to be taken as sufficient marks of penitence, of which it was not the person himself that was to be the judge.

§ 2. Exc. 2. *Ans.* The form of absolution in the liturgy is more agreeable to the Scriptures than that which they desire, it being said in St. John xx, "Whose sins you remit, they are remitted," not whose sins you pronounce remitted; and the condition needs not to be expressed, being always necessarily understood.

Reply. It is a controversy among the learnedest expositors, how much that of John xx was proper to the apostles, and such others as were then to have the spirit in an extraordinary manner, who did remit sin effectively by remitting the punishment of it, by casting out devils, healing the sick, &c., according to that of James v, 14, 15. "Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the church, and let them

pray for him, and anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." If, besides this remitting them effectually, the rest be no other than a ministerial pronouncing them forgiven by God according to his covenant in the gospel, then you cannot plead the phrase of a text, which respecteth another way of remission than we pretend to; but must phrase it according to the nature of the thing, and the sense of other Scriptures also that fullier open it. There are three ways of pardoning. 1. By grant or gift, whether by a general act of pardon or a particular. 2. By sentence. 3. By execution, that is, preventing or taking off the penalty. The first of these is done already by God in the gospel. The second God doth principally, and his ministers instrumentally as his messengers. The third (the taking off the penalty) they can do no otherwise, in the case before us, than by praying that God will take it off, and using his ordinary means. So that it is most evident that this absolution, that ministers are to perform, can be no other than to pronounce the penitent believer to be absolved by God, according to his covenant. And if there be no other, should we not speak as intelligibly as we can? Indeed there is more in absolving the excommunicate; for then the church, both judiciously and executively, remitteth the penalty of excommunication (to which also the text, John xx, may have much respect), but the penalty of damnation can be no otherwise remitted by us, than as is expressed. And indeed the thing is of such exceeding weight, that it behoveth us to deal as intelligibly and openly in it as we can. And therefore we admire that you should say "the condition needs not be expressed, being always necessarily understood." By necessarily do you mean *necessitate naturali et irresistibili*, so that all the wicked men in the world cannot choose but understand us to speak conditionally? Surely this is none of your meaning; if it were, it were far from truth. Or do you mean not *de necessitate vel actitudine eventus*, but *de debito ex obligatione*? No

doubt but it is necessary as a duty, and also, *ad finem*, as a means; and therefore it is that we desire it may be expressed. And doubtless you think not that all men do their duties, and understand all that they ought to understand—no, not in this particu- lar. If you mean that all sick men may be rationally supposed to understand it; this can never be believed by us that are acquainted personally (and have been) with so many of whom it is not true. How many think the minister's absolution, and the sacrament, will serve turn with their unsound, hypocritical repentance! How easily is that understood absolutely, or as bad, while they take you to take it for granted that they have the condition which is absolutely expressed.

COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

Ans. It is not fit the minister should have power to deny this viation, or holy communion, to any that humbly desire it according to the rubric; which no man disturbed in his wits can do, and whosoever does must in charity be presumed to be penitent, and fit to receive.

Reply. There is no condition mentioned in the rubric, but that he be desirous to receive the communion in his house: "humbly" is not there. And why may not a man disturbed in his wits desire the communion? You deny things that ordinarily fall out, and yet lay the weight of your cause on that denial. But why must we give the sacrament to those that have lived in gross ignorance, infidelity, and profaneness, and never manifested, credibly, that they repent? You say that whosoever desireth the sacrament, according to the rubric, must in charity be presumed to be penitent. But where hath God commanded or approved so blind and dangerous an act as this, under the name of charity? The ordinary observation of our lives, is not to be confuted by men's assertions: we know by sad experience, that there is abundance of the worst of men among us, that are desirous to receive the sacrament when they are sick, that give no credible evidence of true repentance; but some in the ignorance, and deceit of their hearts; and some as conscious of their impiety, for

which they seek any shifting remedy to quiet their consciences, for the time, are much more eager for this sacrament in their sickness, than many better and more penitent persons. And must we judge all these penitent, and give them the sacrament as such? We must needs profess that we think this course would not be the least effectual service unto Satan, to deceive poor sinners, and keep them from knowing their misery, and seeking aright after the true remedy in time. Pardon us, while we lay together the parts of your doctrine, as we understand it here delivered; and leave it to your consideration, what a church, and what a ministry it would make. 1. All infants of any parents in the world that we can baptize, are undoubtedly regenerate, and in a state of life, and shall be saved, if they so die. 2. The Holy Ghost, and forgiveness of sin, being then given them, it is charitably presumed that they have not totally lost this, notwithstanding the frailties and slips of their childhood; and so when they can say the Catechism, they are to be confirmed. 3. Being confirmed, they are to be admitted to the Lord's supper. 4. All that marry, and others, thrice a year must receive the Lord's supper, though unfit. 5. The minister must absolve all the sick that say they repent (if we understand you): for we suppose you allow not the minister to be judge. 6. This absolution must be absolutely expressed—I absolve thee from all thy sins—without the condition—if thou repent and believe. 7. Whosoever desireth the communion in his sickness, must in charity be presumed to be penitent, and fit to receive. 8. The minister must not have power to forbear such baptizing, absolving, or delivering the communion as aforesaid. We now omit what is said of the dead at burial. And if this be not the ready way to hinder thousands from the necessary knowledge of their unrenewed hearts and lives, and from true repentance, and from valuing Christ as the remedy, and from making a necessary preparation for death; and also the way to lay by abundance of faithful and conscionable ministers, that dare not take such a deceiving dangerous course; we must confess ourselves

much mistaken in the nature of man's corruption, and misery, and the use of God's ordinances for his recovery.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

§ 1. Rub. 1. [Exc. 2.] *Ans.* It is not fit so much should be left to the discretion of every minister; and the desire that all may be said in the church, being not pretended to be for the ease of tender consciences, but of tender heads, may be helped by a cap better than a rubric.

Reply. We marvel that you say nothing at all to our desire that it be expressed in a rubric, that prayers and exhortations there used, be not for the benefit of the dead, but only for the instruction and comfort of the living. You intend to have a very indiscreet ministry, if such a needless circumstance may not be left to their discretion. The contrivance of a cap instead of a rubric sheweth that you are all unacquainted with the subject of which you speak: and if you speak for want of experience of the case of souls, as you now do about the case of men's bodies, we could wish you some of our experience of one sort (by more converse with all the members of the flock) though not of the other. But we would here put these three or four questions to you.

1. Whether such of ourselves as cannot stand still, in the cold winter, at the grave, half so long as the office of burial requireth, without the certain hazard of our lives, (though while we are in motion, we can stay out longer,) are bound to believe your lordships, that a cap will cure this better than a rubric, though we have proved the contrary to our cost, and know it as well as we know that cold is cold? Do you think no place but that which a cap or clothes do cover, is capable of letting in the excessively refrigerating air?

2. Whether a man that hath the most rational probability, if not a moral certainty, that it would be his death, or dangerous sickness (though he wore twenty caps), is bound to obey you in this case?

3. Whether usually the most studious laborious ministers,

be not the most invaletudinary and infirm? And,

4. Whether the health of such should be made the jest of, by the more healthful; and be made so light of, as to be cast away, rather than a ceremony sometime be left to their discretion? And whether it be a sign of the right and genuine spirit of religion, to subject to such a ceremony, both the life of godliness, and the lives of ministers, and the people's souls? Much of this concerneth the people also: as well as the ministers.

§ 2. [Exc. 5.] *Ans.* We see not why these words may not be said of any person whom we dare not say is damned, and it were a breach of charity to say so even of those whose repentance we do not see: for whether they do not inwardly and heartily repent, even at the last act, who knows? and that God will not even then pardon them upon such repentance, who dares say? It is better to be charitable, and hope the best, than rashly to condemn.

Reply. We spoke of persons living and dying in notorious sins; suppose they were whoredom, perjury, oppression, yea infidelity, or atheism, &c. But suppose we cannot be infallibly certain that the man is damned, because it is possible that he may repent, though he never did express it: will you therefore take him for a brother whose soul is taken to God in mercy? You are not sure that an excommunicate person, or a heathen, doth not truly repent after he is speechless: but will you therefore say, that all such die thus happily? This is a most delusory principle. The church judgeth not of things undiscovered: *non esse et non apparere*, are all one as to our judgment; we conclude not peremptorily, because we pretend not here to infallibility. As we are not sure that any man is truly penitent, that we give the sacrament to; so we are not sure that any man dieth impenitently. But yet we must use those as penitent, that seem so to reason, judging by ordinary means; and so must we judge those as impenitent, that have declared their sin, and never declared their repentance. It seems by you, that you will form your liturgy, so as to say, that every man is saved that you are not sure

is damned, though he shew you no repentance: and so the church shall say, that all things are, that are but possible, if they conceit that charity requireth it. But if the living by this be kept from conversion, and flattered into hell, will they there call it charity, that brought them thither? O lamentable charity, that smoothes men's way to hell, and keepeth them ignorant of their danger, till they are past remedy! Millions are now suffering for such a sort of charity! Lay this to the formentioned propositions, and the world will see that indeed we differ in greater things than ceremonies, and forms of prayer.

CHURCHING WOMEN.

§ 1. Exc. 1. *Ans.* It is fit that the woman performing especial service of thanksgiving should have a special place for it, where she may be perspicuous to the whole congregation, and near the holy table, in regard of the offering she is there to make. They need not fear popery in this, since in the church of Rome she is to kneel at the church door.

Reply. Those that are delivered from impenitency, from sickness, &c., perform a special service of thanksgiving, &c., yet need not stand in a special place: but if you will have all your ceremonies, why must all others be forced to imitate you? We mentioned not the church of Rome.

§ 2. Exc. 2. *Ans.* The Psalm cxxi is more fit and pertinent than those others named, as cxiii, cxxviii, and therefore not to be changed.

Reply. We have proposed to you what we think meetest in our last pages; if you like your own better, we pray you give us leave to think otherwise, and to use what we propounded.

§ 3. Exc. 3. *Ans.* If the woman be such as is here mentioned, she is to do her penance before she is churched.

Reply. That is, if she be accused, prosecuted, and judged by the bishop's court to do penance first, which happeneth not to one of a multitude; and what shall the minister do

with all the rest? All tends to take away the difference between the precious and the vile, between those that fear God, and that fear him not.

§ 4. Exc. 4. *Ans.* Offerings are required as well under the gospel as the law; and, amongst other times, most fit it is that oblations should be when we come to give thanks for some special blessing. *Psa.* lxxvi, 10, 11. Such is the deliverance in childbearing.

Reply. Oblations should be free, and not forced: to some special use, and not to ostentation.

§ 4. Exc. 5. *Ans.* This is needless, since the rubric and Common Prayer require that no notorious person be admitted.

Reply. We gladly accept so fair an interpretation, as freeth the book from self-contradiction, and us from trouble; but we think it would do no hurt, but good, to be more express.

THE CONCESSIONS.

§ 1. *Ans.* We are willing that all the epistles and gospels be used according to the last translation.

Reply. We still beseech you, that all the Psalms, and other Scriptures in the liturgy recited, may (for the same reason) be used according to the last translation.

§ 2. *Ans.* That when anything is read for an epistle which is not in the epistles, the superscription shall be, "For the epistle."

Reply. We beseech you, speak as the vulgar may understand you: "for the epistle" signifieth not plain enough to such, that is indeed none of the epistles.

§ 3. *Ans.* That the Psalms be collated with the former translation, mentioned in rubric, and printed according to it.

Reply. We understand not what translation, or rubric, you mean.

§ 4. *Ans.* That the words "this day," both in the collects and prefaces, be used only upon the day itself; and for the following days it be said, "as about this time."

Reply. And yet there is no certainty, which was the day itself.

§ 5. *Ans.* That a longer time be required for signification of the names of the communicants: and the words of the rubric be changed into these, “at least some time the day before.”

Reply. “Some time the day before” may be near or at night, which will not allow any leisure at all to take notice of the proofs of people’s scandals, or to help them in preparation.

§ 6. *Ans.* That the power of keeping scandalous sinners from the communion may be expressed in the rubric according to the 26th and 27th canons; so the minister be obliged to give an account of the same immediately after to the ordinary.

Reply. We were about returning you our very great thanks, for granting us the benefit of the 26th canon, as that which exceedeth all the rest of your concessions. But we see you will not make us too much beholden to you: and poor Christians that will not receive the sacrament contrary to the example of Christ and his apostles, and the custom of the catholic primitive church, and the canons of general councils, must be also used as the notorious impenitent sinners. But the canon requireth us not to signify the cause, but upon complaint, or being required by the ordinary.

§ 7. *Ans.* That the whole preface be prefixed to the commandments.

Reply. And why not the word “sabbath day” be put for the “seventh day” in the end. Must not such a falsification be amended?

§ 8. *Ans.* That the second exhortation be read some Sunday or holyday before the celebration of the communion, at the discretion of the minister.

§ 9. *Ans.* That the general confession at the communion be pronounced by one of the ministers, the people saying after him, all kneeling humbly upon their knees.

§ 10. *Ans.* That the manner of consecrating the elements be made more explicit and express, and to that purpose these words be put into the rubric, “Then shall he put his hand

upon the bread and break it," "then shall he put his hand unto the cup."

§ 11. *Ans.* That if the font be so placed as the congregation cannot hear, it may be referred to the ordinary to place it more conveniently.

§ 12. *Ans.* That those words, "Yes, they do perform those," &c., may be altered thus, "Because they promise them both by their sureties," &c.

§ 13. *Ans.* That the words of the last rubric before the catechism may be thus altered, "that children being baptized have all things necessary for their salvation, and dying before they commit any actual sin, be undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed."

§ 14. *Ans.* That to the rubric after confirmation these words may be added, "or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

§ 15. *Ans.* That those words, "with my body I thee worship," may be altered thus, "with my body I thee honour."

§ 16. *Ans.* That those words, "till death us depart," be thus altered, "till death us do part."

§ 17. *Ans.* That the words "sure and certain" may be left out.

Reply. For all the rest we thank you, but have given our reasons against your sense expressed in sect. 13, before, and for satisfactoriness of the last. And we must say, in the conclusion, that, if these be all the abatements and amendments you will admit, you sell your innocency, and the church's peace for nothing.

XIX.

Paper offered by Bishop Cosins, and Answer thereto.—
Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 341—3.

A WAY humbly proposed to end that unhappy controversy which is now managed in the church, that the sore may no longer rankle under the debate, nor advantages be got by those that love division.

1. That the question may be put to the managers of the division, whether there be anything in the doctrine, or discipline, or the Common Prayer, or ceremonies, contrary to the word of God; and if they can make any such appear, let them be satisfied.

2. If not, let them then propose what they desire in point of expediency, and acknowledge it to be no more.

3. Let that then be received from them, and speedily taken into the consideration and judgment of the convocation, who are the proper and authentic representatives of the ministry, in whose judgment they ought to acquiesce in such matters; and not only so, but to let the people that follow them, know that they ought not to disturb the peace of the church, under the pretence of the prosecution of expediency, since the division of the church is the great inexpedient.

THE ANSWER TO THE FORESAID PAPER.¹

Right Reverend, &c.

As it was your desire that we should return an answer to these three proposals only in our own names, who are but three, so we must here profess, therefore, that it is not to be taken as the act of the rest of our brethren the commissioners, but as part of the conference to which we are deputed. And though we are the managers of the treaty for pacification or agreement, and not the managers of the division, and therefore cannot take ourselves to be the persons meant by

¹ Drawn up by Baxter, and presented in the names of Dr. Bates, Dr. Jacomb, and himself.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 340.

the author of the proposals, yet we are glad to take the opportunity of your invitation, to profess that the principal part of these proposals is so rational, regular, and Christian-like, that we not only approve of, but should be fully satisfied (as to the debates before us) with the real grant of the first alone, and not be wanting in our duty, according to our understanding and ability, in endeavouring to accomplish the ends of your desires in the rest. More particularly—

Ad 1^m. Though we find by your papers and conference that in your own personal doctrines there is something that we take to be against the Word of God, and perceive that we understand not the doctrine of the church in all things alike, yet we find nothing contrary to the Word of God in that which is indeed the doctrine of the church, as it comprehendeth the matters of faith, distinct from matter of discipline, ceremonies, and modes of worship.

As to discipline—there was given unto his majesty, before his Declaration came forth, a summary of what we think to be contrary to the Word of God, which we shall more fully give in to you, or any others, whenever we are again called to it.

For the Common Prayer and ceremonies we have, in our Exceptions and Reply, delivered you an account of what we take to be unlawful and inconvenient; and we humbly crave that our reasons may be yet impartially considered. At present we shall humbly offer you our judgment concerning the following particulars, and profess our readiness to make it good when we are called to it. It is contrary to the Word of God—

1. That no minister be admitted to baptize without the prescribed use of the transient image of the cross.

2. That no minister be permitted to read or pray, or exercise the other parts of his office, that dare not wear a surplice.

3. That none be admitted in communion to the Lord's supper, that dare not receive it kneeling; and that all ministers be enjoined to deny it to such.

4. That ministers be forced to pronounce all baptized infants to be regenerate by the Holy Ghost, whether they be the children of Christians or not.

5. That ministers be *forced* to deliver the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ unto the unfit, both in their health and sickness, and that with personal application, putting it into their hands; and that such are *forced* to receive it, though against their own wills, in the conscience of their impenitency.

6. That ministers be *forced* to absolve the unfit; and that in absolute expressions.

7. That they are *forced* to give thanks for *all* whom they bury, as “brethren whom God in mercy hath delivered and taken to himself.”

8. That none may be a preacher that dare not subscribe that there is nothing in the Common Prayer book, the Book of Ordination, and the nine and thirty articles, that is contrary to the Word of God.

These are most of the things which we judge contrary to the Word of God, which at present come to our remembrance. So we humbly desire that whenever you would have us give you a full enumeration of such, we may have leave to consult with the rest of our brethren, and deliver it to you by our common consent. And we humbly crave that all these points may be taken into serious consideration, and those of them which we have not yet debated, we are ready to debate, and give in our arguments, whenever we are called to it, to prove them all contrary to the Word of God. And may we be so happy as to have this proposal granted us, we shall undoubtedly have unity and peace.

Ad 2^m. We suppose, according to the laws of distinguishing, you speak, in this second proposal, of all things so inexpedient as not to be contrary to the Word of God. Otherwise the greatest sins may be committed by inexpediences: as a physician may murder a man by giving him inexpedient medicines; and a general may destroy his army by inexpedient ways of conduct and defence. And the pastor may be

guilty of the damnation of his people by doctrines and applications inexpedient and unsuitable to their state; and a way of worship may be so inexpedient as to be sinful and loathsome unto God; such is the battology, or thinking to be heard for affected repetitions or babblings, pharisaical thanksgivings that men are better than indeed they are, with abundance such like. But supposing that you here speak of no such inexpedient things, but such as are not contrary to the Word of God, we add—

Ad 3^m. We are thankful that in such matters we may have leave to make any such proposals as are here mentioned. But we shall not be forward to busy ourselves, and trouble others, about such little things, without a special call. If the convocation at any time desire an account of our thoughts about such matters, we shall readily produce them.

And for “acquiescing in their judgments in such matters” what we three do in that point, is but of small consequence. And for others, seeing the ministers that we speak for were, many hundreds of them, displaced or removed before the advice of the convocation; and others denied their votes because not ordained by diocesans; and others, not approving the constitution of our convocations, durst not meddle in the choice; we cannot tell how far they will think themselves obliged by the determination of this convocation. But this can be no matter of impediment to your satisfaction or ours; for we are commonly agreed that we are bound in conscience to obey the king and all his magistrates in all lawful things; and with Christian patience to suffer what he inflicteth on us for not obeying in things unlawful; and therefore, while we acquiesce thus far in the judgment of those who must make the decrees of the convocation to be civilly obligatory, and the king intendeth to take their advice before he determine of such matters, it is all one as to the end, as if we directly did thus far acquiesce in the judgment of the convocation, if the king approve it. But if the king and parliament dissent or disallow the convocation’s judgment (as it is possible they

may have cause to do) would you have us acquiesce in it, when king and parliament do not?

And for the last part of the proposal, by God's assistance (if you do not silence or disable us), we are resolved faithfully to teach the people, that the division of the church is worse than inexpedient, and the peace of it not to be disturbed for the avoiding of any such inexpediences as are not contrary to the Word of God. We conclude with the repetition of our more earnest request, that these wise and moderate proposals may be prosecuted, and all things be abated us which we have proved, or shall prove to be, contrary to the Word of God. But if we agree not on those things among ourselves, according to his majesty's commission, the world may know we did our parts.

When the liberty of using the alterations and additional forms which were offered to you, according to his majesty's Declaration, would end all our differences about matters of worship; and when you have had them in your hands so long since you called for them, and have not, notwithstanding the importunity of our requests, vouchsafed us any debates upon them, or exceptions against them, but are pleased to lay them by in silence; we once more propose to you, whether the granting of what you *cannot blame*, be not now the shortest and the surest way to a general satisfaction.²

² "I offered to my brethren two more particulars as contrary to the Word of God; which were—

"1. That none may have leave in public worship to use a more suitable orderly way; but all are confined to *this* liturgy, which is so defective and disorderly, which we are even now ready to manifest, if you will receive it.

"2. That none may be a minister of the gospel that dare not subject himself, by an oath of obedience, to the diocesans in that state of government which they exercised in this land, contrary to the practice of all antiquity.

"These ten things I offered as contrary to the Word of God, but the two brethren, with me, thought these two last were better left out, lest they occasion new debates, though they judged them true."—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 343.

XX.

The Discussion on Kneeling at the Lord's Supper.—Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 346—349.

IN our unprofitable disputes all was to be managed in writing *ex tempore*, by Dr. Pearson, Dr. Gunning, and Dr. Sparrow, with Dr. Pierce on one side; and Dr. Bates, Dr. Jacomb, and myself on the other side; we withdrawing into the next room, and leaving the bishops and them together, while we wrote our part. And we began with the imposition of kneeling, upon two accounts (though I took the gesture itself as lawful), 1. Because I knew I had the fullest evidence, and the greatest authority of antiquity, or church law and custom, against them. 2. Because the penalty is so immediate and great to put all that kneel not, from the communion. And it was only the penalty, and so the imposition on that penalty, which we disputed against.

Our Arguments. Oppon. Arg. 1. To enjoin all ministers to deny the communion to all that dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament on the Lord's days, is sinful.

But the Common Prayer book and canons enjoin all ministers to deny the communion to all that dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament on the Lord's days.

Ergo, the Common Prayer book and canons do (or contain) that which is sinful.

Their Answer. Resp. Not granting nor denying the major, in the first place prove the minor.

Oppon. We prove both. 1. Prob. major. To enjoin ministers to deny the communion to men, because they dare not go against the practice of the apostles, and the universal church for many hundred years after them, and the canons of the most venerable councils, is sinful.

But to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to all that dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament on the

Lord's days, is to enjoin them to deny communion to them, because they dare not go against the practice of the apostles, and the universal church for many hundred years after them, and the canons of the most venerable councils.

Ergo, to enjoin all ministers to deny communion to all that dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament on the Lord's day is sinful.

Prob. minor. The words of the Common Prayer book and canons prove it.

Resp. The minor (viz. as to the Common Prayer book, of which the proof must proceed) is not yet proved.

But the major (which we had not then spoke to, but now do, clearly denying that major also of the first syllogism) you prove by the syllogism brought; in which we deny the minor.

Here we told them, that for the proof of both propositions denied, the presence of the books is necessary, which we desired them to procure us; but they were not fetched. And first we had a large debate about the words of the Common Prayer, "he shall deliver it them kneeling on their knees." Dr. Pearson confessed, that the canons did reject them that kneel not, from the communion; but these words of the Common Prayer book do not. But they only include kneelers, but exclude not others. We answered them, that either the Common Prayer book doth exclude them that kneel not, or it doth not. If it doth, the proposition is true. If it do not, then we shall willingly let fall this argument against it, and proceed to another. Therefore I desired them but to tell us openly their own judgment of the sense of the book; for we professed to argue against it only on supposition of the exclusive sense.

Hereupon unavoidably they fell into discord among themselves. Dr. Pearson, who was to defend the book, told us his judgment was, that the sense was not exclusive. Bishop Morley, who was to offend the Nonconformists, gave his judgment for the exclusive sense; viz.—That the minister is to give it to kneelers, and no others. So that we professed

to them, that we could not go any further, till they agreed among themselves, of their sense.

And for the other minor denied, though the books were not present, I alleged the 20th Canon Concil. Nicæn. and Concil. Trull. and Tertullian oft, and Epiphanius, with the common consent of ancient writers, who tell us, it was the tradition and custom of the universal church, not to adore by genuflexion on any Lord's day, or on any day between Easter and Whitsuntide. *Ergo*, not so to adore in taking the sacrament.

Bishop Morley answered, that this was the custom but only between Easter and Whitsuntide, and therefore it being otherwise the rest of the year, was more against us. I answered him that he mistook, where a multitude of evidences might rectify him; it was on every Lord's day through the year that this adoration by genuflexion was forbidden: though on other week-days it was only between Easter and Whitsuntide.

Next he and the rest insisted on it, that these canons and customs extended only to prayer. To which I answered, that 1. The plain words are against them, where some speak of all adoration, and others more largely of the public worship, and offered to bring them full proof from the books, as soon as they would give me time. 2. And if it were only in prayer, it is all one to our case. For the liturgy giveth the sacrament with words of prayer; and it is the common argument brought for kneeling, that it is suitable to the conjunct prayer. And I told them over and over, that antiquity was so clear in the point, that I desired all might be laid on that, and I might have time to bring them in my testimonies. But thus that argument was turned off, and the evening broke off that part of the dispute.

THE NEXT DAY'S ARGUMENT.

Oppon. To enjoin ministers to deny the communion to such as the Holy Ghost hath required us to receive to the communion is sinful.

But to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to all that dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament, is to enjoin them to deny the communion to such as the Holy Ghost hath required us to receive to the communion.

Ergo, to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to all that dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament, is a sin.

Resp. We deny the minor.

Oppon. The Holy Ghost hath required us to receive to the communion, even all the weak in the faith, who are charged with no greater fault than erroneously refusing things lawful as unlawful.

But many of those who dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament are (at the worst) but weak in the faith, and charged with no greater fault than, erroneously, refusing things lawful as unlawful.

Ergo, to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to all who dare not kneel in the reception of the sacrament, is to enjoin them to deny the communion to such as the Holy Ghost hath required us to receive to the communion.

Resp. We say, this is no true but a fallacious syllogism, of no due form; for this reason, that whereas both subject and predicate of the conclusion ought to be somewhere in the premisses, here neither subject of the conclusion (*viz.* to enjoin ministers to deny, &c.) nor the predicate of the conclusion (*viz.* is to enjoin them to deny, &c.) are anywhere found in any part of either of the premisses; so that here are not only *quatuor*, but *quinque termini*.

Oppon. You have both subject and predicate in the premisses as to the sense. If you will have each syllable, take it thus.

If to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to men for no greater fault than being weak in the faith, and refusing things lawful as unlawful, be to enjoin them to deny the communion to such as the Holy Ghost hath required us to receive to the communion, then to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to all, &c.

But to enjoin ministers to deny the communion to men for no greater fault than being weak in the faith, and refusing things lawful as unlawful, is to enjoin them to deny the communion to such as the Holy Ghost hath required them to receive to the communion.

Ergo, to enjoin, &c. (as in the minor.)

Resp. We distinguish to that term "things lawful:" for both things lawful, and by no lawful power commanded to be done, are called such: and also things lawful, and by a lawful power also commanded to be done, are called such.

If you take "things lawful" in the former sense, we deny your major. If you take "things lawful" in the latter sense, we deny your minor.

Oppon. In Rom. xiv, 1—3, and xv, 1, the apostle, by the Holy Ghost, speaking of things lawful and not commanded, yet, being himself a church governor, commandeth them not; but requireth even church governors as well as others to receive the dissenters and forbear them, and not to make these the matter of censure or contempt. *Ergo*, the minor (or consequence) is good.

Resp. We answer four things:

1. We deny the consequence of the enthymeme.

2. Our discourse proceeding wholly about things lawful and commanded by a lawful power, they profess to proceed only upon things lawful and not commanded by a lawful power (in which sense only, of things lawful and not commanded also, we denied your major.) For they that prove the major, which was not denied by us but in such a sense, profess to proceed in that sense.

3. Rom. xiv, 1—3, speaks of things lawful and not commanded by your acknowledgment. And we all along have professed to debate about things lawful and also commanded. So that the text, brought by you, is manifestly not to the purpose of this debate.

4. To receive them in Rom. xiv, is not forthwith to be understood of immediately receiving to the holy communion.

And for this reason again that text makes nothing to prove for their receiving to the holy communion.

When this Answer was given in, it was almost night, and the company brake up. And because I perceived that it was hard (especially among such disturbances) to reduce all in a moral subject (that must have many words) to an exact syllogistical form to the last, without confusion; and that the only advantage they could hope for was to trifle pedantically about the form of arguments, I resolved to imitate them in their last answer, and to take the liberty of more (explicatory) words.

The next day I brought in our Reply to their Answer at large, as here followeth.

Oppon. The syllogisms necessarily growing so long, as that the parts denied cannot be put verbatim into the conclusions, without offence to those that are loth to read that which is pedantic and obscure, we must contract the sense, and divide our proofs.

The sense of your Answer to the hypothetical syllogism was, that if we speak of things lawful and not commanded, then you deny "that those that we must deny communion to are such as the Holy Ghost commandeth us to receive, though those were such that are described in the antecedent." But if we mean such lawful things as are commanded by lawful power, then you "deny that these are such as the Holy Ghost requireth us to receive."

To take away this Answer———If your distinction be frivolous or fallacious, as applied by you in your answer, and one branch of it, but a begging of the question, then your answer is vain, and our argument standeth good. But the antecedent is true. *Ergo*, so is the consequence.

1. It is frivolous and obscure, and rather making than removing ambiguity, and *ergo* useless. 1. It is obscure. For we know not whether you mean "commanded simply without any penalty," or "commanded with the enforcement

of a penalty." If the latter, whether you mean it of "a command with such a penalty as we speak against," or "some other penalty." And whether you mean "commanded by such as have a lawful power *ad hoc*," or "only *ad aliud*." Your distinction must necessarily be distinguished of before it can be pertinent, and applied to our case. *Ergo*, it is frivolous through obscurity.

If you speak of a command without penalty, or with no other penalty than such as is consistent with "receiving, not despising, not judging, and all the indulgence mentioned in the text," then your very distinction granteth us the cause. But if you speak of "a command with such penalty as is inconsistent with the said receiving and other indulgences," then this branch of your distinction, as applied by you, Resp. 2, is but the begging of the question, it being such commanding that we are proving to be forbidden by the text—If there be no power that may command such things any farther than may stand with the reception and other indulgences of the text, then must you not suppose that any power may otherwise command them. But the antecedent is true. *Ergo*, so is the consequent.—For the minor, if Paul and the resident pastors of the church of Rome had no power to command such things, further than may stand with the said reception and indulgences, then no others have such power. But Paul and the resident pastors of the church of Rome had no such power. *Ergo*, there are no others that have such. And so your distinction being frivolous and fallacious, the argument stands good.

The sense of our enthymeme was, that "these things being therefore not commanded, because they ought not to be commanded any farther than may stand with the said reception and indulgences in the text, God having there forbidden men any otherwise to command them; therefore the consequence stands good, your distinction being either impertinent, or granting us the postulatum, or begging the question."

And so we have replied to your first Answer.

Ad 2^m. Again if you speak of a simple command, enforcing

no farther than consisteth with the foresaid reception and forbearance, 1. You grant the thing in question. Or thus 2. If there be no such disparity of the cases as may warrant your disparity of penalty against your brethren, then our argument still stands good. But there is no such disparity of the cases as may warrant your disparity of penalty against your brethren. *Ergo*——

For the minor. If those that Paul speaks of that must be received and foreborne, did sin against the command of God, in the weakness of their faith, and their erroneous refusal of things as sinful that were not so to be refused, then there is no such disparity in the cases, as, &c. For you suppose those that refuse to kneel, to break the command of man, and those that Paul spake of brake the command of God, and yet were to be received and foreborne.

But if you here also speak of “a command enforced by penalties inconsistent with the said receiving and forbearance,” we reply,

If our present work be to prove that God hath forbidden all such commands, then our proceeding (in proving it) is regular, and our supposing the things not so commanded (having proved it); and your discourse wholly proceeding of things so commanded (before you answer our proof that they ought not to be commanded) is an irregular supposition, and begging of the question——But our, &c. *Ergo*——&c.

Ad Resp. 3^m. If Rom. xiv, 1—3. and xv, 1, &c., speak of things lawful, and no farther commanded than may consist with “receiving and forbearing;” forbidding any other commanding of such things, then the text is most pertinent to prove that there ought to be no such commands, and that they are sinful. But the antecedent is true——*Ergo*——

Ad Resp. 4^m. “Immediately” was no term in our question. But that Rom. xiv, 1, speaketh of receiving to the holy communion we prove. If the Holy Ghost command the receiving of men to that church-communion in whole or in general without exception, wherof the communion in the holy sacrament is a most eminent part, then he thereby commandeth

the receiving them to the holy communion in the sacrament, as a principal part. But the antecedent is true. *Ergo*, so is the consequent.

The sum of our reply is, that when we are proving from Rom. xiv and xv, that God hath forbidden men to command such things indifferent on pain of exclusion from communion; for you now "to distinguish of things commanded by authority, and things not commanded," and then to say, "that if they be not so commanded, then we grant that they should not be so commanded; but if they be so commanded, then God hath not forbidden so to command them," this is to make the fact of man antecedent to the law of God, or the law to forbid the fact, in case no man will do it, but not to forbid it if it be done. As if you had said, "God forbade David to commit adultery in case it be not committed by him, but not in case it be committed."

XXI.

*The Discussion on the Sinfulness of the Liturgy.*¹—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, pp. 358-60, Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, Oxford, 1849, pp. 364-368.

Oppon. [Dr. Pearson, Dr. Gunning, Dr. Sparrow, and Dr. Pierce.] My assertion is, Nothing contained in the liturgy is sinful.

This general assertion I am ready to make good in all particulars, in which our brethren shall think fit to charge the liturgy with sinfulness.

¹ "When we [Dr. Bates, Dr. Jacomb, and Mr. Baxter] were going to our disputation, Dr. Pierce asked whether he, that was none of the three deputed by them to that service, [*i.e.* Dr. Pearson, Dr. Gunning, and Dr. Sparrow,] might join with the rest: and we told that we cared not how many joined; the more the better: for if any one of them could see any evidence of truth which the rest did overlook, it would rebound to our benefit, who desired nothing but the victory of truth."—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 344.

And because our brethren have, as yet, by way of disputation charged no other part of it with the imputation of sinfulness, but that which concerneth kneeling at the communion, therefore my first assertion as to that particular is this;—The command contained in the liturgy concerning kneeling at the communion is not sinful.

This truth I am ready to prove by several arguments. First, This only command “The minister shall deliver the communion to the people in their hands kneeling” is not sinful: The command contained in the liturgy concerning kneeling at the communion is this only command “The minister,” &c.—*Ergo*, The command contained in the liturgy concerning kneeling at the communion is not sinful.

Resp. [Dr. Bates, Dr. Jacomb, and Mr. Baxter] Neg. major.
Oppon. Prob. major.

That command which commandeth only an act in itself lawful, is not sinful: This only command “The minister shall deliver, &c.,” commandeth only an act in itself lawful: *Ergo*, This only command “The minister shall deliver,” &c. is not sinful.

Resp. Neg. major et minor.

Oppon. Prob. major.

That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful and no other act or circumstance unlawful, is not sinful: That command which commandeth only an act in itself lawful, commands an act in itself lawful, and no other act or circumstance unlawful: *Ergo*, That command which commandeth only an act in itself lawful, is not sinful.

Resp. 1. We deny the major; and for brevity give a double reason of our denial: one is, because that may be a sin *per accidens* which is not so in itself, and may be unlawfully commanded, though that accident be not in the command. Another is, that it may be commanded under an unjust penalty.

2. We deny the minor for both the same reasons.

Oppon. Prob. minor.

The delivery of the communion to persons kneeling is an

act in itself lawful : This only command “The minister shall deliver, &c.” commandeth only the delivery of the communion to persons kneeling: *Ergo*, This only command “The minister shall deliver, &c.” commandeth only an act in itself lawful.

Resp. We distinguish of delivering to persons kneeling : it signifieth either exclusively (to those and no other,) or not exclusively, (to others.) In the first sense we deny the major; in the second sense we deny the minor.

Oppon. You deny both our propositions for two reasons, both the same : we make good both our propositions, notwithstanding both your reasons.

The major first. That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act, whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined, nor any circumstance, whence, directly or *per accidens*, any sin is consequent, which the commander ought to provide against, is not sinful: that command which commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act or circumstance unlawful, commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act, whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined, nor any circumstance whence, directly or *per accidens*, any sin is consequent, which the commander ought to provide against: *Ergo*, That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act or circumstance unlawful, is not sinful.

Resp. 1. The proposition denied is not in the conclusion.

The major is denied, because the first act commanded may be *per accidens* unlawful, and be commanded by an unjust penalty, though no other act or circumstance be such.

Oppon. The minor next. That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined, nor any circumstance whence, directly or *per accidens*, any sin is consequent, which the commander ought to provide against, commands an act in itself lawful, and no other act or circumstance unlawful: That command which commands only an act in itself lawful, commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined, nor any circumstance whence,

directly or *per accidens*, any sin is consequent, which the commander ought to provide against: *Ergo*, That command which commands only an act in itself lawful, commands an act in itself lawful, and no other act or circumstance unlawful.

Oppon. We prove our major, notwithstanding your reason alleged.

That command which hath in it all things requisite to the lawfulness of a command, and particularly cannot be guilty of commanding an act *per accidens* unlawful, nor of commanding an act under an unjust penalty, is not sinful, notwithstanding your reason alleged: That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined, nor any circumstance whence, directly or *per accidens*, any sin is consequent which the commander ought to provide against, hath in it all things requisite to the lawfulness of a command, and particularly cannot be guilty of commanding an act *per accidens* unlawful, nor of commanding an act under an unjust penalty: *Ergo*, That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful, and no other act whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined, nor any circumstance whence, directly or *per accidens*, any sin is consequent, which the commander ought to provide against, is not sinful, notwithstanding your reasons alleged.

Resp. The minor is denied upon the same reasons, which you do nothing to remove. Such a command hath not in it all things requisite to the lawfulness of a command, because though no other act be commanded, whereby an unjust penalty is enjoined, yet still the first act may be commanded *sub pœna injusta*: and though no other act or circumstance be commanded that is a sin *per accidens*, yet the first act itself commanded may be a sin *per accidens*.

Oppon. Either our minor is true, notwithstanding your reason, or else the first act may be a command commanding an unjust punishment, and be an act lawful: or the first act itself being lawful in itself and all circumstances, may yet be a sin *per accidens*, against which the commander ought to provide: *Posterius utrumque falsum*, both the latter

members are false: *Ergo, prius verum*, therefore the first is true.

Resp. Neg. major. Because 1. The subject is changed: you were to have spoken of the first act commanded, and you speak of the first act commanding, in the first member; you should have said "else the first act may be commanded *sub pœna injusta*, and yet be in itself lawful;" which is true.

2. Because in the second member, where you should have spoken only of the commanded circumstances of the act, you now speak of all its circumstances, whether commanded or not.

3. We undertook not to give you all our reasons; the minor may be false upon many other reasons. And were your major reduced in the points excepted against, we should deny the minor as to both members.

And we should add our reasons:—

1. That command which commandeth an act in itself lawful and only such, may yet be sinful privately, by omission of something necessary, some mode or circumstance.

2. It may sinfully restrain, though it sinfully command not.

3. It may be sinful *in modis*, commanding that universally, or indefinitely, or particularly, or singularly, that should be otherwise; though in the circumstances, properly so called, of the act, nothing were commanded that is sinful.

4. It may through culpable ignorance be applied to undue subjects, who are not circumstances: as if a people that have the plague be commanded to keep assemblies for worship, the lawgiver being culpably ignorant that they had the plague. Many more reasons may be given.

Oppon. We make good our major by shewing that the subject is not changed, thus: If whensoever the first act is commanded *sub pœna injusta*, and no other act is commanded whereby any unjust penalty is enjoined (which were your words), the first act commanding must command an unjust punishment (which were ours), then we have not changed the subject: But the antecedent is true, therefore the consequent.

XXII.

*The Reply to the Bishops' Disputants, which was not answered.*¹—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, by Sylvester, pp. 350—6.

WHETHER it be our arguing or your answering that is “lax, declamatory, pedantic,” (as you call it,) and whether your confident insulting arise from your advantages, or infirmity of mind, and want of matter for more pertinent answers, are questions that we shall leave to impartial judges. And we shall crave pardon if we rather seem to neglect your words, than to follow you in these strange vagaries, any further than mere necessity for saving your readers from the error into which they are fitted to mislead them doth require.

To prove the consequence of an hypothetical argument by an enthymeme hath not been used to be accounted culpable. The proof you shall not want.

That we removed your Answer, by showing your distinction frivolous, deserved not to be called “a popular insinuation, superfluous,” &c. We had two things here to do: the first was, if we had been at hand with you, to have called on you for the necessary explanation of your distinction, whether by “commanded by lawful power,” you mean commanded under no penalty, or commanded under a penalty, consistent with the receiving and forbearing mentioned in the text, or commanding under a penalty inconsistent with this receiving and forbearance. And whether you mean by “lawful power,” that which is indeed lawful power *ad hoc* or only *ad aliud*? As far as we can find in these your papers, you still forbear to explain your distinction. But this we must yet insist upon, and desire of you, notwithstanding all your exclamations.

¹ This paper was drawn up by Baxter, and given in on the last day of the king's commission.—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 356.

And then our next work must be to show you that, indeed your distinction is useless as to the shaking of our argument. The latter branch of your distinction, "if we speak of things lawful and commanded," you apply to the denial of our antecedent or minor, which we prove stands good, notwithstanding this your Answer. Indeed we speak of things lawful as such, abstracting from command: but we speak of things which materially were partly not commanded, and partly commanded. It was not commanded to eat or not eat the meats in question, to keep the days or not keep them: in these they went against no law. But to be weak in the faith, and erroneously to take things lawful to be unlawful, and things indifferent to be necessary, and to offend a brother by the use of liberty on the other side, were against the commands of God. Now the scope of our argument was to shew that, if you speak of a command upon the penalty of the question, your distinction helps you not to shake our argument; because as it is true that the text speaketh not of things so commanded, so the thing that we are proving is, that it is the sense of the text to forbid all such commands. If it be the sense of the text to forbid such commands, then your distinction is frivolous, and the use of it here prevented, and our argument stands good. But it is the sense of the text to forbid all such commands—*ergo*, the minor we are to prove hereafter, when we are further called to it by your answers. But if by "command" you mean any other "command without penalty," or without the penalty forbidden, we argue—If it be all one, as to our case, whether it be so commanded or not, then your distinction is frivolous, and our argument stands good: but it is all one to our case, whether it be so commanded or not: *ergo*, this was the sum of our rejection of your Answer, which we cannot prosecute till you will be persuaded, as we have required, to explain your distinction; and then we shall know what to speak to.

But perhaps you take your very refusal to explain it, to be an explanation; and your words may seem to allow us to understand you of any command, with this penalty or with-

out, where you say, "That text which speaks of things under no command at all, is brought nothing to the purpose of the things which we debate of, being under some command of lawful authority." But still that text which forbiddeth any such command, and so taketh away the authority of so commanding, is something to the purpose, as proving that no human authority should so command. But this text forbiddeth any such command, and so taketh away the authority of so commanding: *ergo*, and as it is a command consistent with "receiving, forbearing," &c., that you may be understood to speak of—1. If you speak *de facto et de jure*, and suppose that there be, and ought to be, no other command, then you grant us the cause that there should be no command, upon penalty of being "not received, not forborne," &c. 2. If your supposition be *de facto* only, then that commanding which consisteth with God's command "to receive and forbear, &c.," altereth not the case. But such is the commanding that now you are supposed to speak of: *ergo*, so still your distinguishing toucheth not our argument, no more than if you had distinguished of the instructed and uninstructed, and said Paul speaketh of those that were uninstructed only; *ergo*, he is not alleged to the purpose.

Whereas you say "That this penalty, that the minister be enjoined not to administer the communion to those that disobey such command, is no ways inconsistent with the receiving and all the indulgences of that truth," we shall prove the contrary anon in due place.

For appellation to indifferent persons, we also are willing such shall judge whether, if your distinction speak of no commanding but such as is consistent with this "receiving, forbearing," &c., it leave us not in possession of the force of our argument? And if it speak, *de jure*, that there should be no other, whether it yield not up the cause?

It seems our very phrase of "begging the question," being misunderstood by you, hath been taken as your greatest occasion of insulting. But if we used an unusual phrase, if that occasioned your mistake, we can beg your pardon, and

explain it, with less wrong to our cause or ourselves than you can make such use of it as to yours. We did not dream of charging you with that begging of the question which is the fallacy and fault of the opponent, as it is the begging of a principle undertaken to be proved: we know this is not incident to the respondent, nor to be imputed to him. We charged you with no such thing, though we confess our phrase was liable to your misinterpretation. But we crave your willingness to understand that we were proving that such things may not be by rulers enjoined or commanded under the penalty of exclusion from communion; and that the latter branch of your distinction hath the nature of a reason of your denial of the proposition denied, viz., because the things are commanded; and that by our telling you of begging the question, we mean but this much:—1. That you give us a reason implied in a distinction, which is but equal to a simple negation, and is not (we say not the giving a sufficient reason, but) the giving of a reason indeed at all. 2. That it is but equal to an unsavory denial of the mere conclusion. 3. Yea, that it is a preposterous reduction of the rule to the action, and of the former to the latter. Suppose we had thus phrased our proposition. “Rulers themselves are here forbidden to enjoin or command the rejecting of such as are only weak in the faith, &c. ;” and you should distinguish and say—“either rulers have commanded the rejecting them for such things, or not; if they then we deny the proposition,” that is, “if they have done it, they may do it, and the text that forbids it, is to be understood of such rulers as have not already forbidden it:” tell us how you will call such distinguishing yourselves, and you may understand our meaning. It is all one if you put your exception into the description of the fault: and when we say God here forbiddeth governors themselves to make any commands or injunctions for rejecting such as are only weak in the faith, and mistake about indifferent things; and you distinguish thus—“either the weak offend against such commands or not; if they do sin against such commands, then the text

forbiddeth not the making of such commands:" give this kind of distinguishing and answering a proper name yourselves. Or if to our proposition you say, "the indifferent things are commanded by the governors, or not; if they be, then God forbiddeth not the governor to command the rejection of the persons from communion;" that is, "though God forbid governors to make laws for rejecting such as err about indifferent things only, yet that is on supposition that the said governors do not first command those indifferent things; for if once they command them, they may then command the rejection of those that break them:" but, on the contrary, he that forbiddeth the rejection of such, simply and antecedently to the laws of men, forbiddeth the rejecting of them, mediately or immediately, and forbiddeth the framing of such commands as shall be means of the prohibited rejection. But God in the text forbiddeth the rejection of such, simply and antecedently to the laws of men: *ergo*, he forbiddeth the rejecting of them, mediately or immediately, and forbiddeth the framing of such commands as shall be means of the prohibited rejection.

Though we have thus taken off your Answer, we shall give you fuller proof in the end of what you can reasonably expect.

You next answer this argument of ours.—"If there be no power that may command such things, any further than may stand with the reception and other indulgences of the text, then must you not suppose that any power may otherwise command them. But the antecedent is true: *ergo*——" Here you deny the minor, which I prove thus:—

If none have power to break the laws of God, then there is no power that may command such things, any further than may stand with the reception, and other indulgences, of the text. But none have power to break the laws of God: *ergo*, there is no power that may command such things, any further than may stand with the reception, and other indulgences of the text.

We had used before another argument to prove the minor,

thus—"If Paul, and the resident pastors of the church of Rome, had no power to command such things, farther than may stand with the said reception and indulgence, then no others have such power: but Paul, and the resident pastors of the church of Rome, had no such power—*ergo*, there are no others that have such." Here you deny the assumption, which is proved by the foregoing medium. If Paul, and the resident pastors of the church of Rome, had no power to cross the will of God, then they had no power to command such things, farther than may stand with the said reception and indulgence: but Paul, and the resident pastors of the church of Rome, had no power to cross the will of God: *ergo*—

You vainly call the explication of our enthymeme, in plainer words, "the proving of its obscure consequence by the more obscure consequence of another," and hereupon insult. But we shall take leave to leave you to your humour, in such things. If it offend you, blot out the enthymeme, seeing you have reply enough without it; or if you will be still tempted to insult till you are delivered from the enthymeme, you have our sense in this argument.

If the things spoken of by the apostle were not only not commanded, but forbidden to be commanded, any further than may stand with the reception and indulgence of the text, then there is no such disparity in the cases as may shake our consequence, though with us such things are commanded. But the antecedent is true; *ergo*, so is the consequent.

To your second Answer, we first again endeavoured to bring you to explain your distinction, what commanding you mean; but have no return to that but silence, which we take to be tergiversation.

Then we argued thus—"If there be no such disparity of the cases as may warrant your disparity of penalty against your brethren, then our argument still stands good. But there is no such disparity of the case as may warrant your disparity of penalty against your brethren;" *ergo*—

You deny the minor, which we proved thus.—"If those that

Paul speaks of, that must be received and forborne, did sin against the command of God, in the weakness of their faith, and their erroneous refusing of things as sinful, that were not to be so refused, then there is no such disparity in the cases as," &c. "But," &c., *ergo*—

Here you deny the consequence, which we prove thus—If the sin of those that dare not kneel be no greater than theirs that were weak in the faith, and refused things lawful as unlawful, and took things indifferent as necessary, and hereby gratified the Jews and other enemies of the church, and trespassed on the church's liberties purchased by Christ, and yet became the censurers of the strong; and if the scruple of kneeling have as fair excuses as the other, then the consequence is good, and there is no such disparity in the cases as may warrant your penalty. But the antecedent is true; *ergo* so is the consequent.

We shall prosecute the comparison further anon.

We added here this reason in brief. "For you suppose those that refuse to kneel to break the command of man, and those that Paul spoke of broke the command of God, and yet were to be received and forborne;" *ergo* there is no such disparity as may warrant your penalty. Here you add to our words, "the command of man," the word "only," and say, that else we do but trifle. We reply, that by adding your own words, and then persuading us to own them lest we trifle, you do worse than trifle, and your gross injustice hath no fair pretence, being against the light of our conclusion and undertaking; we were but to prove that there was no such disparity, *i.e.*, that the fault of those that kneel not, was not greater, and so much greater as might warrant your penalty. Therefore as you will acknowledge kneeling at the sacrament to be immediately but the command of man, and weakness of faith, error, censoring, &c., to be immediately against a command of God, (which yet we spoke of but for just denomination, and not to prove a disparity to our advantage,) so if we prove no disparity against us, we do what we undertake. And that a sin against the command of God immedi-

ately, is as well worthy of punishment as a sin against the command of man immediately *ceteris paribus* is true, and all that we affirmed, and all that we were bound to prove.

Yet you importune us to answer you a question—"Whether is not the erroneous refusing of lawful things commanded by lawful authority, as sinful as the refusing of things as sinful that were not to be so refused?" We answer you—1. But with them and you it is the thing in controversy, whether they are lawful things or not? 2. If they be, what then? Why you say, "If so, then, even according to your own reasoning, if you reason at all, these refusers to kneel sin against God, and the rule yourselves lay down thereof, as well as those Rom. xiv." And what then? Is there therefore a disparity because they do alike? Are such as these the occasions of your insulting? We shall then suspect you have some gross mistake, whenever we find you thus insulting. But you say, "That *ergo* we did fallaciously insinuate the one to break the command of God, and the other to break the command of men." But really is it not so? If you allow not the distinction *inter leges divinas et humanas*, you know how singular you are, and what consequences will follow. If you do, why may we not use such denominations? But you say of the sinfulness, "It is most evidently common to the former with the latter." 1. If the controversy be yielded you, it is so. 2. And what then? Because it is common, *ergo* there is such a disparity as may warrant your grievous penalty. We only prove no such disparity, and we are notably confuted by your proof that the sinfulness is *common*, that is, by yielding what we prove.

Next, in many words you tell us of a disparity. 1. Because in our case kneeling is commanded. 2. Because the things are antecedently helps to piety. To which we have before answered:—1. God hath forbidden all commands of such things, inconsistent with the reception and forbearance in question. 2. Their sin of weakness in faith and error, were also against commands. 3. We shall show greater reasons of disparity on the other side. 4. The thing in question

(kneeling) hath nothing antecedent to the command to make the refusal of it sinful, no, nor [more] meet than other gestures. Of which after.

To your third Answer we replied—"If Rom. xiv and xv speak of things lawful and no further commanded than may consist with 'receiving and forbearing,' forbidding any other commanding of such things; then the text is most pertinent to prove that there ought to be no such commands, and that they are sinful. But the antecedent is true;" *ergo*—

Here you tell us of "manifest fallacy," of "advantageous equivocation," or else a "gross *ignoratio elenchi*," in the conclusion; words easy to be uttered by you. But if you will "profess all along," as you say, "to proceed or debate only of things lawful and commanded by lawful power;" that is, lawfully, when our very question is, "Whether such things can be so commanded?" and we are proving that they cannot; and you will call it an *ignoratio elenchi* if we will not grant you all in question, but will endeavour to prove the contrary to what you would have granted; this is that which we before called even the respondents' begging of the question, when he accuseth the opponent for proving what he denieth, and would put that into the subject as not to be questioned, which is in the predicate, and we are disproving. 2. And remember that in your first paper we were not called to dispute the parity or disparity of the offences: *ergo*, by "such things," we mean such things as are mentioned Rom. xiv and xv. And our conclusion there goeth no further, that matter being further to be carried on in its proper place.

To your fourth answer we replied—"That *immediately* was no term in our question." You say you may distinguish; true, but you cannot bind us to prove that the men that we prove are to be received to communion, must be *immediately* received, when we never affirmed it, as long as you tell us not whether you speak *de immediatione temporis, vel conditionis vel status*, or what you mean by immediately. In regard of time, no man in the church is immediately to be received to the sacrament, till the very time come.

2. We argued—"If the Holy Ghost command the receiving of men to that church-communion in general without exception, whereof the communion in the holy sacrament is a most eminent part, then he thereby commandeth the receiving them to the communion in the sacrament. But, &c. *Ergo,*" &c. Your Answer signifieth that it is a receiving first to instruction, and not to the sacrament, till some change be made; you tell us not what: or that it is such a receiving as may consist with denying them the communion. We shall now, therefore, prove in order these two propositions, which are to be next proved.

1. That the reception that Paul speaketh of is such as is not consistent with denial of the sacrament for those faults.

2. That there is no such disparity between their faults and those that refuse to kneel at the sacrament, as may warrant your disparity of penalty or usages.

The first we shall prove--1. From the text before us. 2. By other Scriptures. 3. By testimony of expositors, especially those of your own way in other things.

I. So to receive one another as Christ received us to the glory of God the Father, and this not to doubtful disputation (or not to judge their doubtful thoughts), and not to despise or judge one another, but to take each other for such as do what we do to the Lord; and let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind; and so as to distinguish the points that we differ about from those in which God's kingdom doth consist, in which whosoever serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and should be approved of men; and so as to follow the things that edify and make for peace, and not lay a stumbling-block or occasion of falling in our brother's way, or destroy him by the uncharitable use of our liberty, knowing it is sin to him that esteemeth it sin; but to forbear ourselves to use those things in controversy whereby our brother stumbleth or is offended, because he is damned if he use them doubtfully; and therefore to have the belief of their lawfulness to ourselves before God, and to bear with the infirmities of the

weak, and please them to their edification, and not to please ourselves, that so being like-minded one towards another, that with one mind and one mouth we may glorify God: we say thus to receive is not consistent with the denial of communion in the sacrament for those faults. But such was the receiving required by the apostle, Rom xiv and xv. *Ergo* --

He that can seriously ponder all these expressions, and the scope of the Holy Ghost, and yet can believe that all this receiving is but such as consisteth with forbidding them communion in the Lord's supper, which then was so great a part of the daily communion of the church; and also may consist with the further process against people and ministers to excommunication, and prohibition to preach the gospel, which is now pleaded for in our case; is of so strange a temperature of understanding, as that we can have little hope by any Scripture evidence to convince him.

2. When the Holy Ghost requireth men in general to receive others as church members into church-communion, with the affection and tenderness here expressed, and doth not except any ordinary part of church communion, it is not lawful for us to interpret it of such a receiving as excludeth the principal part of ordinary church-communion.

But in Rom. xiv and xv, the Holy Ghost requireth men in general to receive others as church members into church-communion, with the affection and tenderness here expressed, and doth not except any ordinary part of church-communion.

Ergo, it is not lawful for us to interpret it of such a receiving as excludeth the principal part of ordinary communion.

The reason of the major is, because as the whole containeth all the parts, so when the whole or general is commanded, if men may take liberty to except the very principal part, where the law doth not except it, then no commands can be intelligible, or such interpreters may have liberty to make void the law at their own pleasure. As when it is said, "Honour the king," and "Let every soul be subject to the higher

powers," and "resist not," &c., if men may take liberty, by interpreting, to except the very principal part of honour, and the principal persons from subjection, and the principal case from "resist not," it will be no just interpretation. If these same persons had a command in general, to "worship God," or "hold communion with the church," if they themselves should interpret it so as to exclude worshipping God in the sacrament of the eucharist, or holding communion with the church therein, we doubt not but they would be judged unjust distinguishers.

The minor is granted us by our reverend brethren, who here openly confess that the text speaketh of church members, and of receiving them to church-communion, though they unwarrantably interpret it of such a communion as extendeth not to the sacrament of the eucharist.

3. If the text, Rom. xiv and xv, forbid not one part to put away others from communion in the sacrament of the eucharist, then it forbiddeth not the other party to separate from their brethren in the sacrament of the eucharist.

But the consequent is false: *ergo* so is the antecedent.

The reason of the consequence of the major is, because if it speak not of that part of communion to one party, it cannot speak of it to the other, it being plainly the same communion that it speaketh of to both.

The minor is ordinarily granted us by the dissenters, when they apply this text against separatists, that upon the account of ceremonies and things indifferent, condemn the church, and judge their brethren, and separate from their communion in the eucharist.

II. From other Scriptures. If in all the Word of God there be no mention of such a receiving into church-communion (much less with all these prohibitions of judging, despising, offending, &c.), as consisteth with rejecting from communion in the eucharist, of any person naturally capable, then the word "receiving" is not to be so expounded here.

But in all the word of God there is no mention of such a

receiving into church-communion (much less with all these prohibitions, &c.) as consisteth with rejecting from communion in the eucharist, of any person naturally capable.

Ergo, the word "receiving;" is not to be so expounded here.

The reason of the consequence of the major is, because here is no apparent ground in this text for us to understand the receiving spoken of, as different from what is mentioned in all other places of the Holy Scripture: and if without any such ground we should allow ourselves a singular interpretation, we should open a way to men to make what they please of Scripture.

The minor being to be proved by an induction of all particular texts, it will be the briefer way for the respondent to instance in any one which he thinks hath such a sense, and then we shall be ready to prove the contrary.

III. For the sense of expositors we shall begin with the learned Dr. Hammond, who expounded the text of church-communion, and such communion as cannot exist with excommunicating from the sacrament of the eucharist, or the other heavy penalties upon ministers and people which we now plead against, as may be seen in these his plain expressions. "Verse 1. And for the preserving of that Christian charity among all, mentioned solemnly, chap. xiii, 8, 9, 10 (*vid. loc.*). I shall enlarge to give these rules. The Jewish believers—on the other side, the Gentile believers seeing the Jewish stand upon such things—are apt to separate; and so, betwixt one and other, the communion is like to be broken. The scrupulous or erroneous Judaizer do the Gentiles not reject, but receive to your communion; yet not so that he thereby thinks himself encouraged or authorised to quarrel with other men's resolutions, and to condemn others. Verse 3. The scrupulous Judaizer must not reject and cast out of his communion the Gentile Christian, for God hath admitted him into his church (without laying that yoke upon him), as a servant into his family, and he is not to be excluded by the

Judaizer for such things as these. Verse 4. What commission hast thou, O Jewish Christian, to judge God's servant, received and owned by him, to exclude him out of the church? God is able to clear him, if he please, and he certainly will, having, by receiving him into his family, given him this liberty. Verse 5. In such things every man must act by his own, and not by another man's judgment or conscience, what he is verily persuaded he ought to do; and therefore unity and charity ought not to be broken by you for such things. Verses 6, 7. And this sure is well done on both sides; for no man of us is to do what he himself likes best, but what he thinks is most acceptable to God. Verse 9. And all the fruit of Christ's death, and suffering, and resurrection, which accrues to him, is only this—that he may have power and dominion over us all, to command or give what liberty he pleaseth. Verse 10. But why dost thou Jewish condemn the Gentile Christian, or exclude him from thy communion, because he useth his Christian liberty? &c. Or thou, Gentile Christian, why dost thou think it a piece of senseless stupidity in the Jew to abstain, and thereupon despise and vilify him, which also is a kind of judging him? Whereas, indeed, neither of you is to be the judge of the other, but Christ of you both. Verse 13. Do not any longer censure and separate from one another's communion for such things as these. Verse 14. The persuasion of its being forbidden him is, as long as he is so persuaded, sufficient to make it to him unlawful to use that liberty: see ver. 15, 16. Verse 17. For Christianity consists not in such external matters, but in mercifulness, and peaceableness, and delight to do good one to another; not dividing, and hating, and excommunicating one another. Verse 19. Let us most zealously attend to those things which may thus preserve peace among all sorts of Christians, though of different persuasions. Verse 20. Do not thou, for so inconsiderable a matter as eating is, or because another will not, or dares not, make use of that Christian liberty, disturb that peace, that unity which God hath wrought. Verse 21. It is not charitable to make

use of any part of Christian liberty, when by this so doing any other man is kept from receiving the faith, or any way wounded or hurt, *i. e.* brought to any kind of sin. Verse 23. And, indeed, for the scrupulous Jew, there is little reason he should be so ill-used for his daring [not] to eat, when he thinks himself otherwise obliged; for it were a damning sin, for which his own conscience already condemns him, should he eat or do any indifferent thing, as long as he thinks in conscience that it is not so. Chap. xv, 5, 6, 7. And that God, for whom we ought to suffer, give you the grace of unity and charity, such as Christ commanded and expects from you, that ye may join unanimously Jews and Gentiles into one, and assembling together, worship and serve the Lord, in all unity of affections and form of words. Wherefore, in all humility of condescension and kindness, embrace and succour one another, help them up when they are fallen, instead of despising and driving them from your communion, after the example of Christ's usage towards men, who came from heaven and laid down his life to relieve us—and there is nothing by which God is more glorified than this."

If all this may consist with rejecting from all communion in the eucharist, and afterwards excommunicating, suspending, silencing, imprisoning, &c., we understand not English.

2. In like manner Grotius, *in loc. cap. xiv. 1. Contra vocati e Gentibus, conscii datæ per Christum libertatis, Judæos Judaice viventes à sua communione volebant excludere*, (11, 18, 21) *unde secuturum erat schisma. . . . Huic malo ut occurrat Paulus, mediam institit viam, et Judæos qui in Christum crediderant, monet ita suam sequantur opinionem, ut à damnandis crimine impietatis qui aliter sentiebant, absterneant. Ex gentibus vero vocatos, ne illorum quamvis Judaice viventium communionem defugiant, et ut imperitos spernant.* Προσλαμβέσθε. *Societate Ecclesiæ, sicut qui hospitio aliquem excipiunt, dicuntur cum προσλαμβέσθην*, (Acts xviii, 26; xxviii, 2.) *Ecclesia enim domui comparatur supra* (xi, 25.) *Sumitur hæc admonitio ex iis quæ de Christo dicta;*

(Matt. xii, 20.) 2. *Tolerandi sunt ii qui ab omnibus animatis abstinendum putant, quod quidam faciebant religione quâdam.* Cap. xv, 6. Ἴνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν Θεὸν, *id est, ut cum Deum laudatis, eique preces funditis, faciatis id non tantum eodem verborum sono—sed et animo pleno mutuae delectionis, sine contemptu, sine odio.* Habes hanc vocem ὁμοθυμαδὸν (Act. ii, 46), *ubi forma est ecclesiæ perfectissimæ.* Adde ad ejus vocis explicationem id quod est, Act. iv, 32, (all which includeth communion in the eucharist.)—Verse 7. *Nolite ob res tales, alii alios à fraternitate abscindere.*

XXIII.

Petition to the King at the Close of the Conference.—Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, pp. 366—8.¹

To the King's most excellent Majesty. The due account and humble Petition of us Ministers of the Gospel lately Commissioned for the Review and Altercation of the Liturgy.

May it please your Majesty;

When this distempered nation, wearied with its own contentions and divisions, did groan for unity and peace, the wonderful providence of the most righteous God appearing for the removal of impediments, their eyes were upon your majesty, as the person born to be, under God, the centre of their concord, and taught by affliction to break the bonds of the afflicted, and by experience of the sad effects of men's uncharitableness and passions, to restrain all from violence and extremities, and keeping moderation and mediocrity, the oil of charity and peace. And when these your subjects' desires were accomplished in your majesty's peaceable possession of your throne, it was the joy and encouragement of the sober and religious, that you began the exercise of your

¹ Printed as originally drawn up by Baxter.—Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, p. 365.

government with a proclamation full of Christian zeal against debauchery and profaneness, declaring also your dislike of "those who under pretence of affection to your majesty and your service, assume to themselves the liberty of reviling, threatening, and reproaching others, to prevent that reconciliation and union of hearts and affections, which can only with God's blessing, make us rejoice in each other." Our comforts also were carried on by your majesty's early and ready entertainment of motions for accommodation in these points of discipline and worship in which we were disagreed, and your professed resolutions to draw us together by mutual approaches, and publishing your healing Declaration, which was received with the thanks of your House of Commons, and the applause of the people, and the special joy of those that longed for concord and tranquillity in the church. In which your majesty declareth so much satisfaction in the foundations of agreement already laid, as that you "should think yourself very unfortunate, and suspect that you are defective in the administration of government, if any superstructures should shake these foundations, and contract or lessen the blessed gift of charity, which is a vital part of Christian religion." And as in the said gracious Declaration, your majesty resolved to "appoint an equal number of learned divines of both persuasions to review the liturgy, and to make such alterations as shall be thought most necessary, and some additional forms (in the Scripture phrase as near as may be) suited unto the nature of the several parts of worship; and that it be left to the minister's choice, to use one or other at his discretion;" so in accomplishment thereof, your majesty among others, directed your commission unto us for the review of "the several directions, rules, and forms of prayer, and things in the said Book of Common Prayer contained:" and "if occasion be, to make such reasonable and necessary alterations, corrections, and amendments therein, as by and between us shall be agreed upon to be needful or expedient for the giving of satisfaction to tender consciences, and the restoring and continuance of peace and

unity in the churches under your protection and government," —and what we "agree upon as needful or expedient to be done, for the altering, diminishing, or enlarging the said Book of Common Prayer, or any part thereof, forthwith to certify and present it in writing" to your majesty.

In obedience to this your majesty's commission, we met with the Right Reverend Bishops, who required of us, that before any personal debates, we should "bring in writing, all our Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer, and all the additional forms which we desired." Both which we performed; and received from them an Answer to the first, and returned them our full Reply. The last week of our time, being designed to personal conference, was at the will of the Right Reverend Bishops spent in a particular dispute by three of each part, about the sinfulness of one of the injunctions, from which we desired to be free; and in some other conference on the by. And though the account which we are forced to give your majesty of the issue of our consultations is that, no agreements are subscribed by us, to be offered your majesty, according to your expectation; and though it be none of our intent to cast the least unmeet reflections upon the Right Reverend Bishops and learned brethren who think not meet to yield to any considerable alterations to the ends expressed in your majesty's commission; yet we must say, that it is some quiet to our minds that we have not been guilty of your majesty's and your subjects' disappointments, and that we account not your majesty's gracious commission, nor our labour lost, having peace of conscience in the discharge of our duties to God and you: that we have been the seekers and followers of peace, and have earnestly pleaded, and humbly petitioned for it; [and offered for it any price below the offence of God Almighty, and the wounding or hazard of our own, or of the people's souls; and that we have in season borne our testimony against those extremes, which at last will appear to those that do not now discern it, to have proceeded from uncharitable mistake, and tended to the division and trouble of the

church : that whatever shall become of charity, unity, and concord, our life, our beauty, and our bands, our consciences tell us we have not deserted them, nor left any probable means unattempted, which we could discern within our power.]² And we humbly beseech your majesty to believe, that we own no principles of faction or disobedience, nor patronize the errors or obstinacy of any. It is granted us by all, that nothing should be commanded us by man, which is contrary to the Word of God : that if it be, and we know it, we are bound not to perform it, God being the absolute universal sovereign ; that we must use all just means to discern the will of God, and whether the commands of man be contrary to it : that if the command be sinful, and any, through the neglect of sufficient search, shall judge it lawful, his culpable error excuseth not his doing of it from being sin ; and therefore as a reasonable creature must needs have a judgment of discerning, that he may rationally obey, so are we with the greatest care and diligence to exercise it in the greatest things, even the obeying of God and the saving of our souls ; and that where a strong probability of great sin and danger lieth before us, we must not rashly run on without search ; and that to go against conscience, even where it is mistaken, is sin and danger to him that erreth. And on the other side we are agreed that, in things no way against the laws of God, the commands of our governors must be obeyed : that if they command what God forbids, we must patiently submit to suffering ; and every soul must be subject to the higher powers, for conscience sake, and not resist : that public judgment, civil, or ecclesiastical, belongeth only to public persons, and not to any private man : that no man must be causelessly and pragmatically inquisitive into the reasons of his superior's commands ; nor by pride and self-conceitedness exalt his own understanding above its worth and office ; but all to be modestly and humbly self-suspicious :

² This passage between brackets was left out in the Address as presented to the king.

that none must erroneously pretend God's law against the just command of his superior, nor pretend the doing of his duty to be sin: that he who suspecteth his superior's commands to be against God's laws, must use all means for full information, before he settle in a course of disobeying them: and that he who indeed discovereth anything commanded to be sin, though he must not do it, must manage his opinion with very great tenderness and care of the public peace, and the honour of his governors. These are our principles. If we are otherwise represented to your majesty we are misrepresented. If we are accused of contradicting them, we humbly crave that we may never be condemned till we are heard. It is the desire of our souls to contribute our parts and interests to the utmost, for the promoting of holiness, charity, unity, and obedience to rulers in all lawful things. But if we should sin against God, because we are commanded, who shall answer for us, or save us from his justice? And we humbly crave, that it may be no unjust grievance of our dissent, that thereby we suppose superiors to err; seeing it is but supposing them to be men not yet in heaven; and this may be imputed to every one that differeth in opinion from another. And we beseech your majesty to believe that, as we seek no greater matters in the world than our daily bread, with liberty to preach the gospel, and worship God according to his Word and the practice of the primitive purest church, so we hope it is not through pusillanimity and overmuch tenderness of suffering that we have pleaded so much for the avoiding of suffering to ourselves or others. May none of our sufferings hinder the prosperity of the church, and the good of souls [of men! May not our dread sovereign, the breath of our nostrils, be tempted by misrepresentations to distaste such as are faithful, and unawares to wrong the interest of Christ, and put forth his hand to afflict those that Christ would have him cherish, lest their head should be provoked to jealousy and offence! May not the land of our nativity languish in divisions, nor be filled with the groans of those that are shut out of the holy assemblies,

and those that want the necessary breaking of the bread of life, nor be disappointed of its expected peace and joy! Let not these things befall us,]³ and we have enough. And we suppose those that think the persons inconsiderable in number and quality for whom we plead, will not themselves believe that we have done this for popular applause. This were not so much to seek the reward of hypocrites, as to play the game of fools; seeing the applause of inconsiderable men can be but inconsiderable; and we know ourselves that we are like thus to offend those that are not inconsiderable. The Lord, that searcheth hearts, doth know that it is not so much the avoiding of suffering to ourselves or any particular persons that is the end of our endeavours (though this were no ambitious end,) as the peace and welfare of the church and kingdoms under your majesty's government. We know that, supposing them that are for the ceremonies to be as pious and charitable as the rest, it cannot so much offend them that another man forbearth them, as it must offend that other to be forced to use them: and we know that conscientious men will not consent to the practice of things in their judgments unlawful, when those may yield that count the matters but indifferent.

And for the management of this treaty, it being agreed at our first meeting, that nothing be reported as the words or sense of either part, but what is by them delivered in writing, we humbly crave that your majesty receive no more as ours; and that what is charged on any particular person, he may be answerable for himself. And though the reverend bishops have not had time to consider of our Additions to the liturgy, and of our Reply, that yet they may be considered before a determination be made. And though we seem to have laboured in vain, we shall yet lay this work of reconciliation and peace at the feet of your majesty, beseeching you to prosecute such a blessed resolution till it attain success. We

³ This passage between brackets was left out in the Address as presented to the king.

must needs believe, that when your majesty took our consent to a liturgy, to be a foundation that would infer our concord, you meant not that we should have no concord, but by consenting to this liturgy without any considerable alteration. And when you comforted us with your resolution to draw us together, by yielding on both sides in what we could, you meant not that we should be the boat, and they the bank that must not stir. And when your majesty commanded us by your letters patents to treat about such alterations as are “needful or expedient for giving satisfaction to tender consciences, and the restoring and continuance of peace and unity,” we rest assured that it was not your sense, that those tender consciences were to be forced to practise all which they judged unlawful, and not so much as a ceremony abated them. Or that our treaty was only to convert either part to the opinion of the other; and that all our hopes of concord or liberty consisted only in disputing the bishops into non-conformity, or coming in every ceremony to their minds.

Finally, as your majesty, under God, is the protection whereto your people fly, and as the same necessities still remain, which drew forth your gracious Declaration, we most humbly and earnestly beseech your majesty, that the benefits of the said Declaration may be continued to your people, and in particular, “that none be punished or troubled for not using the Common Prayer, till it be effectually reformed,” and the additions made as there expressed.

We crave your majesty’s pardon for the tediousness of this Address, and shall wait in hope, that so great a calamity of your people, as would follow the loss of so many able faithful ministers as rigorous impositions would cast out, shall never be recorded in the history of your reign: but that these impediments of concord being forborne, your kingdoms may flourish in piety and peace, and this may be the signal honour of your happy government, and your joy in the day of your accounts. Which is the prayer of

Your majesty’s faithful and obedient subjects.

XXIV.

The Act of Uniformity.

An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers and Administration of Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies: and for establishing the form of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in the Church of England.

WHEREAS, in the first year of the late Queen Elizabeth, there was one uniform order of common service and prayer, and of the administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of England (agreeable to the Word of God, and usage of the primitive church) compiled by the reverend bishops and clergy, set forth in one book, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England," and enjoined to be used by Act of Parliament, holden in the said first year of the said late queen, entitled An Act for Uniformity of Common Prayer and service in the Church, and administration of the sacraments, very comfortable to all good people desirous to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm, upon the which the mercy, favour, and blessing of Almighty God is in no wise so readily and plentifully poured as by common prayers, due using of the sacraments, and often preaching of the gospel, with devotion of the hearers. And yet this, notwithstanding, a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality, and living without knowledge, and due fear of God, do wilfully and schismatically abstain and refuse to come to their parish churches, and other public places where common prayer, administration of the sacraments, and preaching of the Word of God is used upon the Sundays and other days ordained and appointed to be kept and observed as holy days: And whereas, by

the great and scandalous neglect of the ministers in using the said order or liturgy so set forth and enjoined as aforesaid, great mischiefs and inconveniences, during the time of the late unhappy troubles, have arisen and grown, and many people have been led into factions and schisms, to the great decay and scandal of the reformed religion of the Church of England, and to the hazard of many souls. For prevention whereof in time to come, for settling the peace of the church, and for allaying the present distempers which the indisposition of the time hath contracted, the king's majesty (according to his declaration of the five-and-twentieth of October, one thousand six hundred and sixty,) granted his commission, under the great seal of England, to several bishops and other divines, to review the Book of Common Prayer, and to prepare such alterations and additions as they thought fit to offer. And afterwards the convocations of both the provinces of Canterbury and York, being by his majesty called and assembled, (and now sitting) his majesty hath been pleased to authorize and require the presidents of the said convocation, and other the bishops and clergy of the same, to review the said Book of Common Prayer, and the book of the form and manner of the making and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons: and that, after mature consideration, they should make such additions and alterations in the said books respectively, as to them should seem meet and convenient; and should exhibit and present the same to his majesty in writing, for his further allowance or confirmation; since which time, upon full and mature deliberation, they the said presidents, bishops, and clergy of both provinces, have accordingly reviewed the said books, and have made some alterations which they think fit to be inserted to the same; and some additional prayers to the said Book of Common Prayer, to be used upon proper and emergent occasions; and have exhibited and presented the same unto his majesty in writing, in one book, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together

with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches; and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons." All which his majesty having duly considered, hath fully approved and allowed the same, and recommended to this present parliament, that the said Books of Common Prayer, and of the form of ordination and consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons, with the alterations and additions which have been so made and presented to his majesty by the said convocations, be the book which shall be appointed to be used by all that officiate in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, and in all chapels or colleges, and halls in both the Universities, and the colleges of Eton and Winchester, and in all parish churches and chapels within the kingdom of England, dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and by all that make or consecrate bishops, priests, or deacons, in any of the said places, under such sanctions and penalties as the Houses of Parliament shall think fit.

II. Now in regard that nothing conduceth more to the settling of the peace of this nation (which is desired of all good men) nor to the honour of our religion, and the propagation thereof, than a universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God, and to the intent that every person within this realm, may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship, and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church of England, and the manner how, and by whom bishops, priests, and deacons are, and ought to be made, ordained, and consecrated. Be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by the advice and with the consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and of the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and singular ministers in any cathedral, collegiate, or parish church or chapel, or other place of public worship within this realm of England, dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, shall be bound to say and use the morning

prayer, evening prayer, celebration and administration of both the sacraments, and all other the public and common prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book annexed, and joined to this present Act, and entitled, "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David: pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches: and the form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons:" and that the morning and evening prayers therein contained, shall, upon every Lord's day, and upon all other days and occasions, and at the times therein appointed, be openly and solemnly read by all and every minister or curate in every church, chapel, or other place of public worship, within this realm of England, and places aforesaid.

III. And to the end that uniformity in the public worship of God, (which is so much desired may be speedily effected,) Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every parson, vicar, or other minister whatsoever, who now hath and enjoyeth any ecclesiastical benefice or promotion within this realm of England, or places aforesaid, shall in the church, chapel, or place of public worship belonging to his said benefice or promotion, upon some Lord's day before the feast of St. Bartholomew, which shall be in the year of our Lord God, one thousand six hundred and sixty two, openly, publicly, and solemnly read the morning and evening prayer appointed to be read by and according to the said Book of Common Prayer, at the times thereby appointed; and after such reading thereof, shall openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things in the said book contained and prescribed in these words and no other.

IV. I, A. B., do here declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled, "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and

Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches: and the form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons."

V. And that all and every such person who shall (without some lawful impediment, to be allowed and approved of by the ordinary of the place) neglect or refuse to do the same within the time aforesaid (or in case of such impediment), within one month after such impediment removed, shall, *ipso facto*, be deprived of all his spiritual promotions. And that from thenceforth it shall be lawful to, and for all patrons and donors of all and singular the said spiritual promotions, or of any of them, according to their respective rights and titles, to present or collate to the same, as though the person or persons so offending or neglecting were dead.

VI. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person who shall hereafter be presented or collated, or put into any ecclesiastical benefice or promotion within this realm of England, and places aforesaid, shall, in the church, chapel, or place of public worship belonging to his said benefice or promotion, within two months next after that he shall be in the actual possession of the said ecclesiastical benefice or promotion, upon some Lord's day, openly, publicly, and solemnly, read the morning and evening prayers appointed to be read by and according to the said Book of Common Prayer, at the times thereby appointed, or to be appointed, and after such reading thereof, shall openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things therein contained and prescribed, according to the form before appointed. And that all and every such person, who shall (without some lawful impediment, to be allowed and approved of by the ordinary of the place) neglect or refuse to do the same within the time aforesaid, (or in the case of such impediment, within one month after such impediment removed,) shall,

ipso facto, be deprived of all his said ecclesiastical benefices and promotions. And that from thenceforth it shall and may be lawful to and for all patrons and donors of all and singular the said ecclesiastical benefices and promotions, or any of them, according to their respective rights and titles, to present or collate to the same, as though the person or persons so offending or neglecting were dead.

VII. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that in all places where the proper incumbent of any parsonage, or vicarage, or benefice with cure, doth reside on his living and keep a curate, the incumbent himself in person (not having some lawful impediment, to be allowed by the ordinary of the place), shall once (at the least) in every month, openly and publicly, read the common prayers and service, in and by the said book prescribed, and (if there be occasion) administer each of the sacraments, and other rites of the church, in the parish church or chapel of, or belonging to the same parsonage, vicarage, or benefice, in such order, manner, and form, as in and by the said book is appointed; upon pain to forfeit the sum of five pounds to the use of the poor of the parish, for every offence, upon conviction by confession, or proof of two credible witnessess upon oath, before two justices of the peace of the county, city, or town corporate where the offence shall be committed (which oath the said justices are hereby empowered to administer), and in default of payment within ten days, to be levied by distress and sale of the goods and chattels of the offender by the warrant of the said justices, by the churchwardens, or overseers of the poor of the said parish, rendering the surplusage to the party.

VIII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every dean, canon, and prebendary of every cathedral or collegiate church, and all masters, and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors of or in any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital, and every public professor and reader in either of the universities, and in every college elsewhere, and every parson, vicar, curate, lecturer,

and every other person in holy orders, and every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school, and every person instructing or teaching any youth in any house or private family as a tutor or schoolmaster, who upon the first day of May which shall be in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and sixty-two, or at any time thereafter shall be incumbent or have possession of any deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, or reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, or any other ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, or of any curate's place, lecture or school; or shall instruct or teach any youth as tutor or schoolmaster, shall before the feast day of St. Bartholomew which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and sixty-two, or at or before his or their respective admission to be incumbent or have possession aforesaid, subscribe the declaration or acknowledgment following:—*scilicet*.

IX. I, A. B., do declare, that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king: and that I do abhor that traiterous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him: and that I will conform to the liturgy of the church of England as it is now by law established: and I do declare, that I do hold there lies no obligation upon me, or any other person, from the oath commonly called, The Solemn League and Covenant, to endeavour any change or alteration of government either in church or state; and that the same was in itself an unlawful oath, and imposed upon the subjects of this realm against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom.

X. Which said declaration and acknowledgment shall be subscribed by every of the said masters, and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors of, or in any college, hall, or house of learning, and by every public professor and reader in either of the universities, before the vice chancellor of the respective universities for the time being, or his deputy: and the said declaration or acknowledgment shall be sub-

scribed before the respective archbishop, bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, by every other person hereby enjoined to subscribe the same; upon pain that all and every of the persons aforesaid failing in such subscription, shall lose and forfeit such respective deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, curate's place, lecture, and school, and shall be utterly disabled, and *ipso facto* deprived of the same: and that every such respective deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, curate's place, lecture and school, shall be void, as if such person so failing were naturally dead.

XI. And if any schoolmaster or other person instructing or teaching youth in any private house or family as a tutor or schoolmaster shall instruct or teach any youth as a tutor or schoolmaster, before license obtained from his respective archbishop, bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, according to the laws and statutes of this realm, (for which he shall pay twelvecence only,) and before such subscription or acknowledgment made as aforesaid: then every such schoolmaster, and other instructing and teaching as aforesaid shall, for the first offence, suffer three months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprize; and for every second and other such offence shall suffer three months' imprisonment without bail or mainprize, and also forfeit to his majesty the sum of five pounds: and after such subscription made, every such parson, vicar, curate, and lecturer, shall procure a certificate, under the hand and seal of the respective archbishop, bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, (who are hereby enjoined and required upon demand to make and deliver the same,) and shall publicly and openly read the same, together with the declaration or acknowledgment aforesaid, upon some Lord's day within three months then next following in his parish church where he is to officiate, in the presence of the congregation there assembled in the time of divine service; upon pain that every person failing therein shall lose such

parsonage, vicarage, or benefice, curate's place or lecturer's place respectively, and shall be utterly disabled and *ipso facto* deprived of the same; and that the said parsonage, vicarage, or benefice, curate's place or lecturer's place, shall be void as if he was naturally dead.

XII. Provided always, that from and after the twenty-fifth day of March, which shall be in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and eighty-two, there shall be omitted in the said declaration or acknowledgment so to be subscribed and read, these words following, *scilicet* :

And I do declare, that I do hold there lies no obligation on me or any other person, from the oath commonly called The Solemn League and Covenant, to endeavour any change or alteration of government either in church or state, and that the same was in itself an unlawful oath, and imposed upon the subjects of this realm, against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom.

So as none of the persons aforesaid shall from thenceforth be at all obliged to subscribe or read that part of the said declaration or acknowledgment.

XIII. Provided always and be it enacted, that from and after the feast of St. Bartholomew which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and sixty-two, no person who now is incumbent and in possession of any parsonage, vicarage, or benefice, and who is not already in holy orders by episcopal ordination, or shall not before the said feast-day of St. Bartholomew be ordained priest or deacon according to the form of episcopal ordination, shall have, hold, or enjoy the said parsonage, vicarage, benefice, with cure or other ecclesiastical promotion within this kingdom of England, or the dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, but shall be utterly disabled and *ipso facto* deprived of the same, and all his ecclesiastical promotions shall be void as if he was naturally dead.

XIV. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person whatsoever shall thenceforth be capable to be admitted to any parsonage, vicarage, benefice, or other eccle-

siastical promotion or dignity whatsoever, nor shall presume to consecrate and administer the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper before such time as he shall be ordained priest according to the form and manner in and by the said book prescribed, unless he have formerly been made priest by episcopal ordination; upon pain to forfeit for every offence the sum of one hundred pounds, one moiety thereof to the king's majesty, the other moiety thereof to be equally divided between the poor of the parish where the offence shall be committed; and such person or persons as shall sue for the same by action of debt, bill, plaint, or information in any of his majesty's courts of record, wherein no essoin, protection, or wager of law shall be allowed, and to be disabled from taking or being admitted into the order of priest by the space of one whole year then next following.

XV. Provided that the penalties in this Act shall not extend to the foreigners or aliens of the foreign reformed churches, allowed or to be allowed by the king's majesty, his heirs and successors, in England.

XVI. Provided always, that no title to confer or present by lapse, shall accrue by any avoidance or deprivation *ipso facto* by virtue of this statute, and after six months after notice of such avoidance or deprivation given by the ordinary to the patron, or such sentence of deprivation openly and publicly read in the parish church of the benefice, parsonage, or vicarage becoming void, or whereof the incumbent shall be deprived by virtue of this act.

XVII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no form or order of common prayers, administration of sacraments, rites or ceremonies, shall be openly used in any church, chapel, or other public place of, or in any college or hall in either of the universities, the colleges of Westminster, Winchester, or Eton, or any of them, other than what is prescribed and appointed to be used in and by the said book; and that the present governor or head of every college and hall in the said universities, and of the said colleges of Westminster, Winchester, and Eton,

within one month after the feast of St. Bartholomew which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and sixty-two; and every governor or head of any of the said colleges or halls hereafter to be elected or appointed, within one month next after his election or collation and admission into the same government or headship, shall openly and publicly in the church, chapel, or other public place of the same college or hall, and in the presence of the fellows and scholars of the same, or the greater part of them then resident, subscribe unto the Nine-and-Thirty Articles of religion mentioned in the statute made in the thirteenth year of the reign of the late Queen Elizabeth, and unto the said book, and declare his unfeigned assent and consent unto and approbation of the said articles, and of the same book, and to the use of all the prayers, rites, and ceremonies, forms and orders, in the said book prescribed and contained, according to the form aforesaid; and that all such governors or heads of the said colleges and halls, or any of them, as are, or shall be, in holy orders, shall once (at least) in every quarter of the year (not having a lawful impediment) openly and publicly read the morning prayer and service in and by the said book appointed to be read in the church, chapel, or other public place of the same college or hall; upon pain to lose and be suspended of and from all the benefits and profits belonging to the same government or headship, by the space of six months, by the visitor or visitors of the same college or hall; and if any governor or head of any college or hall, suspended for not subscribing unto the said articles and book, or for not reading of the morning prayer and service as aforesaid, shall not, at or before the end of six months next after such suspension, subscribe unto the said articles and book, and declare his consent thereunto as aforesaid, or read the morning prayer and service as aforesaid, then such government or headship shall be *ipso facto* void.

XVIII. Provided always, that it shall and may be lawful

to use the morning and evening prayer, and all other prayers and service prescribed in and by the said book, in the chapels or other public places of the respective colleges and halls in both the universities, in the colleges of Westminster, Winchester, and Eton, and in the convocations of the clergies of either province, in Latin; anything in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

XIX. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that no person shall be, or be received as a lecturer, or permitted, suffered, or allowed to preach as a lecturer, or to preach or read any sermon, or lecture in any church, chapel, or other place of public worship, within this realm of England, or the dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, unless he be first approved, and thereunto licensed by the archbishop of the province, or bishop of the diocese, or (in case the see be void) by the guardian of the spiritualities, under his seal, and shall, in the presence of the same archbishop, or bishop, or guardian, read the Nine-and-Thirty Articles of religion mentioned in the statute of the thirteenth year of the late queen Elizabeth, with declaration of his unfeigned assent to the same; and that every person and persons who now is, or hereafter shall be licensed, assigned, and appointed, or received as a lecturer, to preach upon any day of the week, in any church, chapel, or place of public worship within this realm of England, or places aforesaid, the first time he preacheth (before his sermon) shall openly, publicly, and solemnly read the common prayers and service in and by the said book appointed to be read for that time of the day, and then and there publicly and openly declare his assent unto and approbation of the said book, and to the use of all the prayers, rites and ceremonies, forms and orders therein contained and prescribed, according to the form before appointed in this Act; and also shall, upon the first lecture day of every month afterwards, so long as he continues lecturer or preacher there, at the place appointed for his said lecture or sermon, before his said lecture or sermon, openly, publicly, and solemnly read the common

prayers and service in and by the said book appointed to be read for that time of the day at which the said lecture or sermon is to be preached, and after such reading thereof, shall, openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned assent and consent unto and approbation of the said book and to the use of all the prayers, rites and ceremonies, forms and orders, therein contained and prescribed, according to the form aforesaid; and that all and every such person and persons who shall neglect or refuse to do the same, shall from thenceforth be disabled to preach the said or any other lecture or sermon in the said or any other church, chapel, or place of public worship, until such time as he and they shall openly, publicly, and solemnly read the common prayers and service appointed by the said book, and conform in all points to the things therein appointed and prescribed, according to the purpose, true intent, and meaning of this Act.

XX. Provided always, that if the said sermon or lecture be to be preached or read in any cathedral or collegiate church or chapel, it shall be sufficient for the said lecturer, openly, at the time aforesaid, to declare his assent and consent to all things contained in the said book, according to the form aforesaid.

XXI. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that if any person who is by this Act disabled to preach any lecture or sermon, shall, during the time that he shall continue and remain so disabled, preach any sermon or lecture; that then, for every such offence, the person and persons so offending shall suffer three months' imprisonment in the common gaol, without bail or mainprize; and that any two justices of the peace of any county of this kingdom and places aforesaid, and the mayor or other chief magistrate of any city or town corporate within the same, upon certificate from the ordinary of the place made to him or them, of the offence committed, shall, and are hereby required to commit the person or persons so offending, to the gaol of the same county, city, or town corporate accordingly.

XXII. Provided always, and be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that at all and every time and times when any sermon or lecture is to be preached, the common prayers and service in and by the said book appointed to be read for that time of the day, shall be openly, publiely, and solemnly read by some priest or deacon, in the church, chapel, or place of public worship where the said sermon or lecture is to be preached, before such sermon or lecture be preached; and that the lecturer then to preach shall be present at the reading thereof.

XXIII. Provided nevertheless, that this Act shall not extend to the university churches in the universities of this realm, or either of them, when or at such times as any sermon or lecture is preached or read in the said churches, or any of them, for or as the public university sermon or lecture; but that the same sermons and lectures may be preached or read in such sort and manner as the same have been heretofore preached or read, this Act or anything herein contained to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

XXIV. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that the several good laws and statutes of this realm, which have been formerly made, and are now in force for the uniformity of prayer, and administration of the sacraments within this realm of England, and places aforesaid, shall stand in full force and strength to all intents and purposes whatsoever, for the establishing and confirming of the said book, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be said or sung in churches, and the form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons," herein before mentioned, to be joined and annexed to this Act. And shall be applied, practised, and put in use for the punishing of all offences contrary to the said laws, with relation to the book aforesaid, and no other.

XXV. Provided always, and be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that in all those prayers, litanies, and collects which do any way relate to the king, queen, or royal progeny, the names be altered and changed from time to time, and fitted to the present occasion according to the direction of lawful authority.

XXVI. Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that a true printed copy of the said book, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches, and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons" shall at the costs and charges of the parishioners of every parish church and chapel, cathedral, church, college, and hall, be attained and gotten before the feast day of St. Bartholomew, in the year of our Lord, one thousand six hundred sixty and two, upon pain of forfeiture of three pounds, by the month, for so long time as they shall thereafter be unprovided thereof, by every parish or chapelry, cathedral, church, college, and hall making default therein.

XXVII. Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the Bishops of Hereford, St. David's, Asaph, Bangor, and Landaff, and their successors, shall take such order among themselves, for the souls' health of the flock committed to their charge, within Wales, that the book hereunto annexed be truly and exactly translated into the British or Welsh tongue; and that the same so translated, and being by them, or any three of them at the least, viewed, perused, and allowed, be imprinted to such number at least, so that one of the said books, so translated and imprinted, may be had for every cathedral, collegiate and parish church, and chapel of ease, in the said respective dioceses and places in Wales, where the Welsh is commonly spoken or used, before the first day of May, one thousand six hundred and sixty-five: and that from and after the imprinting and pub-

lishing of the said book so translated, the whole divine service shall be used and said by the ministers and curates throughout all Wales, within the said dioceses where the Welsh tongue is commonly used, in the British or Welsh tongue, in such manner and form as is prescribed according to the book hereunto annexed to be used in the English tongue, differing nothing in any order or form from the said English book, for which book, so translated and imprinted, the churchwardens of every the said parishes shall pay out of the parish money in their hands for the use of the respective churches, and be allowed the same on their account; and that the said bishops and their successors, or any three of them at the least, shall set and appoint the price for which the said book shall be sold. And one other Book of Common Prayer, in the English tongue, shall be bought and had in every church throughout Wales, in which the Book of Common Prayer in Welsh is to had by force of this Act, before the first day of May, one thousand six hundred and sixty-four; and the same books to remain in such convenient places within the said churches, that such as understand them may resort at all convenient times to read and peruse the same; and also such as do not understand the said language, may, by conferring both tongues together, the sooner attain to the knowledge of the English tongue, anything in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding. And until printed copies of the said book so to be translated, may be had and provided, the form of Common Prayer established by parliament before the making of this Act, shall be used as formerly in such parts of Wales where the English tongue is not commonly understood.

XXVIII. And to the end that the true and perfect copies of this Act and the said book hereunto annexed may be safely kept and perpetually preserved, and for the avoiding of all disputes for the time to come, be it therefore enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the respective deans and chapters of every cathedral or collegiate church within England and Wales shall, at their proper costs and charges, before the

twenty-fifth day of December, one thousand six hundred and sixty-two, obtain under the great seal of England, a true and perfect printed copy of this Act, and of the said book annexed hereunto, to be by the said deans and chapters and their successors, kept and preserved in safety for ever, and to be also produced and shewed forth in any court of record as often as they shall be thereunto lawfully required; and also there shall be delivered true and perfect copies of this Act, and of the same book into the respective courts at Westminster, and into the tower of London, to be kept and preserved for ever among the records of the said courts, and the records of the tower, to be also produced and shewed forth in any court as need shall require; which said books, so to be exemplified under the great seal of England, shall be examined by such persons as the king's majesty shall appoint under the great seal of England for that purpose, and shall be compared with the original book hereunto annexed, and shall have power to correct and amend in writing any error committed by the printer in the printing of the same book, or of anything therein contained, and shall certify in writing, under their hands and seals, or the hands and seals of any three of them, at the end of the same book, that they have examined and compared the same book, and find it to be a true and perfect copy, which said books, and every one of them, so exemplified under the great seal of England, as aforesaid, shall be deemed, taken, adjudged, and expounded to be good and available in the law to all intents and purposes whatsoever, and shall be accounted as good records as this book itself hereunto annexed; any law or custom to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

XXIX. Provided also, that this Act, or anything therein contained, shall not be prejudicial or hurtful unto the king's professor of the law within the University of Oxford, for or concerning the prebend of Shipton, within the cathedral church of Sarum, united and annexed unto the place of the same king's professor for the time being by the late king James of blessed memory.

XXX. Provided always, that whereas the Six-and-Thirtieth Article of the Nine-and-Thirty Articles, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord, one thousand five hundred and sixty-two, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for establishing of consent touching true religion, is in these words following, viz. :

“That the book of consecration of archbishops and bishops, and ordaining of priests and deacons, lately set forth in the time of king Edward VI, and confirmed at the same time by authority of parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordaining. Neither hath it anything that of itself is superstitious and ungodly: and therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforementioned king Edward, unto this time or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites. We decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.”

XXXI. It be enacted, and be it therefore enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all subscriptions hereafter to be had or made unto the said Articles, by any deacon, priest, or ecclesiastical person, or other person whatsoever, who by this Act, or any other law now in force, is required to subscribe unto the said Articles, shall be construed and taken to extend and shall be applied (for and touching the said Six-and-Thirtieth Article) unto the book containing the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons in this Act mentioned, in such sort and manner as the same did heretofore extend unto the book set forth in the time of king Edward VI, mentioned in the said Six-and-Thirtieth Article, anything in the said Article, or in any statute, act, or canon heretofore had or made to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

XXXII. Provided also, that “The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, together with the form

and Manner of Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" heretofore in use, and respectively established by Act of Parliament, in the first and eighth years of queen Elizabeth shall be still used and observed in the church of England until the feast of St. Bartholomew, which shall be in the year of our Lord God, one thousand six hundred sixty and two.

XXV.

Efforts of Presbyterian Ministers to have the King's Declaration of October, 1660, enacted.—Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, by Sylvester, and Calamy's Continuation, &c., London, 1727, vol. i.

ALL this while [*i.e.* from the close of the Savoy Conference, to the passing of the Act of Uniformity] Mr. Calamy and some other ministers had been endeavouring with those that they had interest in, and to try if the parliament would pass the King's Declaration into a law; and sometimes they had some hope from the Lord Chancellor and others: but when it came to the trial, their hopes all failed them; and the conformity imposed was made ten times more burdensome than it ever was before. For besides that the Convocation had made the Common Prayer book more grievous than before, the parliament made a new Act of Uniformity, with a new form of subscription, and a new declaration to be made against the obligation of the Covenant; of which more anon. So that the King's Declaration did not only die before it came to execution, and all hopes, and treaties, and petitions were not only disappointed, but a weight more grievous than a thousand ceremonies was added to the old conformity, with a grievous penalty.

By this means there was a great unanimity in the ministers,

and the greater number were cast out. And as far as I could perceive, it was by some designed that it might be so. Many a time did we beseech them that they would have so much regard to the souls of men, and to the honour of England, and of the protestant religion, as that without any necessity at all, they would not impose feared perjury upon them, nor that which conscience, and common esteem, and popish adversaries would all call perjury; that papists might not have this to cast in our teeth, and call the protestants a perjured people, nor England or Scotland perjured lands. Oft have we proved to them that their cause and interest required no such thing. But all was but casting oil upon the flames, and forcing us to think of that monster of Milau, that made his enemy renounce God to save his life, before he stabbed him, that he might murder soul and body at a stroke. It seemed to be accounted the one thing necessary, which no reason must be heard against, that the Presbyterians must be forced to do that which they accounted public perjury, or to be cast out of trust and office, in church and commonwealth. And by this means a far greater number were laid by, than otherwise would have been; and the few that yielded to conformity they thought would be despicable and contemptible as long as they lived. A noble revenge, and worthy of the actors.—[*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 387.]

* * * * *

When I was absent (resolving to meddle in such businesses there no more) Mr. Calamy and the other ministers of London, who had acquaintance at the court, were put in hope that the king would grant that by way of Indulgence, which was before denied them; and that, before the Act was past, it might be provided that the king should have power to dispense with such as deserved well of him in his restoration, or whom he pleased. But that was frustrate.¹ And

¹ “If I should at length recite the story of this business, and what “peremptory promises they had, and how all was turned to their rebuke and “scorn, it would more increase the reader’s astonishment.”—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, p. 429.

after that, they were told that that the king had power himself to dispense in such cases, as he did with the Dutch and French churches. And some kind of Petition (I have not a copy of it) they drew up to offer the king. But when they had done it, they were so far from procuring their desires, that there fled abroad grievous threatenings against them, that they should incur a præmunire for such a bold attempt: when they were drawn to it at first, they did it with much hesitancy (through former experience) and they worded it so cautiously, that it extended not to the papists. Some of the Independents presumed to say, that the reason why all our addresses for liberty had not succeeded was because we did not extend it to the papists; and that, for their parts, they saw no reason why the papists should not have liberty of worship as well as others; and that it was better for them to have it, than for all us to go without it. But the Presbyterians still answered to that motion, that the king might himself do what he pleased: and if his wisdom thought meet to give liberty to the papists, let the papists petition for it, as they did for theirs. But if it be expected by any that it shall be forced upon them, to become petitioners for liberty for popery, they should never do it, whatever be the issue. Nor shall it be said to be their work. [*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, pp. 429—30.

* * * * *

[Mr. Calamy] advising with his great friends at court, a petition was drawn up to his majesty, and signed by a good number of the ministers in and about the city, who were affected with that Act [of Uniformity.] It was in the words following:—

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.

The humble Petition of several Ministers in your City of London.

May it please your most Excellent Majesty.

“ Upon former experience of your majesty's tenderness and indulgence to your obedient and loyal subjects, in which number we can with all clearness reckon ourselves, we, some

of the ministers within your City of London, who are likely by the late Act of Uniformity to be cast out of all public service in the ministry, because we cannot in conscience conform to all things required in the said Act, have taken the boldness humbly to cast ourselves and concernments at your majesty's feet, desiring that of your princely wisdom and compassion, you would take some effectual course whereby we may be continued in the exercise of our ministry, to teach your people obedience to God and your majesty. And we doubt not but, by our dutiful and peaceable carriage therein, we shall render ourselves not altogether unworthy of so great a favour."

This petition was presented to his majesty August 27th, three days after the Act took place, by Mr. Calamy, Dr. Manton, Dr. Bates, and others; and Mr. Calamy made a speech on the occasion, intimating that those of his persuasion were ready to enter the list with any, for their fidelity to his majesty, and did little expect to be dealt with as they had been, and they were now come to his majesty's feet, as the last application they should make, &c. His majesty promised he would consider of their business.

And the very next day the matter was fully debated in council, his majesty himself being present, who was pleased to declare that he intended an *Indulgence*, if it were at all feasible.

The great friends of the silenced ministers, who had encouraged their hopes by a variety of specious promises, were allowed upon this occasion freely to suggest their reasons against putting the Act in execution; and they argued very strenuously. But Dr. Sheldon, Bishop of London, in a warm speech declared that it was now too late to think of suspending that law: for that he had already, in obedience to it, ejected such of his clergy as would not comply with it on the Sunday before; and should they now be restored, after they were thus exasperated, he must expect to feel the effects of their resentment, and should never be able to maintain his episcopal authority among such a clergy, who

would not fail to insult him as their enemy, being countenanced by the court. Nor could the resolutions of the council-board justify his contempt of a law which had passed with such an unanimous consent, and upon such mature deliberation of both houses. Should the sacred authority of this law be now suspended, it would render the legislature ridiculous and contemptible. And if the impertunity of such disaffected people were a sufficient reason to humour them, neither the Church nor State would ever be free from distractions and convulsions.

And upon the whole it was carried that no *Indulgence* at all should be granted.—[Calamy's Continuation, &c., vol. i, pp. 9—11.]

XXVI.

Extracts from Journals of Parliament relating to the passing of the Act of Uniformity.—Journals of the House of Lords, vol. xi; Journals of the House of Commons, vol. viii.

Martis, 25^o Junii, [1661], 13^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 279 *b*—280 *a*.]

Ordered—That a committee be appointed to view the several laws for confirming the liturgy of the Church of England; and to make search, whether the original book of the liturgy, annexed to the Act passed in the fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, be yet extant; and to bring in a compendious bill to supply any defect in the former laws; and to provide for an effectual conformity to the liturgy of the church, for the time to come.

And a committee was accordingly appointed, of all the members of this house that are of the long robe; and the preparing the bill was especially recommended to the care of Mr. Serjeant Keeling.

Sabbati, 29^o Junii, [1661], 13^o Car. Regis. [Journ. H. C., viii, 285 *b.*]

A Bill for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments, was this day read the first time.

Ordered—That the same be read again, the second time, on Wednesday next, the first public bill.

Mercurii, 3^o Julii, [1661], 13^o Car. Regis. Journ. H. C., viii, 288 *b*—289 *a.*

Resolved—That the Bill for Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments, together with the printed Book of Common Prayer, now brought in, intituled, “The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England,” annexed thereunto, be committed to Sir Tho. Fanshaw, Mr. Fane, Mr. Solicitor, Mr. Ashburnham, Mr. Clifford, Sir Rich. Ford, Lord Bruce, Mr. Churchill, Doctor Birkenhead, Mr. Potter, Sir Solomon Swale, Serjeant Keeling, Mr. Clerke, Sir Cha. Herbert, Lord St. John, Mr. Lowther, Mr. Knight, Sir Justin Isham, Mr. Walderon, Mr. Jo. Newton, Sir Phil. Musgrave, Sir Tho. Fanshall, junior, Sir Gilbert Gerrard, Sir Jo. Talbot, Mr. Orme, Sir Tho. Littleton, Sir Courtney Poole, Sir Hen. North, Sir Edw. Wallpoole, Sir Bayne Throgmorton, Sir. Hen. Newton, Sir Geo. Reeves, Mr. Comptroller, Lord Le De Spencer, Mr. Geffery Palmer, Lord Ossery, Sir. Wm. Compton, Mr. Giles Strangwayes, Mr. Edward Seymor, Mr. Stanley, Sir. Tho. Strickland, Mr. Stricklany, Sir Tho. Ingram, Mr. Rigby, Sir Wm. Lewes, Doctor Birwell, Mr. Weld, Sir Phill. Warwick, Sir Tho. Hebblethwaite, Sir Edm. Boyer, Mr. Waller, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Glascock, Mr. Vice-chamber-

lain, Sir Edw. Seamour, Sir Ben. Ayloff, Sir Jo. Strangwayes, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Thompson, Baron of Kinderton, Sir Tho. Leigh, Sir Tho. Lee, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Lovelace, Sir Tho. Smith, Sir John Shaw, Sir Rob. Bolle, Sir Antho. Irby, Sir Allen Apsley, Mr. Crouch, Mr. Lewis Palmer, Sir Robert Howard, Mr. Coventry, Mr. Milward, Mr. Kent, Sir Tho. Peyton, Sir Chichester Wray, Sir Edward Walgrave, Sir Hugh Windham, Sir Edm. Peirce, Mr. Aldworth, Lord Buckhurst, Sir Edw. Smith, Mr. Manwaring, Sir Wm. Hayward, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Secretary Morice, Mr. Ashburnham, Sir Allen Brodrick, Sir Jo. Goodrick, Sir Geo. Sands, Colonel Kyrkby, Lord Rich. Butler, Sir Wm. Hickman, Sir Fran. Clerke, Mr. Coriton, Mr. Wm. Coventrey, Mr. Pleadwell, Mr. Thomas, Sir Edm. Pooley, Sir Hump. Bennet, Sir Tho. Stukley, Colonel Windham, Mr. Swinfen, Mr. Phillips, Sir Roger Bradshaw, Mr. Hender Roberts, Mr. Chetwind, Mr. Tanner, Mr. Montague, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Shaw, Sir Lanc. Lake, Serjeant Charleton, Colonel Legg, Mr. Goodrick, Sir John Holland, Mr. Puckering, Sir Hen. Williams, Mr. Vaughan, Sir Nich. Crisp, Colonel Fretchvill, Mr. Morton, Sir Tho. Coventrey, Mr. Clerke, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Wren, Mr. Wm. Sandys, Mr. Sandys, Sir Hen. North, Sir Jo. Harrison, Mr. Tho. Jones, Sir Ben. Ayloff, Sir Cha. Harbord, Mr. Harbert, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Yorke, Sir Jo. Nicholas, Lord Cornbury, Sir Jos. Craddock, Mr. Lau. Hyde, Mr. Whorwood, Colonel Shakerley, Sir Wm. Gawdy, Sir Phillip Howard, Mr. Font, Lord Richardson, Mr. Robinson, Sir Hen. Wroth, Sir Rich. Oatley, Mr. Nicholas, Mr. Trelawney, Mr. Bulteele, Sir Geo. Reeve, Sir Rich. Breham, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Whittaker, Lord Cavendish, Sir Adrian Scrope, Mr. Dolman, Mr. Attorney of the Duchy, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Mallet, Sir Clem. Throgmorton, Sir Robert Atkins; and they are to meet this afternoon, at four of the clock, in the Star-Chamber. And if the original Book of Common Prayer cannot be found, then to report the said printed book, and their opinion touching the same; and to send for persons, papers, and records.

Veneris, 5^o Julii, [1661], 13^o Car. Regis. [Journ. H. C.,
viii, 291 *b.*]

Resolved—That . . . all the members of this House who are of both robes, be added to the said committee, [to whom the Bill for Uniformity of Public Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, is committed.]

Lunæ, 8^o Julii, [1661], 13^o Car. Regis. [Journ. H. C.,
viii, 294 *b.*—295 *b.*]

Mr. Pryn having made report from the committee, to whom it was referred to see which of the bills depending in the House, and which were committed to committees, were of most necessity to be proceeded in before the adjournment—

* * * * *

A Bill for Uniformity to Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments.

* * * * *

Sir Edmund Peirce reports, from the committee to whom the Bill for Uniformity of Public Prayers and Administration of Sacraments, was committed, several amendments, and an addition and proviso, to be added to the said bill, which he read, with the coherence, in his place, and delivered in at the clerk's table, with the bill; which said amendments were twice read.

Resolved—That this House doth agree to the said amendments and addition. And, upon reading of the said proviso, the same was ordered to be amended at the clerk's table; and, being so amended, was afterwards twice read.

Resolved—That this House doth agree to the said proviso; and that the same be made part of the bill.

Resolved—That the said bill, with the said amendments, addition, and proviso, added thereunto, be ingrossed.

* * * * *

Ordered—That the annexing the Book of Common Prayer

to the Bill for Uniformity, and the obliterating the two prayers inserted before the reading psalms, be taken into consideration to-morrow morning.

Martis, 9^o Julii, [1661], 13^o Car. Regis. [Journ. H. C.,
viii, 296 *a.*]

A Bill for the Uniformity of Public Prayers and Administration of Sacraments, being ingrossed, was this day read the third time.

And a Book of Common Prayer, intituled, “The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England,” which was imprinted at London in the year 1604, was, at the elerk’s table, annexed to the said bill, part of the two prayers, inserted therein before the reading psalms being first taken out, and the other part thereof obliterated.

And a proviso, tendered to be added to the said bill, being twice read, was upon the question, laid aside.

Resolved—That the said bill, with the said Book of Common Prayer so annexed, do pass.

Resolved—That the title of the said bill shall be, An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments.

Die Mercurii, 10^o die Julii, [1661], 13 Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 305 *a.*]

A message was brought from the House of Commons, by Sir Thomas Fanshaw and others; who brought up an act, passed their house, intituled, An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments; wherein they desire their lordships’ concurrence.

Die Martis, 14^o die Januarii, [1661—2], 13 Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 364 *b.*]

Hodie 1^a vice lecta est billa, An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments.

Die Veneris, 17^o die Januarii, [1661—2], 13 Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 366 *a-b*.]

Hodie 2^a vice lecta est Billa, An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments.

Ordered—That the consideration of this Bill is committed to these Lords following :

L. Privy Seal.	Archbp. Eborac.	Ds. Berkeley de
Dux Albemarle.	Bp. London.	Berk.
L. Chamberlain.	Bp. Durham.	Ds. Windsor.
Comes Derby.	Bp. Sarum.	Ds. Pagett.
Comes Dorsett.	Bp. Worcester.	Ds. Hunsdon.
Comes Bridgwater.	Bp. Lincoln.	Ds. Howard de
Comes North'ton.	Bp. Exon.	Charlt.
Comes Bolling-	Bp. Norwich.	Ds. Craven.
brooke.		Ds. Mohun.
Comes Portland.		Ds. Byron.
Comes Anglesey.		Ds. Lucas.
Comes Carlile.		Ds. Lexington.
		Ds. Delamer.
		Ds. Townsend.
		Ds. Crewe.

Their lordships, or any five to meet on Thursday next, [in the afternoon], in the Prince's lodgings, at three of the clock.

Martis, 28^o Januarii, [1661—2], 13^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 352 *b*.]

Ordered—That a message be sent to the Lords to desire them to give dispatch to the Bill of Uniformity; and that Lord Falkland is to carry up this message to the Lords.

Die Martis, 28^o die Januarii, [1661—2], 13^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 372 *b*.]

A message was brought from the House of Commons, by the Lord Viscount Falkland and others :

To put their Lordships in mind of Two Bills brought from the House of Commons; one, concerning Uniformity of Worship; the other, concerning Ministers; wherein they desire their Lordships would please to give what convenient expedition may be.

Die Jovis, 13^o die Februarii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 383 *a-b*.]

The Earl of Dorsett reported, “That the Committee for the Bill for Uniformity of Worship have met oftentimes, and expected a book of Uniformity to be brought in; but, that not being done, their Lordships have made no progress therein; therefore the Committee desires to know the pleasure of the house, whether they shall proceed upon the Book brought from the House of Commons, or stay until the other Book be brought in.”

Upon this, the Bishop of London signified to the House, “That the Book will very shortly be brought in.”

Die Jovis, 20^o die Februarii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 390 *a*.]

Ordered—That the Committee for the Bill for Uniformity [be] put off until Tuesday next, in the afternoon.

Die Martis, 25^o die Februarii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 392 *b*—393 *a*.]

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, “That he was commanded by the King to deliver a message unto their Lordships.” Which his Lordship read, as followeth; *videlicet*,

“CHARLES R,

“His majesty having, according to his Declaration of the 25th of October, 1660, granted his commission under the great seal, to several bishops and other divines, to review the Book of Common Prayer, and to prepare such alterations and additions as they thought fit to offer: afterwards the convoca-

tions of the clergy of both the provinces of Canterbury and York were by his majesty called and assembled, and are now sitting. And his Majesty hath been pleased to authorize and require the presidents of the said convocations, and other the bishops and clergy of the same, to review the said Book of Common Prayer, and the book of the form and manner of making and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons; and that, after mature consideration, they should make such additions or alterations in the said books respectively as to them should seem meet and convenient; and should exhibit and present the same to his majesty in writing, for his majesty's further consideration, allowance, or confirmation. Since which time, upon full and mature deliberation, they the said presidents, bishops, and clergy of both provinces, have accordingly reviewed the said books, and have made, exhibited, and presented to his majesty in writing, some alterations, which they think fit to be inserted in the same, and some additional prayers to the said Book of Common Prayer, to be used upon proper and emergent occasions.

“All which his majesty having duly considered, doth, with the advice of his council, fully approve and allow the same; and doth recommend it to the House of Peers, that the said Books of Common Prayer, and of the form of ordination and consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons, with those alterations and additions, be the book which, in and by the intended Act of Uniformity, shall be appointed to be used, by all that officiate in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, and in all chapels of colleges and halls in both the universities, and the colleges of Eton and Winchester, and in all parish churches and chapels within the kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and by all that make or consecrate bishops, priests, or deacons, in any of the said places, under such sanctions and penalties as the parliament shall think fit.

“Given at our court, at Whitehall, the 24th day of February, 1661”—2.

The book mentioned in his majesty's message was brought

into this House ; which is ordered to be referred to the committee for the Act of Uniformity.

Die Jovis, 27^o die Februarii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 396 *a.*]

Ordered—That the Duke of Bucks and the Earl of Pembroke are added to the committee for Uniformity.

Ordered—That Mr. Justice Hyde and Mr. Attorney General have notice to attend the committee for Uniformity this afternoon.

Lunæ, 3^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 377 *b.*]

[The king having commanded the Commons to attend him in the banqueting house, Whitehall, on Saturday, 1st March, they did so ; and the speaker read his majesty's speech to the house, on the following Monday. In the course of it his majesty said :]

“Gentlemen, I hear you are very zealous for the church, and very solicitous, and even jealous, that there is not expedition enough used in that affair. I thank you for it, since, I presume, it proceeds from a good root of piety and devotion : but I must tell you I have the worst luck in the world, if, after all the reproaches of being a papist, whilst I was abroad, I am suspected of being a presbyterian now I am come home. I know you will not take it unkindly, if I tell you, that I am as zealous for the church of England, as any of you can be ; and am enough acquainted with the enemies of it, on all sides ; that I am as much in love with the Book of Common Prayer, as you can wish, and have prejudice enough to those that do not love it ; who, I hope, in time will be better informed, and change their minds : and you may be confident, I do as much desire to see a uniformity settled, as any amongst you : I pray, trust me, in that affair ; I promise you to hasten the despatch of it, with all convenient speed ; you may rely upon me in it.

“I have transmitted the Book of Common Prayer, with those alterations and additions which have been presented to me by the Convocation, to the House of Peers with my approbation, that the Act of Uniformity may relate to it: so that I presume it will be shortly dispatched there; and when we have done all we can, the well settling that affair will require great prudence and discretion, and the absence of all passion and precipitation.”

Die Mercurii, 5^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 400 *a.*]

Ordered—That the Lord Lovelace and the Lord Widdrington are added to the committee for Uniformity.

Die Jovis, 6^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 400 *b.*]

Ordered—That the Lord Wharton is added to the committee for the Bill of Uniformity.

Die Veneris, 7^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 402 *a.*]

Ordered—That the Lord Berkley, of Straton, is added to the committee for the Bill of Uniformity.

Die Jovis, 13^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 406 *b.*]

The Earl of Bridgwater reported, “That the committee have considered of the Bill concerning Uniformity of Worship; wherein the committee have made divers amendments and alterations, which are offered to the consideration of this House; and that the committee, in their amendments and alterations, have made the bill relate to the book recommended by the king to this House, and not to the book brought with the bill from the House of Commons.”

Next, it was moved, “That the alterations and additions in

the Book of Common Prayer, as it came recommended from his majesty, might be read, before the alterations and amendments in the bill were read;" which was accordingly ordered, and read: but, having made little progress therein, and it being now late, and the business will require longer time, it is ordered, that this House will proceed in the reading the rest of the alterations and additions to-morrow morning at nine of the clock.

Die Veneris, 14^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 407 *a.*]

Then this House proceeded in the reading of the alterations and additions in the Book of Common Prayers; and ordered, to proceed further in the reading of it to-morrow morning.

Die Saturni, 15^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 408 *b.*]

Next, the House proceeded in the further reading of the alterations and additions in the Book of Common Prayers; which being ended, the Lord Chancellor, in the name, and by the directions of the House, gave the lords the bishops thanks, for their care in this business; and desired their lordships to give the like thanks, from this House, to the other House of Convocation, for their pains herein.

Ordered—That this House will take into consideration the alterations and amendments in the Bill concerning Uniformity of Public Worship, as it was lately reported; and this to be on Monday morning next.

Die Lunæ, 17^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 409 *a-b.*]

Next, this House took into consideration the Bill concerning Uniformity in Public Worship, formerly reported from the committee. And, upon the second reading of the alterations and provisos, and considerations thereof, it is ordered,

that this House agrees to the preamble, as it is now brought in by the committee.

And the question being put, “Whether this book that hath been transmitted to this House from the king shall be the book to which the Act of Uniformity shall relate?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Then the Lord Chancellor acquainted the House with a proviso recommended from the king, to be inserted in this Bill of Uniformity; which his lordship read.

And it was commanded that the same should be read again; and it is ordered, that the further debate of this business is deferred until to-morrow morning.

Die Martis, 18^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 410 *a.*]

Next, this House took into consideration the business of presenting the proviso yesterday from the king to this House; for debate whereof, the House was adjourned into a committee during pleasure.

And the House being resumed :

This question was put, “Whether a salvo shall be entered into the book, to save the privilege of this House, upon the occasion of this proviso from the king?”

And it was resolved in the negative.

Ordered—That to-morrow morning the debate concerning the matter of this proviso shall be resumed.

Die Mercurii, 19^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 411 *a.*]

Next, the House took into consideration the matter in the king’s proviso to the Bill for Uniformity of Worship.

And the proviso was read again and debated.

And there being another proviso offered to the House, which was read.

The question being put, “Whether this proviso shall be rejected?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered—That the Bill for Uniformity is re-committed; also the proviso sent from the king is referred to the consideration of the same committee, who are to meet to-morrow in the afternoon; and the Duke of Richmond is added to the said committee.

Die Jovis, 20^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 412 *b.*]

Ordered—That the Earl of Bristol and the Lord Herbert of Cherbury are added to the committee for the Bill of Uniformity.

Die Veneris, 21^o die Martii, [1661—2], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 413 *b.*]

Ordered—That the Lord Newport is added to the committee for the Bill of Uniformity.

Die Veneris, 4^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 421 *a.*]

Next, the Earl of Bridgwater reported from the committee, the alterations and provisos in the Bill concerning Uniformity of Worship.

The said alterations and provisos were read twice, and debated.

The question being put, “Whether these words ‘though indifferent in their own nature’ shall stand in the proviso, as they are brought in by the committee?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered—That this House will resume the further debate of this business to-morrow morning.

Die Saturni, 5^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 422 *a.*]

Next, the House resumed the debate as was yesterday, upon report of the Bill concerning Uniformity of Worship.

The point now in consideration was, the clause of ministers declaring against the covenant.

And, after a long debate, the question was put, “Whether this clause, *videlicet*, ‘I do declare that I hold that there is no obligation upon me, or any other person, from the oath commonly called The Solemn League and Covenant’ shall stand in the bill, as it is brought in by the committee?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered—That this bill shall be taken into further debate on Monday morning next.

Die Lunæ, 7^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 423 a.]

This day being appointed to consider further of the Act of Uniformity; the Lord Bishop of Worcester offered to the consideration of this House an explanation, in a paper, of the vote of this House on Saturday last, concerning the words in the Act of Uniformity, which declared against the solemn league and covenant; which he first opened, and afterwards, by permission of the House read the same: which afterwards the House commanded to be read by the clerk.

And, after debate thereof, the question being put, “Whether that the proceeding of the debate of this paper, thus brought in, be against the orders of this House?”

It was resolved in the negative.

Ordered—That this House will take into debate this paper to-morrow morning.

Memorandum—That, before the putting of the aforesaid question, these Lords whose names are subscribed, desired leave to enter their dissents, if the question was carried in the negative. [No names given.]

Die Martis, 8^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 424 a-b.]

Next, the House took into consideration the paper brought in yesterday, for an explanation of the clause in the Act of

Uniformity concerning the declaring against the covenant; and, after a long debate, it is ordered, that this paper be laid aside.

Ordered—That these Lords following are appointed to consider and draw up a clause, or proviso, whereby it may be left to the king to make such provision for those of the clergy as his majesty shall think fit, who shall be deprived of their livings by the Act of Uniformity; and afterwards to make report thereof to this House:

Dux Bucks.	Bp. Worcester.	Ds. Wharton.
Comes Bristol.	Bp. Exon.	Ds. Mohun
Comes Anglesey.	Bp. Hereford.	Ds. Lucas.
		Ds. Holles.

Their Lordships, or any two, to meet in the Prince's Lodgings, to-morrow morning, at eight of the clock.

Die Mercurii, 9^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 425 a.]

The Earl of Anglesey reported, "That the committee have considered of a proviso, that such persons as are put out of their livings by virtue of the Act of Uniformity, may have such allowances out of their livings, for their subsistence, as his majesty shall think fit."

The said proviso was read; and, after some debate, a few alterations made therein.

And the question being put, "Whether this proviso, with the alterations, shall stand in the bill?"

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Hodie 3^a vice lecta est Billa, An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, and for establishing the Form of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in the church of England.

The question being put, "Whether this bill, with the alterations and amendments, shall pass?"

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered—To send for a conference with the House of Commons to-morrow morning, and communicate this bill with the alterations and amendments to them.

Die Jovis, 10^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 426 *a-b*.]

A message was sent to the House of Commons, by Sir Moundeford Brampton and Sir Nathaniell Hobart :

To desire a present conference, in the painted chamber, concerning the Act of Uniformity.

The Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Bridgwater, and the Bishop of London, were appointed to manage this conference.

The House directed that the Book of Common Prayers, recommended from the king, shall be delivered to the House of Commons, as that being the Book to which the Act of Uniformity is to relate; and also to deliver the book wherein the alterations are made, out of which the other book was fairly written; and likewise to communicate to them the king's message, recommending the said book; and lastly, to let the Commons know, "That the Lords, upon consideration had of the Act of Uniformity, have thought fit to make some alterations, and add certain provisos, to which the concurrence of the House of Commons is desired."

* * * * *

The messengers sent to the House of Commons return with this answer :

That they will give a conference, as is desired.

* * * * *

The House was adjourned during pleasure, and the Lords went to the free conference; which being ended, the House was resumed.

Jovis, 10^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 402 *a-b*.]

A message from the Lords, by Sir Moundeford Brampton and Sir Nathaniell Hobart :

Mr. Speaker—"The Lords desire a present conference with this House upon the Bill for Uniformity, in the painted chamber."

The messengers being withdrawn—

Resolved—That this House doth agree to a present conference; and that Serjeant Keeling, Serjeant Charlton, Sir Robert Howard, Sir Robert Atkins, Sir Tho. Meres, and Dr. Birkinhead, do make report from the Conference.

The messengers being called in, Mr. Speaker does acquaint them, that the House had agreed to a present conference.

* * * * *

Serjeant Keeling reports, from the Conference had with the Lords, upon the Bill for Uniformity, that the reason of the delay of the said bill was, that the Book of Common Prayer had, by reference from his majesty, been under the consideration of the Convocation, who had made some alterations and additions thereunto; and that the Lords had perused the same, as also the bill sent from this House; and had returned the same, together with the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is amended and, by them, agreed to, and some amendments and provisos to the bill; to which they desired the concurrence of this House; and delivered the same in at the clerk's table.

Resolved, upon the question—That this House will enter upon the consideration and debate of this matter to-morrow morning.

Veneris, 11^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 403 *b.*]

Ordered—That the House do proceed upon the Bill for Uniformity to-morrow morning.

Sabbati, 12^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 404 *b.*]

Amendments and additions, sent from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity, were this day read.

Resolved—That the amendments in the Book of Common Prayer, sent down from the Lords, be read on Monday next.

Lunæ, 14^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 405 *b.*]

The amendments in “The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England,” sent from the Lords; the transcript of which book, so amended, therewith sent, they desire to be added to the Bill of Uniformity, instead of the book sent up therewith, was, in part, read.

And then the House adjourned for two hours.

Post Merid.

The rest of the amendments in the said book were then read throughout.

Resolved, upon the question—That the amendments to the said bill, with the additions sent by the Lords, be read the second time, and proceeded in, to-morrow morning, at nine of the clock.

Martis, 15^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 406 *a-b.*]

The House then resumed the debate upon the amendments sent down from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity; which were begun to be read the second time.

Resolved, upon the question—That the first amendment, as to the title of the bill, be postponed.

The question being put, “To agree with the Lords, as to the amendment to the compiling of the Book of Common Prayer by the bishops, and the Act of *primo* Eliz. for enjoining it to be used”—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The rest of the amendments, unto the amendment in the twenty-fifth line, were read the second time, and, upon the question, agreed to.

The question being put, "That the paragraph of the amendment, in relation to the recital of the progress of the proceedings, till that amendment which does concern the book, annexed to the bill, be postponed"—

The House was divided.

The yeas went out.

Sir Robert Howard,	{	Tellers for the yeas.	} 84.
Mr. Hungerford,		With the yeas,	
Sir Tho. Gower,	{	Tellers for the noes,	} 119.
Sir Robert Brooke		With the noes,	

And so it passed in the negative.

Resolved, upon the question—That Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Knight, Mr. Crouch, Dr. Birkinhead, Lord Fanshaw, Sir Edm. Peirce, Dr. Burwell, Sir Tho. Gower, and Mr. Waller, or any six of them, be appointed a committee, to compare the Books of Common Prayer, sent down from the Lords, with the book sent up from this House; and to see whether they differ in anything besides the amendments, sent from the Lords, and already read in this House and wherein; and to make their report therein, with all the speed they can. And, for that purpose, they are to meet this afternoon, at two of the clock, in the Speaker's chamber.

Mercurii, 16^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C.,
viii, 407 *b*—408 *a*.]

Mr. Vaughan reports, from the committee appointed to compare the Books of Common Prayer, sent down from the Lords, with the book sent up from this house; and to see whether they differ in anything besides the amendments sent from the Lords, and already read in this House, and wherein: that the said committee had met yesterday, and sat till eight at night, and had met early this morning, and taken great care and pains in comparing and examining the said books * * * *

Resolved—That the thanks of this House be returned to the said committee, for their great care and pains in compar-

ing and examining the Book of Common Prayer, according to the order and direction of this House.

And Mr. Speaker did return them the thanks of the House accordingly.

The House then resumed the debate upon the amendments, sent down from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity.

And the seventh amendment, at the twenty-fourth line of the bill, being again read—

Resolved, upon the question—That this House doth disagree to these words, in the twenty-fifth line of the said amendment, “and tenderness of some men’s consciences;” and doth think fit, that the word “have,” be made “hath.”

The question being propounded, “Whether debate shall be admitted to the amendments made by the Convocation in the Book of Common Prayer, and sent down by the Lords to this House :”

And the question being put, “Whether that question shall be now put?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

And the main question being put, “Whether debate shall be admitted to the amendments made by the Convocation in the Book of Common Prayer, and sent down by the Lords to this House?”

The House was divided.

The Noes went out.

Mr. Williams,	{	Tellers for the yeas,	} 90.
Mr. Boscowen,		With the yeas,	
Sir Edm. Peirce,	{	Tellers for the noes,	} 96.
Mr. Spencer,		With the noes,	

And so it passed in the negative.

The question being put, “That the amendments made by the Convocation, and sent down by the Lords to this House, might, by the order of this House, have been debated”—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The question being put, “To agree to the said seventh

amendment, sent down from the Lords, at the twenty-fourth line in the Bill of Uniformity, with the alteration made by this House, and before expressed"—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered—That this House do proceed, to-morrow morning, to the further consideration of the residue of the amendments, sent down from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity.

Jovis, 17^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II. [Journ. H. C., viii, 408 *b*—409 *a*.

The House then resumed the consideration of the residue of the amendments, sent from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity.

And the several amendments, from the thirtieth line in the first skin, to the fortieth line, being read the second time, were, upon the question, severally agreed to.

The question being put, "To agree to that part of the amendment, to the fortieth line of the bill, to put in the words 'the said,' instead of 'a'"—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The question being put, "To adhere to these words, 'annexed and joined to this present Act, and;,' which the Lords, in the same amendment, would have omitted"—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The amendment to the forty-second line in the bill was read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the forty-third line was read the second time, and, in part, agreed to, till these words, "appointed to be annexed to this present Act."

The question being put, "To agree to that part of the amendment for inserting the said words, 'appointed to be annexed to this present Act'"—

It passed in the negative.

The amendment to the eighth line of the second skin, being read the second time; and the same being, instead of "Michael, the archangel," to read "Bartholomew"—

The Question being put, “To adhere to the bill as to the words, ‘Michael the archangel’”—

The House was divided.

The noes went out.

Sir Tho. Gower,	{ Tellers for the yeas, }	87.
Mr. Boscoven,		
Sir Robert Holt,	{ Tellers for the noes, }	96.
Mr. Phillips,		

And so it passed in the negative.

And the amendment of the Lords, as to that point, was agreed to.

The question being put, “To agree to the amendment to the ninth line of the second skin, to read, ‘two,’ instead of ‘one’”—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The question being put, “To agree to the amendment to the fifteenth line of the second skin, to read, ‘in the said book,’ instead of ‘therein’”—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The next paragraph of the said amendment, for the ministers’ subscription of their consent, being read the second time—

Resolved, upon the question—That this House doth agree to that paragraph of the said amendment.

Resolved—That this House will proceed upon the rest of the amendments to the Bill of Uniformity to-morrow morning.

Veneris, 18^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 409 *b*—410 *a*.]

The House then proceeded to the reading of the remaining amendments, sent down from the Lords, to the Bill for Uniformity, from the place where they left yesterday.

The last paragraph of the amendment, in the twenty-fifth line of the second skin, being read the second time—

Resolved—That the said paragraph be postponed.

The three next amendments to the thirteenth, thirty-ninth, and forty-first lines of the second skin, were read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the seventh line of the second skin was read the second time: and the amendment being, that after the word "dead," to add the clauses contained in the parchment marked with No. 1—

The said parchment was read the second time.

The first paragraph in the said parchment was read the third time.

Ordered—That Mr. Vaughan, Serjeant Scis, and Mr. Thurland, do peruse the statutes, and bring in a proviso for translating the Book of Common Prayer into Welsh, if it may consist with the laws in force.

Resolved, upon the question—That an amendment be made to the said paragraph, by reading "one month," instead of "three months."

Resolved—That the said paragraph, with the amendment, be agreed to.

* * * * *

The House then proceeded to the reading of the second paragraph of the parchment marked No. 1.

Ordered—That Mr. Crouch, Sir Tho. Meers, Serjeant Charlton, Dr. Birkinhead, Sir Edmund Peirce, Sir John Brampton, and Dr. Burwell, do withdraw, and pen a paragraph upon the present debate.

The next paragraph of the parchment, as to ordination, was read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The next paragraph, as to the administration of the sacraments, was read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

Sabbati, 19^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 410 *b*—411 *a*.]

The amendments to the addition in parchment, sent from the Lords, to the Act of Uniformity, No. 1, being brought

in by the members of this House directed to prepare the same, were this day read the first time.

And the first amendment being, first skin, line twenty-two, after the word "aforesaid," leave out all the words, unto the word "subscribe," in the twenty-ninth line; and, instead thereof, insert these words following: "That every dean, canon, and prebendary, of every cathedral or collegiate church, and all masters, and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors, of or in any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital; and every public professor and reader, in either of the universities, and in every college elsewhere; and every parson, vicar, curate, lecturer, and every other person in holy orders; and every schoolmaster, keeping any public or private school, and every person instructing or teaching any youth, in any house or private family, as a tutor or schoolmaster, who, upon the first day of May, which shall be in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and sixty-two; or, at any time thereafter, shall be incumbent, or have possession of any deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, or reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, or any other ecclesiastical dignity or promotion; or of any curate's place, lecture, or school; or shall instruct or teach any youth, or tutor, or schoolmaster; shall, before the Feast Day of St. Bartholomew, which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and sixty-two, at or before his or their respective admission to be incumbent, or to have possession aforesaid"—

The same was read the second time.

And the question being put, "That the time for declaring against the Covenant be twenty years"—

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Resolved, upon the question—That this House doth agree to the said first amendment: and

Ordered—That the persons formerly appointed to prepare the amendments upon the former debate, do now prepare and bring in a clause, by way of proviso, or otherwise, that none of the persons enjoined to make the declara-

tion and acknowledgment now under debate, be obliged to that part which concerns the covenant, after twenty years.

And then were read the words in the said parchment, hereafter following, line twenty-nine, viz., “subscribe the declaration and acknowledgment following; *scilicet*: ‘I, A. B., do declare, that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king; and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking arms, by his authority, against his person, or against those who are commissioned by him; and that I will conform to the liturgy of the church of England, as it is now by law established. And I do declare, that I do hold there lies no obligation upon me, or on any other person, from the oath commonly called The Solemn League and Covenant; and that the same was in itself an unlawful oath, and imposed upon the subjects of this realm against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom.’”

Resolved—That after the word “covenant,” and before the word “and,” in the thirty-eighth line, these words be added, “to endeavour any change or alteration of government, either in Church or State.”

Resolved, upon the question—That this House doth agree to that part of the said additional amendment in parchment, sent from the Lords, with the said addition last agreed unto.

And the second amendment, being in the fortieth line, after the word “kingdom,” leave out all the words to the first word in the forty-fifth line; and instead thereof, insert the words, “particularly mentioned in the said amendment.”

The first paragraph thereof being in these words, “which said declaration and acknowledgment shall be subscribed by every of the said masters, and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors, of or in any college, hall, or house of learning, and every public professor and reader in either of the universities, before the vice-chancellor of the respective universities for the time being, or his deputy. And the said declaration

or acknowledgment shall be subscribed before the respective bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, by every other person hereby enjoined to subscribe the same, upon pain that all and every of the persons failing in such subscription, shall lose and forfeit such respective deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, curate's place, lecture, and school; and shall be utterly disabled, and *ipso facto* be deprived of the same. And that every such respective deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, curate's place, lecture, and school, shall be void, as if such person, so failing, were naturally dead."

The same was read the second time.

Resolved, upon the question—That this House doth agree to the said paragraph.

And then the House adjourned the further debate of the said amendment till Monday next, at ten of the clock.

Lunæ, 21^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 411 *b*—412 *a*.]

The House did then proceed upon the rest of the amendments to the Bill of Uniformity. And, in the first place, on that part of the paragraph brought in by the committee, which concerns schoolmasters, appointed for that purpose.—

Resolved, upon the question—That all the words after the word "aforesaid," in the seventeenth line of the third page of the said amendment, to the word "and," in the one-and-twentieth line of the same page, be left out: and that these words, "shall, for the first offence, suffer three months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprize; and for every second offence, shall suffer three months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprize; and also forfeit to his majesty the sum of five pounds," be inserted in the said paragraph, instead of the said words to be omitted.

Resolved—That after the word “realm,” in the fourteenth line of the said page, these words, “for which he shall pay twelve pence only,” be inserted.

The question being put, “That the words ‘for the fee of two shillings and sixpence,’ in the twenty-seventh line of the third page of the said amendment, brought in by the committee, be omitted; and that the certificate for every parson, vicar, curate, and lecturer, shall be without fee?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Resolved—That the said paragraph, so amended, be agreed to.

The third amendment, brought in by the committee, being twice read, was, upon the question, agreed unto.

The fourth amendment, by them brought in, being also twice read, was, upon the question, agreed unto.

A proviso in relation to the Covenant for twenty years, this day brought in by the said committee, was twice read, and, upon the question, agreed to.

Resolved—That these words, “now is incumbent, and in possession of any parsonage, vicarage, or benefice, and,” be inserted after the word “parson who,” in the fifty-third line of the first parchment addition, sent from the Lords.

Resolved—That these words, “the said,” be inserted, instead of the word “any,” after the word “enjoy,” in the fifty-seventh line of the said first parchment addition, sent from the Lords.

The question being put, “Whether the words ‘according to the form of the church of England,’ be inserted after the word ‘ordination,’ in the fifty-seventh line of said first addition in parchment, sent from the Lords?”

It passed in the negative.

Resolved—That these words, “thenceforth be capable to be admitted to any parsonage, vicarage, benefice, or any ecclesiastical promotion or dignity; nor shall any person,” be inserted after the word “shall,” in the sixty-third line of the

said first addition in parchment, sent from the Lords: and that the words "or do" be omitted.

Martis, 22^o Aprilis, [1662,] 14^o Car. II. [Journ. H. C., viii, 412 *b*—413 *a*.]

The House then proceeded upon the amendments to the Bill of Uniformity.

The paragraph in the parchment marked No. 1, as to the penalties not to extend to foreigners, or aliens of the foreign reformed churches, was read the second time, and agreed to.

The rest of the paragraphs and provisos, to the end of the said parchment, were read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The House then proceeded to the reading of the second sheet of the amendments, sent from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity.

And the amendment to the eighth line of the third skin being twice read—

Resolved—That these words, "Archbishop of the province," be inserted in the said amendment, after the words "by the," in the eighth line; and the word "archbishop," after the word "said," in the eleventh line.

And the said amendment, with the additions aforesaid, was agreed to.

The amendment to the ninth line was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the thirteenth line of the third skin, was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The next amendment to the twenty-sixth line was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the twenty-seventh line was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the twenty-eighth line, and the proviso directed by way of amendment, marked No. 2, were twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth lines was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the thirty-seventh line being twice read; was, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the fortieth line was read.

Ordered—That the word “are,” be inserted betwixt the word “and,” and the word “hereby,” in that amendment.

Resolved—That the amendment, so altered, be agreed to.

The next amendment, to the one-and-fortieth line, was read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The next amendment to the forty-second line was read the second time; and the provisos, marked No. 3, directed, by way of amendment, to be inserted instead of the words “which are to be omitted,” were read the second and third time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the twenty-seventh line of the fourth skin was read the second time; and, on the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the twenty-eighth line of the fourth skin was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the twenty-ninth line of the fourth skin was read the second time; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the one-and-thirtieth line was twice read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The amendment to the thirty-seventh line being, after the word “authority,” to leave out the rest of the bill; and add the provisos beginning, “Provided also, and be it enacted,” and marked No. 4.

The rest of the bill, after the word “authority,” being twice read—

Resolved, upon the question—That the same be left out of the bill.

The said provisos in the parchment No. 4 were read the second time.

The first paragraph of the said provisos in parchment,

“for providing the Book of Common Prayer in every parish,” &c., being read the third time—

Resolved, upon the question—That this House doth agree to the said paragraph.

A proviso, by way of amendment, touching the prices to be set on the Book of Common Prayer, was read.

Ordered—That liberty be given to bring in a proviso, such as shall be fit for setting the rates on the quires of the Book of Common Prayer in folio, to be used in churches and public places : and Mr. Pryn, Dr. Birkinhead, Sir Edmund Peirse, and Dr. Burwell, to bring it in.

The next paragraph, touching the king’s professor of the law in the university of Oxford, was read the third time ; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The fourth paragraph, touching the subscription to the Thirty-Sixth Article of the Thirty-Nine Articles, was read the third time ; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The proviso, as to the dispensation with deprivation for not using the cross and surplice, was read the second and third time.

The question being put, whether the question concerning amendments to be made to this proviso, should be now put :

It passed in the negative.

The main question being put, for agreeing with the Lords as to this proviso concerning the cross and surplice :

It passed in the negative.

Jovis, 24 Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 413*b*.]

The House then proceeded upon the remaining amendments to the Bill for Uniformity ; and that part of the paragraph concerning the allowance to such as are in livings, and will be outed by this Act.

Ordered—That the debate be adjourned till Saturday.

Sabbati, 26^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 414*a-b*.]

The House then resumed the debate upon the amendment

to the Bill of Uniformity, as to the last paragraph of the parchment marked No. 4, touching an allowance of fifths to such as shall not conform, but lose their livings.

The question being propounded, that amendments be made to the proviso, touching the allowance of fifths, to such as shall not conform ;

The question being put, “ Whether the question shall be now put ? ”

The House was divided.

The Noes went forth.

Sir Richard Temple,	{	Tellers for the yeas :	}	87.
Sir John Talbot,		With the yeas,		
Sir Robert Holt,	{	Tellers for the noes :	}	94.
Mr. Puckering,		With the noes.		

And so it passed in the negative.

The main queston being put, to agree to the amendment, sent from the Lords, as to that paragraph of the parchment touching allowance of fifths to such as shall not conform :

It passed in the negative.

The House then resumed the amendment, as to the title of the Bill, sent from the Lords ; which was, by order, postponed.

And the same, being twice read, was, upon the question, agreed.

The next amendment, beginning with the word “ nevertheless,” in the sixteenth amendment of the first paper, sent from the Lords, which was also postponed, was read the second time.

The question being put, to agree to the said amendment :

It passed in the negative.

Lunæ, 28^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. II. C., viii, 415*a-b*.]

The House then resumed the matter upon the Bill of Uniformity.

An amendment, to be added to the amendment sent from the Lords, for the preserving of the Book of Common Prayer,

by having it recorded, and kept in cathedral churches, in the courts at Westminster, and in the tower, was twice read.

Resolved—That those words, which concern the heads of colleges, be struck out of the amendment.

Resolved—That the amendment be agreed to: and that the same be added to the parchment amendment, sent from the Lords, No. 4, after the word “therein,” in the fifteenth line of the said amendment.

Another amendment, for translating the Bible into Welsh, was twice read; and some additions, upon the question, agreed to be made thereto:

Which was done at the table.

Resolved—That the said amendment be agreed to: and that the same be added to the parchment, sent from the Lords, marked No. 4, after the word “therein,” in the fifteenth line of the parchment.

A proviso, for being uncovered, and for using reverent gestures, at the time of divine service, was twice read.

But the matter being held proper for the convocation;

Ordered—That such persons, as shall be employed to manage the conference with the Lords, do intimate the desire of this House, that it be recommended to the Convocation, to take order for reverent and uniform gestures and demeanors to be enjoined at the time of divine service and preaching.

Ordered—That it be referred to Mr. Solicitor General, the Lord Fanshaw, Serjeant Charlton, Mr. Vaughan, Dr. Birkinhead, Mr. Knight, Sir Tho. Meres, Mr. Clifford, Sir Tho. Gower, Sir Edm. Peirse, Sir Tho. Littleton, Sir Francis Goodrick, Mr. Crouch, and Sir Rich. Temple, or any three of them, to see the amendments and additions, to be made and added to the amendments sent from the Lords to the Bill of Uniformity, so placed and ordered, that they may cohere; and to prepare and draw up instructions and reasons in writing; for the conference to be had with the Lords, upon the Bill of Uniformity, against to-morrow; and to report it to the House: and they are to meet in the speaker’s chamber this afternoon, at two of the clock.

Martis, 29^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 416*b*.]

Ordered—That the report from the committee upon the Bill of Uniformity be heard to-morrow morning.

Mercurii, 30^o Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 417*a*.]

Serjeant Charlton reports, from the committee which were appointed to peruse the amendments, made by this House to the amendments and provisos sent from the Lords, to the Bill of Uniformity, and to draw up instructions and reasons, to be insisted on at the conference to be had with the Lords upon the said amendments: the several reasons which were agreed by the committee to be insisted on, which were allowed by this House.

Ordered—That Mr. Herbert do go up to the Lords, to desire a conference upon the amendments to the Bill for Uniformity.

Die Mercurii, 30^o die Aprilis, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 441*b*—442*a*.]

A message was brought from the House of Commons, by James Herbert, Esquire, and others:

To desire a conference concerning the Bill for Uniformity.

The answer returned was:

That this House will give the House of Commons a present conference, in the painted chamber.

* * * * *

The Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer, the Lord Privy Seal, the Earl of Bridgwater, and the Earl of Portland, are appointed to report the matter of the next conference with the House of Commons, concerning the Bill for Uniformity.

* * * * *

Next, the House was adjourned during pleasure, and the Lords went to the conference with the House of Commons: which being ended, the House was resumed.

Ordered—That the report of this conference shall be made on Friday morning next.

Die Martis, 6^o die Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 445 *b.*]

A message was brought from the House of Commons, by Sir Thomas Meares and others :

To put their Lordships in mind of giving dispatch to the Bill for Uniformity, as conceiving it to be of great consequence : and the rather, because they believe they shall not sit long.

Die Mercurii, 7^o Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 423 *b.*]

Ordered—That a message be sent to the Lords, by Colonel Fretchvile, to desire them to expedite the bill for restoring impropriations to the loyal party.

Die Mercurii, 7^o die Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 446 *b*—450 *a.*]

A message was brought from the House of Commons, by Mr. Fretswell and others :

To put their Lordships in mind of a bill concerning the restoring of impropriations to his majesty's loyal subjects.

Next, the Lord Privy Seal made a long report of the effect of the conference with the House of Commons : " That Mr. Serjeant Charlton managed the conference ; who, in the name of the House of Commons, acquainted their Lordships, that this conference was desired concerning the amendments to the Bill of Uniformity.

" He said, they did agree in most of them with their Lordships. And wherein they differ, will appear by what follows.

" The first difference was in omitting these words, ' Tenderness of some men's conscience,' being in the fifth line of the seventh amendment, and instead thereof insert the word ' hath ' ; and then it runs thus, ' which the indisposition of

the time hath contracted,' turning the word 'have' into 'hath.' He said these words might well be omitted, in respect there were causes enough besides mentioned; and the phrase of 'tenderness of conscience' having been much abused, the Commons were loth to give so much countenance to an abused phrase as to insert it.

"He proceeded to the eleventh amendment; unto which he said, the House agreed in part; as, instead of 'a,' to read the word 'said:' but disagreed in the other part thereof, that is, to leave out these words 'annexed and joined to this present Act, and,' adhering to the bill in that particular; and then it goeth thus, 'in such order and form as in the said book, entitled, the Book of Common Prayer, &c.,' and so put it in the present tense, upon which, he said, two or three more differences depend.

"To the thirteenth amendment, they agreed in all except these words, 'which book is appointed to be annexed and joined to this present Act.'

"The sixteenth amendment they agreed to, till it come to the word 'nevertheless' in the first line of the fourth part of the paper amendment; after which word, they disagree to all that follows in that amendment concerning the cross in baptism; the reasons whereof he deferred till he came to the proviso. And this was all he offered to their Lordships' paper amendments; and so descended to those additions sent by their Lordships to the Commons in parchment.

"To the first of those, in the sixth line, instead of 'three months,' insert 'month;' the reason is, that it was thought heretofore too slight a work for the chief minister to read Common Prayer, which was usually performed by the inferior sort of clergy; and, therefore, to meet with that inconvenience, they desired the chief minister might read it once a month.

"The next alteration was in the twenty-second line: from the word 'aforesaid' leave out all to the word 'subscribed' in the twenty-ninth line, and instead thereof insert these words following, 'That every dean, canon, and prebendary,

of every cathedral or collegiate church, and all masters and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors, of or in any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital, and every public professor and reader in either of the universities, and in every college elsewhere, and every parson, vicar, curate, clerk, lecturer, and every other person in holy orders, and every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school, and every person instructing or teaching any youth in any house or private family as a tutor or schoolmaster, who, upon the first day of March, which will be in the year of our Lord God 1662, or at any time thereafter, shall be incumbent, or have possession of any deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, or reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, or any other ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, or of any curate's place, lecture, or school, or shall instruct or teach any youth as tutor, or schoolmaster, shall, before the feast day of St. Bartholomew which shall be in the year of our Lord 1662, or at or before his or their respective admission to be incumbent, to have possession aforesaid.' The reason of this addition was, in extending it so far as schoolmasters, in that the Commons observed the force of education was great, so as the Commons thought they ought to take care for the education of youth : for so many, he said, of the gentry and nobility found in the long parliament differing from the Church of England did (as was conceived) arise from this root.

“ He observed, it was an oversight in the usurped powers, that they took no care in this particular, whereby many young persons were well seasoned in their judgments as to the king. This made the Commons take care that schoolmasters as well as ministers should subscribe, and rather more.

“ The next amendment was in the thirty-eighth line ; after the word ‘ covenant,’ add these words ‘ to endeavour any change or alteration of government either in church or state :’ ”

The reason of this alteration was in respect the added

words were the very same which were used in the Act for the safety of the king's person.

“The next alteration is in the fortieth line; after the word ‘kingdom,’ leave out all the words to the first word in the forty-fifth line, and instead thereof insert these words ‘which said declaration and acknowledgment shall be subscribed by every of the said masters, and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors, of or in any college, hall, or house of learning, and every public professor and reader in either of the Universities, before the vice-chancellor of the respective Universities for the time being, or his deputy; and the said declaration or acknowledgment shall be subscribed before the respective archbishop, or ordinary of the diocese, or every other person hereby enjoined to subscribe the same, upon pain that all and every of the persons aforesaid, failing in such subscription, shall lose and forfeit such respective deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, curate's place, lecture, and school, and shall be utterly disabled, and *ipso facto* deprived of the same; and that every such respective deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place, reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, curate's place, lecture, and school, shall be void, as if such person so failing were naturally dead: and if any schoolmaster, or other person instructing or teaching youths in any private house or family as a tutor or schoolmaster, shall instruct or teach any youth, as a tutor or schoolmaster, before license obtained from his respective archbishop, or ordinary of the diocese, according to the laws and statutes of this realm, for which he shall pay twelve pence only, and before such subscription and acknowledgment made as afore, shall for the first offence suffer three months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprize; and for every second and other such offence shall suffer three months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprize, and also forfeit to his majesty the sum of five pounds: and, after such subscriptions made, every parson, vicar, curate,

and lecturer, shall procure a certificate, under the hand and seal of the respective archbishop, bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, who are hereby enjoined and required, upon demand, to make and deliver the same, and shall publicly and openly read the same, together with the declaration or acknowledgment aforesaid, upon some Lord's day within three months then next following, in his parish church where he is to officiate.

“The clause of three months' imprisonment is added, to meet with those men who have no livings to lose; and therefore the Commons thought this addition necessary.

“Then he descended to an amendment in the forty-ninth line: after the word ‘benefice,’ leave out the word ‘with cure,’ and insert these words ‘curate's place, or lecturer's place respectively.’ In the disabling clause, livings with cure were only included; but the Commons think not fit to leave sinecures to nonconformists; for therein he thinketh more favour would be shewn them, than to permit them to have livings with cure; wherefore they have inserted these words ‘curate's place or lecturer's place.’

“In the fiftieth line, after the word ‘dead,’ insert the words following, ‘Provided always, that, from and after the 25th day of March, which shall be in the year of our Lord 1682, there shall be omitted in the said declaration or acknowledgment so to be subscribed and read, these words following, *videlicet*, ‘And I do declare, that I do hold there lies no obligation upon me, or any other person, from the oath commonly called The Solemn League and Covenant, to endeavour any change or alteration of government, either in church or state; and that the same was in itself an unlawful oath, and imposed upon the subjects of this realm against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom; so as none of the persons aforesaid shall from thenceforth be at all obliged to subscribe or read that part of the said declaration or acknowledgment.’

“The reason of this proviso was, that the Commons would not perpetuate the memory of the covenant, which a common

medium of twenty years may probably determine the lives of such as took it.

“The next was in the fifty-third line: after the word ‘who,’ insert these words ‘now is incumbent, and in possession of any parsonage, vicarage, or benefice, and who;’ and leave out the word ‘who’ in the fifty-fourth line.

“The reason of this alteration was, they would not exclude such as hereafter might be willing to conform from other livings, though they disabled them as to such as for the present they enjoyed; whereas, in their Lordships’ alteration, there was no limitation of time, and so none capable of livings, who were capable hereafter to conform.

“The next alteration was in the fifty-seventh line: after the word ‘enjoyed,’ insert the words ‘the said,’ instead of the word ‘any;’ and then it goeth thus, ‘shall have, hold, or enjoy, the said parsonage, vicarage, benefice, or other ecclesiastical promotion.’

“The next amendment is in the sixty-third line: after the word ‘shall’ leave out the words ‘or do,’ and instead thereof insert the words ‘thenceforth be capable to be admitted to any parsonage, vicarage, benefice, or other ecclesiastical promotion or dignity whatsoever, nor shall presume to consecrate or administer the Lord’s supper.’

“The Commons think every incumbent should, before his admission, give testimony of his conformity, and ought before such admission to be in full orders.

“The next amendment is in the sixty-third skin, where the fifth line of that skin as omitted. The line is, ‘or that the same avoidance be openly and publicly declared.’ Now it doth not appear by that clause what is meant by ‘openly,’ and there being certainty enough in the former words, the Commons were not willing to leave in a clause which might raise disputes.

“And then the gentlemen came to the amendments in the second paper, which they agreed to with this addition of the words, ‘archbishop, bishop of the province, or,’ after the words ‘by the’ in the fourth line; and the words “arch-

bishop or,' after the word 'same' in the eleventh line of the said amendment, the Commons inserted the archbishop, as being unfit to omit him in that affair. The same reason is for the amendment in the eleventh line.

"The next amendment is in the fortieth line. Agreed, with the addition of the word 'are' between the word 'and' and 'hereby' in the amendment.

"The next is the thirty-seventh line. Agreed to leave out the rest of the bill, after the word 'authority.'

"Then he came to the provisos in parchment No. 4.

"The first paragraph for providing the book, unto the word 'provided' in the fifteenth line in the first skin: agreed, with the addition following, *videlicet*, after the word 'therein' add the words following, 'provided always, and be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that the Bishops of Hereford, St. David's, Asaph, Bangor, and Llandaff, and their successors, shall take such order amongst themselves, for the souls' health of the flocks committed to their charge in Wales, that the book hereunto annexed be truly and exactly translated into the British or Welsh tongue; and that the same being translated, and being by them, or any three of them at the least, viewed, perused, and allowed to be imprinted, to such number at least so that one of the said books so translated and imprinted may be had for every cathedral, collegiate, and parish church, and chapel of ease in the said respective dioceses and places in Wales, where the Welsh is commonly spoken or used, before the 1st day of May, 1665; and that, from and after the imprinting and publishing of the said book so translated, the whole divine service shall be used and said by the ministers and curates throughout all Wales, within the diocese where the Welsh tongue is commonly used, in the British or Welsh tongue, in such manner and form as is prescribed, according to the book hereunto annexed, to be used in the English tongue, differing nothing in any order or form from the said English book, for which book so translated and imprinted, the churchwardens of every the said parishes shall pay out of the parish money in their hands

for the use of the respective churches, and be allowed the same in their accompt; and the said bishops and their successors, or any three of them at the least, shall set and appoint the price for which the said book shall be sold: and another Book of Common Prayer, in the English tongue, shall be bought and had in every church throughout Wales, in which the Book of Common Prayer, in Welsh, is to be had by force of this Act, before the 1st day of May, 1664; and the same book to remain in such convenient places within the said churches, that such as understand them may resort, at all convenient times, to read and peruse the same; and also such as do not understand the said language may, by conferring both tongues together, the sooner attain to the knowledge of the English tongue, anything in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding: and, until printed copies of the said book, so to be translated, may be had, provided, the form of Common Prayer, established by parliament, before the making of this Act, shall be used as formerly, in such part of Wales where the English tongue is not commonly understood: and, to the end that the true and perfect copies of this Act, and the said book hereunto annexed, may be safely kept and perpetually preserved, and for the avoiding of all disputes for the time to come, be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that the respective deans and chapters of every cathedral or collegiate church within England and Wales, shall, at their proper costs and charges, before the five-and-twentieth day of December, 1662, obtain, under the great seal of England, a true and perfect copy of this said Act, and of the said book annexed hereunto, to be, by the said deans and chapters and their successors, kept and preserved in safety for ever, and to be also produced and shewed forth in any court of record as often as they shall be thereunto lawfully required; and also there shall be delivered true and perfect copies of this Act, and of the same book, in the respective courts at Westminster, and into the Tower of London, to be kept and preserved for ever amongst the records of the said courts, and records of the

Tower, to be produced and shewed forth in any court as need shall require; which said books, so to be exemplified under the great seal of England, shall be examined by such persons as the king's majesty shall appoint under the great seal of England for that purpose, and shall be compared with the original book hereunto annexed, and shall have power to correct and amend in writing, any error committed by the printer in the printing of the same book, or of anything therein contained; and shall certify in writing under their hands and seals, or the hands and seals of any three of them, at the end of the same book, that they have examined and compared the same book, and find it to be a true and perfect copy; which said books, and every of them, so exemplified under the great seal of England as aforesaid, shall be deemed, taken, adjudged, and expounded, to be good and available in the law to all intents and purposes whatsoever, and shall be accounted as good records as this book itself hereunto annexed, any law or custom to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

“The second and third paragraphs, touching the king's professor of law, and touching the subscription to the thirty-sixth Article: agreed, unto the word, ‘provided,’ in the seventeenth line, in the second skin; all which proviso they reject, for these reasons:

“1. It is a proviso without precedent.

“2. That it would establish schism.

“3. That it would not gratify such for whom it was intended.

“To the first, he said, It was very apparent in England, that it was without precedent; and, as he thought, in the world also, for they never heard that ever any national church did the like.

“It was one thing, he said, to allow a differing religion in a nation; another thing to allow men to receive profits for that church unto which men would not conform.

“Secondly, though there were dissenters in the particulars of the proviso in the time of queen Elizabeth and king James,

yet in those days those opinions stayed there, and went no further.

“To the second head, That it would unavoidably establish schism. All persons of different inclinations would apply to such as should have this liberty, and that necessarily make parties, especially in great cities. He did observe these two ceremonies of the cross and surplice were long in use in the church; and he found a high commendation of the use of the cross in baptism, in the book sent to the Commons from the Lords, wherein it is so clearly explained, as there can be no suspicion of popery in it. It was used, he said, to quicken the memory, as to the benefits of baptism; and if that were omitted, much of the service belonging to baptism must be omitted also, many passages depending upon the use of that ceremony.

“The gentleman added, that he thought it better to impose no ceremonies, than to dispense with any; and he thought it very incongruous, at the same time when you are settling uniformity, to establish schism.

“To the third head, It would not satisfy those for whom it was intended; for such chiefly reject it upon these grounds, that things indifferent ought not to be enjoined; which opinion, he said, took away all the weight of human authority, which consists in commanding things otherwise indifferent; so as, when this shall be yielded, you give them nothing, they opposing for the imposition sake.

“He added, these were reasons as to the nature of the thing; and as to the reasons given by their lordships to the Commons, he answered to as followeth:

“The king’s engagement at Breda as to tender consciences; unto which he said, that his majesty could not understand the misleaders of the people, but the misled. It would be very strange to call a schismatical conscience a tender conscience. He said a tender conscience denoted an impression from without, received from another, and that upon which another strikes.

“Secondly, suppose these had been meant, yet he said

there could be no inference of any breach of promise in his majesty, because that Declaration had these two limitations :

“First, a reference to parliament.

“Secondly, such liberties to be granted only as consisted with the peace of the kingdom.

“Then he came to the second proviso, touching allowing fifths to such incumbents as should be excluded their livings ; which, he observed, was no seasonable proviso, at least at this time ; and if it were, yet not fit to allow such persons any things out of ecclesiastical livings.

“He said, what could be more repugnant, at the same time, to enact uniformity, and to allow the fifth of an ecclesiastical living to a nonconformist, for not conforming ; which, he said, joined with the pity of their party, would amount to more than the value of the whole living ?

“He said, such a course was too jealous a reflection upon the Act, when you say some godly people would not submit ; and it can signify nothing but fear, in making such a concession.

“He added, this would make the Act contradictory ; to say in one part of the bill that it was an equal Act, and in another part to allow dissenters to it.

“There was another reason of the Commons’ dissent : that divers wives and children of orthodox ministers were made miserable by some of these men ; it may be, for not paying unto them those fifths which were allowed unto them in the late times.

“He added, that none that make laws ought to suppose that any would break them.

“He said further, that it was not reasonable to allow the fifths of ecclesiastical livings ; because generally such livings were too small, not able to maintain a learned man with books ; and by lessening livings thus, it would gratify unconformable men, who desire livings in such hands should be made small, whereby the reputation of the conformable clergy would be lessened.

“Secondly, he said, such a concession is not only against

reason, but justice also. It was a divine canon which said, he that served at the altar should live at the altar; therefore the profit of the living ought to go to the labourer.

“He said, that unity was so precious, that it served not only for the peace of the church, but of the kingdom also; for to give occasions for multitudes to meet which would certainly follow the dissenters, what danger that might carry with it, was worthy your Lordships’ consideration.

“He did from the House of Commons desire their Lordships that they would recommend to the Convocation the directing of such decent gestures to be used in time of divine service as was fit. He found one mistake in the rubric of baptism, which he conceived was a mistake of the writer, ‘persons’ being put instead of ‘children.’ And having thus far dissented from their Lordships in *decimo sexto*, he came to an argument in *folio*; giving the Commons’ consent, that their Lordships should annex to the bill that book sent to the Commons by your Lordships; and so at length came to a final concord by his silence, which put an end to that conference.”

Ordered, That the alterations, and the matter of this conference, shall be read and taken into consideration tomorrow in the afternoon.

Die Jovis, 8^o Die Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, post meridiem,
[Journ. H. L., xi, 450 *b*—451 *a*.]

The amendments and alterations in the Bill of Uniformity, brought from the House of Commons at a conference, and reported yesterday, were now read twice.

And, for the better consideration hereof, the House was adjourned into a committee during pleasure.

And being resumed;

The question being put, “Whether this House agrees with the House of Commons in the clause concerning schoolmasters, with the alterations and amendments?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

The next question put was, “Whether this House agrees to all the rest of the alterations and amendments as came up from the House of Commons?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Then the alterations and amendments in the said Bill of Uniformity were read the third time.

And the question being put, “Whether this House agrees to these alterations and amendments?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Whereas it was signified by the House of Commons, at the conference yesterday, “That they found one mistake in the rubric of baptism, which they conceived was a mistake of the writer, ‘persons’ being put instead of ‘children:’”

The Lord Bishop of Durham acquainted the House, that himself, and the Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, and the Lord Bishop of Carlile, had authority from the Convocation to mend the said word, averring it was only a mistake of the scribe. And accordingly they came to the clerk’s table, and amended the same.

Whereas it was intimated at the conference yesterday, as the desire of the House of Commons, “That it be recommended to the Convocation, to take order for reverend and uniform gestures and demeanors to be enjoined at the time of divine service and preaching:”

It is ordered by this House, and hereby recommended to the Lords, the Bishops, and the rest of the Convocation of the Clergy, to prepare some canon or rule for that purpose, to be humbly presented unto his majesty for his assent.

Die Veneris, 9^o die Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ.H. L., xi, 451 *b.*]

A message was sent to the House of Commons, by Sir Justinian Lewin and Sir Toby Woolridge:

* * * * *

To let them know, that the Lords do agree with them in the alterations, amendments, and provisos, in the Bill concerning Uniformity.

Veneris, 9^o Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. C., viii, 424 *b.*]

A message from the Lords, by Sir Justinian Lewin and Sir Toby Woolrich;

Mr. Speaker, the Lords have returned you two bills: . . .

And they do further command us to give you notice, that they have agreed to the Bill of Uniformity, with the amendments and alterations sent from this House.

Die Lunæ, 19^o die Maii, [1662], 14^o Car. II, [Journ. H. L., xi, 470 *a*—472 *a.*]

Then his majesty came and sat in his throne arrayed with his royal robes; the peers likewise sitting in their robes uncovered.

The king gave command to the gentleman usher of the black rod, to let the House of Commons know, "It is his majesty's pleasure, they should attend him forthwith."

Who, in obedience, came presently, attended with their speaker; who, after low obeisance made to his majesty, made this speech following: *videlicet*,

"May it please your most excellent majesty,

"The glorious body of the sun doth exhilarate the soul of man with its light, and fructify the earth by its heat. In like manner, we, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the Commons House of Parliament, do with all humility and thankfulness acknowledge, these frequent accessions to your royal presence do both comfort our hearts, and influence our actions.

* * * * *

"Great Sir,

"We know, the strongest building must fall, if the coupling pins be pulled out: therefore our care hath been, to prepare such constitutions, that the prerogative of the crown and the propriety of the people may, like squared stones in a well built arch, each support the other, and grow the closer and stronger for any weight or force that shall be laid upon them.

“We cannot forget the late disputing age, wherein most persons took a liberty, and some men made it their delight, to trample upon the discipline and government of the church. The hedge being trod down, the foxes and the wolves did enter; the swine and other unclean beasts defiled the temple. At length it was discerned, the smectymnian plot did not only bend itself to reform ceremonies, but sought to erect a popular authority of elders, and to root out episcopal jurisdiction. In order to this work, church ornaments were first taken away; then the means whereby distinction or inequality might be upheld amongst ecclesiastical governors; then the forms of common prayer, which as members of the public body of Christ’s church were enjoined us, were decried as superstitious, and in lieu thereof nothing, or worse than nothing, introduced.

“Your majesty having already restored the governors and government of the church, the patrimony and privileges of our churchmen; we held it now our duty, for the reformation of all abuses in the public worship of God, humbly to present unto your majesty, a Bill for the Uniformity of Public Prayers and Administration of Sacraments.

“We hope the God of order and unity will conform the hearts of all the people in this nation, to serve him in this order and uniformity.”

* * * * *

Then the clerk of the crown read the titles of these bills following:—

“1. An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies; and for establishing the form of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in the Church of England.”

* * * * *

To all these bills severally the royal assent was pronounced, by the clerk of the parliaments, in these words,]

“*Le Roy le veult.*”

XXVII.

The Six Hundred Alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer by Convocation, and adopted by Parliament.— Cardwell's History of Conferenees, Oxford, 1849, pp. 380—6.

OF the alterations made at this time in the Prayer Book the following are the most important. The Sentences, the Epistles and Gospels, and other extracts from the Bible (except the Psalter, the Ten Commandments, and other portions of the Communion Service) were taken generally from the version of 1611. The Absolution was ordered to be pronounced by the "priest" alone, instead of the "minister." The book of Bel and the Dragon was re-inserted in the Calendar of Lessons. The prayers for the king, the royal family, the clergy, and people, together with the prayers of St. Chrysostom and the Benediction, were printed in the order both of Morning and Evening Service, instead of being left, as formerly, at the end of the litany. The Evening Service, which previously began with the Lord's prayer, was now opened with the sentences, the exhortation, the confession, and absolution, printed as in the Morning Service. In the litany the words "rebellion" and "schism" were added to the petition respecting "sedition, privy conspiracy," &c. In a subsequent petition the words "bishops, priests, and deacons" were employed instead of "bishops, pastors, and ministers of the church." Among the occasional prayers and thanksgivings were now introduced a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for the ember weeks, the prayers for the parliament and for all conditions of men, a thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home, and the general thanksgiving. New collects were appointed for the third Sunday in Advent, and for St. Stephen's day. The Genealogy, which previously made part of the gospel for the Sunday after Christmas, was now omitted. A distinct col-

lect, epistle, and gospel, were provided for a sixth Sunday after the Epiphany. The gospels for the Sunday next before Easter and for Good Friday were shortened, having formerly contained within them respectively the second lesson for the day. In several places, as in one of the collects for Good Friday, in those for the fifth and sixteenth Sundays after Trinity, for St. Simon and St. Jude, and in other places, the word "church" was used for "congregation." A distinct collect was supplied for Easter even. The first of the anthems used on Easter day was added. A distinct epistle was provided for the day of the purification. The last clause respecting saints departed was added to the prayer for the church militant. The rubric was added as to "covering what remaineth of the elements with a fair linen cloth." The order in council respecting kneeling at the Lord's supper, which had been introduced in 1552 and removed by queen Elizabeth, was restored, with this alteration; instead of "any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood," it is now read, "any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." A new office was appointed for the "baptism of such as are of riper years;" and some alterations made in the other offices of baptism. The preface to confirmation was curtailed, and the clause respecting the undoubted salvation of baptized infants dying before the commission of actual sin, was placed after the office for infant baptism. Some changes were made in the offices for confirmation and matrimony; and in the rubric at the end of the latter, the receiving the communion on the day of marriage was no longer made imperative. In the visitation of the sick the words "if he humbly and heartily desire it" were added to the rubric respecting absolution: the benediction also and the prayers that follow, appear now for the first time. In the order for burial the first rubric respecting persons unbaptized or excommunicate was added. Forms of prayer were supplied to be used at sea: and, lastly, offices were provided for the 30th of January and 29th of May, and the old service for the 5th of November was cor-

rected. These and many other minor alterations, amounting, as Dr. Tenison computed, to about six hundred in number, were made in the Book of Common Prayer by the Convocation of 1662, and were finally ratified by the Act of Uniformity.

XXVIII.

The Publication of the Book of Common Prayer.

London, August 6th, [1662.]

IN pursuance of the late Act for Uniformity of Publique Prayers in the Church of England, the same itself is now perfectly and exactly printed, and by the great care and prudence of the most Reverend Archbishops and Bishops, books in folio are provided for all churches and chapels in this kingdom; the price of which book (though it contains one hundred and sixty-five sheets) is ordered to be but six shillings ready bound.¹

A Certificate given by the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, allowing a lawful impediment for persons not reading the Book of Common Prayer, &c., within the time prescribed by the late Act of Uniformity.

“Whereas, by an Act of Parliament, made and printed in this present year, 1662, for the *Uniformity of Public Prayer, &c.*, it is enacted, among other things, &c., ‘and that every such person who shall (without some lawful impediment, to be allowed and approved of by the ordinary of the place,) neglect or refuse to do the same within the time aforesaid, shall *ipso facto* be deprived of his spiritual promotions.’ And forasmuch as the Books of Common Prayer appointed

¹ *Mercurius Publicus*. Published by Authority. From Thursday, July 31st, to Thursday, August 7th, 1662. p. 514.

by the said Act to be read, could not be gotten by the dean and prebendaries of the cathedral church of Peterborough (so that they might read the same in the said cathedral) before the 17th of this instant, August, being the *Sunday* immediately preceding the Feast of St. Bartholomew, upon which day it is not possible that all the members of the said cathedral church should read the said service in manner and form as is by the said Act directed. We, therefore, by the power given to us by the said Act, do allow and approve of the said impediment, and do hereby declare it so to be for the not reading of the said service as directed, and for not declaring of their contents as required in and by the said Act. Sealed and signed this 17th of August, 1662.

“B. PETERBOROUGH.”²

“A complaint was made [says Dr. Calamy in his *Life of Mr. Baxter*, p. 201] that very few of them [the clergy] could see the book, to all things in which they were to declare their assent and consent before the time limited by the Act expired. For the Common Prayer book with the alterations and amendments (for so they are called, how deservedly I inquire not) made by the Convocation, did not come out of the press till a few days before the 24th of August. So that of the seven thousand ministers in England who kept their livings, few, except those who were in or near London, could possibly have a sight of the book with its alterations, till after they had declared their assent and consent to it.

“Mr. Olliffe, in his ‘*Defence of Ministerial Conformity*,’ to take this off, reports, from an aged minister in their parts, that he and his neighbours sent to London, and had the amendments and alterations copied out; and adds, that it is to be hoped, that the charge here brought is groundless against so many thousand ministers, &c.

“The return made by Dr. Calamy, in his *Defence of Moderate Nonconformity*, part ii, pp. 100, 101, is this, that

² Kennett’s Register and Chronicle, Ecclesiastical and Civil. London, 1728, p. 743.

perhaps that might be a peculiar favour, because I have it under the hand of another, worthy ejected minister (who is since dead) that this was true in fact; and that several ministers now in London never read it before they gave their assent and consent, and that in Middlesex few parishes had the book till a week, fortnight, three weeks, or a month after. But as for written copies of the amendments, they were so liable to abuses and mistakes, that 'tis dubious how far they might be safely depended on."³

XXIX.

The King's Declaration.

CHARLES R.

As it hath pleased Almighty God so wonderfully to restore us to the throne of our ancestors, and our subjects to happy peace and tranquillity without the least bloodshed by the military sword; so having still earnestly wished that both might be secured and maintained with the least effusion possible of the same by the sword of justice, as desiring much rather to cure the ill intentions of the disaffected by our clemency, than to punish the effects by rigour of law: we cannot but express our great grief and trouble, that the unpardonable as well as incurable malignity of some should have carried them anew to such traitorous practices against our person and government, as have necessitated us to make fresh examples by the death of any more of our subjects. But as the publicness of their trial in the ordinary course of law, hath by their conviction sufficiently

³ Kennett's Register and Chronicle, Ecclesiastical and Civil. London, 1728, p. 837.

satisfied the world of the enormity of their crimes, so we have thought fit, at the same time that we are forced to punish, to endeavour, as much as in us lieth, the preventing all occasions of the like for the future by this Declaration; wherein our principal aim is, to apply proper antidotes to all those venomous insinuations, by which (as we are certainly informed) some of our subjects of inveterate and unalterable ill principles, do daily endeavour to poison the affections of our good people, by misleading their understandings, and that principally by four sorts of most false and malicious scandals, which we do look upon as the grounds of those traitorous attempts.

The first, By suggesting unto them, that having attained our ends in re-establishing our regal authority, and gaining the power into our own hands by a specious condescension to a general act of indemnity, we intend nothing less than the observation of it; but on the contrary, by degrees to subject the persons and estates of all such who stood in need of that law, to future revenge, and to give them up to the spoil of those who had lost their fortunes in our service.

Secondly, That upon pretence of plots and practices against us, we intend to introduce a military way of government in this kingdom.

Thirdly, That having made use of such solemn promises from Breda, and in several declarations since, of ease and liberty to tender consciences, instead of performing any part of them, we have added straiter fetters than ever, and new rocks of scandal to the scrupulous, by the Act of Uniformity.

Fourthly and lastly, We find it as artificially as maliciously divulged throughout the whole kingdom, That at the same time we deny a fitting liberty to those other sects of our subjects, whose consciences will not allow them to conform to the religion established by law: we are highly indulgent to papists, not only in exempting them from the penalties of the law, but even to such a degree of countenance and encouragement, as may even endanger the protestant religion.

Upon occasion of all which wicked and malicious suggestions, although we are confident that the innate loyalty and good affections of the generality of our people, strengthened by a due sense of the late calamities brought upon them by the same arts, will hinder seeds of so detestable a nature from taking root, and bringing forth the fruits aimed at by the sowers of them: yet we think that in our fatherly care to prevent any misleading of those who are so dear to us, we owe unto them and to ourselves this publication of our steadfast resolutions in all these particulars.

As to the first point, concerning the Act of indemnity; certainly there can be no greater evidence that the passing it proceeded from the clemency of our nature, as well as from the present conjuncture of that parliament wherein it was first framed, than that we have been pleased to make it our especial care to have it confirmed by a new Act in this, a parliament composed of members so full of affections to our person, and of zeal for the public good, as we could never have cause to apprehend their exacting from us a confirmation of anything that had been extorted, or had at present been judged by us prejudicial to either: and, therefore, as we not only consented unto, but most earnestly desired the passing that Act at first, and confirming it since, as being no less conformable to our nature, than conducive to a happy settlement; so we do hereby most solemnly renew unto all our subjects concerned in it, this engagement, on the word of a king,—That it shall never be in the power of any person or interest whatsoever, to make us decline from the religious observance of it: it having been always a constant profession of ours,—That we do and shall ever think our royal dignity and greatness much more happily and securely founded on our own clemency and our subjects' loves, than in their fears, and our power.

Which most sincere profession of ours may suffice also to expose the wickedness and falsehood of the other malice concerning the design of introducing a way of government by military power.

It is true, we should not think that we discharged rightly what we owe to the public peace, and to the freedom and security of parliaments, as well as to the safety of our person, if, whilst we daily discover such multitudes of dis-tempered minds, and such dangerous practices issuing from them, we should, from want of sufficient guards, put it in the power of those rebellious spirits to undertake, probably, at any time, what they have at several times so madly attempted for the ruin and destruction of us all. Of which certainly, besides the present occasion of new precaution as well as new severity, we suppose all our good subjects need not a livelier nor more moving instance, than what their memories can furnish them with, from the desperate undertaking of Venner and his crew, which (as mad as it was) we leave to all the world to judge of how dangerous a consequence it might have been, without that little strength remaining of those forces, which (to give our people a testimony of our founding all our security rather in their affections than in any military power) we had so frankly disbanded, and which afterwards, by advice of our council merely upon motives of the public safety, we consented to increase to that moderate proportion, which was, indeed, absolutely necessary, and hath since been sufficiently proved to be so, by the security which we owe to them from the late dangerous practices.

But the reasons of such precautions once ceasing, we are very sure that what guards soever may be found necessary for us to continue, as in former times, for the dignity and honour of our crown; the sole strength and security we shall ever confide in shall be the hearts and affections of our subjects, endeared and confirmed to us by our gracious and steady manner of government, according to the ancient known laws of the land; there being not any one of our subjects who doth more from his heart abhor, than we ourselves, all sort of military and arbitrary rule.

As for the third, concerning the non-performance of our promises, we remember well the very words of those from

Breda; viz., We do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom: and that we shall be ready to consent to such an act of parliament, as upon mature deliberation shall be offered to us for the full granting that indulgence.

We remember well the confirmations we have made of them since upon several occasions in parliament: and as all these things are still fresh in our memory, so are we still firm in the resolution of performing them to the full. But it must not be wondered at, since that parliament, to which those promises were made in relation to an act, never thought fit to offer us any to that purpose, and being so zealous as we are (and by the grace of God shall ever be) for the maintenance of the true protestant religion, finding it so shaken (not to say overthrown) as we did, we should give its establishment the precedency before matters of indulgence to dissenters from it. But that once done, (as we hope it is sufficiently by the bill of uniformity,) we are glad to lay hold on this occasion to renew unto all our subjects concerned in those promises of indulgence by a true tenderness of conscience, this assurance:

That, as in the first^e place, we have been zealous to settle the uniformity of the church of England, in discipline, ceremony, and government, and shall ever constantly maintain it;

So as for what concerns the penalties upon those who (living peaceable) do not conform thereunto through scruple and tenderness of misguided conscience, but modestly and without scandal perform their devotions in their own way, we shall make it our special care so far forth as in us lies, without invading the freedom of parliament, to incline their wisdom at this next approaching sessions, to concur with us in the making some such act for that purpose, as may enable us to exercise, with a more universal satisfaction, that power of dispensing, which we conceive to be inherent in us. Nor

can we doubt of their cheerful co-operating with us in a thing wherein we do conceive ourselves so far engaged, both in honour and in what we owe to the peace of our dominions, which we profess we can never think secure, whilst there shall be a colour left to the malicious and disaffected to inflame the minds of so many multitudes upon the score of conscience, with despair of ever obtaining any effect of our promise for their ease.

In the last place, as to that most pernicious and injurious scandal, so artificially spread and fomented, of our favour to papists; as it is but a repetition of the same detestable arts, by which all the late calamities have been brought upon this kingdom in the time of our royal father, of blessed memory, (who, though the most pious and zealous protestant that ever reigned in this nation, could never wash off the stains cast upon him by that malice, but by his martyrdom,) we conceive all our subjects should be sufficiently prepared against that poison by memory of those disasters; especially since nothing is more evident, than that the wicked authors of this scandal are such as seek to involve all good protestants under the odious name of papists, or popishly affected: yet we cannot but say upon this occasion, that our education and course of life in the true protestant religion has been such, and our constancy in the profession of it so eminent in our most desperate condition abroad among Roman catholic princes, whenas the appearance of receding from it had been the likeliest way in all human forecast, to have procured us the most powerful assistances of our re-establishment, that should any of our subjects give but the least admission of that scandal unto their beliefs, we should look upon it as the most unpardonable offence that they can be guilty of towards us. 'Tis true, that as we shall always according to justice retain, so we think it may become us to avow to the world, a due sense we have of the greatest part of our Roman catholic subjects of this kingdom, having deserved well from our royal father, of blessed memory, and from us, and even from the protestant religion itself, in adhering to us with

their lives and fortunes for the maintenance of our crown in the religion established, against those who, under the name of zealous protestants, employed both fire and sword to overthrow them both. We shall, with as much freedom, profess unto the world that it is not in our intencion to exclude our Roman catholic subjects, who have so demeaned themselves, from all share in the benefit of such an act, as in pursuance of our promises, the wisdom of our parliament shall think fit to offer unto us for the ease of tender consciences. It might appear no less than injustice, that those who deserved well and continued to do so, should be denied some part of that mercy which we have obliged ourselves to afford to ten times the number of such who have not done so. Besides, such are the capital laws in force against them, as though justified in their rigour by the times wherein they were made, we profess it would be grievous unto us to consent to the execution of them, by putting any of our subjects to death for their opinions in matters of religion only. But at the same time that we declare our little liking of those sanguinary ones, and our gracious intentions already expressed to such of our Roman catholic subjects as shall live peaceably, modestly, and without scandal; we would have them all know, that if for doing what their duties and loyalties obliged them to, or from our acknowledgment of their well-deserving, they shall have the presumption to hope for a toleration of their profession, or a taking away either those marks of distinction or of our displeasure, which in a well-governed kingdom ought always to be set upon dissenters from the religion of the state, or to obtain the least remission in the strictness of those laws, which either are or shall be made to hinder the spreading of their doctrine, to the prejudice of the true protestant religion; or that upon our expressing (according to Christian charity) our dislike for bloodshed for religion only, priests shall take the boldness to appear and avow themselves to the offence and scandal of good protestants, and of the laws in force against them, they shall quickly find we know as well to be severe, when wisdom

requires, as indulgent when charity and sense of merit challenge it from us.

With this we have thought fit to arm our good subjects' minds against the practices of our ill ones, by a true knowledge of our own; of which, now rightly persuaded, we make no question, but that whosoever they be from whom they can derive the spreading or fomenting of any of those wicked suggestions, they will look upon them with detestation, as the most dangerous enemies of our crown, and of the peace and happiness of the nation: and that what we have here published will happily prepare them all to a cheerful expectation of the approaching sessions of parliament; an assembly so eminent in their loyalty and their zeal for the peace and prosperity of our kingdoms, that having already made those happy settlements for the maintenance of the religion established, and of our just rights, their full concurrence with us can no way be doubted in the performance of all our promises, and to the effecting of those gracious intentions, which (God knows) our heart is full of, for the plenty, prosperity, and universal satisfaction of the nation.

In order to which, although it be foreign to the main scope of this our Declaration, which is principally to prevent the mischiefs aimed at by the scandals therein mentioned, and that wherein we reserve the enlargement of ourself till the opening of the next sessions of parliament, yet we cannot forbear hinting here unto our good subjects four particulars, wherein we think to give them the most important marks of our care. First, In punishing, by severe laws, that licentiousness and impiety, which, since the dissolution of government, we find, to our great grief, hath overspread the nation. Secondly, As well by sumptuary laws as by our own example of frugality, to restrain the excess in men's expenses, which is grown so general and so exorbitant, beyond all bounds either of their qualities or fortunes. Thirdly, So to perfect what we have already industriously begun in the retrenching of all our own ordinary and extraordinary charges

in navy, garrisons, household, and all their dependants, as to bring them within the compass of our settled revenue, that thereby our subjects may have little cause to apprehend our frequent pressing them for new assistants. And lastly, So to improve the good consequences of these three particulars to the advancement of trade, that all our subjects finding (as well as other nations envying) the advantage this hath of them in that prime foundation of plenty, they may all, with minds happily composed by our clemency and indulgence (instead of taking up thoughts of deserting their professions, or transplanting) apply themselves comfortably and with redoubled industry to their several vocations, in such manner as the private interest of every one in particular may encourage him to contribute cheerfully to the general prosperity.

Given at our court at Whitehall, this twenty-sixth day of December, in the fourteenth year of our reign.

XXX.

Proceedings in Parliament upon the King's Declaration of 26th December, 1662.—Journals of the House of Commons, vol. viii.

Sabbati, 21^o Februarii, [1662—3], 15^o Car II, [p. 438 *b.*]

Resolved, &c.—That Wednesday next be appointed for reading the king's majesty's Declaration and last Speech, and for taking the same into consideration and debate.

Mercurii, 25^o Februarii, [1662—3], 15^o Car. II, [p. 440 *a, b.*]

The House then took into consideration the order, made the one-and-twentieth of this month, for reading the king's majesty's Declaration and Speech.

And taking the same into debate ;

And the Declaration and Speech being read ;

The question being put, That the House do now proceed in the debate upon the king's majesty's Declaration and Speech, The House was divided.

The Noes went out :

Mr. Clifford,	{	Tellers for the noes :	}	30.
Sir Sol. Swale,	{	With the noes,	}	
Sir Courtney Poole,	{	Tellers for the yeas :	}	269.
Colonel Strangeways,	{	With the yeas,	}	

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

And the House accordingly proceeding in the debate ;

Upon consideration had by the House of the king's majesty's Declaration and Speech ;

Resolved, upon the question, *Nemine contradicente*—That the humble thanks of this House be returned to the king's majesty, for his constancy in the observation of the Act of Indemnity.

Resolved, &c., *Nemine contradicente*—That the humble thanks of this House be returned to the king's majesty, for his profession against introducing a government by a military power.

Resolved, &c., *Nemine contradicente*—That the humble thanks of this House be returned to his majesty, for his gracious invitation to this House to prepare some laws against the growth and progress of popery.

Resolved, &c., *Nemine contradicente*—That the humble thanks of this House be returned to his majesty for his resolution to maintain the Act of Uniformity.

Jovis, 26^o Februarii, [1662—3], 15^o Car. II, [p. 441 a.]

Ordered—That it be referred to a committee, to collect and bring in the reasons of the House for the vote of advice to his majesty, upon the debates had yesterday ; and also to prepare and bring in a bill to prevent the further growth of popery : *viz.*, Sir Hen. North, Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr.

Vaughan, Sir Edw. Walpoole, Sir Tho. Meres, Sir Fra. Goodrick, Colonel Windham, Lord Fanshaw, Mr. Hungerford, Mr. Ashburnham, Sir Rich. Everard, Sir Bain. Throckmorton, Lord Newburgh, Lord Falkland, Lord Ancram, Major-General Egerton, Sir John Goodrick, Sir John Duncombe, Lord Bruce, Sir Robert Atkyns, Sir John Birkinhead, Sir Wm. Lowther, Master of the Rolls, Sir Anthony Cope, Mr. Broome Whorwood, Colonel Strangeways, Sir Tho. Gower, Serjeant Charlton, Colonel Progers, Sir Edm. Peirce, Sir Cha. Harbord; and they are to meet in the Speaker's chamber, at two of the clock this afternoon; and to send for persons, papers, and records.

Resolved, &c.—That, in the close of the reasons to be presented to his majesty, for the vote of advice, it be also added, that this House, in pursuance thereof, will assist his majesty with their lives and fortunes; and that the committee appointed to bring in the reasons do pen an address, to that purpose, to his majesty.

Veneris, 27^o Februarii, [1662—3], 15^o Car II,
[pp. 442a—443b.]

Sir Heneage Finch reports, from the committee appointed to collect and bring in the reasons of this House for their vote of advice to the king's majesty; and, in the close of those reasons, to add—That the House will assist his majesty with their lives and fortunes; and to pen an address to his majesty for that purpose; the several reasons, and address, agreed by the committee, in writing, which he read in his place, and did after bring up and deliver the same in at the clerk's table.

The first paragraph was read; and, upon the question, agreed to.

The second paragraph was read; and, on the question, agreed to.

The third was read; and, on the question, agreed to.

The fourth paragraph was read; and, on the question, agreed to.

The fifth paragraph was read.

Resolved—That after the word “endeavours,” these words, “by your declaration,” be inserted.

And the same was done accordingly.

Resolved, &c.—That the words “by a gracious forbearance,” be omitted.

Which were struck out accordingly.

Resolved—That these words, “that there be any indulgence to such persons who presume to dissent from the Act of Uniformity,” be inserted.

Which was done accordingly.

Resolved, &c.—That the paragraph, so amended be agreed to.

The reasons were read.

The first paragraph was read the second time ; and, on the question, agreed to.

The next paragraph was read.

Resolved, &c.—That the word “and” be inserted, instead of “if.”

Resolved, &c.—That this clause be added in the close of the first paragraph ; “nor could it be otherwise understood, because there were laws of uniformity then in being, which could not be dispensed with, but by Act of Parliament.”

Which was done accordingly.

Resolved, &c.—That these words, “they who do pretend a right to that supposed promise,” be inserted in the beginning of the second paragraph.

Which was done accordingly.

Resolved, &c.—That the paragraph, so agreed to, do pass.

The next paragraph was read the second time ; and agreed.

The next was read the second time ; and, on the question, agreed to.

The rest, until the last paragraph, were severally read ; and, on the question, agreed to.

An additional reason, in writing, tendered to be inserted before the last reason.

Resolved, &c.—That the reason, being in these words, “It is a thing altogether without precedent, and will take away all means of convicting recusants, and be inconsistent with the method and proceedings of the laws of England,” be inserted.

Which was done accordingly.

The last reason was read.

Resolved, &c.—That these words, in the close of the last paragraph, viz., “it being most notorious, that the very prayers, which some pretend to make for the supreme authority, are still mingled with vile and seditious reflections,” be omitted.

The question being put, “To agree to the address and reasons, to be presented to his majesty, as they are amended, and read?”

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Which are as followeth, viz. :

“May it please your most excellent majesty,

“We, your majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subjects, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the House of Commons, in parliament assembled, having, with all fidelity and obedience, considered of the several matters comprised in your majesty’s late gracious Declaration of the twenty-sixth of December last, and your most gracious speech at the beginning of this present session, do, in the first place, for ourselves and in the names of all the Commons of England, render to your sacred majesty, the tribute of our most hearty thanks, for that infinite grace and goodness wherewith your majesty hath been pleased to publish your royal intentions of adhering to your Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, by a constant and religious observance of it. And our hearts are further enlarged in these returns of thanksgivings, when we consider your majesty’s most princely and heroic professions, of relying upon the affections of your people, and abhorring all sort of military and arbitrary rule. But, above all, we can never enough remember, to the honour of your majesty’s piety, and our own unspeakable comfort, those solemn and

most endearing invitations of us your majesty's subjects, to prepare laws, to be presented to your majesty, against the growth and increase of popery; and, withal, to provide more laws against licentiousness and impiety; at the same time declaring your own resolutions for maintaining the Act of Uniformity. And it becomes us always to acknowledge and admire your majesty's wisdom in this your Declaration; whereby your majesty is pleased to resolve, not only by sumptuary laws, but by your own royal example of frugality, to restrain that excess in men's expences which is grown so general and so exorbitant; and to direct our endeavours to find out fit and proper laws for advancement of trade and commerce.

“After all this, we most humbly beseech your majesty to believe, that it is with extreme unwillingness and reluctancy of heart, that we are brought to differ from anything which your majesty hath thought fit to propose. And though we do no way doubt, but that the unreasonable distempers of men's spirits, and the many mutinies and conspiracies which were carried on during the late intervals of parliament, did reasonably incline your majesty to endeavour, by your Declaration, to give some allay to those ill humours, till the parliament assembled, and the hopes of an indulgence if the parliament should consent to it; especially seeing the pretenders to this indulgence did seem to make some title to it, by virtue of your majesty's Declaration from Breda. Nevertheless, we, your majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, who are now returned to serve in parliament from those several parts and places of your kingdom for which we were chosen, do humbly offer it to your majesty's great wisdom, that it is in no sort advisable that there be any indulgence to such persons who presume to dissent from the Act of Uniformity and religion established, for these reasons:

“We have considered the nature of your majesty's Declaration from Breda, and are humbly of opinion that your majesty ought not to be pressed with it any further; because it is not a promise in itself, but only a gracious declaration

of your majesty's intentions to do what in you lay, and what a parliament should advise your majesty to do: and no such advice was ever given, or thought fit to be offered; nor could it be otherwise understood, because there were laws of uniformity then in being which could not be dispensed with, but by Act of Parliament.

“They who do pretend a right to that supposed promise, put their right into the hands of their representatives, whom they chose to serve for them in this parliament; who have passed, and your majesty consented, to the Act of Uniformity.

“If any shall presume to say, that a right to the benefit of this Declaration doth still remain after this Act passed, it tends to dissolve the very bonds of government, and to suppose a disability in your majesty and your Houses of Parliament, to make a law contrary to any part of your majesty's Declaration, though both Houses should advise your majesty to it.

“We have also considered the nature of the indulgence proposed, with reference to those consequences which must necessarily attend it.

“It will establish schism by a law, and make the whole government of the church precarious, and the censures of it of no moment or consideration at all.

“It will no way become the gravity or wisdom of a parliament, to pass a law at one session for uniformity, and at the next session (the reasons for uniformity continuing still the same) to pass another law to frustrate or weaken the execution of it.

“It will expose your majesty to the restless importunity of every sect or opinion, and of every single person also, that shall presume to dissent from the church of England.

“It will be a cause of increasing sects and sectaries; whose numbers will weaken the true protestant profession so far, that it will at least become difficult for it to defend itself against them. And, which is yet further considerable, those

numbers which, by being troublesome to the government, find they can arrive to an indulgence, will, as their numbers increase, be yet more troublesome, that so, at length, they may arrive at a general toleration, which your majesty hath declared against; and, in time, some prevalent sect will, at last, contend for an establishment; which, for aught can be foreseen, may end in popery.

“It is a thing altogether without precedent; and will take away all means of convicting recusants, and be inconsistent with the method and proceedings of the laws of England.

“Lastly, it is humbly conceived, that the indulgence proposed will be so far from tending to the peace of the kingdom, that it is likely rather to occasion great disturbance; and, on the contrary, that the asserting of the laws, and the religion established, according to the Act of Uniformity, is the most probable means to produce a settled peace and obedience through the kingdom; because the variety of professions in religion, when openly indulged, doth directly distinguish men into parties, and, withal, gives them opportunity to count their numbers; which, considering the animosities that, out of a religious pride, will be kept on foot by the several factions, doth tend, directly and inevitably, to open disturbance; nor can your majesty have any security, that the doctrine or worship of the several factions, which are all governed by a several rule, shall be consistent with the peace of your kingdom.

“And if any person shall presume to disturb the peace of the kingdom, we do, in all humility, declare, that we will for ever, and upon all occasions, be ready with our uttermost endeavours and assistance, to adhere to, and serve your majesty, according to our bounden duty and allegiance.”

Ordered—That such members of this House, as are of his majesty's privy council, do move the king's majesty, that he would give leave to this House to wait on him, at such time and place as his majesty shall think fit and appoint.

Sabbati, 28° Februarii, [1662—3], 15° Car II,
[pp. 443 *b*—444 *a*.]

Sir William Compton reports that he, with some other members of this House, of his majesty's honourable privy council, had attended his majesty, and signified unto him the desires of this House to wait on his majesty at such time and place as he should please to appoint; and that his majesty did receive the message very graciously, as he doth all things that come from this House; and, to give them a testimony of it, had appointed the shortest time he could for the House to attend him, which was this afternoon, at three of the clock, in the Banqueting House at Whitehall.

The address and reasons of this House, to be presented to his majesty, being fair written, were this day read the third time.

Resolved, &c.—That the word “in” be made “upon.”

Resolved, &c.—That these words, “and religion established,” be added after the word “uniformity.”

Post Meridiem.

Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House accompanying him, according to his majesty's appointment, went in a body to attend his majesty at the Banqueting House in Whitehall, with the address of thanks and reasons for the vote of non-indulgence to be presented to his majesty; and, being returned,

Mr. Speaker reported that the answer his majesty gave thereunto was to this effect, viz. :

“That he gave us hearty thanks for our many thanks; that never any king was so happy in a House of Commons as he is in this; that the paper and reasons were long, and therefore he would take time to consider of them, and send us a message; that we could never differ but in judgment, and that must be when he did not rightly express himself, or we did not rightly understand him; but our interest was so far linked together, that we could never disagree.”

Lunæ, 16^o Martii, [1662—3], 15^o Car. II, [p. 451 *a.*]

Mr. Secretary Morice reports a message from his majesty, in writing, which he delivered to Mr. Speaker; and the same was twice read, and was as followeth :

“CHARLES R.

“His majesty is unwilling to enlarge upon the address lately made to him by his House of Commons, or to reply to the reasons; though he finds what he had said much misunderstood: but renews his hearty thanks to them for their expressions of so great duty and affection; and for their free declaration, ‘that if any persons shall presume to disturb the peace of the kingdom, they will for ever, and in all occasions, be ready, with their utmost endeavours and assistance, to adhere to, and serve his majesty;’ and doth very heartily desire them so to enable him, and to put the kingdom into such a posture, as, if any disturbance or seditious designs arise, they may be easily suppressed.”

Resolved, &c.—That the humble thanks of this House be returned to the king’s majesty, for his gracious message to this House. And such members of this House as are of his majesty’s honourable privy council, are to present the thanks of this House to his majesty.

XXXI.

The Conventicle Act, 1664.

An Act to prevent and suppress Seditious Conventicles.

WHEREAS an Act made in the five-and-thirtieth year of the reign of our late sovereign lady queen Elizabeth, entitled, an Act to retain the queen’s majesty’s subjects in their due obedience, hath not been put in due execution by reason of some doubt

of late made, whether the said Act be still in force; although it be very clear and evident; and it is hereby declared, that the said Act is still in force, and ought to be put in due execution.

II. For providing therefore of further and more speedy remedies against the growing and dangerous practices of seditious sectaries, and other disloyal persons, who, under pretence of tender consciences, do at their meetings contrive insurrections, as late experience has showed.

III. Be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that if any person of the age of sixteen years or upwards, being a subject of this realm, at any time after the first day of July, which shall be in the year of our Lord, one thousand six hundred sixty-and-four, shall be present at any assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion, in other manner than is allowed by the liturgy or practice of the church of England, in any place within the kingdom of England, dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed; at which conventicle, meeting, or assembly, there shall be five persons or more assembled together, over and above those of the same household; then it shall and may be lawful to, and for any two justices of the peace of the county, limit, division, or liberty wherein the offence aforesaid shall be committed, or for the chief magistrate of the place where such offence aforesaid shall be committed; (if it be within a corporation where there not two justices of the peace); and they are hereby required and enjoined upon proof to them or him respectively made of such offence, either by confession of the party, or oath of witness, or notorious evidence of the fact (which oath the said justices of the peace, and chief magistrate respectively, are hereby empowered and required to administer) to make a record of every such offence and offences under their hands and seals respectively; which record so made, as aforesaid, shall, to all intents and purposes, be in law taken and adjudged to be a full and perfect

conviction of every such offender for such offence : and thereupon the said justices and chief magistrates respectively, shall commit every such offender, so convicted as aforesaid, to the gaol or house of correction, there to remain without bail or mainprize, for any time not exceeding the space of three months, unless such offender shall pay down to the said justices or chief magistrate, such sum of money, not exceeding five pounds, as the said justices or chief magistrate (who are hereby thereunto authorized and required) shall fine the said offender at, for his or her said offence ; which money shall be paid to the churchwardens for the relief of the poor of the parish where such offender did last inhabit.

IV. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if such offender, so convicted as aforesaid, shall at any time again commit the like offence contrary to this Act, and be thereof in manner aforesaid convicted, then such offender so convicted of such second offence, shall incur the penalty of imprisonment in the gaol or house of correction, for any time not exceeding six months, without bail or mainprize, unless such offender shall pay down to the said justices or chief magistrate, such sum of money, not exceeding ten pounds, as the said justices or chief magistrate (who are thereunto authorized and required, as aforesaid) shall fine the said offender at, for his or her said second offence, the said fine to be disposed in manner aforesaid.

V. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any such offender so convicted of a second offence contrary to this Act in manner aforesaid, shall at any time again commit the like offence contrary to this Act, then any two justices of the peace, and chief magistrate, as aforesaid, respectively, shall commit every such offender to the gaol, or house of correction, there to remain without bail or mainprize until the next general quarter sessions, assizes, gaol delivery, great sessions, or sitting of any commission of Oyer and Terminer in the respective county, limit, division, or liberty which shall first happen ; when and where every such offender shall be proceeded against by indictment for such

offence, and shall forthwith be arraigned upon such indictment, and shall then plead the general issue of not guilty, and give any special matter in evidence, or confess the indictment; and if such offender proceeded against, shall be lawfully convicted of such offence, either by confession or verdict, or if such offender shall refuse to plead the general issue, or to confess the indictment, then the respective justices of the peace at their general quarter sessions, judges of assize and gaol delivery at the assizes and gaol delivery, justices of the great sessions at the great sessions, and commissioners of Oyer and Terminer, at their sitting, are hereby enabled and required to cause judgment to be entered against such offender, that such offender shall be transported beyond the seas to any of his majesty's foreign plantations (Virginia and New England only excepted) there to remain seven years; and shall forthwith under their hands and seals make out warrants to the sheriff or sheriffs of the same county where such conviction or refusal to plead or to confess, as aforesaid, shall be, safely to convey such offender to some port or haven nearest or most commodious to be appointed by them respectively; and from thence to embark such offender to be safely transported to any of his majesty's plantations beyond the seas, as shall be also by them respectively appointed (Virginia and New England only excepted:) whereupon the said sheriff shall safely convey and embark, or cause to be embarked such offender, to be transported, as aforesaid; under pain of forfeiting for default of so transporting every such offender, the sum of forty pounds of lawful money; the one moiety thereof to the king, and the other moiety to him or them that shall sue for the same in any of the king's courts of record, by bill, plaint, action of debt, or information; in any of which, no wager of law, essoin, or protection shall be admitted: and the said respective court shall then also make out warrants to the several constables, headboroughs, or tithingmen of the respective places where the estate, real or personal, of such offender so to be transported shall happen to be, commanding them thereby to sequester into their hands

the profits of the lands, and to distrain and sell the goods of the offender so to be transported, for the reimbursing of the said sheriff all such reasonable charges as he shall be at, and shall be allowed him by the said respective court for such conveying and embarking of such offender so to be transported, rendering to the party, or his or her assigns, the overplus of the same, if any be, unless such offender, or some other on behalf of such offender so to be transported, shall give the sheriff such security as he shall approve of, for the paying all the said charges unto him.

VI. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that in default of defraying such charges by the parties to be transported, or some other in their behalf; or in default of security given to the sheriff, as aforesaid, it shall and may be lawful for every such sheriff to contract with any master of a ship, merchant, or other person, for the transporting of such offender at the best rate he can: and that in every such case it shall and may be lawful for such persons so contracting with any sheriff for transporting such offender, as aforesaid, to detain and employ every such offender so by them transported, as a labourer to them or their assigns, for the space of five years, to all intents and purposes, as if he or she were bound by indentures to such person for that purpose: and that the respective sheriffs shall be allowed or paid from the king, upon their respective accounts in the exchequer, all such charges by them expended, for conveying, embarking, and transporting of such persons, which shall be allowed by the said respective courts from whence they received their respective warrants, and which shall not have been by any of the ways aforementioned paid, secured, or reimbursed unto them, as aforesaid.

VII. Provided always, and be it further enacted, that in case the offender so indicted and convicted for the said third offence, shall pay into the hands of the registrar or clerk of the court or sessions where he shall be convicted (before the said court or sessions shall be ended) the sum of one hundred pounds, that then the said offender shall be discharged from

imprisonment and transportation, and the judgment for the same.

VIII. And be it further enacted, that the like imprisonment, indictment, arraignment, and proceedings shall be against every such offender, as often as he shall again offend after such third offence; nevertheless is dischargable and discharged by the payment of the like sum as was paid by such offender for his or her said offence next before committed, together with the additional and increased sum of one hundred pounds more upon every new offence committed: the said respective sums to be paid, as aforesaid, and to be disposed of as followeth, (*viz.*) the one moiety for the repair of the parish church or churches, chapel or chapels of such parish within which such conventicle, assembly, or meeting shall be held; and the other moiety to the repair of the highways of the said parish or parishes (if need require) or otherwise for the amendment of such highways as the justices of peace at their respective quarter sessions shall direct and appoint; and if any constable, headborough, or tithingman shall neglect to execute any the said warrants made unto them for seques-tering, distraining, and selling any of the goods and chattels of any offender against this Act, for the levying such sums of money as shall be imposed for the first or second offence, he shall forfeit for every such neglect the sum of five pounds of lawful money of England; the one moiety thereof to the king, and the other moiety to him that will sue for the same in any of the king's courts of record, as is aforesaid: and if any person be at any time sued for putting in execution any of the powers contained in this act, such person shall and may plead the general issue, and give the special matter in evidence; and if the plaintiff be nonsuit, or a verdict pass for the defendant thereupon, or if the plaintiff discontinue his action, or if, upon demurrer, judgment be given for the defendant, every such defendant shall have his or their treble costs.

IX. And be it further enacted, that if any person against whom judgment of transportation shall be given in manner

aforesaid, shall make escape before transportation, or being transported, as aforesaid, shall return unto this realm of England, dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, without the special licence of his majesty, his heirs, and successors, in that behalf first had and obtained, that the party so escaping or returning shall be adjudged a felon, and shall suffer death as in case of felony, without benefit of clergy: and shall forfeit and lose to his majesty all his or her goods and chattels for ever; and shall further lose to his majesty all his or her lands, tenements, and hereditaments for and during the life only of such offender, and no longer: and that the wife of any such offender by force of this act shall not lose her dower, nor shall any corruption of blood grow or be by reason of any such offence mentioned in this act; but that the heir of every such offender by force of this act, shall and may, after the death of such offender, have and enjoy the lands, tenements, and hereditaments of such offenders, as if this act had not been made.

X. And for better preventing of the mischiefs which may grow by such seditious and tumultuous meetings under pretence of religious worship: be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the lieutenants or deputy lieutenants, or any commissioned officers of the militia, or any other of his majesty's forces, with such troops or companies of horse or foot; and also the sheriffs and justices of peace and other magistrates and ministers of justice, or any of them jointly or severally within any the counties or places within this kingdom of England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, with such other assistance as they shall think meet or can get in readiness with the soonest, on certificate made to them respectively under the hand and seal of any one justice of the peace, or chief magistrate, as aforesaid, of his particular information or knowledge of such unlawful meetings or conventicles held or to be held in their respective counties or places, and that he (with such assistance as he can get together, is not able to suppress or dissolve the same) shall and may, and are hereby required and enjoined to repair

unto the place where they are so held, or to be held, and by the best means they can to dissolve and dissipate, or prevent all such unlawful meetings, and take into their custody such of those persons so unlawfully assembled as they shall judge to be the leaders and seducers of the rest, and such others as they shall think fit to be proceeded against according to law for such their offences.

XI. And be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person who shall wittingly and willingly suffer any such conventicle, unlawful assembly or meeting aforesaid, to be held in his or her house, outhouse, barn or room, yard or backside, woods or grounds, shall incur the same penalties and forfeitures as any other offender against this act ought to incur, and be proceeded against, in all points, in such manner as any other offender against this act ought to be proceeded against.

XII. Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any keeper of any gaol or house of correction, shall suffer any person committed to his custody for any offence against this act, to go at large, contrary to the warrant of his commitment according to this act, or shall permit any person, who is at large, to join with any person committed to his custody by virtue of this act, in the exercise of religion, differing from the rites of the church of England; then every such keeper of a gaol or house of correction shall for every such offence forfeit the sum of ten pounds, to be levied, raised, and disposed by such persons, and in such manner as the penalties for the first and second offences against this act are to be levied, raised, and disposed.

XIII. Provided always, that no person shall be punished for any offence against this act, unless such offender be prosecuted for the same within three months after the offence committed: and that no person who shall be punished for any offence by virtue of this act, shall be punished for the same offence by virtue of any other act or law whatsoever.

XIV. Provided also, and be it enacted, that judgment of

transportation shall not be given against any feme covert, unless her husband be at the same time under the like judgment, and not discharged by the payment of money, as aforesaid; but that instead thereof she shall by the respective court be committed to the gaol or house of correction, there to remain without bail or mainprize, for any time not exceeding twelve months, unless her husband shall pay down such sum, not exceeding forty pounds, to redeem her from imprisonment, as shall be imposed by the said court, the said sum to be disposed by such persons, and in such manner as the penalties for the first and second offence against this act are to be disposed.

XV. Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the justices of the peace, and chief magistrate respectively empowered, as aforesaid, to put this act in execution, shall and may, with what aid, force, and assistance they shall think fit, for the better execution of this act, after refusal or denial, enter into any house, or other place where they shall be informed any such conventicle, as aforesaid, is or shall be held.

XVI. Provided, that no dwelling house of any peer of this realm, whilst he or his wife shall be there resident, shall be searched by virtue of this act, but by immediate warrant from his majesty under his sign manual, or in the presence of the lieutenant, or one of the deputy lieutenants, or two justices of the peace, whereof one to be of the quorum of the same county or riding: nor shall any other dwelling house of any peer or other person whatsoever, be entered into with force by virtue of this act, but in the presence of one justice of the peace, or chief magistrate respectively, except within the city of London, where it shall be lawful for any such other dwelling house to be entered into, as aforesaid, in the presence of one justice of the peace, alderman, deputy alderman, or any one commissioner for the lieutenancy for the city of London.

XVII. Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person shall by virtue of this act be com-

mitted to the house of correction, that shall satisfy the said justices of the peace, or chief magistrate respectively, that he or she (and in case of a feme covert, that her husband) hath an estate of freehold, or copyhold to the value of five pounds per annum, or personal estate to the value of fifty pounds; anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding.

XVIII. And in regard to a certain sect called quakers, and other sectaries, are found not only to offend in the matters provided against by this act, but also obstruct the proceeding of justice by their obstinate refusal to take oaths lawfully tendered unto them in the ordinary course of law: therefore be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any person or persons being duly and legally served with process or other summons to appear in any court of record, except court leets, as a witness, or returned to serve of any jury, or ordered to be examined upon interrogatories, or being present in court shall refuse to take any judicial oath legally tendered to him by the judge or judges of the same court, having no legal plea to justify or excuse the refusal of the same oath: or if any person or persons being duly served with process, to answer any bill exhibited against him or them in any court of equity, or any suit in any court ecclesiastical, shall refuse to answer such bill or suit upon his or their corporal oath, in cases where the law requires such answer to be put in upon oath; or being summoned to be a witness in any such court, or ordered to be examined upon interrogatories, shall for any cause or reason, not allowed by law, refuse to take such oath, as in such cases is required by law: that then, and in such case, the several and respective courts wherein such refusal shall be made, shall be, and are hereby enabled to record, enter, or register such refusal, which record or entry shall be, and is hereby made a conviction of such offence; and all and every person and persons so, as aforesaid, offending, shall for every such offence incur the judgment and punishment of transportation in such manner as is appointed by this act for other offences.

XIX. Provided always, that if any the person or persons

aforesaid, shall come into such court, and take his or their oath in these words :

I do swear, that I do not hold the taking of an oath to be unlawful nor refuse to take an oath on that account.

XX. Which oath the respective court or courts aforesaid, are hereby authorised and required forthwith to tender, administer, and register, before the entry of the conviction aforesaid ; or shall take such oath before some justice of the peace, who is hereby authorized and required to administer the same, to be returned into such court : such oath so made shall acquit him or them from such punishment ; anything herein to the contrary notwithstanding.

XXI. Provided always, that every person convicted as aforesaid in any courts aforesaid, (other than his majesty's court of king's bench, or before the justices of assize, or general gaol delivery) shall by warrant containing a certificate of such conviction under the hand and seal of the respective judge or judges before whom such conviction shall be had, be sent to some one of his majesty's gaols in the same county where such conviction was had, there to remain without bail or mainprize until the next assizes, or general gaol delivery : where, if such person so convicted shall refuse to take the oath aforesaid, being tendered unto him by the justice or justices of assize or gaol delivery ; then such justice or justices shall cause judgment of transportation to be executed in such manner as judgment of transportation by this act is to be executed : but in case such person shall take the said oath, then he shall thereupon be discharged.

XXII. Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any peer of this realm shall offend against this act, he shall pay ten pounds for the first offence, and twenty pounds for the second offence, to be levied upon his goods and chattels by warrant from any two justices of the peace, or chief magistrate of the place or division where such peer shall dwell : and that every peer for the third, and every further offence against the tenor of this act, shall be tried by his peers, and not otherwise.

XXIII. Provided also, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that this act shall continue in force for three years after the end of this present session of parliament; and from thenceforward, to the end of the next session of parliament after the said three years and no longer.

XXXII.

The Five Mile Act.

An Act for Restraining Nonconformists from Inhabiting in Corporations.

WHEREAS divers parsons, vicars, curates, lecturers, and other persons in holy orders, have not declared their unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things contained and prescribed in "The Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church, according to the use of the church of England," or have not subscribed the declaration or acknowledgment contained in a certain Act of Parliament made in the fourteenth year of his majesty's reign, and entitled, an Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, and for the Establishing the form of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of England, according to the said Act, or any other subsequent Act. And whereas they or some of them, and divers other person and persons not ordained according to the form of the church of England, and as have since the Act of Oblivion taken upon them to preach in unlawful assemblies, conventicles, or meetings, under colour or pretence of exercise of religion, contrary to the laws and statutes of this kingdom, have settled themselves in divers corporations in England, sometimes three or more of them in a place, thereby taking an opportu-

nity to distil the poisonous principles of schism and rebellion into the hearts of his majesty's subjects, to the great danger of the church and kingdom.

II. Be it therefore enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the said parsons, vicars, curates, lecturers, and other persons in holy orders, or pretended holy orders, or pretending to holy orders, and all stipendiaries, and other persons who have been possessed of any ecclesiastical or spiritual promotion, and every of them, who have not declared their unfeigned assent and consent, as aforesaid, and subscribed the declaration aforesaid, and shall not take and subscribe the oath following:

I, A. B., do swear, that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king; and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him, in pursuance of such commissions; and that I will not at any time endeavour any alteration of government, either in church or state.

III. And all such person and persons as shall take upon them to preach in any unlawful assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion, contrary to the laws and statutes of this kingdom; shall not at any time from and after the four and twentieth day of March, which shall be in this present year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred sixty-and-five, unless only in passing upon the road, come or be within five miles of any city or town corporate, or borough that send burgesses to the parliament, within his majesty's kingdom of England, principality of Wales, or of the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed; or within five miles of any parish, town or place, wherein he or they have since the Act of Oblivion been parson, vicar, curate, stipendiary, or lecturer, or taken upon them to preach in any unlawful assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion, contrary to the

laws and statutes of this kingdom; before he or they have taken and subscribed the oath aforesaid, before the justices of the peace at their quarter sessions to be holden for the county, riding, or division, next unto the said corporation, city, or borough, parish, place, or town in open court, (which said oath the said justices are hereby empowered there to administer); upon forfeiture for every such offence the sum of forty pounds of lawful English money; the one third part thereof to his majesty and his successors; the other third part to the use of the poor of the parish where the offence shall be committed; and the other third part thereof to such person or persons as shall or will sue for the same by action of debt, plaint, bill, or information in any court of record at Westminster, or before any justices of assize, Oyer and Terminer, or gaol delivery, or before any justices of the counties palatine of Chester, Lancaster, or Durham, or the justices of the great sessions in Wales, or before any justices of peace in their quarter sessions, wherein no essoin, protection, or wager of law shall be allowed.

IV. Provided always, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that it shall not be lawful for any person or persons restrained from coming to any city, town corporate, borough, parish, town, or place, as aforesaid, or for any other person or persons as shall not first take and subscribe the said oath, and as shall not frequent divine service established by the laws of this kingdom, and carry him or herself reverently, decently, and orderly there, to teach any public or private school, or take any borders, or tablers that are taught or instructed by him or herself, or any other; upon pain for every such offence to forfeit the sum of forty pounds, to be recovered and distributed, as aforesaid.

V. Provided also, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that it shall be lawful for any two justices of the peace of the respective county, upon oath to them of any offence against this act, which oath they are hereby empowered to administer, to commit the offender for six months, without bail or mainprize, unless, upon or before such commitment, he

shall, before the said justices of the peace, swear and subscribe the aforesaid oath and declaration.

VI. Provided always, that if any person intended to be restrained by virtue of this act, shall without fraud or covin be served with any writ, subpœna, warrant, or other process, whereby his personal appearance is required, his obedience to such writ, subpœna, or process, shall not be construed an offence against this act.

XXXIII.

The Conventicle Act, 1670.

An Act to Prevent and Suppress Seditious Conventicles.

FOR providing further and more speedy remedies against the growing and dangerous practices of seditious sectaries, and other disloyal persons, who, under pretence of tender consciences, have or may at their meetings contrive insurrections (as late experience hath shewn): be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons in this present parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, that if any person of the age of sixteen years or upwards, being a subject of this realm, at any time after the tenth day of May next, shall be present at any assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercises of religion in other manner than according to the liturgy and practice of the church of England, in any place within the kingdom of England, or dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, at which conventicle, meeting, or assembly, there shall be five persons or more assembled together, over and besides those of the same household, if it be in a house where there is a family inhabiting; or if it be in a house, field, or place where there is no family inhabiting;

then where any five persons or more, are so assembled, as aforesaid, it shall and may be lawful to and for any one or more justices of the peace of the county, limit, division, corporation, or liberty wherein the offence aforesaid shall be committed, or for the chief magistrate of the place where the offence aforesaid shall be committed; and he and they are hereby required and enjoined, upon proof to him or them respectively made of such offence, either by confession of the party or oath of two witnesses: (which oath the said justice and justices of the peace, and chief magistrate respectively, are hereby empowered and required to administer) or by notorious evidence and circumstance of the fact, to make a record of every such offence under his or their hands and seals respectively: which record so made, as aforesaid, shall to all intents and purposes be in law taken and adjudged to be a full and perfect conviction of every such offender for such offence; and thereupon the said justice, justices, and chief magistrate respectively, shall impose on every such offender so convicted, as aforesaid, a fine of five shillings for such first offence; which record and conviction shall be certified by the said justice, justices, or chief magistrate, at the next quarter sessions of the peace, for the county or place where the offence was committed.

II. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if such offender so convicted, as aforesaid, shall at any time again commit the like offence or offences, contrary to this act, and be thereof in manner aforesaid convicted, then such offender so convicted of such like offence or offences, shall for every such offence incur the penalty of ten shillings: which fine and fines, for the first and every other offence shall be levied by distress and sale of the offender's goods and chattels; or in case of the poverty of such offender, upon the goods and chattels of any other person or persons who shall be then convicted in manner aforesaid of the like offence at the same conventicle, at the discretion of the said justice, justices, or chief magistrate respectively, so as the sum to be levied on any one person in case of the poverty of other

offenders, amount not in the whole to above the sum of ten pounds, upon occasion of any one meeting, as aforesaid: and every constable, headborough, tithingman, churchwardens, and overseers of the poor respectively, are hereby authorized and required to levy the same accordingly, having first received a warrant under the hands and seals of the said justice, justices, or chief magistrate respectively so to do: the said monies so to be levied, to be forthwith delivered to the same justice, justices, or chief magistrate, and by him or them to be distributed, the one third part thereof to the use of the king's majesty, his heirs and successors, to be paid to the high sheriff of the county for the time being, in manner following: that is to say, the justice or justices of peace shall pay the same into the court of the respective quarter sessions, which said court shall deliver the same to the sheriff, and make a memorial on record of the payment and delivery thereof, which said memorial shall be a sufficient and final discharge to the said justice and justices, and a charge to the sheriff, which said discharge and charge shall be certified into the exchequer together, and not one without the other: and no justice shall or may be questioned or accountable for the same in the exchequer or elsewhere, than in quarter sessions: another third part thereof to and for the use of the poor of the parish where such offence shall be committed; and the other third part thereof to the informer and informers, and to such person and persons as the said justice, justices, or chief magistrate respectively shall appoint, having regard to their diligence and industry in the discovery, dispersing, and punishing of the said conventicles.

III. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person who shall take upon him to preach or teach in any such meeting, assembly, or conventicle, and shall thereof be convicted, as aforesaid, shall forfeit for every such first offence the sum of twenty pounds, to be levied in manner aforesaid upon his goods and chattels; and if the said preacher or teacher, so convicted, be a stranger, and his name and habitation not known, or is fled, and cannot be

found, or in the judgment of the justice, justices, or chief magistrate before whom he shall be convicted, shall be thought unable to pay the same, the said justice, justices, or chief magistrate respectively, are hereby empowered and required to levy the same by warrant, as aforesaid, upon the goods and chattels of any such persons who shall be present at the same conventicle; anything in this or any other act, law, or statute to the contrary notwithstanding; and the money so levied, to be disposed of in manner aforesaid: and if such offender so convicted, as aforesaid, shall at any time again commit the like offence or offences contrary to this act, and be thereof convicted in manner aforesaid, then such offender so convicted of such like offence or offences, shall for every such offence, incur the penalty of forty pounds, to be levied and disposed, as aforesaid.

IV. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person who shall wittingly and willingly suffer any such conventicle, meeting, or unlawful assembly aforesaid, to be held in his or her house, outhouse, barn, yard or backside, and be convicted thereof in manner aforesaid, shall forfeit the sum of twenty pounds, to be levied in manner aforesaid, upon his or her goods and chattels; or in case of his or her poverty or inability, as aforesaid, upon the goods and chattels of such persons who shall be convicted in manner aforesaid, of being present at the same conventicle; and the money so levied, to be disposed of in manner aforesaid.

V. Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person shall by any clause of this act be liable to pay above ten pounds for any one meeting, in regard of the poverty of any other person or persons.

VI. Provided also, and be it further enacted, that in all cases of this act, where the penalty or sum charged upon any offender exceeds the sum of ten shillings, and such offender shall find himself aggrieved, it shall and may be lawful for him within one week after the said penalty or money charged shall be paid or levied, to appeal in writing from the person or persons convicting, to the judgment of the justices of the peace in

their next quarter sessions: to whom the justice or justices of the peace, chief magistrate, or alderman, that first convicted such offender, shall return the money levied upon the appellant, and shall certify under his and their hands and seals, the evidence upon which the conviction past, with the whole record thereof, and the said appeal; whereupon such offender may plead and make defence, and have his trial by a jury thereupon: and in case such appellant shall not prosecute with effect, or if upon such trial he shall not be acquitted, or judgment pass not for him upon his said appeal, the said justices at the sessions shall give treble costs against such offender for his unjust appeal: and no other court whatsoever shall intermeddle with any cause or causes of appeal upon this act, but they shall be finally determined in the quarter sessions only.

VII. Provided always, and be it further enacted, that upon the delivery of such appeal, as aforesaid, the person or persons appellant shall enter before the person or persons convicting, into a recognizance, to prosecute the said appeal with effect: which said recognizance the person or persons convicting is hereby empowered to take, and required to certify the same to the next quarter sessions: and in case no such recognizance be entered into, the said appeal to be null and void.

VIII. Provided always, that every such appeal shall be left with the person or persons so convicting, as aforesaid, at the time of the making thereof.

IX. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the justice, justices of the peace, and chief magistrate respectively, or the respective constables, headboroughs, and tithingmen, by warrant from the said justice, justices, or chief magistrate respectively, shall and may, with what aid, force, and assistance they shall think fit, for the better execution of this act, after refusal or denial to enter, break open, and enter into any house or other place, where they shall be informed any such conventicle, as aforesaid, is or shall be held, as well within liberties as without: and take into their custody

the persons there unlawfully assembled, to the intent they may be proceeded against according to this act: and that the lieutenants or deputy lieutenants, or any commissioned officer of the militia, or other of his majesty's forces, with such troops or companies of horse and foot; and also the sheriffs, and other magistrates and ministers of justice, or any of them jointly or severally, within any the counties or places within this kingdom of England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, with such other assistance as they shall think meet, or can get in readiness with the soonest, on certificate made to them respectively under the hand and seal of any one justice of the peace or chief magistrate, of his particular information or knowledge of such unlawful meeting or conventicle held, or to be held in their respective counties or places, and that he with such assistance as he can get together, is not able to suppress and dissolve the same, shall and may, and are hereby required and enjoined to repair unto the place where they are so held, or to be held, and by the best means they can to dissolve, dissipate, or prevent all such unlawful meetings, and take into their custody such and so many of the said persons so unlawfully assembled as they shall think fit, to the intent they may be proceeded against according to this act.

X. Provided always, that no dwelling house of any peer of this realm, where he or his wife shall then be resident, shall be searched by virtue of this act, but by immediate warrant from his majesty, under his sign manual, or in the presence of the lieutenant, or one deputy lieutenant, or two justices of the peace, whereof one to be of the quorum of the same county or riding.

XI. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any constable, headborough, tithingman, churchwarden or overseer of the poor, who shall know, or be credibly informed of any such meetings or conventicles held within his precincts, parishes, or limits, and shall not give information thereof to some justice of the peace, or the chief magistrate, and endeavour the conviction of the parties

according to his duty; but such constable, headborough, tithingman, churchwarden, overseers of the poor, or any person lawfully called in aid of the constable, headborough, or tithingman, shall wilfully and wittingly omit the performance of his duty, in the execution of this act, and be thereof convicted in manner aforesaid, he shall forfeit for every such offence, the sum of five pounds, to be levied upon his goods and chattels, and disposed in manner aforesaid: and that if any justice of the peace, or chief magistrate, shall wilfully and wittingly omit the performance of his duty in the execution of this act, he shall forfeit the sum of one hundred pounds; the one moiety to the use of the informer, to be recovered by action, suit, bill, or plaint, in any of his majesty's courts at Westminster, wherein no essoin, protection, or wager of law shall lie.

XII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid that if any person be at any time sued for putting in execution any of the powers contained in this act, otherwise than upon appeal allowed by this act, such person shall and may plead the general issue, and give the special matter in evidence: and if the plaintiff be nonsuit, or a verdict pass for the defendant, or if the plaintiff discontinue his action, or if upon demurrer, judgment be given for the defendant, every such defendant shall have his full treble costs.

XIII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that this act, and all clauses therein contained, shall be construed most largely and beneficially for the suppressing of conventicles, and for the justification and encouragement of all persons to be employed in the execution thereof: and that no record, warrant, or mittimus to be made by virtue of this act, or any proceedings thereupon, shall be reversed, avoided, or any way impeached by reason of any default in form: and in case any person offending against this act, shall be an inhabitant in any other county or corporation, or fly into any other county or corporation after the offence committed, the justice of peace or chief magistrate before whom he shall be convicted, as aforesaid, shall certify the

same under his hand and seal, to any justice of peace, or chief magistrate of such other county or corporation wherein the said person or persons are inhabitants, or are fled into: which said justice or chief magistrate respectively, is hereby authorized and required to levy the penalty or penalties in this act mentioned, upon the goods and chattels of such person or persons, as fully as the said other justice of peace might have done, in case he or they had been inhabitants in the place where the offence was committed.

XIV. Provided also, that no person shall be punished for any offence against this act, unless such offender be prosecuted for the same within three months after the offence committed: and that no person who shall be punished for any offence by virtue of this act, shall be punished for the same offence by virtue of any other act or law whatsoever.

XV. Provided, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every alderman of London for the time being, within the city of London, and the liberties thereof, shall have (and they and every of them are hereby empowered and required to execute) the same power and authority within London, and the liberties thereof, for the examining, convicting and punishing of all offences within this act committed within London, and the liberties thereof, which any justice of peace hath by this act in any county of England, and shall be subject to the same penalties and punishments, for not doing that which by this act is directed to be done by any justice of peace in any county of England.

XVI. Provided, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if the person offending, and convicted, as aforesaid be a feme covert, cohabiting with her husband, the penalties of five shillings, and ten shillings, so as aforesaid incurred, shall be levied by warrant, as aforesaid, upon the goods and chattels of the husband of such feme covert.

XVII. Provided also, that no peer of this realm shall be attached or imprisoned by virtue or force of this act; anything, matter, or clause, therein to the contrary notwithstanding.

XVIII. Provided also, that neither this act, nor anything

therein contained, shall extend to invalidate or void his majesty's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs: but that his majesty, and his heirs and successors may from time to time, and at all times hereafter, exercise and enjoy all powers and authority in ecclesiastical affairs, as fully and as amply as himself or any of his predecessors have or might have done the same; anything in this act notwithstanding.

XXXIV.

The Test Act.

An Act for Preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants.

FOR preventing dangers which may happen from popish recusants, and quieting the minds of his majesty's good subjects: Be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, that all and every person or persons, as well peers as commoners, that shall bear any office or offices, civil or military, or shall receive any pay, salary, fee, or wages, by reason of any patent or grant from his majesty, or shall have command or place of trust from or under his majesty, or from any of his majesty's predecessors, or by his or their authority, or by authority derived from him or them, within the realm of England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, or in his majesty's navy, or in the several islands of Jersey and Guernsey, or shall be of the household, or in the service or employment of his majesty, or of his royal highness the Duke of York, who shall inhabit, reside, or be within the

city of London or Westminster, or within thirty miles distant from the same, on the first day of Easter term that shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and seventy-three, or at any time during the said term, all and every the said person and persons shall personally appear before the end of the said term, or of Trinity term next following, in his majesty's High Court of Chancery, or in his majesty's Court of King's Bench, and there in public and open court, between the hours of nine of the clock and twelve in the forenoon, take the several oaths of supremacy, and allegiance, which Oath of Allegiance is contained in the statute made in the third year of king James, by law established; and during the time of the taking thereof by the said person and persons, all pleas and proceedings in the said respective courts shall cease; and that all and every of the said respective persons and officers, not having taken the said oaths in the said respective courts aforesaid, shall, on or before the first day of August, one thousand six hundred and seventy-three, at the quarter sessions for that county or place where he or they shall be, inhabit, or reside, on the twentieth day of May, take the said oaths in open court, between the said hours of nine and twelve of the clock in the forenoon; and the said respective officers aforesaid, shall also receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper, according to the usage of the church of England, at or before the first day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and seventy-three, in some parish church, upon some Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, immediately after divine service and sermon.

II. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every person or persons that shall be admitted, entered, placed, or taken into any office or offices, civil or military, or shall receive any pay, salary, fee, or wages, by reason of any patent or grant of his majesty, or shall have command or place of trust, from or under his majesty, his heirs or successors, or by his or their authority, or by authority derived from him or them, within this realm of

England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, or in his majesty's navy, or in the several islands of Jersey and Guernsey, or that shall be admitted into any service or employment in his majesty's or royal highness's household or family, after the first day of Easter term aforesaid, and shall inhabit, be, or reside, when he or they is or are so admitted or placed, within the cities of London or Westminster, or within thirty miles of the same, shall take the said oaths aforesaid, in the said respective court or courts aforesaid, in the next term after such his or their admittance or admittances into the office or offices, employment or employments aforesaid, between the hours aforesaid, and no other, and the proceedings to cease, as aforesaid; and that all and every such person or persons to be admitted after the said first day of Easter term, as aforesaid, not having taken the said oaths in the said courts aforesaid, shall, at the quarter sessions for that county or place where he or they shall reside, next after such his admittance or admittances into any of the said respective offices or employments aforesaid, take the said several and respective oaths, as aforesaid: And all and every such person and persons so to be admitted, as aforesaid, shall also receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper, according to the usage of the Church of England, within three months after his or their admittance in or receiving their said authority and employment, in some public church, upon some Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, immediately after divine service and sermon.

III. And every of the said persons in the respective court where he takes the said oaths, shall first deliver a certificate of such his receiving the said sacrament, as aforesaid, under the hands of the respective minister and churchwarden, and shall then make proof of the truth thereof, by two credible witnesses, at the least, upon oath; all which shall be enquired of, and put upon record in the respective courts.

IV. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,

that all and every the person or persons aforesaid, that do or shall neglect or refuse to take the said oaths and sacrament in the said courts and places, and at the respective times aforesaid, shall be *ipso facto* adjudged incapable and disabled in law, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, to have, occupy, or enjoy the said office or offices, employment or employments, or any part of them, or any matter or thing aforesaid, or any profit or advantage appertaining to them, or any of them; and every such office and place, employment and employments, shall be void, and is hereby adjudged void.

V. And be it further enacted, that all and every such person or persons that shall neglect or refuse to take the said oaths, or the sacrament, as aforesaid, within the times and in the places aforesaid, and in the manner aforesaid, and yet after such neglect or refusal, shall execute any of the said offices or employments, after the said times expired, wherein he or they ought to have taken the same, and being thereupon lawfully convicted, in or upon any information, presentment, or indictment, in any of the king's courts at Westminster, or at the assizes, every such person or persons shall be disabled from thenceforth, to sue, or use any action, bill, plaint, or information in course of law, or to prosecute any suit in any Court of Equity, or to be guardian of any child, or executor or administrator of any person, or capable of any legacy, or deed of gift, or to bear any office within this realm of England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed; and shall forfeit the sum of five hundred pounds, to be recovered by him or them that shall sue for the same, to be prosecuted by any action of debt, suit, bill, plaint, or information in any of his majesty's courts at Westminster, wherein no essoin, protection, or wager of law shall lie.

VI. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the names of all and singular such persons and officers aforesaid, that do or shall take the oaths aforesaid, shall be in the respective Courts of Chancery and King's Bench, and the quarter sessions, inrolled, with the day and time of their

taking the same, in rolls made and kept only for that intent and purpose, and for no other; the which rolls, as for the Court of Chancery, shall be publicly hung up in the office of the Petty-bag, and the roll for the King's Bench in the Crown-Office of the said court, and in some public place in every quarter sessions, and there remain during the whole term, every term, and during the whole time of the said sessions, in every quarter sessions, for everyone to resort to, and look upon, without fee or reward; and likewise none of the person or persons aforesaid shall give or pay, as any fee or reward, to any officer or officers belonging to any of the courts, as aforesaid, above the sum of twelve pence for his or their entry of his or their taking of the said oaths aforesaid.

VII. And further, that it shall and may be lawful to and for the respective courts aforesaid, to give and administer the said oaths aforesaid, to the person or persons aforesaid, in manner as aforesaid; and upon the due tender of any such person or persons, to take the said oaths, the said courts are hereby required and enjoined to administer the same.

VIII. And be it further enacted, that if any person or persons not bred up by his or their parent or parents from their infancy in the popish religion, and professing themselves to be popish recusants, shall breed up, instruct, or educate his or their child or children, or suffer them to be instructed or educated in the popish religion, every such person being thereof convicted, shall be from thenceforth disabled of bearing any office, or place of trust or profit, in church or state; and all such children as shall be so brought up, instructed, or educated, are and shall be hereby disabled of bearing any such office or place of trust or profit, until he and they be perfectly reconciled and converted to the church of England, and shall take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance aforesaid, before the justices of the peace, in the open quarter sessions of the county or place where they shall inhabit, and thereupon receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper, after the usage of the church of England, and

obtain a certificate thereof, under the hands of two or more of the said justices of the peace.

IX. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that at the same time when the persons concerned in this act shall take the aforesaid Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, they shall likewise make and subscribe this declaration following, under the same penalties and forfeitures as by this act is appointed :

I, A. B., do declare, that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.

X. Of which subscription there shall be the like register kept as of the taking the oaths aforesaid.

XI. Provided always, that neither this act, nor anything therein contained, shall extend, be judged or interpreted any-ways to hurt or prejudice the peerage of any peer of this realm, or to take away any right, power, privilege, or profit, which any person (being a peer of this realm) hath or ought to enjoy by reason of his peerage, either in time of parliament or otherwise; or to take away creation-money or bills of impost, nor to take away or make void any pension or salary granted by his majesty to any person for valuable and sufficient consideration, for life, lives, or years, other than such as relate to any office, or to any place of trust under his majesty, and other than pensions of bounty or voluntary pensions; nor to take away or make void any estate of inheritance granted by his majesty, or any his predecessors, to any person or persons, of, or in any lands, rents, tithes, or hereditaments, not being offices; nor to take away or make void any pension or salary already granted by his majesty to any person who was instrumental in the happy preservation of his sacred majesty after the battle at Worcester, in the year one thousand six hundred and fifty-one, until his majesty's arrival beyond the seas; nor to take away or make void the grant of any office or offices of inheritance, or any fee, salary, or reward, for executing such office or offices,

or thereto any way belonging, granted by his majesty, or any his predecessors, to, or enjoyed, or which hereafter shall be enjoyed by any person or persons who shall refuse or neglect to take the said oaths, or either of them, or to receive the sacrament, or to subscribe the declaration mentioned in this act, in manner therein expressed: nevertheless, so as such person or persons having or enjoying any such office or offices of inheritance, do or shall substitute and appoint his or their sufficient deputy or deputies (which such officer or officers respectively are hereby impowered, from time to time, to make or change, any former law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding) to exercise the said office or offices, until such time as the person or persons having such office or offices shall voluntarily, in the Court of Chancery, before the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper for the time being, or in the Court of King's Bench, take the said oaths, and receive the sacrament according to law, and subscribe the said declaration, and so as all and every the deputy or deputies so as aforesaid to be appointed, take the said oaths, receive the sacrament, and subscribe the said declaration from time to time, as they shall happen to be so appointed, in manner as by this act such officers whose deputies they be, are appointed to do, and so as such deputies be, from time to time, approved of by the king's majesty, under his privy signet: but that all and every the peers of this realm shall have, hold, and enjoy what is provided for, as aforesaid, and all and every other person or persons before-mentioned, denoted or intended within this proviso, shall have, hold, or enjoy what is provided for, as aforesaid, notwithstanding any incapacity or disability mentioned in this act.

XII. Provided also, that the said peers and every of them may take the said oaths, and make the said subscription, and deliver the said certificates before the peers sitting in parliament, if the parliament be sitting within the time limited for doing thereof, and in the intervals of parliament, in the High Court of Chancery, in which respective courts all the said proceedings are to be recorded in manner aforesaid.

XIII. Provided always, that no married woman, or person under the age of eighteen years, or being beyond or upon the seas, or found, by the lawful oaths of twelve men, to be *non compos mentis*, and so being and remaining at the end of Trinity term in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and seventy-three, having any office, shall by virtue of this act, lose or forfeit any such his or her office (other than such married woman during the life of her husband only) for any neglect or refusal of taking the oaths, and doing the other things required by this act to be done by persons having offices, so as such respective persons, within four months after the death of her husband, coming to the age of eighteen years, returning into this kingdom, and becoming of sound mind, shall respectively take the said oaths, and perform all other things in manner as by this act is appointed for persons to do, who shall happen to have any office or offices to them given or fallen after the end of the said Trinity term.

XIV. Provided also, that any person, who by his or her neglect or refusal, according to this act, shall lose or forfeit any office, may be capable, by a new grant, of the said office, or of any other, and to have and hold the same again, such person taking the said oaths, and doing all other things required by this act, so as such office be not granted to, and actually enjoyed by some other person at the time of the re-granting thereof.

XV. Provided also, that nothing in this act contained shall extend to make any forfeiture, disability, or incapacity in, by, or upon any non-commissioned officer or officers in his majesty's navy, if such officer or officers shall only subscribe the declaration therein required, in manner as the same is directed.

XVI. Provided also, that nothing in this act contained, shall extend to prejudice George Earl of Bristol, or Anne Countess of Bristol, his wife, in the pension or pensions granted to them by patent under the great seal of England, bearing date the fifteenth day of July, in the year of our

Lord one thousand six hundred sixty-and-nine, being in lieu of a just debt due to the said earl from his majesty, particularly expressed in the said patent.

XVII. Provided also, that this act, or anything therein contained, shall not extend to the office of any high constable, petty constable, tithingman, headborough, overseer of the poor, churchwardens, surveyor of the highways, or any like inferior civil office, or to any office of forester, or keeper of any park, chase, warren, or game, or of bailiff of any manor of lands, or to any like private offices, or to any person or persons having only any the before-mentioned, or any the like offices.

XXXV.

The Toleration Act.

An Act for Exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects, Dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain laws.

FORASMUCH as some ease to scrupulous consciences in the exercise of religion may be an effectual means to unite their majesties' protestant subjects in interest and affection,

II. Be it enacted, by the king's and queen's most excellent majesties, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that neither the statute made in the three-and-twentieth year of the reign of the late queen Elizabeth, entitled, an Act to retain the queen's majesty's subjects in their due obedience; nor the statute made in the twenty-ninth year of the said

queen, entitled, an Act for the more speedy and due execution of certain branches of the statute made in the three-and-twentieth year of the queen's majesty's reign, viz., the afore-said act; nor that branch or clause of a statute made in the first year of the reign of the said queen, entitled, an Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and Administration of the Sacraments; whereby all persons, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, are required to resort to their parish church or chapel, or some usual place where the common prayer shall be used, upon pain of punishment by the censures of the church, and also upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit for every such offence twelve pence; nor the statute made in the third year of the reign of the late king James the first, entitled, an Act for the better Discovering and Repressing Popish Recusants; nor that other statute made in the same year, entitled, an Act to prevent and avoid Dangers which may grow by Popish Recusants; nor any other law or statute of this realm, made against papists or popish recusants, except the statute made in the five-and-twentieth year of king Charles II, entitled, an Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants; and except also the statute made in the thirteenth year of the said king Charles II, entitled, an Act for the more effectual preserving the King's Person and Government by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament; shall be construed to extend to any person or persons dissenting from the church of England, that shall take the oaths mentioned in a statute made this present parliament, entitled, an Act for removing and preventing all Questions and Disputes concerning the assembling and sitting of this present parliament; and shall make and subscribe the declaration mentioned in a statute made in the thirtieth year of the reign of king Charles II, entitled, an Act to prevent Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament: which oaths and declaration the justices of peace at the general sessions of the peace to be held for the county or place where such person shall live, are hereby required to tender and

administer to such persons as shall offer themselves to take, make, and subscribe the same, and thereof to keep a register: and likewise none of the persons aforesaid shall give or pay, as any fee or reward, to any officer or officers belonging to the court aforesaid, above the sum of sixpence, nor that more than once for his or their entry of his taking the said oaths, and making and subscribing the said declaration; nor above the further sum of sixpence for any certificate of the same to be made out and signed by the officer or officers of the said court.

III. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every person and persons already convicted or prosecuted in order to conviction of recusancy, by judgment, information, action of debt, or otherwise, grounded upon the aforesaid statutes, or any of them, that shall take the said oaths mentioned in the said statute made this present parliament, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, in the Court of Exchequer, or assizes, or general or quarter sessions to be held for the county where such person lives, and to be thence respectively certified into the Exchequer, shall be thenceforth exempted and discharged from all the penalties, seizures, forfeitures, judgments, and executions, incurred by force of any the aforesaid statutes, without any composition, fee, or further charge whatsoever.

IV. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every person and persons that shall, as aforesaid, take the said oaths, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, shall not be liable to any pains, penalties, or forfeitures, mentioned in an act made in the five and thirtieth year of the reign of the late queen Elizabeth, entitled, an Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's Subjects in their due Obedience; nor in an act made in the two and twentieth year of the reign of the late king Charles II, entitled, an Act to prevent and suppress Seditious Conventicles; nor shall any of the said persons be prosecuted in any ecclesiastical court, for or by reason of their non-conforming to the church of England.

V. Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority

aforesaid, that if any assembly of persons dissenting from the church of England shall be had in any place for religious worship with the doors locked, barred, or bolted during any time of such meeting together, all and every person or persons, that shall come to and be at such meeting, shall not receive any benefit from this law, but be liable to all the pains and penalties of all the aforesaid laws recited in this act, for such their meeting, notwithstanding his taking the oaths, and his making and subscribing the declaration aforesaid.

VI. Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt any of the persons aforesaid from paying of tithes or other parochial duties, or any other duties to the church or minister, nor from any prosecution in any ecclesiastical court, or elsewhere, for the same.

VII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any person dissenting from the church of England, as aforesaid, shall hereafter be chosen or otherwise appointed to bear the office of high constable, or petit constable, churchwarden, overseer of the poor, or any other parochial or ward office, and such person shall scruple to take upon him any of the said offices in regard of the oaths, or any other matter or thing required by the law to be taken or done in respect of such office, every such person shall and may execute such office or employment by a sufficient deputy, by him to be provided, that shall comply with the laws on this behalf. Provided always, the said deputy be allowed and approved by such person or persons, in such manner as such officer or officers respectively should by law have been allowed and approved.

VIII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person dissenting from the church of England in holy orders, or pretended holy orders, or pretending to holy orders, nor any preacher or teacher of any congregation of dissenting protestants, that shall make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, and take the said oaths at the general or quarter sessions of the peace to be held for the county,

town, parts, or division where such person lives, which court is hereby empowered to administer the same, and shall also declare his approbation of and subscribe the articles of religion mentioned in the statute made in the thirteenth year of the reign of the late queen Elizabeth, except the thirty-fourth, thirty-fifth, and thirty-sixth, and these words of the twentieth article, viz., "the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith, and yet" shall be liable to any of the pains or penalties mentioned in an act made in the seventeenth year of the reign of king Charles II, entitled, an Act for restraining Non-conformists from inhabiting in Corporations; nor the penalties mentioned in the aforesaid act made in the two-and-twentieth year of his said late majesty's reign, for or by reason of such persons preaching at any meeting for the exercise of religion; nor to the penalty of one hundred pounds mentioned in an act made in the thirteenth and fourteenth of king Charles, II, entitled, an Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies: and for establishing the Form of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of England, for officiating in any congregation for the exercise of religion permitted and allowed by this act.

IX. Provided always, that the making and subscribing the said declaration, and the taking the said oaths, and making the declaration of approbation and subscription to the said articles, in manner as aforesaid, by every respective person or persons herein before mentioned, at such general or quarter sessions of the peace, as aforesaid, shall be then and there entred of record in the said court, for which sixpence shall be paid to the clerk of the peace, and no more: provided that such person shall not at any time preach in any place, but with the doors not locked, barred, or bolted, as aforesaid.

X. And whereas some dissenting protestants scruple the baptising of infants, be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every person in pretended holy orders, or pretending to holy orders, or preacher, or teacher, that shall subscribe the

aforesaid articles of religion, except before excepted, and also except part of the seven-and-twentieth article touching infant baptism, and shall take the said oaths, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, in manner aforesaid, every such person shall enjoy all the privileges, benefits, and advantages, which any other dissenting minister, as aforesaid, might have or enjoy by virtue of this act.

XI. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every teacher or preacher in holy orders, or pretended holy orders, that is a minister, preacher, or teacher of a congregation, that shall take the oaths herein required, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, and also subscribe such of the aforesaid articles of the church of England, as are required by this act in manner aforesaid, shall be thenceforth exempted from serving upon any jury, or from being chosen or appointed to bear the office of churchwarden, overseer of the poor, or any other parochial or ward office, or other office in any hundred of any shire, city, town, parish, division, or wapentake.

XII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every justice of the peace may at any time hereafter require any person, that goes to any meeting for exercise of religion, to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, and also to take the said oaths or declaration of fidelity hereinafter mentioned, in case such person scruples the taking of an oath, and upon refusal thereof, such justice of the peace is hereby required to commit such person to prison without bail or mainprize, and to certify the name of such person to the next general or quarter sessions of the peace to be held for that county, city, town, part, or division where such person then resides, and if such person so committed shall upon a second tender at the general or quarter sessions refuse to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, such person refusing shall be then and there recorded, and he shall be taken thenceforth to all intents and purposes for a popish recusant convict, and suffer accordingly, and incur all the penalties and forfeitures of all the aforesaid laws.

XIII. And whereas there are certain other persons, dissenters from the church of England, who scruple the taking of any oath, be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every such person shall make and subscribe the aforesaid declaration, and also this declaration of fidelity following, viz. :—

I, A. B., do sincerely promise and solemnly declare before God and the world, that I will be true and faithful to king William and queen Mary ; and I do solemnly profess and declare, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and renounce, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm.

And shall subscribe a profession of their Christian belief in these words—

I, A. B., profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, his Eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, one God, blessed for evermore ; and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration.

Which declarations and subscription shall be made and entered of record at the general quarter sessions of the peace for the county, city, or place where every such person shall then reside. And every such person that shall make and subscribe the two declarations and profession aforesaid, being thereunto required, shall be exempted from all the pains and penalties of all and every the aforementioned statutes made against popish recusants, or protestant nonconformists, and also from the penalties of an act made in the fifth year of the reign of the late queen Elizabeth, entitled, an Act for the Assurance of the Queen's Royal Power over all Estates and Subjects within her Dominions, for or by reason of such persons not taking or refusing to take the oath mentioned in the said act ; and also from the penalties

of an act made in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the reign of king Charles the Second, entitled, an Act for preventing Mischiefs that may arise by certain persons called Quakers refusing to take lawful oaths; and enjoy all other the benefits, privileges, and advantages, under the like limitations, provisos, and conditions, which any other dissenters should or ought to enjoy by virtue of this act.

XIV. Provided always, and be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that in case any person shall refuse to take the said oaths, when tendered to them, which every justice of the peace is hereby empowered to do, such person shall not be admitted to make and subscribe the two Declarations aforesaid, though required thereunto either before any justice of the peace, or at the general or quarter sessions before or after any conviction of popish recusants, as aforesaid, unless such person can, within thirty-one days after such tender of the Declarations to him, produce two sufficient protestant witnesses, to testify upon oath that they believe him to be a protestant dissenter; or a certificate under the hands of four protestants, who are conformable to the church of England, or have taken the oaths and subscribed the Declaration above mentioned, and shall also produce a certificate, under the hands and seals of six, or more, sufficient men of the congregation to which he belongs, owning him for one of them.

XV. Provided also, and be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that until such certificate, under the hands of six of his congregation, as aforesaid, be produced, and two protestant witnesses come to attest his being a protestant dissenter, or a certificate under the hands of four protestants, as aforesaid, be produced, the justice of the peace shall, and hereby is required to take a recognizance with two sureties in the penal sum of fifty pounds, to be levied of his goods and chattels, lands and tenements, to the use of the king's and queen's majesties, their heirs and successors, for his producing the same; and if he cannot give such security, to commit him to prison, there to remain until he has

produced such certificates, or two witnesses, as aforesaid.

XVI. Provided always, and it is the true intent and meaning of this act, that all the laws made and provided for the frequenting of divine service on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, shall be still in force, and executed against all persons that offend against the said laws, except such persons come to some congregation or assembly of religious worship, allowed or permitted by this act.

XVII. Provided always, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that neither this act, nor any clause, article or thing herein contained, shall extend, or be construed to extend, to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any papist or popish recusant whatsoever, or any person that shall deny, in his preaching or writing, the doctrine of the blessed trinity, as it is declared in the aforesaid articles of religion.

XVIII. Provided always, and be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that if any person or persons, at any time or times after the tenth day of June, do and shall willingly and of purpose, maliciously or contemptuously come into any cathedral or parish church, chapel, or other congregation permitted by this act, and disquiet or disturb the same, or misuse any preacher or teacher, such person or persons, upon proof thereof before any justice of peace, by two or more sufficient witnesses, shall find two sureties, to be bound by recognizance in the penal sum of fifty pounds, and in default of such sureties, shall be committed to prison, there to remain till the next general or quarter sessions; and upon conviction of the said offence, at the said general or quarter sessions, shall suffer the pain and penalty of twenty pounds, to the use of the king's and queen's majesties, their heirs and successors.

XIX. Provided always, that no congregation or assembly for religious worship shall be permitted or allowed by this

act, until the place of such meeting shall be certified to the bishop of the diocese, or to the archdeacon of that archdeaconry, or to the justices of the peace at the general or quarter sessions of the peace for the county, city, or place in which such meeting shall be held, and registered in the said bishop's or archdeacon's court respectively, or recorded at the said general or quarter sessions; the register, or clerk of the peace whereof respectively, is hereby required to register the same, and to give certificate thereof to such person as shall demand the same, for which there shall be no greater fee nor reward taken, than the sum of sixpence.

THE END.

PUBLICATIONS

OF

THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE.

- I. OBJECTS AND PLANS OF THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE. Price 3s. per 100.
 - II. A SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS WHICH ISSUED IN THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY. Price 2*d.* each.
-

TRACT SERIES.

1. THE FIRST PROTEST. Price 2*d.*
 2. THE BOOK OF SPORTS. Price 2*d.*
 3. THE STAR CHAMBER AND HIGH COMMISSION. Price 2*d.*
 4. THE EJECTION OF THE EPISCOPALIANS. Price 2*d.*
 5. THE SAVOY CONFERENCE. Price 2*d.*
 6. THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY. Price 2*d.*
 7. THE FAREWELL SUNDAY. Price 2*d.*
 8. THE EFFECTS OF THE EJECTION. Price 2*d.*
 9. ON THE PRAYER BOOK. Price 2*d.*
 10. ON CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION. Price 2*d.*
 11. THE ACT OF TOLERATION. Price 2*d.*
-

LECTURE SERIES.

- I. THE STORY OF THE EJECTION. By the REV. THOMAS McCRIE, D.D. Price 3*d.*
 - II. FIDELITY TO CONSCIENCE. By the REV. A. McLAREN, B.A. Price 3*d.*
 - III. NONCONFORMITY IN 1662 AND IN 1862. By the REV. R. W. DALE, M.A. Price 3*d.*
 - IV. THE DESIGN AND EFFECTS OF THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY. By the REV. R. HALLEY, D.D. Price 3*d.*
-

LONDON :

W. KENT & CO., 23, PATERNOSTER ROW,

AND AT

THE OFFICE OF THE COMMITTEE, 10, BROAD STREET BUILDINGS.

Handwritten notes at the top left corner, including the number '100' and some illegible scribbles.

A vertical column of faint, illegible text or markings running down the left side of the page.



